

Editorial Opinion

USG and Discipline

The chief item of business for tonight's USG meeting is the formation of a committee to investigate and make recommendations on the men's and women's disciplinary systems.

The importance of this committee cannot be overstated, for its subject matter is of direct importance to every undergraduate.

But in addition, USG's initiative in attempting to overhaul the discipline system may give student government some unification and governing power.

Inherent in the committee's consideration of Penn State's judicial codes or lack thereof, is the goal of establishing a series of common pleas courts, operating under USG rather than under the area governments as is now the case.

Revision and codification of the present rules is necessary and desirable, since there are, at present, various agencies making rules and dispensing discipline on this campus.

They are the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, its subcommittee on discipline, the Dean of Men's office, the Dean of Women's office, the AWS judicial, the MRC judicial and the off-campus tribunal.

Too often, the regulations set up by and interpretations fostered within some of these groups prove to be contrary to regulations and interpretations on the same subject in other judicial groups. Codification of common offenses and standard penalties for such offenses should be first on the USG committee check list.

The system of courts which USG is attempting to create would be ultimately responsible to the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, which initially chartered USG.

In addition, the system we visualize would include an appellate structure, with the USG Supreme Court at its top. This Supreme Court would not have to burden itself hearing the case of every student who feels unjustly treated, but by discriminating attention, it could hear cases which are representative.

The dean's offices have the right to circumvent the present judicial structure. This could only be altered by a change in the Senate regulations which we think unlikely. But should a student feel that this right is abused, he could bring it to the attention of the Supreme Court which could hear the case and reach a decision.

The important point, benefitting the entire student body is not whether this individual case is reversed, but whether, for the record, the Supreme Court feels that injustice has been committed.

In brief then, this is, on the lower levels, a codification and unification of diverse judicial powers and, on the upper levels, an appellate structure.

Above all, it would mean that the USG really is a governing body administering justice and seeking to protect and preserve student rights and dignity.

Although this is claimed by the USG constitution it remains for the infant organization to prove it.

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

Member of The Associated Press



Letters to the Editor

Grad Questions Causes of Apathy

TO THE EDITOR: In your issues of Feb. 1 and 3, I have read letters concerning the alleged student apathy toward world and domestic affairs which is supposed to be so pervasive on this campus.

While I am personally not in a position to comment on the extensiveness of student lethargy—I have taken no surveys—I am interested by the causes assigned to it, namely, Mr. Sprintzen's oversimplified "we just don't care" syndrome, and Mr. McHale's highly subjective notion that religious malaise is at the root of the trouble.

To say "we just don't care" is not to give a cause, but merely to identify a symptom. Apathy is what is really under attack here, and not noncommitment.

Mr. Sprintzen's charges do not go deeper than the obvious symptom of the condition and therefore do not shed much light on its causes.

Mr. McHale attempts to isolate the causes with a little more depth, but his conclusions arouse some curiosity. He assumes that commitment is a moral responsibility. No one, I think, will question that human affairs, and problems of justice in them, are moral as well as political issues.

However, it is not necessarily true that the kind of morality involved here is the kind which takes one to church on Sunday.

The two kinds may be related, but they are not always

mutually dependent. And everyday morality does not have to be dependent on God. The fact is, that some of us are oriented toward a particular God, and some of us are not. The capacity for assuming moral responsibility is not a function of category.

The popular notion that the religious nonconformist—the "honest doubter," skeptic, agnostic, or atheist—is morally degenerate and irresponsible, is a myth.

A person who thinks nothing of God whatever is capable of humane, intelligent, and responsible behavior. Likewise, an individual with his eye firmly fixed on God is capable of mistreating his fellow men. History bears this out.

I do not wish to imply here that I think churches foster civic irresponsibility far from it. But I do wish to point out that moral responsibility is an individual matter, a function of an individual's capacity for justice and humanitarian thought and behavior.

Mr. McHale also cites belief in the "natural law" as a necessity for revitalization. As there is no universal interpretation of God in 20th century America, how can there be universal agreement on what this "natural law" stands for?

In the area of principle, Mr. McHale's meaning gets even more obscure. Any doctrinaire concept, religious or political, rests on principles of some kind. Democracy, we know, is based on principle, but so is Marxism.

Our reactions to various

concepts depend solely on whether or not we happen to be sympathetic with the principles involved. Our rejection of certain ones does not, however, eliminate them as valid principles.

It is true that commitment to principle has given rise to the development of great countries like ours. But it has also been responsible, in the historical past, for much intolerance, persecution, and generally inhumane behavior.

I do not feel that I am in a position to cite causes for such a widespread situation as student apathy is supposed to be in a one- or two-column letter. But I think I would urge those who cry commitment to be cautious.

Certainly, it is every student's moral obligation to know what is going on in the world, to learn the meaning of "isms," and to understand the principles upon which they operate.

Commitment must only follow such understanding, and never precede it.

There is a considerable danger that, in the struggle between opposed principles, the person in the middle may be caught and confused.

To commit oneself in mid-confusion is irresponsible, and it is on such commitments that mass movements thrive.

In other words, commitment to no principle is better than commitment to one that is not understood.

—Donald Wineke, Graduate Student

Final Exam 'Experience' Unnecessary

TO THE EDITOR: Last week in discussing a finals period for next year, Dr. Bernreuter said "students could make a clear stand on this issue on what is good for them educationally, and would probably get a good hearing."

The student opinion should be known to our stagnant bureaucracy by now—regardless of Dr. Bernreuter's "personal opinion that final examinations were to be de-emphasized and all examinations were to be held in the regular class periods."

To anyone taking a realistic attitude toward the problem of finals, it becomes obvious that:

• Final examinations have NOT been de-emphasized in the great majority of classes.

• A majority of professors dislike being forced to use their class time to give finals.

• The student body finds the present system of finals an extreme hardship—certainly not an "educational" experience.

Penn State students would gladly welcome the chance to voice their opinions, especially if they thought that by doing so the policy-makers of this University would take heed.

—Ray M. Anderson, '63

Fisher Interprets OSGA Vote

TO THE EDITOR: The most recent turn of events in the controversial USG name change is one that necessitates a closer look at the implications of the OSGA decision of last weekend, when the body voted against recommending that University Park's USG change its name back to SGA.

Note that they voted against recommending a change, and not, as the Feb. 13, Daily Collegian implied, against changing the name ("OSGA Defeats USG Name Change"). Just what is the significance of this decision of OSGA?

The significance is simply this: OSGA, considered among other things, the "political implications" and complexities which a name change would have at University Park; according to USG President Dennis Folanini, who very skillfully presented his side of the story.

The organization felt that to recommend a name change would be to place unfair pressure upon one of its member campuses, and its biggest member, as well. A year ago when such a recommendation was made, it was for all campuses to comply—not any specific one. This year the case is different.

No, "the bottom" has not "fallen out of the principle argument" for a USG name change; on the other hand,

OSGA has distinguished itself for not having put one of its member campuses on the proverbial "spot," a decision which even to the OSGA president appeared erroneous at the time.

OSGA has said, in essence, "It's your problem at University Park; we realize your problems there and would rather not get involved in them."

"We want you as a member whatever you call yourselves; we need you for the betterment of the University as a whole. We can see both sides of your position at University Park and would rather not interfere, lest we cause any resentment against OSGA. It's your problem; make your own decision."

This is the decision of OSGA, yet I can't help feel the majority of its members would be happy to see the name changed back to SGA. USG Congressmen, the decision is up to you.

—Robert M. Fisher '63, President, OSGA

(Editor's Note: At the OSGA convention last weekend, the organization voted down a motion which would have recommended a name change for USG. The vote was: six opposed, two in favor, four abstaining. The story in The Daily Collegian noted that the OSGA voted on recommendation, not on legislation. OSGA is an "advisory liaison" and has no legislative power.)

Committee Offers 'Thank You'

TO THE EDITOR: On behalf of the Military Ball Committee I would like to publicly thank the administration, particularly Mr. George Donovan, Dean Frank Simes, and Vice President Stanley Campbell for their help in negotiating for the opening of the HUB parking lot for student use.

The weeks of negotiations showed that there are times when the administration will not only listen to student requests, but will honor them.

I also would like to plead with

the students to respect this privilege and to use it wisely. Should the privilege be abused, the lot will again be closed.

—Gomer Williams '63, Mil Ball Committee

Valentine Heart

TO THE EDITOR: I wish to commend the sisters of Phi Sigma Sigma Sorority for certainly having their hearts in the right place on Valentine's Day.

—Mark Solovovsky, '63

WDFM Schedule THURSDAY

- 6:00 News
6:05 Dinner Date
6:55 Weatherscope
7:00 CAMPUS BEAT
7:00 Call from London
7:30 Album Review
7:30 Musically Speaking
8:00 News
8:05 This is the Subject
8:00 News in French
9:05 Folk Music
9:30 Opinion 15
9:45 News, Sports and Weather
10:00 Chamber Concert
12:00 Sign-off

FRIDAY

- 6:00 News
6:05 Dinner Date
6:55 Weatherscope
7:00 Spotlight
8:00 Light Classical Jukebox
9:00 Marquee Memories
9:45 News, Sports and Weather
10:00 Ballet Theatre
12:00 News
12:05 Night Sound
2:00 Sign-off