

# EDITORIAL:

NOTE FROM THE EDITOR:

An explanation is in order. The credibility gap that exists between the administration and certain elements of the student body has widened in the past several days, and the time has come to try to clear things up. I would like to put in black and white the waxy core and intricacies of the problem in such a way that God, the campus, and the world would understand. But I find that omnipotence has completely passed me by, and in its stead remains a mellow, hurt, and in some ways confused reporter. Because what we have here is not only a lack of communication, but also a web of gratitude, shame, wounded pride and respect, and a great deal of ambiguity. How can that be explained in black and white? The most I can do is to try to clear up my part of the misunderstanding, and I will. For those of you who do not know the situation up to this point, I'll back-track a bit, giving, quite obviously, my part of the story.

It all started weeks ago when certain elements of the Academy High School student body rioted during the lunch hour, and several students from B.C. decided to investigate the situation, purely and solely because of their desire to find the truth about the situation, prompted by the gross inconsistencies between the information given on the news media, and reports given by persons involved. Their purposes were not to act as reporters incognito, or any other manipulative function. They went on good will, purely as interested parties who wanted to help. As fate would have it, however, two of the members of the above mentioned party happened to be in the newspaper office as this reporter was trying to compile an editorial about the incident. After some discussion, it was decided that those better-informed persons should write the story, thus, the "Academy Story" which appeared in the Cub. What happened next is, fortunately, history, but the regrettable scandal that ensued was certainly not anticipated, and was not the purpose for which we published the article. Our intentions were purely innocent, if not naive, to present the truth as we saw it. We intended to slander no one. We intended to deface no public institution. However, since the story was interpreted that way, we found many parties at arms against us, and we also found Mr. Koedel, Dean Lane and Dean Crowleying right beside us, indeed, they were out in front doing a marvelous job of protecting us. I feel it very necessary to make it extremely clear that the parties involved feel nothing but gratitude and appreciation for the help, and almost more important, the opportunity to learn from the experience without being forced to "learn the hard way".

You may be wondering at this point, just when the problem comes in. However hard I try, I don't think I shall be successful in

explaining it with any degree of clarity. The credibility gap, and the hard feelings arose, I think, due to the fact that what I just said had never before been said. The student parties involved had, in a way left the administration hanging, not knowing what we were thinking about the situation, not knowing what we intended to do, not knowing if we understood or appreciated what they had been and were doing for us, and along that line, not knowing if we had even learned anything from the experience.

As a result, each party involved approached this new problem in a different way, leading to conflicting opinions, ambiguity, and the like. The result was a credibility gap that did nothing but widen in the succeeding days, and was never directly dealt with. The situation at hand is not a workable one, and should be altered at any cost. It would be a shame to let trite personal feeling dissolve all the rapport that has been developed throughout the year, over an issue that turned into a personal problem because of the age-old difficulty people have with efficient communication.

E.B.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

To the Editor:

The SGA has taken it upon itself to submit a document to the Senate Rules Committee without submitting it to the student body for approval. This body of unelected officials has decided that the Behrend Campus student body is not interested in the constitution, and if given the chance, would not vote anyway. Whether these assumptions are true or not is not relevant. What does matter here is that the SGA was invested with the power to draw up a document, and the students that invested this power to them have the right to ratify the document before it goes to the Senate. How can the SGA, in all honesty, submit a document to the Senate which is supposed to have come from the Behrend Campus when no one but the SGA voted on it?

It appears to me that the SGA is taking much for granted. It is a sad fact when a body of students, who have no legal jurisdiction to govern, can make a move such as this, doing it in the name of the Campus, and the Campus is not consulted.

Another excuse for this undemocratic action is the time element. There is not enough time to get a student mandate after final approval by Student Affairs. It is my understanding that when an issue of importance arises, the Student Affairs Committee can call an emergency action to cope with it. Doesn't the SGA or "Student" Affairs consider a student vote on the Constitution important enough for an emergency meeting to be called so that the students can vote on this highly pertinent matter?

I am only one student, one of the nameless, faceless group, who believes that student government should speak for the student body as a whole. How in the world do they think that a