



Plan, after January 1, 1996, students would begin paying back their loans only after they wore their cap and gown. The House plan also would raise the cost PLUS loans 75 percent by increasing the maximum rate from 9 to 11 percent. The change would affect 340,000 borrowers and could increase parents' total payments as much as \$5000. The bill would also cap annual PLUS loan borrowing at \$15,000.

Another phase of the plan, to be implemented in the future, contains cuts that would seriously affect over half a million graduate students by increasing the cost of loans from 13 to 50 percent. An average student who completes a two-year master's program would owe an additional \$2,250 without interest exemption for a total of \$19,250, which would increase their monthly payments by \$27. Ph.D. students would take an enormous hit - eight years of schooling without interest exemption would add \$30,916 to their loan for a total of \$96,416. This would represent a 100 percent increase and raise monthly payments from \$793 to \$1,167.

Students were not only cut from aid, but colleges and universities were also targeted. In the Senate a .85-percent tax was proposed on an institution's total student federal student loan volume, which if implemented would cost Columbia University \$714,000 a year. The Senate also proposed to completely eliminate direct lending as of June 30, 1996, which would force all colleges and universities to return to bank based student loans. The Department of Education also did not escape cuts - the entire department may possibly close in seven years.

"It's an issue of accessibility to higher education," said Sarah Katz, Representative for Government Affairs for Columbia College Student Council. She continued, "Without it, the nature of this university will change. You will see that this campus will be a campus of the affluent. You have a nation shooting itself in the foot when they cut education. Without an educated populace, you're not furthering yourself as a country."

The potential cuts may affect the makeup of college student bodies nationwide. Thomas Mortenson, publisher of the journal *Postsecondary Education Opportunity*, says in the October 13, 1995 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* that in 1979 affluent high school students were four times as likely to go to college than poor ones. In 1993, the U.S. Census Bureau reports wealthy high school students were 13 times as likely to go to college than poorest. Despite statistics like these, the cuts in student aid still directly hurt students from lower income families. Pell Grants, a type of financial aid given to students that requires no return payments, were also targeted for \$481 million in cuts. The new plan would close out Pell grants to students whose parents earn \$25,000 or more and totally cut out 285,000 students who are annually awarded \$400 dollar Pell Grants by introducing a minimum award amount.

"It's not just about people on financial aid, but it has something to do with every student," said Katz. "We know it would disproportionately affect the minority student body population because of the unfortunate way race and class are separated. It would make it impossible for students who are totally supported on financial aid to attend a university like Columbia."

Katz and other student government leaders have planned several strategies

## Columbia University Federal Student Aid Program 1993-4

Type	# Awarded	Dollar Amount
Pell Grants	960	1,647,558
FSEOG	1,966	1,219,175
FWS	6,855	5,621,486

Type	# Awarded	Dollar Amount
PLUS Loans	186	1,647,558
SLS Loans	2,624	15,985,768
Stafford Loans (Subsidized)	112	539,198

Type	# Awarded	New Federal Capital (US \$)	Total Expenditure (US\$)
Stafford Loans (Subsidized)	4,406	1,314,982	5,728,989

Type	# Awarded	New Federal Capital (US \$)	Total Expenditure (US \$)
Stafford Loans (Subsidized)	4,831	28,248,504	31,435,550

(Adapted by National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.)

In their part as a campus to protest the cuts. This fall approximately 1,000 groups of students were sent out by Columbia University students to protest the student aid cuts. Each student sent three cards - one to each of their two Senators and one to their Congressman. Voter registration activities, a lobby trip to protest New York state aid cuts, and a plan with other campus groups to invite speakers to the Columbia campus were other approaches that the students created to express their opposition to these cuts.

"Apart from random people, people are extremely reactive," said Katz. "Some people still feel detached from the whole government process. They feel they're not being heard as a single person. We're (CCSC) just trying to give them anything they can do - like sign a postcard. People seem very receptive to help in any way they can."

Besides students, administrators at Columbia have also been actively lobbying. "Both the president and provost have been very active," said Ellen Smith, Director of Federal Relations at Columbia University. "They've both made several trips to Washington and I've also been working with other universities to protest the cuts."

The Columbia campus' reaction reflects a national movement to stop the

educational cuts. From the original Budget Resolution plans to the current stance of Congress, student financial aid has gained widespread support on and off Capitol Hill after a strong public outcry. Currently student loans seem to have gained most of its original financial status, but several students, such as graduates, still face severe cuts. The final student aid package will not be finalized until President Clinton either signs or vetoes the final bill presented after both the Senate and House reconcile their current bills. "Things definitely look better than they did, said Smith. The biggest problem remains with a general attitude toward graduate students."

The American voting population seems firm-footed in their stance to preserve student financial aid. According to a national public opinion survey of registered voters conducted by KRC Research and Consulting with a 3 percent margin of error, nearly three-quarters believe that making it possible for students to go to college should not be sacrificed in the name of deficit reduction. 68 percent support maintaining federal funding for student aid programs even if it prolongs deficit reduction efforts. Finally, nearly seven in 10 said their member of Congress' stance on student aid would affect their vote in the next election. These opinions have been at the heart of an opposition that has stopped the slashing tide against student financial aid. Groups such as the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) have sponsored a Save Student Aid Hotline phone number that connects students directly with their congressional offices. The NAICU claims that 10,000 constituents called the members of Congress that helped protect the interest exemption on loans for undergraduate students, Federal Work Study, and certain grant programs from any cuts. "It's been the public outcry that's changed this momentum to cutting student aid, said Smith."

Regardless of the final bill signed by President Clinton, supporters for a strong student financial aid system continue to intensely lobby, citing its importance to the American belief that opportunities in this country are for anyone. "Education society would consist only of the affluent if cuts like these were implemented," said Bell, who continues to take advantage of his Columbia education supported on financial aid. "Higher education should be available to everyone."

## International Affairs

### The Mullahs Move towards Democracy

By Mohammad Ahmad Qayyum

*This paper compares the theocratic institutions installed by Ayatollah Khomeini immediately after the Iranian Revolution to the institutions and policies that currently exist, after Khomeini's death. He argues that, with pragmatism taking over, elements of democracy have come into the Iranian political system.*

Iran, since the revolution, has been experiencing democratic and counter-democratic tendencies; the interplay of these tendencies has brought about the evolution of the political system and institutions of the country. The Islamic revolution of Iran, like several other revolutions, seems to have blazed a trail for both pragmatists and hard-liners. In Iran, one line, identifying itself with Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini is the so-called hard-liners, regard themselves as the revolutions authentic followers. These people controlled Iran for the earlier post-revolution period, and their policies characterized an authoritarian bent in the political system. But because the implacable and unalterable opposition to what Khomeini considered as the imperialist designs of the West did not produce the intended results, the other line, the pragmatic line, has prevailed: its leader, Hashemi-Rafsanjani has emerged as the supreme leader of his country (after Khomeini's death in 1989), and has set in motion his pragmatic strategies. Rafsanjani's line of reasoning has been that Iran with its depleted resources could not afford to wage ceaseless ideological and other forms of struggle against the West. After the Iran-Iraq war as well as certain revolutionary emphases on developing the public sector had almost exhausted the country's economy, radical restructuring and reflation is needed and is possible only through a new strategy of maximum encouragement to the private sector.

This paper will seek to compare the theocratic institutions installed by Ayatollah Khomeini immediately after the Iranian Revolution to the (more democratic - this paper will attempt to prove) institutions and policies that currently exist, after Khomeini's death. It will seek to show that with pragmatism elements of democracy have come into the Iranian political system. Today Iran while not a perfect democracy, is closer to the ideal of democracy than it has ever been since the revolution. As parameters for democracy in our analysis in this paper we shall use the standards we have developed through discussions in class: the parameter of individual rights; the notion of accountability of the leaders to the public; the concepts of citizens being protected from the government, and being protected from fellow citizens; the essence of individual and group participation, debate and opposition in the political system; and the provision of equal opportunity and economic equitabili-

#### POST-REVOLUTION KHOMEINISM: THE HARD-LINE RULES:

The Iranian regime under Khomeini was more concerned than anything with imposing its ideology, and as such, had an authoritarian (non-democratic) bent.