

Editorial Opinion

SGA—Of, For and By the Students

The much contested SGA Constitution was withdrawn from the arena of the joint Senate committees which were discussing it Monday night.

It was withdrawn at the request of SGA President Dennis Foianini—who felt that what was left after the committees changes was a jumble of illogical procedural rules and emasculated "power."

It is indeed unfortunate that there does not remain a constituted body to rework this constitution. But reworked it must be if it is to be a firm and lasting document.

The constitution which the Senate Committee on Student Affairs received earlier this year was not such a document. It had been written and re-written by various committees all trying to satisfy diverse pressure groups and interests.

The result, though theoretically good,

Right to Organize

Two additional points must be made concerning the reworking of this constitution. They are theoretically similar as they both represent areas of strong student government. Specifically they concern the maintenance of the party system in Assembly and the assumption by SGA of a disciplinary function.

The major point of contention in the Senate committee meeting was the party system. Three students appeared before the committee and proposed elimination of the political party from the nominating and election procedure for Assembly representatives.

They contended, that nominees for one residence area should not be nominated by the entire party. In theory we support this.

But vehemently oppose their view that the nomination and election procedures should be carried on solely by the governments of the residence areas. This would in effect eliminate the party system from the SGA Assembly.

Assembly members are not supposed to be concerned with the piddling problems encountered by the residence area councils.

Their job is to legislate on matters of an All-University nature. The separate parties often hold divergent views on these matters and on basic philosophies of government.

The Assemblymen elected under such a system would not have the strength of party unity behind their legislation, or the research facilities of the party at hand.

Right to Govern

The function of an SGA judicial—with disciplinary power—cannot be decided until there is a meeting ground of the several bodies now dispensing discipline—the Dean of Men's office, the Dean of Women's office and the Senate Sub-committee on discipline.

The section of the constitution which would give SGA the power to assume this function was therefore deleted for further consideration when such a consensus is reached.

We trust that the administrative personnel presently involved in this function are acting in good faith. We do not want to see a permanent "postponement" of this discussion nor an evasion of the issue.

That the present judicial structure varies with the dispenser is not to be denied

left loop-holes and inconsistencies. In trying to anticipate any and all disputes, power cliques and procedural stratagems before they could occur, the document faltered of its own weight.

The last SGA constitution failed for similar reasons. And to head off another fruitless and frustrating student government it has been suggested that the new constitution be made shorter and far more general in nature but specific in philosophy.

All the extraneous details should be placed in the by-laws section and in a handbook of procedural rules.

Such a constitution would be a workable document needed in times of change at the University. And it will, we hope, represent student opinion voiced through a powerful student government.

But most important, no student would be able to vote for a platform or a principle—only for a face.

We cannot conceive of a strong government built on the arbitrary decisions of four elections committees and uncommitted candidates not responsible after election to any philosophy or position on an issue.

This issue has evolved from a basic misunderstanding of the terminology of the SGA constitution. For convenience the term AWS was used when actually "all women living in residence halls" was meant. Likewise, MRC, TIM and IFC do not refer to those existing governing bodies, but to the people living in the areas. The representation was specifically arranged in this manner so that SGA Assemblymen could go right back to their living areas (not residence councils) to find their constituencies.

There is a compromise measure to be proposed here, which we favor strongly over all other suggestions.

Each political party should hold nominations in the four "districts" of representation. This would insure a uniform nomination and election procedure for each district.

Moreover, it would retain the party system which is the only way the electorate can hold their representative accountable for his actions and his vote.

Any committee considering the abolition of this power of the electorate is violating a premise upon which informed democracy must operate.

and therefore we hope SGA's desire to assume the function will spur the much needed revision in this area.

As expressed at Student Encampment this is the realm in which SGA would like to begin to assume real governing power—rather than remain a government in name only.

In conclusion we say that the Senate Committee on Student Affairs and its sub-committee on Organization Control have only one moral obligation before them.

That, plainly, is to act according to the student body in reference to how they want to run their government and its political structure.

Any other course on the part of the committee could only be construed as dictatorship.

Interpreting

Khrushchev Tries For Party Control

By WILLIAM L. RYAN

Associated Press News Analyst

BERLIN (AP) — The results of the Soviet Communist congress which ended yesterday indicate that Premier Khrushchev, having won his battle with dissidents, now will attempt to tighten his control of the party.

The Presidium, supposed to be the ruling body of the party, has been pared to 11 members, which makes it resemble the old Stalinist Politburo.

But if there is to be any Stalinism, the chances are that it will be administered collectively. If Khrushchev gets any ideas of exercising anything approaching the enormous power wielded by the old dictator, he probably will face yet another battle.

Limiting the Presidium to 11 members may have been a move to safeguard the Kremlin's central control while Khrushchev goes ahead in industry and agriculture with measures designed to remove bureaucratic roadblocks. These always have hampered the Soviet economy.

The names of those dropped indicate compromise at the top. Ekaterina Furtseva, Nikolai Ignatov and Nuriidin Mukhitdinov were left off the Presidium. All staunchly backed Khrushchev in his battle against the group headed by V. M. Molotov and Georgi A. Malenkov.

The Presidium is supposed on paper to be elected by the party congress. Such matters actually are decided well in advance of congresses; the rank-and-file delegates simply

approve what has been decided for them.

Thus whatever compromises were made came before Khrushchev mounted the congress rostrum to pour vitriol on the memory of Stalin and to denounce Stalin's lieutenants as bunglers and murderers.

There had to be a reason for this, and the reason seems to be that elements within the party still oppose Khrushchev both in his domestic economic policies and in his foreign policy. There are likely people still in high places whom Khrushchev would like to push out of the way.

The party secretariat now enlarged to nine members, seems to reflect a division between points of view in a collective leadership. It is noteworthy that Mikhail Suslov, long known for his Stalinist outlook, remains both on the Presidium and the secretariat.

One may speculate that Khrushchev so far has missed by a fairly wide margin getting all he wants. He made it clear he wanted all the antiparty group people expelled from the Communist party. But there was no such action in the congress, at least publicly.

Letters

An Invitation to Give Thanks

TO THE EDITOR: Since it is a foregone conclusion that the student body will spend Thanksgiving Day here at the University, I should like to extend an invitation to President Walker, Dr. Bernreuter, Mr. Read and the other high-ranking University officials to come to West Halls for Thanksgiving Dinner.

I'm sure that the knowledge

that these men, too, will be away from their families for this meal will go far towards quieting the protests of angry students.

I'm sure, also, that if Food Service wills it, we here at West Halls will be glad to contribute towards providing guest meal tickets for this occasion.

—Andrew Hailstone '63

A Student-Operated Newspaper

The Daily Collegian

Successor to The Free Lance, est. 1887

Published Tuesday through Saturday morning during the University year. The Daily Collegian is a student-operated newspaper. Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1934 at the State College, Pa. Post Office under the act of March 3, 1879.

Mail Subscription Price: \$6.00 a year

Mailing Address — Box 261, State College, Pa.

JOHN BLACK
Editor

WAYNE HILINSKI
Business Manager

Gazette

TODAY

Air Force Mixer, 7 p.m., HUB ballroom
Alpha Phi Omega, 8 a.m., 1st floor
HUB
AWS, 6:30 p.m., 217-218 HUB
Block "S" Executive Committee, 6:30 p.m., 214 HUB
Chem-Phys Student Council, 6:45 p.m., 212-213 HUB
Chess Club, 7 p.m., HUB card room
East Halls Council, 6 p.m., 102 East Dining Hall

History Round Table, 7:30 p.m., 214-215 HUB
NDEA French Institute Movie, 8 p.m., 209 Home Ec. South
Nittany Grotto Meeting, 7:15 p.m., 121 Mineral Industries
PS Bible Fellowship, 12:15 p.m., 212 HUB
Sports Car Club, 8 p.m., 301 Boucke
Women's Chorus, 8:30 p.m., HUB assembly hall

