

PARKING: 15¢ PER DAY IS TOO MUCH!

Each term, shortly after registration, the Business Office issues a statement to the effect that all cars parked in the Behrend Campus parking lots must have stickers on them. The cost of these "stickers" is \$7.50 per term. If nearly 450 day students buy these and other forms of parking permits for three terms, the total revenue from parking lots is in the neighborhood of \$10,000. (The exact figures and tabulations were not made known.) The Nittany Cub does not know what this money is used for, although a logical conclusion would be maintenance. Ten-thousand dollars is certainly a high price to pay for maintenance for two black-top lots and a muddy gravel lot.

It is the suggestion of the staff of the Nittany Cub that the term parking fee of \$7.50 be lowered to \$5.00, and that all other rates be lowered accordingly. The students and faculty should then feel obligated to fully comply rather than defy Campus parking rules and regulations. If support is given to this suggestion by the administration, faculty, and students the parking and heavy traffic on the Behrend Campus will flow cheaper and more according to law.

#### POLICY

The Nittany Cub editors welcome letters on vital topics from all readers. These letters may be turned in to the editors or other members of the staff.

The author of the letter must sign his name, but if he requests not to have his name printed we will comply.

We reserve the right to print only those letters which we deem appropriate and to print only excerpts of others.

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

To the Editor:

As a member of the Student Government Association, I have found no justice in your criticism of it. You have stated that you will accept all letters to the editor. You should have stated they must agree with you. This is my third such letter disputing your editorials on the SGA. I am tired of writing and not satisfied with their reception.

As the only circulated means of communication on the campus, you have succeeded in an attack, but you have not informed the student body of any facts other than those you criticize.

I will no longer refer to your previous articles, since you will not accept criticism. I will instead direct my pleas to the student body. You, the student body, have the right to be better informed on the situation in question, and I am hoping that you will demand this from the Nittany Cub. Any reply that is received will prove the student body is not as apathetic as the Cub has said them to be.

Concetta Rizzo

To the Editor:

I have been reading the Nittany Cub faithfully from cover to cover for the last five weeks. I particularly liked the article where you stated this year's Cub wanted to print the student's views on issues brought up in the newspaper. That is why I cannot understand why the few letters to the editor have all been in favor of the paper's stand on these controversial subjects. I know it is not that everyone agrees with everything printed in the Cub. I also understand that you have "editorial privilege" which means that you can revise any letters. Is this so and if so in what ways can you change them?

Patricia Franz

To the Editor:

What in blue blazes gives some people the supreme gall to criticize a newspaper that's doing exactly what it is supposed to...inform the students on what's going on around here?

I'll tell you, it takes a lot of nerve to write a letter like the one's published in this issue.

It is a right... an undeniable right, at that, for a person to voice his opinion. We don't belittle this.

Nobody can challenge this right. It's basic to our society.

But it becomes a downright abuse of a right when someone attempts to slander the operation of a newspaper that is probably the greatest motivating force in keeping a tight rein on campus politics.

The letters submitted, as you can well see, are nothing more than a bunch of malarkey expounding the virtues of the SGA without so much as offering a hint of solution to the problems the paper presents.

These letters are meant as nothing more than a jibe-a smear. They attempt to accomplish zero and do just that.

Constructive criticism with answers, or counter-solutions is the acceptable method of accomplishing what you want. You can't get something published that is just a confederation of jibberish.

I'm sure you'd get the same affect if you tried to have a dissertation of the beauty of cumulus clouds published in any other newspaper.

It's all along the same lines.

The paper is doing exactly what it is supposed to do. If SGA members do not like what the paper is saying about their organization, then let's see them do something about it, in deed not word.

That's the paper's goal. They'll continually be subjected to attack from the people whose toes they step on, whether SGA or not.

An appropriate statement to tack on the door of the publications room would be one uttered by Abe Lincoln a long time ago. It went something like this: "You can please all of the people some of the time and you can please some of the people all of the time, but you can't please all the people all of the time."

An Interested Student