

EDITORIAL

Concerned Students Should Get Involved

Not included in our brief list of comments made by people during the course of our readership survey (page 8), was one student who said:

"Despite publicity and lip service to the contrary, the atmosphere and teaching methods at Capitol Campus tend to be quite conservative and traditional. Perhaps the C.C. Reader could editorialize on the possibility of bringing our school into the America of the 1970's?"

Sir, your comment is the familiar one to anyone who's ever complained about how the "system" works, in universities in particular.

I began college during the late 1960's, and during that period students were concerned with a lot of things, not the least of which was the quality and methods of their particular institution. Life magazine, among others, help keep this concern alive by regularly regaling America with photos of students dissenting against their university as well as their government.

Over a decade has passed since the opening shot of this period was fired in California with the Free Speech movement's protests at Berkley. And in the time that's elapsed since then, I no longer picture student dissent as taking over the college president's office, and having the protest leader sit at the president's desk with his feet propped up on it, smoking the former occupant's cigars. Instead, I've come to see it as a necessary and ongoing process of responsible criticism, debate, protest and wrangling. And, as an obligation to participate by all students.

You may be right in any criticism you have of Capitol Campus, but to merely make such a comment on a readership survey and to leave it at that is to forget the process and a hard learned lesson for American Academia.

Just bitching to each other never helps. Get involved!

During the Winter term a "concerned students" meeting will be held, where students will be able to exchange arguments and ideas with Messrs. Dressler, South, McDermott and Deardorf. It's at that time and all such others that concerned students, formed around any idea, should organize and present their case to the university.

To present any new idea requires time and, "bringing pressure to bear" is the best way of speeding it up.

Letters to the Editor

Your article, "Professor fights retirement," (November 20) is indeed disturbing, but to better appreciate the situation a broader perspective has to be established.

The pertinent question is not "whether Ambrose Klain is harassing the Regional Planning Program" but "whether there is a path provided by the University for Ambrose Klain to process his grievance." In fact, there is no well-defined procedure which will enable Ambrose Klain to obtain due process for a decision of

vital importance to him. The University remains deaf to the faculty demands for proper grievance machinery. Faculty participation in the grievance process is nonexistent. Grieved faculty have two choices: submit and vanish, or question and be considered bothersome. Ambrose Klain is not the troublemaker portrayed in your article, but a capable faculty member seeking due process and his civil rights.

George Gumes
Associate Professor

The C.C. Reader is published by the students at Capitol Campus every two weeks during the fall, winter and spring terms. Printing is done at the Middletown Press and Journal. The Reader office is located in W-129, Main Building.

The opinions expressed in this newspaper do not necessarily represent the views of the students, faculty or staff of Capitol Campus or The Pennsylvania State University.

Paid advertisements in the Reader are not necessarily endorsed by the editors or staff.

- Editor-in-Chief..... Phyllis Schaeffer
- Associate Editor..... Gerry Achenbach
- Assistant Editor..... John Stanchak
- Photography Editor..... Mark Feldman
- Business Manager..... Tom Grogan
- Advertising Manager..... Robert Bennett
- Staff..... Jean Beatty, Sherry Lukoski, Rebecca Rebok, Keltha Kessler, Virginia Lehman, Deborah Young, William Kane, Vern Martin, John Leierzapf, Mike Barnett, Cliff Eshbach, Mark Switzer, Pattie Stanchak, Ray Martin
- Assistant Advertising Manager..... Robin Platts
- Advertising Staff..... Beth Kopas, Wayne Metheny
- Hot Lion Coordinator..... Paul Balile, Social Committee Chairman
- Technical Adviser..... James Ferrer
- Faculty Adviser..... Dr. Melvyn Haber
- Typesetters..... Deborah Young, Mike Barnett, Gerry Achenbach, Karen Pickens, Robert L. Fisher Jr.

The Truth About 1776

During the observation of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of the United States as an independent country, we find ourselves conjuring up images of the founding fathers compelled to resort to arms to oppose a misguided, if not quite tyrannical ruler, George III. Any thoughts of radicalism are too reminiscent of the unpleasant 1960's to be a part of our bicentennial celebration. yet the strategies of the patriots of 1776 were similar to the radical tactics of the recent past. A brief review of the strategies of mass meetings and urban guerilla warfare during the years 1765-76 illustrates the parallel between the American Revolution and our experience during the 1960's when radicals called mass meetings to demand immediate changes in American public policies, an end to a government unresponsive to the people and premeditated assaults and kidnappings of individuals who were considered enemies of the people.

Initially, the revolutionary radicals held mass meetings to demand changes of British policies which they deemed unacceptable. Their strategy was to produce a display of power which promoted these ends. The use of mass meetings, which implied a threat of violence if change was not forthcoming, demonstrated popular sentiment for change and made clear to the British government the consequences of delay would be additional turmoil. The first demonstration of

colonial solidarity in opposition to British policy came in protest to the enactment by Parliament of a Stamp Tax in 1765. Mass meetings, which were held throughout the colonies, called for the immediate repeal of the tax. Several months after these mass meetings, Parliament repealed the Stamp Tax. Thus the radicals were encouraged by this act of Parliament to utilize this tool to protest other unpopular British policies. But the boldest use of mass meetings came in Pennsylvania where the radicals went beyond protest and called for the end to the proprietary government. Declaring the Pennsylvania colonial government unresponsive to the will of the people, a mass meeting met in the spring of 1776 and organized a revolutionary government of the people.

Another useful tool of radical strategy aimed at destroying the political government in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, urban guerilla warfare began during the

Faculty Forum

late 1760's. This strategy eroded the political authority of government officials and their civilian supporters outside the government. The tactics used by the revolutionary guerillas included direct physical attack, intimidation and arrest of alleged enemies of the people.

The earliest victims of physical assault were customs officials. In Providence, Rhode Island tactics included beating, stripping,



tarring, feathering and strangling of the unfortunate Jesse Saville. Other enemies of the people were eventually brought before committees that persuaded them to reconsider their view towards radicalism. These meetings were always cloaked with the rhetoric of constituting bodies that derived their authority from the people. Yet the accused were summoned without warrant and evidence was usually scant regarding the alleged violation of the people's rights. By 1775, these committees also assumed the tasks of arresting and silencing considerable numbers of citizens.

Thus by means of radical strategies aimed at revolution, the colonies experienced a breakdown in law and order which ultimately led to the overthrow of the legitimate government in America. Therefore, when we speak of the bicentennial, an awareness of just how radical that era was needs to be kept in mind. The proximity of the turbulent 1960's to our own life and the similarity between contemporary strategies and the founding fathers should help us maintain a balanced perspective of what 1776 was all about.

by Dr. Lem Molovinsky
Assistant Professor American Studies and History

...And More Letters—

Now, Now, N.O.W.

Dear Editor:

I read your article in The Reader dated November 6, 1975, subject: "N.O.W. Puts Heat on Banks."

I feel that N.O.W. has been a sacred cow but I am so tired of hearing claims from them, I'm going to make a few comments.

Exactly what they accuse the banks of doing (catering to males) they are now doing through their "feminist bank" (or credit union). They are advocating a financial institution that caters to females.

Any female who has anything to do with this type action is being used. I am a male, and I will deal with that institution that pays the best interest and gives me the best service. The average and above average "person" will do the same and not be bilked by a few self-serving females (who are being duped by a few shrewd individuals willing to take advantage of a lot of name-calling).

The woman who claims she is being "bilked", "used" and "down-trodden" by the fair sex (or someone pretending concern for them).

They are both negative in their approach.

It is time we all united under a common banner of helping one another in this world that is so concerned with selfish motives. With so many adults running around with selfish motives, how can we expect children to be different.

I know many of you will call me a male-chauvinist pig. I will still hold the door open for you, ladies. When you "grunt" instead of saying "thank-you", I'll smile and say "you're welcome". It is my nature to be polite - but not hoodwinked.

Organize politically - not for someone who will cater to men OR women - but who will serve all of us honestly and fairly.

When you go for true equality, that is one thing. When you want rights without equal responsibility, that is another thing.

I see where women are now going to the military academies. They will not, however, have to have their heads shaved like the men, and they have also modified the physical training (example: push-ups). In plain language I ask if this is true equality. Honest persons will say "no". Why isn't N.O.W. demanding that all women in the academies be

treated EXACTLY the way men are treated?

If you really want equality, you should be willing to accept the same hardships, heartaches and pain. Anything short of this is NOT equality but equal rights without responsibilities. If you accept that, then the males will not have equal rights because you will be asking for more from them (which they give in most cases now).

If I saw a woman getting less pay just because of her sex, I'd be the first to come to her rescue and help anyway I could. If her job description is modified even slightly, it is NOT the same job.

All I ask is open mindedness from you readers - maybe we should have a Saturday workshop to organize in a united way - for good and useful purposes.

If N.O.W. would really believe in equality, they would have no trouble getting support. Their caustic attitude breeds retaliation. You'll attract more bees to your hive with honey than vinegar. Try it - we like it.

Robert Kelley
Cumberland-Perry
Technical School