

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 viewpoints of the writers, not necessarily the policy of the paper, the student body or the University.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1931 at the State College, Pa. Post Office under the act of March 3, 1879.

MIKE WEINBERGER Editor
MIKE MILLER Associate Editor

ROGER VOGELSINGER, Business Manager

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Night Editor, Pat Hunter; Copy Editors, Al Klumcke, Ted Serrill; Assistants, Joe Cheddar, Lou Prato, Carl Tucker, Lal Junas, Ruth Billig, Hannah Yashan, Kip Newlin, Mickie Cohen, Pauline Metz.

Senate Adopts a Regrettable Inequity

Senate, the University's academic policy and rule-making body, last week wrote an old inequity into law.

In so doing, it defeated one of the prime purposes of the Academic Honesty Code adopted by the University last May.

Senate adopted a rule allowing a professor to fail a student after he has been found guilty of cheating in his classroom.

On the surface, this may appear to be reasonable. But, in actuality, it provides for unequal treatment of equally-guilty students.

We have no argument against punishing students who cheat. This, we realize, is the only way a measure of classroom honesty may be restored to Penn State, presently a nest of cheaters.

But the effect of the rule passed by Senate on Thursday is to put part of the punishment in the hands of the professor and thus to eliminate equality of treatment of the cheater.

The procedure adopted by the University provides for a trial for the student accused of cheating with a committee of three faculty members and two students drawn from the student's college as judge and jury.

This court decides if the student is guilty of cheating and, if he is found guilty, it determines in which of three types of cheating the student engaged. The three types are "presumably unpremeditated," "premeditated," and "cooperative, premeditated cheating involving collusion." Then, pre-arranged, proscribed penalties are imposed.

One of the purposes of these provisions is to assure equal treatment for equal offenses. This assurance is furthered by another rule adopted by Senate Thursday; it allows the student found guilty of cheating to appeal the decision to the subcommittee on discipline of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs.

But the attempts to afford equal treatment

are negated by allowing professors to impose further penalties. Two students in different sections of the same course with different professors may commit precisely the same cheating offense. The professor of one may fail his student while the more sympathetic professor may feel the student who cheated in his section has been punished enough.

This is a regrettable inequity. It existed before the Academic Honesty Code was adopted. And it existed during the past year while the code was in practice because a professor's class is in his own hands. He can grade the way he sees fit.

But now Senate has seen fit to sanction this and, it appears, to encourage it by writing it into law. The regulation adopted does not say all professors must fail students who are found guilty of cheating; it leaves the decision up to him. Thus the inequity.

The new rule also has the effect of making the penalties for cheating tougher. Last Spring's code provided that when students are caught cheating they would be given a numerical grade of zero on the exam. This was to have been the only effect of the offense on the student's grade for the course.

Now there may be an extreme effect—failure—or no effect at all.

Because it indicated that students were to get a fair break on the cheating problem, we enthusiastically supported the new code when it was announced last year. We cannot be enthusiastic about this change. In destroying one of the assurances of equal treatment of cheaters, the new regulation destroys one of the reasons for student support of the academic honesty program. And if the program is to be successful in eliminating cheating as one of Penn State's gravest problems, student support is necessary.

We call upon Senate to rescind its action.
—The Editor

Mud at Meal Time?

Yesterday's snow turned much of the campus to mud and with the annual Spring "monsoons" nearing the mud will probably be with us for quite some time.

This type of mud is almost unavoidable at Penn State, but another type, which is also often with us in this season, is avoidable.

The avoidable variety is a figurative mud which Penn State politicians are in the habit of smearing and slinging about at random in their search for votes in the Spring All-University and class elections.

The Spring campaign got underway yesterday as candidates of both parties sloshed through the mud to speak at various student living quarters. To the best of our knowledge the only mud bandied about was the real variety the candidates tracked in on their shoes.

But as the campaign increases in intensity and the voting days near the candidates and their backers may fall into the old temptation of making sensational pitches to the voters which they know they cannot follow through on but believe to be excellent vote-getting devices.

Already, pre-campaign clashes indicate that this may well be the case.

We caution the candidates and party leaders against falling into this old deceit which is so often well-recognized by the voters.

Many times in the past political mud-slinging has boomeranged on the throwers when a vigilant Elections Committee or a wise electorate squared up to the issue.

And a clean campaign could do much to restore respect in student government.

—Mike Miller

The Bullonly

Professor Theodore J. Gates, head of the Department of English Composition, remarked yesterday, with a considerable degree of accuracy it seems to us, "If you don't like State College weather, wait a minute!"

—Bob Franklin

Or, to put it another way:
Did summer last only three days this year?
—Ron Gatehouse

Gazette

Today
CHRISTIAN SCIENCE ORGANIZATION, 7 p.m., 304 Old Main
DAILY COLLEGIAN Advertising Staff, 6:30 p.m., 9 Carriage
DAILY COLLEGIAN Promotion Staff, 6:30 p.m., 193 Willard
ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING SOCIETY, 7 p.m., 219 Electrical Engineering
ENGINEERING STUDENT COUNCIL, 7 p.m., 213 Hetzel Union
FRUTH Circulation Staff, 7 p.m., Hetzel Union
GERMAN CLUB, 7:30 p.m., 105 Willard
PENN STATE BARBELL CLUB, 7 p.m., 102 Willard
Student Employment
The following camps will interview at the Student Employment Service, 112 Old Main. Sign up in advance for an appointment.
CAMP QUINIBECK, Vermont—March 13
CAMP CONRAD WEISER, Pennsylvania—March 14-15
CAMP MENATONA, Maine—March 14-15
CAMP CARONDOWANNA, Penna.—March 21

Safety Valve

A Voice for Conservatism

TO THE EDITOR: Regarding the "smoking" editorial by Becky Zahm on "Flag Waving," I might suggest that she take a closer look at the facts.

She speaks about academic freedom . . . For three years I've seen very little suppression of academic freedom except (for) a student speaking up in class for conservatism . . . The professor flew into a puerile rage—that one should dare to question his ultra-liberal ideas. . . . It seems to me there is a preponderance of "liberal" profs at this institution . . .

But consider this: I never saw a conservative article in the Collegian. Only on two occasions did I hear the conservative viewpoint in . . . lectures, and that on a small scale. What is meant by academic freedom could be interpreted as freedom for liberals only. ADA speak up! American Legion, quiet!

The unorthodox dealings of Robert Hutchins and the recent expose of the dealings of the ADA to get McCarthy make McCarthy look like a Puritan in comparison. What are we advocating? A double set of standards?

Let's have academic freedom by all means. Let's hear the conservative viewpoint. Let's get some conservative speakers on campus. Let's publish some conservative editorials or letters occasionally . . .

Since when is the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists seeking communist professors? I'd like to find some too. It's definitely known that communism is devoid of objectivity, and we want objectivity in academic freedom. We also want to take an intelligent perspective. If my understanding is correct not all professors show this rare quality.

●Letter Cut

—Robert R. Ernst

Is Competition Bad?

TO THE EDITOR: To quote Mr. Kenworthy "A new book store would involve a state institution going into competition with free enterprise . . ."

But first, I would like to point out that there is no connection between the student body and the University as an institution. An institution being a set of integrated rules of behavior. But this is not the important part.

I ask you, don't we already have the Lion's Den, the Terrace Room, the BX, and the laundry machines in the dormitories, to mention a few. (Bless 'em all)

Can you say that the above are not in direct "competition with free enterprise (State College merchants?)

In closing, I must admit that this competition, builder of our capitalistic nation, improver of industry, is definitely bad. Even though it already has cleaned up State College dining places, and would lower book prices, it is very bad.

—Robert Kopf

University Hospital
David Bamford, Richard Christian, Ray Clauser, John Cooper, Malvin Goode, Kurt Haas, Millis Mershan, Roy Miles, Robert Moyer, Dale Smith, Paul Snyder, and Robert Stewart.

Little Man on Campus

By Bibler



"Why Worthall, how considerate of you to come all the way up here to bring that Mint Julip to little ole me."

—the cobbler's bench

Blank Plank

By DON SHOEMAKER

There are three groups in the cast of this story: the Positives, or those who favor the Issue; the Negatives, or those who oppose the Issue; and the Neutrals, or those who are to pass judgment on the Issue.

This is a story of Political Intrigue. As it opens, the Positives, Negatives and Neutrals are meeting in an attempt to resolve the Issue.

The Negatives and the Neutrals have gathered early at the appointed meeting place. The Positives have not yet put in an appearance. Obviously, they are creating suspense.

Finally, the Positives—three of them—arrive. They march in, single file, headed by their Leader. He is a dapper young fellow and looks for all the world like—A Politician.

Behind the Leader walks his Right-Hand Man. He has a threatening look about him. He wears a blue trench coat, collar turned up; a broad-brimmed hat pulled so far down over his face that it hides his glasses; and he walks with a sinister crouch.

Behind the right-hand man comes the Left-Hand Man. He is dressed in a ROTC uniform—obviously to add an element of force to the argument.

The Positives sit on the far side of the room opposite the Negatives. In the middle, between the two opposing forces, sit the Neutrals.

Debate on the Issue is about to begin.

The chairman of the Neutrals rises to outline procedure. Each side is to present its case. Then everyone is to adjourn while the Neutrals decide the Issue.

The Negatives speak first. One member of their group, acting as chairman, presents facts and figures to support his case.

The other members of his contingent sit, drinking in his words with varying degrees of interest. Some stare blankly at the walls. Some take notes. And one dozes.

The Positives sit, also drinking in the debate. The Leader sits smoking, a thoughtful look on his face. He stares hard at the end of his cigarette. He has a grim look on his face.

The Right-Hand Man sits taking notes, chin in hand. He too looks grim. But then, this is a ucrisis.

The Left-Hand Man sits on a desk-top, listening to all that goes on. An avid look is on his face. Occasionally he takes a note.

The Neutrals sit listening—now and then holding little side discussions among themselves. They are not being discourteous—it is imperative that they talk it over thoroughly.

For they must make an Important Decision.

The night before, the Neutrals were lucky. Another group appeared before them to have an Issue resolved.

The Issue this group presented was not Controversial. The Neutrals were happy. This they could resolve and offend no one.

But now they must make a Decision.

The speaker for the Negatives is finished. Now the Positives speak. They present their arguments. Their spokesman, the Right-Hand Man, jumps up. He says he took notes.

He reads his notes, interspersing his comments with "these gentlemen" and "worthy opponents." He talks like a debater. He is polite—very polite. He even addresses everyone as Mr. or Miss.

At one point, he poses several questions to the Negatives. "I want answers," he says.

Then, turning to the Left-Hand Man who is now taking notes, he says, "Write the answers down."

The debate continues for some time in ever-decreasing concentric circles. No one is getting anywhere—fast. Finally one of the Neutrals—apparently tired of it all—moves that debate be closed. "The time has come," he says, "for the Decision."

According to plan, the Positives and Negatives leave the room. The Neutrals debate their decision. Finally they decide.

They call the Positives and Negatives back.

They announce their Decision. The Negatives smile—they have won.

The Positives scowl—they have lost.

And the Neutrals smirk—they are self-satisfied. They have done their Duty.

This, Kiddies, is True Statesmanship.

Tonight on WDFM

91.1 MEGACYCLES	
7:15	Sign On
7:20	News
7:25	Sports
7:30	Invitation to Relax
8:00	Phil Wein Show
8:30	Decision
8:00	Agriculture News
9:15	News
9:30	This World of Music
10:30	Sign Off