

# EDITORIAL

## THE HONORABLE WAY

Recently, there has been considerable speculation concerning the ethical standards of college students in general, and Penn State students in particular. A discussion of this matter was conducted on February 21-22, during the regional O. S. G. A. Conference held at the Scranton Center. Some of the points discussed were academic dishonesty, disregard for the rights and property of others, and personal codes or standards in regard to drinking, cheating, and other items.

Naturally, it is difficult to discuss such matters, let alone try to institute a code or honor system which would attempt to regulate or at least alleviate their occurrence. For one thing, no one cares to be told how to act. We all have our own standards, our own conception of what is ethically good and ethically bad, or what is morally right and morally wrong. We all feel ourselves mature, intelligent adults. But, I would like to say, in support of the O. S. G. A.'s attempt, that even adults must have regulation. The laws of our society, for instance, were put there for the express purpose of setting a concrete base on which all men could build their own ideas of right and wrong and have a clear understanding of the line that divides the two. So, too, with a code of ethics. Not only would students have a clearer picture of what is expected of them morally, but they'd be able to have a reference to use in order to preserve the morals of others. For example, not only would one refrain from cheating himself, but by establishing this code, he would deter others from cheating from him.

Naturally, as I said before, it will be quite difficult to establish such a code. The honorable way is always the hard way, the slow, self-sacrificing way, in contrast to the fast and easy path of dishonor. The honorable way is all too often the old-fashioned and antiquated way in relation to our accelerated, liberal age. To my mind, it is a fine, courageous attempt on the part of the O. S. G. A. to encourage the establishment of a code of ethics. It seems to me a fresh and invigorating step away from the smog of hazy scruples and lackadaisical morality. We should all laud their effort to encourage them toward success in establishing their ends.

It's my opinion that in order to live in the world today, in order to live with one another, we all must develop a sense of deep responsibility toward ourselves and our fellow man. Men no longer walk alone. They influence and, in turn, are affected by others. How can we, as men, conquer the tyrannies, injustices, and wrongs surrounding us, if we cannot first become masters of our own actions? To bring this idea of ethical responsibility into more familiar terms, I'd like to cite this question: Would you want a doctor who cheated his way through school to operate on you? I assume the majority of answers would be a resounding, "no!"

Of course, the example above was a little extreme, but the fact remains that college is not the place to ignore, but, rather, to encourage and enhance the practice of responsibility and to bring dignity and respect to the individual, now, as well as in the future. It's a small start, this idea of a code of honor, but, it seems to me, a very good one.

## The Surgeon General's Report On Smoking and Health

By CARMEN LOMBARDO

To smoke or not to smoke—that is the question.

For the past several decades, there has been increasing interest in the effects of tobacco on health. The climax of a phase of these studies came with the publishing of a report on "Smoking and Health" by the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

The Committee made the following judgment: "Cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action."

Several specific conclusions and findings by the Committee are listed below, along with some background information.

Lung cancer deaths rose from less than 3,000 in 1930, to 41,000 in 1962. Deaths from arteriosclerotic, coronary, and degenerative heart disease rose from 273,000 in 1940, to 578,000 in 1962. Deaths caused by chronic bronchitis and emphysema rose from 2,300 in 1945, to 15,000 in 1962.

Cigarette consumption has increased from 50 cigarettes per year per person, at the turn of the

century, to 3,986 per person in 1961. Cigar and pipe smoking declined during this same period.

The Committee founded their evidence on three main points: (1) animal experiments, (2) clinical and autopsy studies, and (3) population studies.

The Committee found that cigarette smoking is a causal factor in lung cancer, chronic bronchitis and emphysema, and cardiovascular diseases. Evidence also exists that smoking is a causal factor in cancer of the larynx and esophagus and, perhaps, the urinary bladder in men. Smoking also affects other conditions as peptic ulcers, tobacco amblyopia, cirrhosis of the liver, accidents, and infant birth weight.

Reaction to the report has been world-wide. England is preparing to ban smoking commercials; Italy, where it was already illegal to advertise cigarettes, is planning to curtail national consumption still further.

Closer to home, some colleges (Bloomsburg, for example) have voted to remove cigarette vending machines from the campuses.

I don't know about you, but would someone care to help a will-powerless writer to quit smoking?

## STUDENT POLL

**Question: Do you feel a woman could ever become President of the United States?**

Carmen Lombardo — 5th Term — Foreign Relations:

I feel a woman could become President, but not in this country. Women have only too recently received the political and social rights which were formerly only held by the male population. The stigma of inferiority, especially in political matters, still weighs heavily on the female. I believe it will be several generations until this historical feeling of political inferiority has worn off through the educational process. Only then would it be possible for a woman to be president.

Mr. David Oden — History and Political Science Instructor —

She could become President because the female population is higher and could swing the vote. However, women tend to vote for male candidates. They like to have a male symbol to respect, for instance, Kennedy. Men are leader symbols, whereas women are more domestic.

Janet Astleford — 2nd Term — Home Economics:

No, because women are basically dependent. Although a woman would probably be able to command respect of her male counterparts, men would not be willing or able to succumb to the dominance of a woman.

James Scarcella — 5th Term — Business:

If she's beautiful, I'd vote for her. It's possible because women are constantly invading a world dominated by men. If a woman were qualified, I would vote for her.

Rich Kauffman — 5th Term — E.E.T.:

Certainly, there's nothing in the Constitution that prohibits it. There are some women who are better politicians than men. If she had the requirements and outstanding qualifications, there is no reason why it wouldn't be possible.

Mary O'Donnell — 5th Term — Business:

No, women are too emotional. A country needs a man as a leader, strong and capable of making decisions. Women seem more interested in women's things; their place is in the home. Besides, the country wouldn't back a woman for President.

(Continued on Page Four)

# Highacres Collegian



"HAZLETON CAMPUS' OWN NEWSPAPER"

Published by the Journalism Club of the Hazleton Campus of the Pennsylvania State University, Hazleton, Pennsylvania

### STAFF

Editor ..... Kathy Botchick  
Assistant Editor and Photographer ..... Phil Jefferies  
Assistant Editor ..... Janet Mihal  
Sports Editor ..... Carmen Lombardo  
Typists ..... Noreen Reytar, Cheryl Fedullo, Anita Augustine  
Staff ..... Joe Broyan, Tony Sulkevick, Joe Lucia, Tony Genaro, Carol Yurkovic, Karen Kreitzberger, Marcia Juda, Carmen Lombardo.  
Faculty Advisor ..... Mr. Thomas Price

