

Editorial Opinion

Great Responsibility Faces New Congressmen

The Undergraduate Student Government Congress is one of the three divisions of student government on this campus. But, it wields more than a third of the power present in student government.

The Congress is the watchdog for the executive branch. That branch can take no actions without the approval, either implicit or explicit, of the Congress.

The Congress also has the responsibility to propose actions for student government to take.

You, new Congressmen, have been elected to fill just this capacity.

Last year's premier Congress compiled an unenviable record. But it also left many things in the legislative hopper for his Congress to consider and, indeed, several items which this Congress should begin moving again.

Among the most notable of the latter is a study on the feasibility of USG financing a system of radio signal converters so that FM broadcasts as from the campus radio station, WDFM, can be received on AM radios.

Also, the student government newspaper, The USG Record, has been struggling, mostly due to understaffing, and we feel an earnest effort should be made to get this publication on its feet.

A current study which the new Congress will have to cope with is that of the best type of grading system for the University.

In addition, the new Congress will have to decide whether or not this University will join NSA permanently and determine the role of the USG Supreme Court.

Several valuable precedents have been set by student government organizations in the past which we feel should be adhered to.

Aside from precedents involving internal structure such as the composition of the Rules Committee, the Congress has followed a precedent of carefully examining all executive appointments. In the recent past, especially under ex-President Dennis Folanini, all executive appointments were scrutinized and many of them rejected. We feel this is a responsibility of the Congress.

A precedent has also been set to run the USG meetings like those of a governmental legislative body and not like the meetings of a trivial little club. We firmly believe each Congressman and as many students as are interested should have the opportunity, either directly or indirectly, to speak their minds on each issue. They should not be hampered by a "quick-draw" gavel-hammering vice president.

The Congress has also spread out its range of activity. For instance, it approved a bill endorsing the Senate's decision on discrimination on campus.

USG President Dean Wharton has made plans for the education of the new congressmen. He has arranged times for the Congressmen to become acquainted personally and ideally with members of the administration, faculty, University senate and student body.

However, the education of you, the new Congressmen, must not stop with planned instruction. We feel that student government in the past has become too involved with trivialities, internal matters and technicalities which have hampered its total effectiveness.

As shown by the poor turnout for elections this fall, the student body is tired of ineffective government. We believe that an upward trend for student government began this fall and we charge you as representatives of the Penn State Student body to push for increased effectiveness of student government in your term of office.

We expect each of you to have knowledge of the past and present of student government, maturity to make decisions without trivial squabbling, foresight to plan ahead for those who come after you, and an acute awareness of student situations here at the University.

We feel that Congress in the past has lacked the unity of purpose necessary for effective government. We urge you to strive for this quality.

Each of you has accepted a tremendous responsibility to the student body by accepting a seat on the USG Congress. We expect full recognition of this responsibility and effectiveness in maintaining this responsibility to the student body of this University.

We can accept nothing less.

Letters to the Editor

Froth Condemned by Graduate Student; Collegian's Stand on Issue Questioned

TO THE EDITOR: To quote Froth, "As September slowly progressed a group of evil-eyed, crude, filthy-minded but shamefully intelligent people began to filter to campus. The Froth staff has returned. The University has requested that our own brand of mind-rotting drivel not be put on sale until all the parents have left. All obscene four-letter words have been deleted for the sake of the virgin ears of the Freshman boys (we have already met many of the Freshman girls) which may prevent the truth from being said, but at least keep us on campus."

I have read the letters to the editor concerning student opinion of Froth, I have read your editorial concerning the Collegian's stand on the Froth issue and for the first time in many years I have wasted my time to read Froth cover to cover. As a result I condemn Froth and question the Collegian's stand on the issue. I know what the Collegian means when it says that "Froth is exercising its valuable right of free expression"; or "no administrative committee should be allowed or should attempt to suppress expression of student opinion or comment"; or "which is more deteriorating to the University—a humor magazine which is allowed to criticize freely the operations of this university or an ad-

ministration which squelches freedom of expression."

But at first I found it hard to believe that Froth was the humor magazine you were talking about because you say that you support the right of Froth to express its views. I ask "What views is Froth expressing?" Look through the whole issue and try to find one view except perhaps that "the best time in the world is rubbing rectums with 500 sweaty people." to quote Froth again. I can't see where Froth is an instrument of student opinion and comment. (The last issue was a collection of jokes of extremely bad taste and cheap vulgar stories.)

Also I hold an opinion contrary to that of The Daily Collegian and any American Civil Liberties Union that says, "in the long run, the editors' products will be accepted or rejected by student readers." This will never bring about the downfall of any magazine like Froth at Penn State, because there are enough clods and cloddoses on this campus who would buy Froth if it published just jokes taken from lavatory walls.

These are the people who travel with the herd and haven't yet thought for themselves how badly such a magazine speaks for Penn State.

I also question the competence

of the Froth writer who apologizes at not being able to make a point because he won't be using any obscene four-letter words, and I wonder at the kind of people who derive satisfaction from their "work of art" which consists of nothing more than a conglomeration of dirty jokes, cheap, suggestive stories, cuss words and not-so-subtle allusions that are degrading to sex, religion and morals.

I don't see how the writers with one track minds running on booze, cheating, sex, sadism and immorality can claim pride in a work like Froth. There is nothing in Froth to be proud of (except perhaps Urie's column on jazz).

I think the main objection causing University action is that Froth is a Penn State humor magazine and some intelligent people are insulted enough at being identified with a place that allows trash like Froth claim to be representative of the kind of humor that most Penn Staters appreciate.

I think the University should challenge the crude, filthy-minded writers of their own brand of mind-rotting drivel to write something worth reading for us not-so-filthy-minded readers — for a better Penn State.

—William S. Bickel
Grad student

Waelchli Clarifies Fraternity Probation Rules

TO THE EDITOR: The rule to which you refer in your Sept. 25 editorial is not an IFC rule, but paraphrases the following, a portion of Rule W-5, Senate Policies and Rules for Undergraduate Students, 1961-62: "Information which appears to the administrative officers of the University to be substantially indicative of violation of the provisions and conditions of Regulations W-4 and/or W-5 above shall be sufficient for the Secretary of the Committee on Student Affairs to notify the group concerned that the information is being referred to the appropriate student judicial body for study and recommendation to the Committee or a designated subcommittee."

"The issuance of such a notice to any group shall immediately suspend the social activities of

that group until the case is settled."

Interfraternity Council feels this to be an unfair rule, and the Executive Committee of IFC asked to have it modified by the Senate. In the 1962-63 Edition of Senate Policies and Rules for Undergraduate Students, Rule W-5 has been eliminated, and the rule you mentioned: "Violators of regulations governing fraternities and sororities shall be disciplined by the IFC Board of Control or the Panhellenic Judicial Committee, subject to review by the dean of women or dean of men and/or the Senate Subcommittee on Group Discipline.", along with the following rule which was not mentioned in the editorial: "... Information which appears to the administrative officers of the University to be substantially indicative of violation of the provisions and conditions of rules on conduct of students, on student activities, and on student social organiza-

tions shall be sufficient reason for the dean of men or dean of women to notify the group concerned that the information is being referred to the appropriate student judicial body for study and recommendation, or to the Senate Subcommittee on Group Discipline."

"The issuance of such a notice to a group may result in the suspension of any or all activities of that group until the case is settled."

"Guide to University Regulations Concerning Student Affairs, Conduct and Discipline," Page 5), has been substituted.

The new rule, we feel, is a step in the right direction; but you will note that neither IFC nor the Board of Control have any power to exercise the "suspension until the case is settled" clause. This power is totally vested in the Office of the dean of men.

—Fred Waelchli
Chairman,
IFC Board of Control

Department Juggling Seen As Administrative Abuse

TO THE EDITOR: One of the many signs of administrative abuse of the university concept at Penn State is the present epidemic of juggling of departments and laboratories into new jig-saw puzzle arrays, mainly without consultation with faculties and individual scholars concerned. However the President justifies this game to a mesmerized Board of Trustees, its results are revealed to our university scholars by administrative fiat, via the News Bureau.

If you want to know where you are on the Great Re-Organizational Chart, Professor, just wait for the newspaper!

Even if the faculty had any confidence in the wisdom and good faith of Old Main boozes, it must sturdily reject the idea that these managers, in whose selection the faculty had no part whatever, should take over matters which through reason and tradition are the prerogatives of the scholarly

body. Does the Board of Trustees recognize the anomalous nature of the source of these cut-and-paste activities? If so, are its members concerned?

Perhaps some of the difficulties at Penn State arise from the fact that although humanism is the core of a modern university, there are now no humanists on the heights of Old Main. That there is also little human feelings at these rarified levels is suggested by the administrative behavior which led for example to the destruction of the physics department. Through our telescopes we see only a hierarchy, guarding its self-assigned power. How long could a humanist survive in that air?

Must not this re-organizational razzle-dazzle be regarded as a device to distract attention from deep troubles within our institution? Can changes be made where they are needed most?

—Ray Pepinsky, TOCS
Research Professor



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 2, 1879.

Mail Subscription Price: \$6.00 a year
Mailing Address — Box 261, State College, Pa.

Member of The Associated Press

ANN PALMER
Editor

HERBERT WITMER
Business Manager