

Published Tuesday through Saturday mornings, during the University year, the Daily Collegian is a student-operated newspaper.

The Daily Collegian

Successor to THE FREE LANCE, est. 1887

Editorials represent the viewpoint of the writers, not necessarily the policy of the paper. Unsigned editorials are by the editor.

Entered as second-class matter July 9, 1934 at the State College, Pa. Post Office under the act of March 3, 1879.

DAVE JONES, Editor

VINCE DRAYNE, Business Mgr.

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Night editor, Nancy Ward; Copy editors, Mary Bolich, Ed Reiss; Assistants, Earl Kohnfelder, Mike Miller, Gay Snodgrass, Bob Thomas, Ira Wasserman, Ad Staff, Connie Anderson, Diane Hallock.

Judicial Amendment: Scratch the Surface

An amendment has been presented, for first approval by the Association of Independent Men Board of Governors, to permit at-large selection of the eight members of the Judicial Board of Review.

AIM is trying to improve its judicial system. It is questionable, however, how much further improvement can be made in the existing disciplinary system.

Proponents of the AIM plan are avowedly attempting to obtain more justice for those students appearing before the board. However, in their quest for justice, the proponents have overlooked a basic reason why the AIM judicial system should be altered.

It is true the AIM judicial board has made some questionable decisions this year. First came the case involving a Nittany Dorm. The board decided to have the offenders donate blood to the Red Cross as punishment for holding a beer party in the dormitory. No one but board members seemed to agree with the decision. If this decision had been more than a recommendation to an administrative office, the decision would have stood unless appealed and changed by a higher body. It was buffeted, however, between the AIM board and the Dean of Men's office until worthwhile punishment was impossible.

Next came a case in which the board asked office probation for five students accused of setting off firecrackers in a dormitory. Subsequent referral by the Dean of Men's office to the Senate committee on student affairs' subcommittee on discipline led to suspension of the five. The board would have approved such referral. The board falsely believed, however, it did not have the power to recommend such a referral.

In a third case, two students were to be referred to the subcommittee for holding a beer

party in the dormitory room with a revolver in full sight. Tribunal altered the decision on appeal, giving the students a deferred suspension. Tribunal's decision may have been the key factor in permitting those students to remain in school. This means that, if the board's decision had stood, the students might not be at the University now.

A student is not referred to a student disciplinary body unless "the goods" have already been placed on him by the Dean of Men's office. The dean's office presents the evidence to the board as well as the charges against the defendant. In this way, any appeal must be on the punishment meted out, not on the guilt of the defendant.

Cases arise, as they have this year, in which best punishment is not the most popular—not only with the offender—but with the accuser. In a student government situation, this is unfortunate because the accuser has the power to alter the board's decision. The Dean of Men's office does try to minimize alterations in recommendations. Yet, it is sometimes necessary to make alterations.

Publications of a list of violations for which students may be tried, and an explanation of the operation of student judicial bodies, could be an initial step in implementation of such a program. The undergraduate regulations are of little help to students because they do not list all violations for which a student may be disciplined. Nor do they explain the meaning of the nebulous charge for which all students are sent to the subcommittee: "Conduct detrimental to the good name of the University."

The AIM amendment may be a step in the right direction. But it barely scratches the surface of the main problem—that of student self-discipline in a college community.

—Phil Austin

A Partial Vote Count: Not a Good Idea

It would be unwise for the All-University elections committee to make a partial count of spring election returns after the first day of balloting.

Announcement was made last week that the committee is considering such a count. Results of the first day's voting would remain secret, according to the committee.

It is with a more realistic view of human nature that this problem must be seen. There is no reason to believe the elections committee lacks integrity, and no reason to believe it would openly reveal results of the first day's voting. But since the committee is as human as the rest of us, there is some doubt as to how secret the first day results would remain.

If a partial count were made, first day results would have to be kept secret. Revelation of what candidates are ahead, and by how much, before the election is over is not wise. It could result in dirty campaigning. Therefore, results

must be kept secret. The 11-member elections committee, no matter how conscientious, cannot be expected to do it.

The argument for counting first day votes is that such a count would spread out the elections committee's work load. Obviously, it would be easier on the committee to divide the count into two days. Hand-counting spring election ballots is no fun.

This argument, however, is not strong enough to make such a count desirable. Had centralized voting been used this semester, voting machines might have solved the problem. When the committee decided to employ decentralized voting, it must have realized hand-counting would result. This problem, then, is the by-product of decentralized voting. The elections committee must bear with this by-product.

Counting votes after the first day of voting would almost certainly result in a leak. A leak in partial results is not worth the work that would be saved the elections committee.

—Baylee Friedman

Compensation: Cabinet Must Check the List

The All-University Cabinet budget revision for next year is hardly a revision at all.

Last year's budget allotted \$1975 in compensation for elected and appointed officials. The newly-approved budget allocates the same amount. Practically everyone who got paid before will get paid now, plus one. And not all compensated persons deserve the amount they will receive.

Whether or not compensation is morally correct is not the problem here. Compensation takes up a large slice of cabinet's budget. Cabinet's money is student money. For that reason, every cent should be spent sensibly. The new budget is not as sensible as it should be.

The budget committee has made changes—good changes—which reflect the realization that money has been spent unnecessarily in the past. For instance, the committee wisely eliminated scholarships for the Junior and Senior Prom committee members, persons whose work is concentrated in a short period of a semester. Yet various members of the Spring Week committee are also engaged in time-concentrated work, and they will receive compensation.

Another good change was the reduction of

the freshman class president's scholarship from \$50 to \$25. The freshman president, as the other class presidents, presides over no more than a few meetings a year. In contrast, the student council presidents, who hold meetings almost every week and participate in Intercollege Council Board activities, receive \$15. The budget committee has reasons for this distribution. It feels class presidents are representative of the entire student body. Council presidents are elected by their immediate college governing bodies. This may be so, but students generally receive equal benefits from classes and councils, if not more from their individual colleges.

Unfortunately, few students realize the amount of money going into compensation, and so pressure on cabinet to evaluate and re-evaluate financial allocations is low. But despite student indifference, cabinet should realize its responsibility to check and recheck every financial move.

It's quite easy to be generous with other people's money.

—Baylee Friedman

Safety Valve...

Hits Party Planks

TO THE EDITOR: . . . (A campus political party) has included in its platform for the spring elections two planks which are pertinent to residents of the West Dorms, namely:

1. Advocacy of more upperclassmen in the West Dorms.
2. Advocacy of informal coed dining for the West Dorms.

We realize this is only a "paper platform" and, judging from past experience, little will probably be done along these lines . . . Our grievance is this: we do not like the idea of having a political party use as a political platform something that we have worked on exclusively . . . In short, we do not wish the fruits of our labor to be capitalized upon by a political party.

—Reed J. Dunn
Sec'y, West Dorm Council

Gazette . . .

Today

- FENCING CLUB, 7:30 p.m., North Corridor, Recreation Hall
- INKLING CIRCULATION STAFF, Candidates, 6:30 p.m., 108 Willard
- NEWMAN CLUB RADIO PROGRAM, 9:15 p.m., WMAJ
- NEWS AND VIEWS, 6:30 p.m., 14 Home Economics
- POLITICAL SCIENCE CLUB, 7:30 p.m., Home Economics Living Center
- WSGA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 6:30 p.m., WSGA Room, White Hall

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

The following camps will interview at the Student Employment Service, 112 Old Main: Camp Skycrest on April 12; Camp Kiwanis on April 2; Camp Conrad Weiser on April 7. Sign up for interviews in advance.

Little Man on Campus

By Bibler



"Oh, I haven't been tryin' to answer your questions—I just wanna sharpen my pencil."

Interpreting the News

Atom May Alter Russian Strategy

By J. M. ROBERTS JR.

Associated Press News Analyst

There are many flaws and possibly many dangerous traps in the new Russian security proposals, but this is one time when it would not be safe for the Allies to cry "phony" before very careful consideration, and probably not before the Geneva conference.

This is written on the basis of the first brief reports from Paris on the contents of the Russian

note to France, Britain and the United States, delivered in Moscow Wednesday. The French foreign office has more leaks than a sieve, and these first drippings of note contents have not always been entirely accurate.

But it does seem pretty clear that the Russians have made two very important switches in policy on security since their proposals on the subject at the Berlin conference.

Then, Russia was obviously trying, primarily, to split the United States out of European affairs. They proposed a European security pact eliminating her. Now they "no longer have any objection," they say, to having the United States join the proposed mutual security system.

At the same time they suggest their own membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Could it be that the Russians now realize the United States has not been exaggerating the awful potentials of atomic war? Could that bring the change in their international relations for which the West has hoped so long?

It would be foolish to accept any such theory. It would be even more foolish not to use every avenue of finding out whether it is more than theory.

The Russian note bears down at great length on the horrors of any future war and the necessity of great power action to prevent it.

That is the same tune that the Allies have been playing since the March 1 explosion at Bikini which tipped off the full truth about hydrogen bombs. In particular the British have cried out that no pride, no preconceived notions, no consideration of relatively inconsequential matters, must prevent an all-out drive for peace in the face of such an awesome threat.

Malenkov recently indicated a new realization on his own part. The Russians have always said that Western reliance on atomic warfare meant the capitalist world would be destroyed. Now Malenkov says civilization would be destroyed—an echo of President Eisenhower's United Nations speech. All of this indicates the bomb

may be a greater deterrent to war than most of us had estimated before.

In effect, as a member of NATO, with the United States a member of a European security pact, Russia would have to give up world revolution or else plan a secret attack behind the facade of the treaties.

Such an attack would not be beyond her normal policy. It is what has long been feared. In NATO, Russia would be in on Western planning for defense against Russia, while any forces that she might be required to contribute to the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe would be strictly expendable.

The whole Russian proposal, presuming she has any intent other than disruption of the Western Alliance and the prevention of ratification of the European Defense Community, is out of kilter with her recent demonstrations of determination to hold tight to everything she has in eastern and central Europe, particularly East Germany.

Therefore, any slightest suggestion that such a change could just possibly have taken place must be carefully investigated. The first real opportunity for that investigation will probably be the Geneva conference.

Application Deadline Set for Spring Week

The deadline for all committee chairmen to give their names and the names of their group and the group they are combining with for Spring Week activities has been extended to 5 p.m. Friday, George Richards, Spring Week chairman, announced. Names, which are necessary to make up a mailing list, may be turned in to Richards at the Student Union desk in Old Main, he added.

Tonight on WDFM

- 91.1 MEGACYCLES
- 7:25 Sign On
 - 7:30 Record Review
 - 8:00 Adventures in Research
 - 8:15 Horizons Unlimited
 - 8:30 Semi-Pops
 - 9:15 News
 - 9:30 Music of America
 - 10:30 Sign Off