

Editorial Opinion

Take the Good Points; Progress from There

Many incidents have occurred these past few weeks to arouse speculation as to the worth of the entire system of student government on this campus.

Is student government on the rocks? Is this new system ineffective? Has it been corrupted by dirty politics?

First of all, let us say that the new system did not appear on the scene unexpectedly, nor was it the product of one mastermind interested in promoting his own personal gains.

Reorganization came after years of careful study. The system was born out of extensive debates on its values and faults. It was designed to give the students a better degree of representation directly from the classes, so that the system could not be controlled by interest groups which represent a small number of students.

The important thing that is to be observed in viewing these recent events is that the SGA system as it now stands is dependent upon the responsibility and reliability of campus political parties.

Through these parties, candidates for SGA positions are chosen to run on a ballot in the hopes that the results will be determined by the student body, in hopes that the student body will have a choice as to which candidate would best fulfill his major duties of representing their views.

Penn State has had a long-standing reputation among colleges throughout the nation for its effective system of student government. And student government for the most part deserved this reputation. At times accusations have been levied at actions taken by the student leaders—they have been declared irresponsible. This may be true in some instances, but the good side of student government far outweighs its bad angles.

We do not think that student government will fail in its objectives if the students recognize how imperative it is to maintain good government and that the SGA members represent the student body.

Students may become disillusioned with these incidents. They may lose faith in student government. But this is the coward's way out. They do not want to look at both sides of the story nor do they want to consider the many accomplishments that could be made under this new system if responsibility is inherent in its members.

The facts are out on various incidents but these facts are not designed to dissuade the student body from the good side that student government has to offer.

What would happen if there was no student government? Or if the administration were obliged to take over where student government had failed?

What are we going to do about it? We can all shrug our shoulders and say "why bother". Why bother? So we can make our student government work. So we can clear up the bad spots in the system and leave no room for criticism.

How to do this patching up? By cooperation on the part of all people directly and indirectly connected with SGA so that it can have the results that were intended last year.

Cooperation cannot be forced upon the students. They must realize its necessity by themselves. But if the statements that have been issued in the past week hold any truth, if party chairmen, candidates, and people within the SGA are sincerely concerned with producing a good system of government, let us see them all working together for a common goal.

This is the only way to make student government work for the students. Individuals, political parties, student leaders should combine their efforts to maintain the party system and thus maintain the forum of the student body.

Letters

Brandt States Campus Party Principles

TO THE EDITOR: In the past political parties have been, for the most part, election clubs which have had as their sole purpose that of getting people elected to office. More often than not, the candidates have been motivated by self gain and desire for recognition by various pressure groups which, so it appears, admire the ability to control rather than to govern.

The present Campus party consists of a small group of people who feel that the establishment of a proper political party and the holding of a real nominating convention supercedes the desire to elect and particular candidate at the present time.

Proper candidates will arise in the debate on the issues that form party planks and in the interaction of actual factions that would come to exist in a properly-run political convention where the deck, for the first time, has not been dealt until the candidates votes are counted.

Therefore, Campus party proposes to make available a large room, a competent chairman, several issues we feel are worthy of student support and an open debate in which students may express themselves fully.

If anyone feels like bringing forth such issues as the exemption of active reservists from ROTC, the participation of student government in the affairs of borough, state and national governments or the establishment of the students' voice a force that cannot be ignored, then this is the time for all good men to form a party.

The opportunity for political activity on this campus and especially in Campus party is now possibly greater than it has ever been.

The failure of students to participate in behalf of their own interests will result in interest groups picking away at our representative government until it reverts back to the previous aristocratic Cabinet system.

Campus party feels that a two-party system is essential to the continuance of an elected Assembly. If public support is forthcoming, we pledge not only to work and to win for candidates who represent the student interests, but to devote our time and energy to establish a proper political party which feels its membership and whose membership is felt.

If not, then we refuse to run a sham election.

—John Brandt, '61

Little Man on Campus by Dick Bibler



"MIGHT BE DANGEROUS TO ASK A FACULTY MEMBER TO INTRODUCE OUR COMMENCEMENT SPEAKER—THEY'RE USED TO GIVING 50-MINUTE LECTURES."

Students Comment on Parties

TO THE EDITOR: It seems to me that the talk of party sell-outs, party collapses and election fixes points up the fact that the two political parties now stand for little more than the personalities that run them.

Campus party must stand for something more than a campus, and the University party a university, but not much more. How then can we blame anyone for leaving his party if such action will further his political career?

If a two-party system is necessary to good student government, and if the parties must stand for something to hold their members, it is obvious that these two parties must find something, some issue, on which they will permanently disagree.

Because both parties are composed entirely of students it is not enough for a candidate to say that he will work for the betterment of the student's position. He must say how he will do this.

There are, it seems to me, at least two alternatives. One can take a liberal or a conservative attitude toward cooperation with the administration. The conservative attitude would amount to a close cooperation with the administration in the hope that favors would be

granted. The liberal attitude would be that of very directly representing the student, of criticizing administration policy when it adversely affects the students, of trying to force action with a "damn the torpedoes" attitude.

Comparing the student situation with that of labor, the conservative element would favor a sort of company union. The liberal element would of course, claim that a company union is no union at all.

The union comparison is not at all unrealistic when one considers that the administration, like management, makes all the important decisions. The students have the power to criticize, to demonstrate and to demand action. But the final decision on such action rests with the administration.

I don't claim that the suggested party philosophies are the only ones possible. Parties could divide on the basis of fraternity-sorority versus independent and fight eternally over the best way to live. They could divide according to curriculum and fight over the relative merits of technical and liberal educations. I do claim that this division would be one with the inherent power to improve the student's position.

—Robert Biesterfeldt, '60

... And Propose Alternatives

TO THE EDITOR: Although I saw some truth in your editorial, "Party Sell-Out," I feel that I must disagree with some points.

It is certain that we need two political parties, or more, if our system of student government is to be successful at all. It is a sorry thing when a strong political machine is able to entice candidates to desert their party.

It also seems that Messrs. Crosby and Darran are showing a definite Judas tendency in switching parties. What I dislike is the hanging of Howard Byers from the same dogwood as the other two.

Each of these three were charged with "trying to further his own interest forgetting his primary job of adequately representing the students and his secondary job of supporting the party. It was

also stated that these people were unable to have their "interests . . . transcend the mere level of personal gain."

I do not see how the charges fit Mr. Byers. Although he has severed the ties with the party which elected him, this action may not be without reason. Is it not true that Mr. Byers found it necessary, earlier in the term, to resign from his position of minority leader and from the Rules Committee?

As for the charge of seeking personal gain, how can this be true in the case of Mr. Byers? He is a senior and will have no use for future office in the Assembly.

As for representing students, it seems to me that his name has been outstanding in your paper when you gave coverage to any SGA business which had an effect on us, the students.

—Lawrence Royer, '60

Gazette

- TODAY
Center Stage, production of "An Italian Straw Hat," 3 p.m.
Cwena, card party and fashion show, 1 p.m., HUB ballroom
Freshman-Sophomore Dance Committee, 1 p.m., 212 HUB
T.M. Dance, 9-12 p.m., HUB ballroom
UCA Faculty Committee and SCA, lecture by Dr. J. Neal Hughley, professor of economics, North Carolina College, 8 p.m., Chapel, topic: "The Christian Faith and the Capitalist-Socialist Controversy"
TOMORROW
Chem-Physics Student Council, 2 p.m., 212 HUB
Chess Club, 2 p.m., HUB cardroom
Christian Fellowship, 2 p.m., 217 HUB
Commerce 474 Planning Committee, 3:30 p.m., 218 HUB
Emerson Society, 6:30 p.m., 205 Boucke
Executive Committee, 6 p.m., 216 HUB
Freshman Advisory Board, 3:30 p.m., 208 HUB
Graduate Students Bridge, 7 p.m., 212-18 HUB
Management Meeting, 7 p.m., 217 HUB
Newman Club, 7 p.m., 214-15 HUB
Protestant Worship Service, 9 a.m., Chapel, Rev. William Kuhre
Reception, 8:45-11 p.m., HUB main lounge
Roman Catholic Mass, 9 a.m., Schwab
Sophomore Advisory Board, 1:30 p.m., HUB assembly room
Swedenborgian Service, 10:30 a.m., 212-18 HUB
University Lecture Series, 8 p.m., Schwab, Dr. Herman J. Muller, Topic: "The Future Physical Development of Man"
USF, 9:30 a.m., 217-18 HUB
MONDAY
A Phi O, 7 p.m., 212-13 HUB
Botany Club, 7 p.m., Buckhout Lab
Chi Lambda, 4 p.m., HUB main lounge
Christian Fellowship, 12:45 p.m., 218 HUB
College of Mineral Industries, lecture by Dr. W. S. von Ark, 10 a.m., 317 Willard, topic: "Heat Balance of the Oceans"
Engineering Mechanics Seminar, 4:15 p.m., 203 Eng A, G. T. Vavouras, topic: "Special Stress Problems Caused by Two-Dimensional Temperature Distributions"
Faculty Luncheon Club, noon, HUB dining room A, Wallace F. Workmaster, topic: "Conserving our Historical Resources"
IFC, 7 p.m., HUB assembly room
IUCF, 7 p.m., 217 HUB
SGA, 8 p.m., 218 HUB

