

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 4, 1934 at the State College, Pa. Post Office under the act of March 3, 1879.

DIEHL McKALIP Editor

WILLIAM DEVERS, Business Manager

Managing Ed., Mary Lee Lanter; City Ed., Mike Feinsilber; Copy Ed., Nancy Ward; Sports Ed., Dick McDowell; Edit. Dir., Peggy McClain; Radio News Ed., Phil Austin; Soc. Ed., Marie MacDonald; Asst. Sports Ed., Herm Welkopf; Asst. Soc. Ed., Mary Bolich; Feature Ed., Edmund Reiss; Librarian-Exchange Ed., Ann Leh; Senior Board, Phyl Probert; Photog. Dir., Ron Hoopes.

Asst. Bus. Mgr., Benjamin Lowenstein; Local Adv. Mgr., Fay Goldstein; National Adv. Mgr., John Albrecht; Circulation Mgr., Richard Gordon; Promotion Mgr., Evelyn Riegel; Personnel Mgr., Carol Schwanz; Office Mgr., Peggy Troxell; Classified Adv. Mgr., Dorothea Ebert; Sec., Gertrude Malpass; Research and Records Mgr., Virginia Coakley.

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Night Editor, Dottie Stone; Copy Editors, Don Shoemaker, John Lawrence; Assistants: Joe Cheddar, Ned Frear, Dodi Jones, Marilyn Zabusky, Marion Beatty, Phyllis Shivery, Elaine Huberman, Julia Matras.

Clique Chairmen Must Not Get Voting Seat

Let's take all government check off campus political parties! Let the cliques compromise their ways through nominations, campaigns, and elections, and embark on a general policy of "appeasing" the crushed incentive and muffled voices of our student politicians.

That's about the gist of the elections committee's proposed amendment to give clique chairmen voting seats on the committee.

Fairly logical reasoning has been offered for such action. Apparently, factions of the committee feel it is not a completely impartial group, in that it tends to lean in the opposite direction from party interests. To be blunt, the committee has been informally charged, from time to time, with not particularly liking political parties in general and trying to stifle party action rather than channel it.

Frankly we doubt this. It's probable the committee often has been opposed to the trend general party actions take. It follows that by trying to censor some of the less desirable ones, like mudslinging and indecent campaign literature, the committee will be tagged with the reputation of disliking campus parties.

However, this not necessarily a reflection on the personnel of the committee. It is implementation of the policy and duties set up for the committee to follow.

Those students feeling the committee has too much control over the parties should direct their complaints against the constitutional authority given the committee, not against the composition of it.

As the committee and the elections code now exist, they are a watchdog—sort of device over

the parties, set up to make sure party actions are harmonious with the desires of student government (namely, All-University Cabinet) and to penalize if these actions go astray.

The committee is Cabinet's judicial and police body over the parties. And so long as this role is given the committee, there is no room on it for clique chairmen.

To make such provision would be like allowing a defendant, in a legal trial, to sit on his own jury.

The parties, and some committee members, claim parties do not command enough respect from the committee, that their opinions (expressed at committee meetings to which they are invited) carry little weight. With a voting power on elections committee, these supporters say, party wishes would have more power over their own actions.

This is debatable. The parties would have exactly as much power as three votes to ten votes offer. Their voice on the committee would be small. The matter becomes, in this light, an attempt to appease the parties, give them some "busy work" while the committee goes about its business, and convince them they have a "say" in the regulations, vague though it will be.

But if the parties cannot commandeer enough respect from the committee on their actions alone, a mere three-to-ten vote is not going to help them much.

Cabinet must not pass this amendment. It's one of the most subtle attempts at compromise of student government we've seen in a long time.

—Peggy McClain

Hell Week Control: Necessary Move

Where does the responsibility lie for control of the so-called fraternity hell week?

In the light of the Interfraternity Council hell week committee report of Monday night, two schools of thought have formed on this issue. One says the IFC should establish and enforce the policy for the entire fraternity community while the other maintains it is the responsibility of each individual house.

The staunch defenders of house rights declare there is no room for IFC to step in and dictate internal affairs. The way a fraternity conducts its hell week and what it is called is the business of no outsiders, they contend, as long as it does not break civil laws.

Proponents of a strong IFC claim the council should have the prerogative of setting regulations and procedures for its member units since they see fit to invest it with governing power. The only way the fraternity system can quiet its critics, it is pointed out, is coordinated action under the guidance of IFC.

As proposed, the hell week code is not too unreasonable. It asks the establishing of a standing hell week procedure committee, that pre-initiation practices be restricted to solely within the fraternity, that it be called Hell Week, and that a minimum of five hours sleeping and three hours studying time be allotted each day of the week.

This code would be enforced by the IFC Board of Control through an amendment to the council constitution. Presently the board handles the social checking and judicial action for the fraternity system.

It seems about time IFC takes a strong hand in dealing with hell week practices. This must be done to halt the critics of this practice and to turn the high point of pledge training from a possible period of farce and destruction to one of construction. The IFC is not butting in-

to house matters; fraternities have had many years to put their programs above reproach and have not done so. Thus they must be pulled into line sharply. Those who have cleaned house have nothing to lose by the code.

IFC is not striving for the complete elimination of pre-initiation practices, and many of them are even to be encouraged as shown in a survey of practices. There is no objection to quizzes, some hard work, dressing up for classes, and a bit of fun within the house. Trouble starts when this fun goes outside the house and extends to unreasonable physical and mental punishment and practices which hurt academic pursuits.

One word of caution must be forwarded to the officials of IFC. They must be as willing to be firm with other problems inside and out of the organization as they are with hell week practices. Another recent display of the big stick has been fines for not having men on door duty to control parties. It is often easier to be firm within an organization than in representing it.

This code does not seem unfair inasmuch as fraternities have proved themselves, unable to police their own practices; it is not a case of an attempt to remove individual rule. In return for this police power, however, the council must work all the harder in representing those who are allowing them to make all-encompassing rules.

Safety Valve—

On 'Green Blobs'

TO THE EDITOR: Last Saturday you mentioned (Daily Collegian) the unsightliness of the "green semi-permanent blobs" on the diagonals of Old Main. Just what permanence I'm not certain, because evidence of the footsteps is faint for the most part and their unattractiveness was of short duration.

Our "bad taste" was authorized by the Physical Plant and, while not conventional in University tradition, was not sufficiently detrimental to the appearance of the campus to merit rebuke. The footsteps, to me, are only an example of the spirit of a relatively small group—a spirit rare here at State.

I do appreciate your holding the issue until after the Forestry Ball and the recognition of an enthusiastic publicity campaign.

—Peter Dress

Gazette...

Today
AIM JUDICIAL, 7:15 p.m., 213 Willard
COLLEGIAN SOPHOMORE BOARD, 7 p.m., 9 Carnegie
FENCING CLUB, 7:30 p.m., North Corridor, Rec Hall
FROTH CIRCULATION STAFF, 7 p.m., 317 Willard
FROTH INTERMEDIATE JUNIOR AND JUNIOR BOARD OF CIRCULATION STAFF, 6:30 p.m., 317 Willard

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL
John Arnold, Richard Baker, Richard Brandt, Raymond Carlin, Thomas Grimson, Robert Hackman, Maria Hammel, Irene Jacob, James Keenan, William Lebig, Nancy Marshall, Kenneth McClmonds, William Murray, Marcia Ripper, Jane Schroepe, Mary Ann Week, Florence Woolley.

Correction

The deadline for nominations to Interfraternity Council offices is March 21 not March 23 as reported in yesterday's Daily Collegian. Self-nomination speeches will be given March 21.

Junior Exec Board

Junior Class Executive Board will meet at 3:30 p.m. today in 227 Sparks to discuss the new All-University constitution. Interested students may attend.

Eng Society Will Meet

The Society of American Military Engineers will meet at 7 tonight in the Mineral Science Auditorium. The speaker will be Lt. Col. Carroll L. Buhman, substitute professor of air science.

Little Man on Campus

By Bibler



"I wonder why the Sigma Phi Nothings can't learn to use the phone like the other fraternities do!"

Centennial:

Pat of Butter Leads To First Coeds in '71

One of the professors who presided at a dining table in the first years of the University always said grace with his head unbowed and his eyes wide open.

He had once been hit in the face by a pat of butter thrown by a student, and he was far too wary to invite a repeat performance.

Such table manners may have been in the mind of President James Calder when in 1871 he urged opening the doors of the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, as the institution was then known, to women students.

Women Welcomed

At any rate, in a report to the trustees, he welcomed the women as "an influence as beneficial as it is powerful in restraining those who would be rude and untidy, compensating largely for the absence of home restraints and incentives, and giving our College, in its retired location, increased society, which has long been felt a necessity."

In addition, President Calder was a firm believer in co-education, having been previously president of Hillsdale College in Michigan, which was one of the first schools in the country to admit women.

Indeed, the arrival of the first two co-eds on campus in 1871 was sparked by the president himself. Ellen A. Cross, the first woman to register, wrote in her reminiscences that she was invited to leave Hillsdale "to start the women's department at the University."

150 Guys, 6 Dolls

Enrollment of women during the first year of the experiment totaled six. They lived, along with 150 men and several professors in the five-story main building on campus. Their rooms were on the fifth floor, under the supervision of a preceptress.

While President Calder had welcomed women to the campus for their "increased society," a rule promptly went into effect which forbade students "to talk or ride with students of the opposite sex or to meet such students in the parlor or any other place except by special permission of the president and the preceptress."

The lapse of a decade only multiplied the rules. One stated that all requests by gentlemen to call on or accompany young ladies and all requests on the part of young ladies to receive or accompany gentlemen must

be presented to the lady principal in the ladies' parlor between 6:45 and 7 p.m.

Time Limit

Even if permission were granted, the time to enjoy the company of the opposite sex was limited, for the parlor closed at 9 p.m. Gentlemen desiring to accompany ladies outside the parlor had to obtain written permission from the President.

And just to seal off the co-eds completely, a last rule declared: "Young ladies are absolutely forbidden to hold any communication out of the windows or by means of the steam pipes."

One Condition

Finally, in 1890, the co-eds moved out of Old Main into a new cottage constructed on campus. Simultaneously they were now allowed to meet their "friends" in the parlor Wednesday evenings from the close of rhetorical to 9 p.m. "without special permission."

Once, during this period, they were even permitted to go away to a football game—an encounter with Bucknell at Williamsport. Permission was granted, however, only on condition the girls returned to campus by midnight.

Through no fault of the girls, their train was late, and the next year, they were not allowed to attend away games!

WSGA Candidates

Candidates for Women's Student Government Association elections will meet at 7 tonight in 105 Willard. Candidates for Women's Recreation Association will not meet at that time as was announced previously.

Tonight on WDFM

8.1 MEGACYCLES
7:25 _____ Sign On
7:30 _____ Adventure in Research
7:45 _____ As You Believe
8:00 _____ Concert Cameo
8:30 _____ Just Out
9:00 _____ Guest Star
9:15 _____ Debate News
9:30 _____ Debate Congress
9:40 _____ The Master's Palette
10:30 _____ Thought for the Day

Now's the time to ask her to the . . .

AIM-LEONIDES SPRING DANCE

Friday, March 18, 8:30-12:00 p.m. TICKETS ON SALE AT STUDENT UNION DESK — INFORMAL — \$2.50 per Couple Music by Johnny Nicolosi