

Editorial Opinion

Effects of the Froth Ban

The Undergraduate Student Government has formed a committee to meet with the co-editors of Froth to work out recommendations for that publication's operations. It has also approved an amendment to a bill which states that the highest body of student representation "feels that proper consideration was not given . . . to the possibilities offered by Froth to clean its own house."

While we don't wholeheartedly support the formation of this committee or the amendment passed by the Congress, we do find something of promise in the action.

First, in the entire debate as well as in the report of the executive committee, Froth was referred to as part of the University. Even though the charter of Froth has been revoked, the Congress indicated that in the minds of the student body, Froth is still very much a part of University life, perhaps more so than at any other recent time.

We see this as an indication that the student body is not going to accept the decision of the Committee on Student Organizations in banning Froth. And that the dean of men and the dean of women will not be able to kill this humor magazine for good.

Secondly, although we believe the Congress has taken the weakest stand possible in criticizing the administrative committee which banned Froth from campus, we see its adoption of a motion of censure as an official rebuke of the committee's action.

Again, this indicates to us that the Froth issue is not dead and that Froth must be accepted by the University as a college humor magazine with increased responsibility but with complete editorial freedom.

The Daily Collegian has felt deeply the sorrow and amazement of the student body, alumni and interested persons throughout the state and from other sections of the country at the loss of Froth.

At a recent college publications convention in Detroit, Michigan, representatives of The Daily Collegian were much impressed by the respect which Froth commands from humor magazine representatives from other Universities.

On the other hand, we have been disturbed by the many "letters to the editor" from freshmen at this University. For the most part, these freshmen have been disillusioned by the action of the dean of men and the dean of women in bringing charges against Froth and by the total banning of Froth from campus by the Committee on Student Organizations.

At one time or another nearly every college student becomes disillusioned with his school, but we are sorry to observe that first term freshmen have gotten this feeling so early in their college careers.

We wonder just what this action by the two deans and the administrative committee, which we can now call rash beyond any doubt, will eventually have upon these freshmen and upon, in the words of President Walker, the University as a whole.

We do not think it will be good.

for the record

For Dilworth

by carol kunkleman

The Daily Collegian is probably the only publication for which I will ever write with complete freedom to disagree in print with the views of my fellow editors. Such is the case now in regard to this paper's support of William Scranton for governor of Pennsylvania.

While all of us weighed the merits of each candidate's platform, I seem to be the only one who tipped the scales in favor of Richardson Dilworth, the Democratic candidate.

Admittedly, the campaign of both candidates has been seasoned with verbal invectives. But the palatability of the stands taken by Dilworth seems to me to be more desirable because his approaches are more specific, realistic and practical.

Dilworth, at 64, is a veteran Democratic politician who has been busy running for or filling a public office for the last 15 years. His experience, I think is reflected in the suggestions he advocates to boost Pennsylvania's economic ailments.

Dilworth has pledged his administration to a massive hunting of industry and jobs for Pennsylvania's approximately 350,000 unemployed. He advocates attracting aircraft, electronics and chemical concerns to fill the gap of the declining coal and textile industries across the state.

My fellow editors feel that a retraining program should be carried on for these unemployed (mostly unskilled and semi-skilled workers), to make them better-qualified for already-existing industries. I think these industries will move regardless of the people retrained to work in them. This move is caused by other factors than qualified workers such as rising labor costs and available resources. I also think that these technical industries can use semi-skilled labor and at the same time help keep the state's college graduates here instead of losing them to other industries in Michigan,

Delaware and New Jersey, where the chemical industries are now located.

Dilworth supports a general sales tax with proper exemptions in place of the selective sales tax enforced today. This state has had a budget deficit of \$177 million dollars which has been built up through the years. Under Gov. Lawrence's present administration, the state has finally achieved a balanced budget.

Scranton suggests that a departmental analysis be made to determine where government expenses could be cut. He feels this is where savings could be made. What Scranton has not mentioned is that this state now has an ideal tax climate, for there is no property tax on manufacturer's machinery, inventory, or equipment, and manufacturing capital and equipment is exempt from the Capital Stock and Franchise Tax and from the Sales and Use tax. These exceptions may help to attract new industry but at the same time put a heavy burden on sales and corporation tax. A more equitably distributed general sales tax and equal taxation of corporate assets could conceivably standardize state income, thereby defining spending and thus creating a secure climate for both labor and industry.

Both candidates agree that constitutional revision is necessary, but Dilworth feels that Pennsylvania needs a brand new document to replace that adopted in 1874. He wants the legislature to call for a constitutional convention. Scranton wants the people to decide on having a convention through a referendum. While in theory I would side with Scranton and the other Collegian editors that the people should be given the chance to decide through referendum, I would disagree with my fellow editors that a massive state re-education program would aid state residents in deciding this issue.

A call for a constitutional convention has failed five times in the past. Here is one time that I would bank on tradition and say that the plea would fail again.

I would side with Dilworth in having legislature call the convention, and then submit to the people the proposed changes or possible new draft. If discussions were then held on the merits of the

proposals, I feel this aid would be more beneficial than if they are asked to determine whether or not a convention is needed.

Both Scranton and Dilworth plan to improve and expand higher education. Scranton's most specific proposal is that a State Board of Education be set up apart from the state administration to handle the improvement and maintenance of the state's schools.

Dilworth's plan is similar to the "master plan" proposed by state education superintendent Charles E. Boehm. This plan includes: a state-wide system of community colleges, expansion and improvement of this University and its Commonwealth campuses, improvement of the state's colleges, more aid for private institutions, provision of state scholarships, loans and building of research centers.

I question my colleagues' faith that politics would not enter a separate division of the government that certainly must be set up by the administration. And couldn't the present department do just as much in implementing a program?

I would also point out that Richardson Dilworth has been an interested and active member of our University Board of Trustees. He has specifically mentioned this university in his goals, while Scranton, as evidenced in his visit here, seems to be aiming toward a more general program. Because of Dilworth's experience, I would say he is more familiar with the present numerous conditions in Pennsylvania that must first be improved. Because of Dilworth's background concerning this university, I feel he would be more forceful in insuring that necessary funds be appropriated to continue the realistic placement of them.

This realism, on Dilworth's part, has made him the more qualified of the two candidates. In fact, as his opponents are quick to point out, he has made many enemies in the state during his years because he has held on to his views. Nevertheless, he has consistently upheld and carried out his programs. In this campaign, he has given voters specific suggestions and not generalities, in most cases, for improving the welfare of Pennsylvania.



KUNKLEMAN

Letters

Students Urged To Fight for Froth

TO THE EDITOR: I wish to applaud the letter of the University of Pennsylvania student who has guts enough to tell us to fight for our rights. But, do we need someone from another campus to tell us what we should do? Aren't we grown up enough to know how to stand up and fight, or are we too becoming pseudo-intellectuals who will grope blindly, searching for a direction in which to go—all the while losing our identity and our school spirit?

Will the only cheer we shall ever hear on this campus be "Suppress them, suppress them, make them relinquish their rights," as the administration continues to revoke charter after charter of our student organizations because they express themselves openly.

Let's show that we will stand up and fight—let's shout it from every corner—WE WANT FROTH. Let's not forget our causes—five letters in 10 years, supposedly sufficient warning to the harmful contents of the Froth. Yes, Froth is crude, but if taken as a cutting type of humor it is funny.

There is more than just a magazine involved. There is a principle involved. Let's not forget how to laugh. Let's not forget that we too have rights, and that every man has the right of freedom of expression. God grant it that we are not suppressed to the point of apathetically relinquishing our rights.

—Judith Holton, '64

Sophomore Questions Reason for Fighting

TO THE EDITOR: World War II was a war for physical survival. Peaceful co-existence would have been impossible. Today we may have a new war on our hands. What will we be fighting for? The Russian people desire peace as much as we Americans say we do. Does Khrushchev want peace? Does Kennedy want peace? What about some large corporate interests? Do they want peace?

How does a young person go

to war, fight, and perhaps die for an idea so nebulous as "The American Way?" We will certainly not be fighting for world peace. The most "peaceful" place I know is a graveyard. Is that the kind of peace we fight for? These are the questions I ask myself before I say, "Should Froth continue publishing?" Or, "Who's gonna win the next big game?" What do you ask yourselves?

—Peter A. Miller, '65



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

