

Bryce Jordan

# The secret selection

On October 14, the press was invited to University Park and a special trustees meeting where a new P.S.U. president would be voted in.

It was a sham. The decision was made long before. At least one radio newscast reported Bryce Jordan's appointment while we were en route to University Park—before the trustees meeting started.

The actual meeting turned out to be a puff performance unanimously electing Jordan with scarcely a chance for dissent.

After the meeting, the press conference carried on the facade. Jordan's "spontaneous" comments were as canned as the press release packages handed out.

The front stage theatrics and back stage decision making seems to be typical of the entire selection process of our new president.

Since then much has been said and written about the lack of student and faculty input and opportunity to meet the final candidates for the position.

Barry Lee Myers, associate professor of business administration at Main Campus

said: "There is overwhelming disbelief regarding the lengths to which fiat in decision making has gone this past year...I think the faculty feels it is important that a broad cross-section of the University community—faculty, students, administrators—get an opportunity to meet with and hear the views of the final group of candidates."



It was rightly felt that many faculty members and students know more about the University's functioning than do some trustees, many of whom are independent business people.

We agree with the committee members who said confiden-

tiality was necessary for early presidential candidates. But after the 301 candidates were reduced to eight, the interviews should have included a wider student and faculty base.

Walter J. Conti, board president, promised the faculty and student members of the Presidential Search and Screen Committee an opportunity to interview the final candidate before the recommendation was made to the board. However, that interview consisted of only a few words, moments before the election. Why? Why the need for such great secrecy?

Perhaps some clue lies within the bureaucratic structure itself. Perhaps even Oswald, Jordan's former boss at the University of Kentucky, hand-picked his successor after all. We don't know, but we do know that the selection process itself created suspicions that didn't need to exist.

Moreover, the Presidential Search and Screen Committee was picked by the Presidential Selection Committee, but who selected the selection committee members? Quentin Wood, then president of the Board of Trustees, did and he was named chairman of the committee and announced the names of trustees who would serve on the Trustee Presidential Selection Committee.

We don't claim to have any answers to these questions, but we do feel that more exchange



within the University groups would have precluded the shadowy areas.

The University Faculty Senate, the Undergraduate Student Government and the Council of Academic Deans probably should have had access to discuss educational and administrative philosophies with the final candidates for president.

We agree with the editors of the *Weekly Collegian* who feel that "As Bryce Jordan familiarizes himself with the University over the next nine months, he should be aware that many students and faculty members are dissatisfied with the selection process. He would do well to transcend the selection process and present the University with an open-minded chief executive."

*Pat Wenger*

## Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor:

Having observed with great amusement the controversy surrounding the recent showing of *Debbie Does Dallas* at Capitol Campus, I instituted an immediate search on campus for anyone who was forced at gunpoint to attend. I found no one.

I also looked for anyone who changed their opinion, or became more exploitive of women after they had seen this film. Again, the search was fruitless. Why?

It does not follow that because one views a pornographic film, one becomes more exploitive of women. Similarly, it does not follow that because an autonomous student committee chose to show this film, the University condones exploitation. The goal of a college education is to explore all facets of life, including potentially distasteful facets like poverty, nuclear war, and pornography. It is not the goal of a college to exclude those parts of life which certain people find immoral. An individual's objective in this case is to learn the facts and make his own choice, and not to hide the facts to preclude anyone else from doing the same. Once this choice is made, one can either view the film or hit the "off" button.

Censorship is one increasing reality with the advent of New Right thought. Intolerance of divergent views is another. I challenge anyone to prove any harmful effects that resulted from the showing of this film. The fact is, this "total exploitation of women" could not have been possible without the enthusiastic cooperation of a woman: Debbie herself. If one were to ask Debbie if she was exploited, she would probably laugh...all the way to the bank.

Phil Intrieri

# Capitol Times

Vol. 17, No. 2

November 8, 1982

Published by the students of The Capitol Campus of The Pennsylvania State University, Middletown, PA, 17057. PHONE: (717) 944-4970.

Executive Editor ..... Pat Wenger  
 Editor ..... George P. Yanoshik, Jr.  
 Production Manager ..... Marsha L. Larsen  
 Layout Editor ..... Jerry Trently, Jr.  
 Photography Editor ..... Joe Hart  
 Assistant Photography Editor ..... Mark Clouser  
 Sports Editor ..... Robert Rejmaniak  
 Copy Editors ..... Mary Diehl  
 ..... Barbara Myers  
 Business Manager ..... Charles R. Cobourn, III

### STAFF MEMBERS

Monica Auld  
 Annette Bux-Cremo  
 Judith Faruquee  
 Joe Guberman  
 Kim Guzzi  
 Philip Intrieri  
 Donna Kirker  
 Sheryl Machita  
 Mike Markle  
 William Negley  
 Marcia Rogers  
 Betsy Sheehan  
 Bud Smith  
 Ronald Smith

Don Strausburger

The Capitol Times welcomes letters from readers. Letters intended for publication must indicate the writer's college affiliation, if any. All letters MUST be signed by the writer. Unsigned letters cannot be printed. A writer's name may be withheld upon request. Letters should be typewritten and double spaced; and, any material that is libelous or does not conform to publication standards will be edited or rejected.