

Editorial Opinion

2 Words for Cabinet

It seems that whenever student leaders go to Old Main to talk with administrative officials, one word often creeps into the conversation in one way or another.

That word is "responsible." Old Main tells student leaders they should be responsible—that is, according to Webster, "able to respond or answer for one's conduct and obligations."

This is mainly responsibility to the University. We expect the same thing in our national leaders. We expect them to be responsible to our country.

There's another word we have never heard told to a student leader in Old Main. That is "responsive"—that is, according to Webster "ready or inclined to respond or react in sympathy." We expect our national leaders to be responsive to our wishes.

Let's try to apply "responsible" leadership to All-University Cabinet, the highest student government body.

Being a "responsible" member of Cabinet means, to us, that the person checks both sides of the issue, weighs the evidence carefully, and votes intelligently and honestly.

Let's try to apply "responsive" leadership to Cabinet.

The main purpose of student government, supposedly, is to represent the students. After all, most of Cabinet's major action isn't final—it merely recommends something to Old Main, the Trustees, etc. In doing this, it should be "responsive" to the wishes of the student body.

Then, we expect our elected representatives to be "responsible" and "responsive."

Too often Cabinet falls down on the "responsive" part. It could be said that Cabinet tries too hard to be "responsible" and forgets too often to be "responsive." Maybe this is because Cabinet members don't realize they can be "responsible" and still disagree with Old Main.

In Memory of . . .

The late Joseph F. O'Brien, professor of public speaking and for 30 years coach of the men's debate team, was honored this weekend when the name of the Interstate Debate Congress was changed to the Joseph F. O'Brien Interstate Debate Congress.

The honor was bestowed at the 23rd annual congress by representatives from 16 colleges and universities from the eastern states.

O'Brien, who passed away Feb. 14, was an outstanding orator and active in many state and national speech organizations.

Coming to the University in 1928, he substituted for John H. Frizzell as coach of men's debate and continued for 30 years, coaching teams that achieved amazing success.

For a number of years, he served as president of the Pennsylvania Speech Association and also served as president of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges and the Pennsylvania Speech Roundtable.

When the Interstate Debate Congress chose to rename itself in memory of O'Brien, it remembered one man who contributed inestimable service to both the University and the art of public speaking.

Gazette

- Today Agriculture Student, 7 p.m., 214-215 HUB AUSA, 7 p.m., Carnegie Cline, Editorial Staff, 7:30 p.m., 104 Boucke BA College, 3:10 p.m., 111 Boucke. Collegian Ad Staff, 6:45 p.m., 9 Carnegie Collegian Business Staff, 6:30 p.m., 202 Willard Collegian Promotion Staff, 6:30 p.m., 209 Willard Education Council, 7 p.m., 216 HUB Emerson Society, 3:30 p.m., Small Chapel Lounge Eng Council, 7 p.m., 217 HUB, election of officers ICG Meeting, 7:30 p.m., 204 Willard Five O'Clock Theatre, 5 p.m., Little Theatre, "Anatoli's Wedding Day," by Arthur Schnitzler Froth Ad Staff, 7 p.m., Froth Office Gamma Sigma Sigma, 6:45 p.m., Grange Rec Room, sisters and pledges Hat Society Council, 7 p.m., 107 Boucke Military Round Table, 7:30 p.m., 217 Willard HEC Student Council, 7 p.m., Living Center Leonides, 7:15 p.m., HUB Auditorium, fashion show LA Student Council, 7 p.m., 217-218 HUB MI Student Council, 7 p.m., 214 HUB Nalada, 6:45 p.m., WH pool, all swimmers, Critique Newman Club, 7 p.m., 110 Electrical Eng. film—"History of Catholic Education" New Bayrisches Schuplatzlers, 7:30 p.m., 3 White

- Panhellenic Council, 6:30 p.m., 208 HUB American Society for Metals, 7:30 p.m., Mineral Sciences Auditorium, speaker, Rock Climbing Division of the Outing Club, 7 p.m., 317 Willard, nomination of officers Scabbard and Blade Rushing Smoker, 7 p.m., Alpha Tau Omega Senior Class Ad Board, 8:15 p.m., 203 HUB UCA Cabinet, 6:30 p.m., 211 Chapel Vesper service, 4:30 p.m., Helen Eakin Eisenhower Chapel

Job Interviews

- Companies interviewing Mar. 25: Travelers Insurance Co., Jun & Aug grads in Bus Ad Janaky & Bailey, Jun & Aug grads. Jrs. in EE Lord & Taylor, Jun & Aug BS, MS in L.A. Bus Ad. Home Ec. Paych Bell Telephone Co., of Penna. Jun & Aug grads in LA, Soc, Pay, LMR, Acctg A T & T (Western Electric), Jun & Aug grads in Bus Ad. LA, Soc, Pay, LMR, Acctg Parke Davis & Co., Jun & Aug BS, MS, Bact, Zool, Med Tech, (Women only); Chem Ohio Power, Jun & Aug EE, ME General Electric, will hold a group meeting at 7:15 in 105 Armby for Jun & Aug BS MS Aero E, ME, EE, Eng Sci, ChE, IE, Phys, Metal CAMP INTERVIEWS Camp Conrad Weiser (men) Mar 11-12; Camp Wise (men and women) Mar 12-13; Camp Carondowanna (women) Mar 13; Philadelphia YMCA Camps (men and women) Mar 20.

Letters

Freund Writes On the Ethics Cabinet Forgot

TO THE EDITOR: I am writing you because I am extremely puzzled by a certain decision of the student Cabinet which seems to me to be strangely at odds with the facts which it intended to adjudicate. I refer to the discussion of the All-University President's trip to New York to deliver to Larry Sharp the contributions from the student body.

If my facts are correct, the All-University President stayed in New York for a day longer than was necessary to fulfill his mission, and he did so at the expense of student funds allocated for this mission. Following a thorough discussion the Cabinet was reported to have endorsed all the actions and judgments of their president connected with the New York trip.

I would like to submit that the particular action of staying over in New York for another day also to be paid from student fees was wrong, and that therefore the decision of the Cabinet to approve all actions and judgments in the case as right was self-contradictory.

Now why is the action referred to wrong? It is wrong because it falls under one of the basic "do-not" principles of social living which can be formulated as follows: If money is collected from people under the laws of society and entrusted to a person to be spent in a specified manner, then it would be wrong for such a person to use it wholly or partly in a way in which it was not meant to be used considering the purpose for which it was allocated. This principle covers all kinds of funds socially collected, taxpayers' money, church money, charitable and welfare drive money and so on and sets up social limitations regarding the way in which group funds may be spent.

Many students to whom I spoke objected here that they would have acted exactly in the same manner as their president did if placed in the same situation. But this objection completely misses the point.

The rightness or wrongness of an action is not determined by what we actually do, it is determined by what we ought to do. Even if the whole of the United States agreed upon a certain line of action, this alone could not render it right if it were in conflict with the values and ideals to which United States citizens are committed.

We all are well aware of the frailty, the imperfection of human nature, of the numerous wrongs which we constantly commit in the performance of our regular duties. But this fact does not relieve us of our responsibility to recognize whatever wrong we may do and to keep intact our sense of the real values in life to which we are dedicated. It does not relieve us of the responsibility to live by these values and ideals instead of merely conforming to what we see other people doing.

If, for instance, taken prisoner in a war we find all our fellow prisoners succumbing to enemy pressure toward some kind of collaboration, it would still be wrong for us to succumb too. To do so might be understandable, it might be excusable, it might even be inevitable, but it could never be right.

Thus we seem to be driven to the conclusion that the Cabinet's decision, being self-contradictory, was an irrational one such as cannot be defended on rational grounds.

—E. H. Freund Professor Philosophy

THE DAILY COLLEGIAN

Successor to THE FREE LANCE, est. 1887

Published Tuesday through Saturday mornings inclusive during the University year by the staff of The Daily Collegian of The Pennsylvania State University.

Entered as second-class matter July 6, 1934, at the State College, Pa., Post Office under the act of March 3, 1879.

ED DUBBS, Editor STEVE HIGGINS, Business Manager

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Night Editor, Mary Kelly; Copy Editor, Denny Malick; Wire Editor, Bill Jaffe; Assistants: Marlene Milani, Jeannette Saxe, Thea Del Prete, Dodi Kota, Amy Rosenthal, Carol Blakeslee, Betty Anderson and Ernie Williams.

Little Man on Campus by Dick Bibler



"I feel LOUSY, Miss Mohr, let's make out a test today!"

To State, with Love

'Paths of Glory'—And the Military

By Larry Jacobson

Although not an ardent movie-goer, I had the pleasure Saturday night of standing through a performance of "Paths of Glory"—along with what seemed like 4000 other students.

Billed as one of the top ten pictures of the year, this movie lives up to all advance billing. It's the type you

have to see twice to really extract all the complex meanings inherent in the show.

"Paths of Glory" is an expose of an infamous episode during World War I when a French commander tried to fire his artillery on his own men for not taking part in a charge on a German hill. He undertook the task of trying to take the heavy fortified hill, and when the attack failed, he had to cover up for his own mistake in judgment. In spite of the fact that the charge failed because of heavy enemy artillery, the commander has one man from each battalion tried before a court martial on the charge of "cowardice." Although the real reason for the court martial was to cover up for his error in ordering the attack, he runs the court martial under the guise of "building the moral of the men."

Although innocent, the three men are convicted by a rigged trial and shot to death. The commander gets his due when it is discovered he ordered his artillery to fire on his own men, and although it doesn't happen in the picture, one gets the impression that he too eventually gets court-martialed.

Although I walked away from the movie with 15 or 20 thoughts swimming around in my head, the movie made one point that overshadowed all others: whether right or wrong,

you must obey orders in any military service. One entire facet of military philosophy is that to question an order, or disobey it, is treasonable.

Now this philosophy is fine during wartime, because war is in itself an ugly thing, and battles are oftentimes won or lost on split-second timing. There is no time, or place in discipline, for questions. The only trouble is that this philosophy doesn't disappear from the military during peace-time.

And with that thought in mind, I kept recalling the ROTC controversy on campus a few months ago. Somewhere during the many discussions, the statement was made that the military has become a part of the American way of life, and should be included in the College of The Liberal Arts because military and civilian principles could be interchanged. In other words, each would get a taste of the other.

Perish the thought! I grant we are no longer the country of free thinkers we once were. I also grant that the military principle is becoming more and more dominant as the years pass by. But why help this transition along?

The LA College is the last haven of the free thinker. Put the military in that college, and if by nothing more than osmosis, some of this strict dis-

(Continued on page five)

