

Editorial Opinion

Polls on Wheels

The small turnout of town independent men in the past election has prompted the Elections Commission to initiate floating polls in town for the spring elections.

Three floating polls on cars will travel on Garner, Pugh, and Locust Lane from 7 to 9 p.m. April 25, 26 and 27.

These cars will remain at each intersection for at least 15 minutes so that all interested students can vote with a minimum of effort.

In the past election only about 10 per cent of the town independent men cast ballots as compared with an all-campus voter turnout of about 33 per cent.

One of the reasons for this comparatively small voter turnout in town might have been the lack of a convenient polling place.

Both of the polling places designated for town independent men in the last election were located on campus.

In contrast, residence hall dwellers could vote during either lunch or dinner hours in their dining halls.

The traveling polls will remove any complaints that the town independent men might have about voting convenience.

The Elections Commission has done all it can to encourage these students to vote in the spring election.

It can only be hoped that the extra time and energy of the commission will be rewarded by a larger town vote turnout.

A Student-Operated Newspaper
57 Years of Editorial Freedom

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: \$4.00 a year. Mailing Address - Box 261, State College, Pa.

Member of The Associated Press

JOHN BLACK
Editor

WAYNE HILINSKI
Business Manager

City Editors, Lynne Cereffice and Richard Leighton; Editorial Editor, Joel Myers; News Editor, Paula Dranev; Sports Editor, James Karl; Assistant Sports Editors, Dean Billick and John Morris; Picture Editor, John Beauge.

Local Ad Mgr., Marge Downer; Assistant Local Ad Mgr., Martin Zonis; National Ad Mgr., Marcy Gross; Credit Mgr., Ralph Friedman; Assistant Credit Mgr., Kathy Notopoulos; Classified Ad Mgr., Kathie Ibbotson; Circulation Mgr., Mason Chesler; Personnel Mgr., Anita Hall; Office Mgr., Lynn Murphy.

Persons with complaints about The Daily Collegian's editorial policy or news coverage may voice them in the letters to the editor column or present them in person or in writing, to the editor. All complaints will be investigated and efforts made to remedy situations where this newspaper is at fault. The Daily Collegian, however, upholds the right to maintain its independence and to exercise its own judgment as to what it thinks is in the best interest of the University as a whole.

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS by Dick Bibler



WHY, FREDA, YOU DIDN'T TELL ME YOU HAD A DATE WITH A FRATERNITY MAN!

snowed

Propaganda Cycles

by Joel Myers

President Kennedy's refusal to hold a summit conference until there is a significant improvement in East-West relations has temporarily prevented the further success of a major portion of Premier Khrushchev's foreign policy.

Soviet foreign policy is partially based on mass psychology that is directed at the peoples of the world. This policy follows a cyclic process that causes East-West dealings to pass through alternating periods of improving relations and increasing tensions.

The peaks of this cycle, which are represented by relatively congenial relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., are usually characterized by a summit conference.

These conferences fit neatly into the Communist psychological assault because they allow Khrushchev to command an unearned position as world leader.

Khrushchev is the man who calls for the conference. He is the man upon whom progress depends. He is the man who

ultimately torpedoes the conference. All of these seemingly wasteful actions serve as a psychological victory for the Communist world because they permit the Soviet leader to convey an over-inflated image of control and power.

The Kennedy-Khrushchev confrontation in Vienna last spring was preceded by unusually good U.S.-Soviet relations, but soon after the meeting tension between two mighty powers increased greatly. The crisis over Berlin and the resumption of Russian nuclear explosions marked the low point of the cycle last summer.

In line with the cyclic nature of Soviet foreign relations, there was a substantial easing of tensions between East and West during the autumn and winter. This improvement in relations was accompanied by Soviet suggestions for another Kennedy-Khrushchev summit conference.

Finally, Khrushchev proposed that the Geneva Disarmament Conference take the form of a giant summit. Realizing that this was just another attempt by Mr. K to convey an image of peacemaker to the world, Kennedy and Macmillan politely dismissed this idea.

Khrushchev must now face the fact that he can no longer

pressure the U.S. into a summit conference by simply relaxing falsely-created tensions.

Kennedy has stated clearly that he will only meet with the top Russian when significant progress toward settling major differences has begun.

This leaves Khrushchev with two probable alternatives for obtaining a face-to-face meeting with the U.S. President. Either he can make an effort to settle some U.S.-Soviet disputes or he can take the opposite approach of raising tensions to such a high level that Kennedy could only avoid a summit conference at the risk of war.

Signs of U.S.-Soviet cooperation in space might serve as a base for building improved relations, while increased harassment of U.S. flights to West Berlin and hints that tensions over Berlin will again increase could signal a deterioration of relations.

The Soviet decision on which course to follow will not only be based on which path has the greatest chance of forcing Kennedy to the Summit, but also on which method will best benefit Russian interests in the long run.

The apparent lack of direction that has recently been observed in Soviet foreign policy may indicate that this course of action has not yet been determined.

Letters

Coed Hits University Services

TO THE EDITOR: I guess the story on housing and the health service at this University is the same all over. It seems we are having some of the same problems in the girls' dormitories as were mentioned in previous letters to the editor.

Our floor is never washed during the school year—rather, the dust is waxed in at 2-month intervals.

To send a woman in to clean our rooms every other week is quite unnecessary for in two days the dust is one-half inch thick and the floors will continue to look dusty until they are washed, not waxed! These women who clean do a wonderful job considering the short amount of time they have for each room. We want our floors washed. Do we have to hire people to do it?

In the lavatory I found a white sheet put out by the Department of Housing:

"Emergencies—A Doctor and Nurse are on Duty at all times at the University Health Center..."

It sounds impressive but why:

•When I arrived at the health center at 4:45 I was told all the doctors had left because it was almost 5:00?

•Why was I asked if I felt I was an emergency when I went to the emergency entrance of the health center and asked to see a doctor? (I didn't get to see one, by the way!)

•Why on certain occasions does a student find no one at the desk of the emergency exit and have to wander around the halls in search of a nurse or something?

Something terrible could happen in case of a real emergency! Let's not wait until it does and then do something.

Fellow students—I'd like to hear some of your attitudes about housing and the health center! Speak up now!

—Lynn Sirofka, '64

Letters

Student Favors Shelter

TO THE EDITOR: In Thursday's Collegian a group of professors stated that our government should not provide its citizens with shelter protection from an atomic attack. I feel that their position is in error.

The letter opened with the statement that shelter protection would be of little use in the area of total destruction. This is perfectly true. However, President Kennedy, Sec. of Defense McNamara, and others who support fallout shelter protection are very careful to state that the reason for this protection is to save those people outside the area of total destruction who would otherwise be killed by radioactive fallout.

It is further stated in the letter that shelter protection would be of little value in the event of a large scale attack on the populus. First, our military experts feel that a surprise nuclear attack will be directed primarily at our retaliatory capabilities and NOT at the general populus. Against this kind of attack fallout shelters would be invaluable in saving American lives.

Second, war gaming on computers has estimated that fallout protection would save about 15 million lives in the case of an attack against our retaliatory capabilities and about 35 million lives in the

case of an attack against our cities.

The letter also stated that the greatest danger in a shelter program is that it will lull the people into a false sense of security believing that we can survive a nuclear war and thus make such a war more likely. There is no doubt of the holocaust that would be ours in the event of a nuclear attack, shelters or no.

If the people are made aware of this then there is certainly NO danger of creating a false sense of security. The real danger lies in allowing this argument to persuade America not to build fallout shelters and thus leave ourselves totally vulnerable.

We must realize that nuclear war is distressingly likely as Mr. Kennedy himself has stated. When Mao says he could sacrifice 300 million Chinese and experts predict that China will have the bomb in two years the imminence of nuclear war is made very clear.

Furthermore, we must realize that fallout shelters will save millions in the event of such an attack. The Kennedy Administration estimates that for 700 million dollars we can provide some measure of protection for 70 million Americans. This is a cost of \$10 per man, woman and child. I sincerely hope we value our lives that highly.

—William Stout '62

