

Editorial Opinion

# Political Party Pact: Its Unstated Words

The three political party heads on campus—Michael Dzvonic, chairman of University Party; Allison Woodall, acting chairman of Campus Party; and Anne Morris, chairman of Liberal Party—assumed dictatorial control of Congressional elections Wednesday night when they made public their pact declaring that political parties would not nominate candidates for this fall's election.

This pact leaves us with only one thought for political parties—that they must either participate in all student government elections or participate in none. They must organize a strong year-round party system or fold.

Politics even on a student level cannot be a once a year thing. It is impossible to have one half of the student policy-making team—the president, vice president and secretary—elected in a political campaign, and the other half—the Congress—elected in a non-political election.

We believe that the real situation posed in between the brief lines of this pact is that the parties could not organize and field a slate of candidates in all of the Congressional election districts this fall. If this inference is correct, it is unfair for parties to participate in the "easy," more spectacular spring elections and disregard the "tough" but equally important one in the fall.

Furthermore, we believe that Congressmen should be elected only after students are given a chance to consider the stands they will take on the relevant issues. It is completely unfair both to the student body and to the future of student government at this University to have the majority of candidates judged on appearance of the number of activities in which they have participated.

The party heads supported their nefarious pact by saying that they felt a non-partisan Congress would be a more responsible legislative body.

We disagree with this statement on two points. First, we believe a non-partisan Congress would be an unorganized Congress and as such would be led around by the executive, which would be elected on party slates.

Secondly, we do not believe a Congress elected without parties could remain non-partisan. As an example, we point to last year's Congress which, by University Senate decree, was elected without party participation. Within six weeks of that Congress' election, political parties had gained enough support in the Congress to hold caucuses before the weekly USG meeting.

Thus, it appears that an "issue-centered" campaign, which we feel is extremely vital to the success of USG elections, is being sacrificed for convenience and for an attempt to insure a non-partisan Congress—an attempt which has failed in the past year under similar circumstances.

We have also found that the chairmen's pact is full of loopholes, the most notable of these being that parties may back candidates. In effect, parties are permitted to maintain an organization within the Congress while shirking the work necessary in the campaign to capture a Congressional seat.

If the party heads sincerely want to eliminate "bossism" in the Congress as they vowed to the USG Congress Wednesday night, they should get down to work and organize a good, clean political campaign for this fall's Congressional elections.

The time has come when all three parties must take a good look at their ideals and aims for bettering this University. Each was organized by a group of students who felt that they had an ideal good enough and strong enough to benefit student government.

If parties have lost sight of this ideal and if they do not feel it is important enough to renew, then they are existing without purpose and their presence is superfluous to student government.

However, we of The Daily Collegian feel that parties are a vital necessity to the strength of student government. If they weaken, so weakens student government.

We urge the party chairmen, the party members, the USG Congress, the Elections Commission and the student body to consider these views.

We are certain that if parties have the initiative and the will to become an asset to student government, the elections date could be moved back to give them time to organize both themselves and their slates.

Despite the inconvenience we suggest, we feel that adherence to our proposal is a sound way to insure the continuation of student government at this University.

qui salt?

# Postal Rate Bill

by saralee orton

The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has passed a postal rate bill which provides not only for an increase in postal rates effective Jan. 7, but for a pay increase for 1,600,000 government workers.

The bill as approved by the committee has many commendable points. However, it has one highly disturbing aspect. An amendment to the bill would direct the Post Office to detain any "Communist political propaganda" contained in mail from abroad.

True, the bill exempts entirely any mail addressed to government agencies, libraries, institutions of higher education and individuals connected therewith, since the material would then presumably be used for purposes of education and information.

Also exempted would be mail delivered under a reciprocal international agreement by which the United States government mails an equal amount of material to Communist countries.

However, as the New York Times times stated in an editorial, this still means that there are two kinds of Americans: those who can be trusted to receive any kind of mail from the Communist world and those who cannot.

This distinction is an insult to the American people.

Moreover, this is contradictory to the principles of a free society.

Why should the Secretary of the Treasury be permitted to judge what is "Communist political propaganda" and what is not, as the bill provides? What are his special qualifications for judging what is safe and good for the American public to read? This censorship, however token, does violence to the principles expounded by the founders of this country.

The bill does provide that the persons to whom the material is addressed, if they are not among those presumably trustworthy and intelligent enough to read the material without defecting to Communism, can receive their material. They can, that is, after considerable delay and after subjecting themselves to the embarrassment of requesting it.

It's hard to judge how many Americans will be adversely affected by exposure to Communist propaganda. However, in a free society, a person has the right to be exposed to almost anything, if he so chooses. It is in no way consistent with democratic ideals to set up an authority to judge what the people should see and what they should not see. This smells strongly of totalitarianism.

Unfortunately, this is not the first peacetime postal censorship in the United States. Last year, President Kennedy halted an executive program begun in 1950 by which all books, magazines and other non-first class mail from behind the Iron Curtain were detained by the Post Office.

When he discontinued the program, Kennedy said the State, Treasury, Justice and Post Office Departments had found it to be without "useful intelligence func-

tion." Earlier the National Security Council had unanimously recommended termination of the mail interception.

If this was true then, what has changed the nature of Communist propaganda and the American people so much in a year's time that a similar program is necessary?

When the postal bill passed the House a year ago, it contained the Cunningham Amendment which provided that anything determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda would not be allowed delivery in the United States.

The Senate committee softened the tone of the Cunningham Amendment in its version of the bill. They would have done well to eliminate it entirely. The Senate will do well to strike off this provision before passing the Senate postal rate bill.

Carl Sandburg had something to say on propaganda in a poem titled "The People, Yes." The last lines run something like this:

"The storm of propaganda blows always.  
In every air of today the germs float and hover.  
The shock and contact of ideas goes on.  
The people have the say-so  
Let the argument go on,  
Let the people listen.  
Tomorrow the people say Yes or No by one question:  
"What else can be done?"  
In the drive of faiths on the wind today the people know—  
"We have come far and we are going farther yet . . ."

Carl Sandburg has a lot more faith in the American people than does the United States Congress.



MISS ORTON

Letters

## TOCS II Advocate Asks 'Who Are All Those Others?'

WHO ARE ALL THOSE OTHERS? Following his speech in State College on Sept. 13, the Republican candidate for governor, Rep. Scranton, was asked whether he thought meetings of Penn State's Board of Trustees should be open to the public. The Centre Daily Times of Sept. 14 quoted candidate Scranton as replying "that they should not be open as general policy but he felt townspeople, students or others should have the opportunity to meet with the board on occasion."

I am reminded of William Steig's cartoon in "The Lonely Ones," entitled "Who are all those others?"

A time-honored definition of a university is that it is a community of scholars and students, concerned with preservation, transmittal and advancement of knowledge.

Did Rep. Scranton assume that scholars already have access to the trustees? Please, someone, show him copies of those directives! Or does he classify scholars under just Others? Or did he recognize the political expediency, as a guest of the Penn State administration, of ignoring the existence of scholars completely? Did he know why the question

was asked, in the first place?

Perhaps he has heard of l'affaire Sauer? (If so, whose version?)

Continued demands for open meetings of the Penn State trustees might suggest that not everyone believes the board is properly informed as to University problems. Dr. John D. Millett, President of Miami University of Ohio and a distinguished political scientist, in his volume "The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization" (McGraw-Hill, 1962) has some interesting recommendations for the university administration involved in arguments over wider contacts with trustees (pp. 241-2).

Of course President Millett is biased; he also rejects the concept of hierarchic organization in a university, proposing in its place the concept of community, operating through consensus. Since Penn State is the antithesis of what President Millett advocates, is he wrong?

It is all very confusing, this, and merits much thought. Let's think. How about a new TOCS: Thoughtful Others of the Contemporary Scene (buttons still five cents)?

—Ray Pepinsky,  
TOCS—II

## Plea Made For Coeds

TO THE EDITOR: Two girls I know came back to school this past week with plans for beautifying their room in Atherton Hall. They went to considerable expense to buy small items that would make their room more attractive and livable. They had a large white bedspread to cover their beds, pictures to hang on the wall, and a variety of other things to add a little charm to their room. Today, when they returned to their room, there was a note instead of a bedspread saying that the spread would be returned when they were ready to take it home. The note was the decree of the Department of Housing.

It's truly a shame that these two girls and many other dorm residents are being discouraged from taking pride in their rooms. Women students cannot have an apartment or room of their own to decorate as they desire, so how can housing be so inconsiderate of their wishes to do a little work with what they have.

I realize that the regulation was made with good in mind, but when nothing is obviously wrong, can't an exception be made? These two girls are petitioning now to get their bedspread back. I ask you for your signature.

—Ralph Guokas, '64

LETTER POLICY

Letters to the editor must carry the full name of the author and identification of the author will be verified before any letter is published. In most cases, letters over 400 words will not be published. The Daily Collegian reserves the right to edit any letter if it is deemed necessary. The decision to publish or reject a letter lies solely with the editor; letters containing obvious misstatements or lacking in good taste or fair play will be rejected.

A Student-Operated Newspaper

58 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

ANN PALMER  
Editor

HERBERT WITMER  
Business Manager

City Editors: Joan Mohan and David Balbach; News and World Affairs Editor, Kay Mills; Editorial Editor, Carol Kwikeman; Sports Editor, John Morris; Assistant Sports Editor, Ken Deuling; Photograph Co.-editors, Tom Browne and Don Coleman; Personnel Director, Saralee Orton.  
Local Ad Mgr., Joan Kahl; Assistant Local Ad Mgr., Jane Silverstein; National Ad Mgr., Barbara Brown; Credit Mgr., Ralph Friedman; Assistant Credit Mgr., Harry Raach; Promotion Mgr., Barry Levitz; Classified Ad Mgr., Catherine Saumer; Circulation Mgr., Phil Guest; Personnel and Office Mgr., Lynn Murphy.