

Eye spy

If the owner of a house looked out a window and saw someone peering at him with a telescope, he'd probably call the police. But if a student complained about a "peeping Tom," Tom would probably turn out to be an officer looking for pot.

It's scary to learn that campus police are playing telescope games with all the fervor of FBI and CIA agents. Bugged rooms and secret agent infiltration might be the next step. Or may be used even now.

A dorm room is private, even though it's on University property. A landlord downtown can't spy on his tenants, so why should the University have that permission? Besides that, it's an invasion of

privacy. A policeman needs a warrant before he can physically search any dorm room. And he needs a list of specific illegal material to search for. But when a policeman looks through a telescope, he's basically searching a room without a warrant. He may not be physically in the room but the telescope just about puts him there.

When the government spies on its own citizens it's bad enough. But when the University spies on the very students that pay to keep it going it's disgusting. And scary. Because for students to feel really safe in their rooms anymore they're going to have to keep their curtains closed. And you thought that kind of thing happened only in

police states. Or in Orwell's "1984."

The police claim telescopes can be used to prevent rapes and other violent crimes in dorms. First of all, not enough violent crimes occur in dorm rooms to warrant spying with telescopes. Second of all, a policeman on top of a campus building can see a rape being committed just as easily without a telescope. How are women to tell if a policeman is looking for pot with his telescope or looking for some excitement?

"I spy with my little eye" used to be played during grade school recess. But now University Safety is playing. And instead of marbles, they're playing for real.



'We still have a firm hold on Saigon.'

Letters to the Editor

Commendations

TO THE EDITOR: As usual, the University Concert Committee is getting blasted for their choice of concerts, by letter writers to the Collegian. The general complaint seems to be a lack of "good concerts."

Let us examine the list of performers that have appeared here thus far this year. Relying on memory, I have compiled this list: Miles Davis, Cannonball Adderly, Dave Mason, Norman Blake, Vassar Clements, Loggins & Messina, Emir Dedeato, Bruce Springsteen, Sonny Terry, Herbie Hancock, Richie Havens, Bonnie Raitt, Jackson Browne, Mahavishnu, John McLaughlin, and Jean-Luc Ponty. Hardly anywhere can one find a list of more talented musicians, nor more diversified. It is true, however, that the majority of these performers are not "million selling" singles stars, and perhaps this is the root of the complaints. It does seem to me that the UCC is more interested in bringing in artists of exceptional talent, rather than exceptional "top-forty" record sales (two categories which seem to be mutually exclusive these days), and I applaud them for this stand.

To those who complain of the UCC's selections, I offer my sympathies for their inability to enjoy the fine and varied musical entertainment provided; to the UCC, I offer my commendations for a job well done this year.

David Carlson
12th-electrical engineering

Student power

TO THE EDITOR: I would like to comment on a casual statement made by Tony Pallimore, vice presidential candidate for USG in the April 1st issue of the Collegian. When asked if he would support a faculty union, Pallimore commented, "I thought they already had a union. They always seem to work together against us." Despite the casualness of this remark the misconception it contains is very dangerous. What incident is Pallimore referring to? If he considers the use of mid-terms and finals an example of the faculty working together against the students, he has a very distorted view of the process of education.

Furthermore, the faculty of this university is just as poorly organized and powerless as the student body. Both students and faculty from their lack of meaningful participation in decision-making. Both students and faculty would benefit from gains made by either of them in changing this situation. Pallimore's remark implies that greater faculty power would be used against the students. On the contrary, a faculty union makes it easier for students to attain power by breaking into the administration's domination of the decision-making process and opening it up to other groups. If Williams and Pallimore are really interested in student power, they should think before making a statement that alienates a useful ally.

Name Withheld

Law enforcement

TO THE EDITOR: I have now almost completed four years of studying "Law Enforcement" here at Penn State University and am somewhat disillusioned at our own law enforcement system here on University Park Campus. I feel that I know the rules and am familiar with when and how they can be effectively enforced.

Resident Assistants and the police face many problems, both major and minor, on a daily basis. For example, last week there was a fire in Hamilton Hall at 1 a.m. Within minutes, University Safety officers responded and risked their lives to put out the fire. The smoke was very, very thick—visibility was zero and breathing was difficult. I know, I was there. The officers on the scene handled the problem tactfully and efficiently. Overall—very professional.

On the other hand, the arrest of underage "possessors of alcoholic beverages" and subsequent confiscation of the beverage can be very abused at times. To be more specific, on Saturday morning at approximately 11:20 a.m., two guests of a

Hamilton resident were arrested in Hamilton Court and charged with possession by a University Safety supervisor, who happened to be sitting in an unmarked car writing out parking tickets. The two individuals were caught carrying a tub with a half-empty half barrel of beer in it (with the tap removed). The two 18-year-olds were simply helping out another person (over 21) by carrying his beer which weighs over 100 pounds. They had not had a drop to drink nor was there a noisy or rowdy party out of hand. They now face a possible fine of up to \$300 (usually only \$25 plus costs is levied by Mr. Yorks, who tries very hard to be fair and understanding).

The beer was confiscated, including the tap and ice, and when I inquired as to why the tap, tub and ice must also be taken, I was told "It is all evidence—the beer will be destroyed and the empty keg, tap and tub can be picked up at the sheriff's office." (Please do not interpret this as any insinuation on my part that the officers will have a party with the "evidence," which is what students yelled out to the officers. All I am stating is what I was told.)

I just hate to see \$20 worth of beer taken from people who are not causing any problems.

I can only interpret this action by the officers as harassment showing a lack of good judgement and discretion in police work in a college environment where drinking apparently is an accepted norm.

I have worked in a State Correctional Institution and with the State Parole Board and I have found that under certain situations not every rule should be enforced "strictly by the book" (The officer quoted statutes and numbers to me from the crime code.)

However, the non-drinking supervisor informed me that he feels that 75 per cent of our damages occur when students drink alcohol. He told me, "Beer is worse than a drug; I don't drink." (I was always under the impression that alcohol is a drug.)

Anyway, if and when I am a law enforcement official, I hope I can do more useful and helpful things than write tickets and confiscate (and "destroy") beer from underage people. So it goes!

Name Withheld

True beauty

TO THE EDITOR: The obvious narrow-mindedness of some students could not have been better exemplified than by Linda Skyrms' "sexist photo" letter. Yes, Linda, an offense has been committed against women, caused by lack of perceptual abilities, ignorance and selfishness. It truly enrages me to discover that some person has had the blatant rudeness to throw such a stone in the eye of pure beauty. But this offense has not been committed by the Collegian or Eric Felack, but oddly enough by a real live woman.

The assumption that the "posed picture shot" was taken with a pre-conceived notion of displaying a woman as a sex object is as stupid as it is outrageous. How could such a deduction possibly be derived from a beautiful picture of such a beautiful person? The Collegian and Diane have been offended by such a gross misunderstanding of their true intent to bring beauty and aesthetic value to the masses. To these two parties, an apology is due. I'm sure most students recognize the picture for what it was, an expression of true, unpolluted beauty.

It also needs pointing out that Joe Penn State is not necessarily more or less enlightened than anyone else. We are not a free-thinking student body, we are people with objectivity, prejudices, values, enlightenment, sexist and non-sexist attitudes.

Beauty, then, is truly in the eye of the beholder, as is ugliness, obscenity, prejudice and humor. So Linda, bring your head down from your self-righteousness cloud and realize your own shortcomings. The picture is only degrading because you perceive it to be so.

After all, you never thought a wrestler's ass was sexist, did you?

How about it, girls?

Michael Prens
9th—business administration

Vietnam commitments finished

By CHARLEY MITCHELL
Collegian Columnist

The current disastrous situation in South Vietnam is valuable in the sense that it has finally rammed home a lesson for the U.S. South Vietnam has received over 28 per cent of all U.S. foreign aid since 1950. Close to 50,000 American men have died over there since 1965. And what has happened? The Communists from the North are methodically overrunning the country.

America was by far the most powerful nation immediately following WWII. We were the military and industrial leaders of the world. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower challenged communism with a passion, pouring money into areas throughout Europe and Asia. This big-brother attitude was evident in President Kennedy's 1960 inaugural address in which he promised that the U.S. would do most anything to "insure the survival and success of liberty."

This belief that it is America's duty to protect endangered countries of the world peaked during the Kennedy Administration, as 15,000 military advisors set up shop in South Vietnam to help Saigon run the war against the Viet Cong. Before long, these advisors turned into ground troops, and, suddenly, Lyndon Johnson found himself facing America's first controversial post-war involvement. In 1965, under the advice of the Kennedy Administration which still dominated the White House, Johnson elected to escalate the war.

It is easy now for America to look back and blame Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon for Vietnam, for hindsight is far simpler than foresight. Due to the emergence of hotbeds of Communism around the world

and the increasing strength of the Communist superpowers, Nixon had us patching differences with the Soviet Union and China while we continued to fight communism in other areas—such as Vietnam.

American foreign policy was wise until the Vietnam tragedy. Economic aid failed to stop Communism in China, so we swallowed the lumps and went on. The Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine bolstered the entire free world, and the U.S. was truly big brother to the free world.

Smaller countries no longer line up behind either the U.S. or the Soviet Union. Many are pursuing their own interests independent of the superpowers—Portugal is not as closely aligned with the West as it once was, and North Vietnam, while Communist, has managed to remain free of policy commitments to either China or the Soviet Union.

What the U.S. elects to do about South Vietnam in 1975 will be a landmark decision in its foreign policy. In four short months since Christmas, we will have cut off military aid to Turkey, almost certainly to Cambodia, and probably South Vietnam, which has received more U.S. aid since 1950 than any other nation.

The Executive branch of government doesn't seem to want to stop playing big brother. President Ford wants to send \$300 million to South Vietnam, despite the fact that the Viet Cong have captured five provinces in the last week and now control roughly half of the country. Virtually all of the remaining area is endangered of falling: South Vietnamese soldiers are deserting at the rate of 24,000 per month, corruption infests both the government and the military, and opposition to President Thieu runs deeper than ever.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has been chiding a

Congress reluctant to grant the aid. He claims that the \$300 million investment is worth proving to our allies that we will uphold our commitments, even if the country is to fall anyway. Kissinger has offered a compromise to Congress, asking them to authorize \$5.5 billion to be spread out over a three-year period. Congressional approval appears highly unlikely.

President Thieu has given up several northern provinces, abandoning thousands of his countrymen to the advancing Communists. This abandonment was done in the hope that what is left of South Vietnam's military forces will be able to set up stronger lines of defense to the south, protecting the area around Saigon.

The possibility of this strategy succeeding is not very good, with or without Ford's \$300 million. South Vietnamese morale has never been lower, the Communists have captured many South Vietnamese troops and their U.S.-made weapons, and the Southern cities are teeming with starving, homeless refugees. At this point, the only tactic which can save off an eventual Communist take-over is the reentry of the U.S. into the war—a prospect that governmental pragmatism and public opinion will never permit.

By trying to send more military aid to South Vietnam, Ford and Kissinger are perpetuating the myth that the U.S. has to support every nation of the free world. Why not send humanitarian assistance to the country while negotiating a peaceful transition to power by a coalition government consisting of North and South Vietnamese? Indochina is no longer America's backyard, for our key interests lie elsewhere. We have been in South Vietnam for 17 years, and, finally, our commitments and obligations are finished.

Assert your voting power

By BOB BRICMONT
Collegian Columnist

In a town where students comprise more than half of the population, it's amazing what little influence they have.

Consider our situation, due to this lack of influence. We have landlords who are unresponsive to the needs of their tenants. Our State College Borough Council has taken two years to legislate one bike path. We have the third highest rents in the state. Borough Council has failed to act on the proposed Human Relations Ordinance. The list goes on and on.

The reason students have so little influence is because they choose to. They sit back and let others participate in community affairs for them. And frequently those people who do the participating don't care much about students.

This week you can do something to rectify this situation. This week the League of Women Voters will be conducting a local voter registration drive for the upcoming May 20th primary.

From 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. today and from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. on Friday, you can register to vote at the Glennland Building—137 S. Pugh St., across from the parking garage. Or at the Nittany Mall on Saturday.

It's completely painless and chances are you'll be glad you did it. If you're afraid, or don't know the advantages of registering to vote in State College—read on!

Today, the privilege of registering to vote locally is guaranteed. This hasn't always been the case though. It is important to understand the battle students fought to obtain this privilege.

In June, 1970, the 26th Amendment was ratified, giving 18-year-olds the right to vote. Also that year, the Federal Bureau of Census counted students as residents of their college towns. All over the country, students began registering in their college communities.

All over the country that is, except in Centre County, where the county commissioners ruled that students were not residents and refused to allow them to register. A popular slogan at the time

was, "In Russia they tell you who to vote for—in Centre County, they tell you you can't vote."

In October of 1971, 11 Penn State students filed a class action suit against the commissioners in Federal Court in Scranton. Judge Neiland ruled in favor of the students and ordered the commissioners to open the registration process. The commissioners, however, resisted. They set up guidelines that many students were unable to meet. They demanded proof of residency: past rent receipts, local credit cards and a local driver's license. Students were effectively unable to register.

This time however, the Commonwealth came to the students' aid. Delores Tucker, Secretary of State, brought in Federal marshals to oversee the registration process. Finally students were allowed to register without harassment.

Things moved along smoothly until December of 1973, when the commissioners came up with a new trick: student taxation.

This in itself was not a crime. All good citizens are expected to pay taxes. What was a crime was that the commissioners changed the county exoneration policy at the same time. (Exonerations is the process by which those who are unable to pay their taxes are excused from doing so.)

Prior to this policy change, exonerations had been granted for two reasons.

- 1) Financial inability excused anyone who earned under \$1,800 annually.
 - 2) Non-residency was granted to any citizen who paid taxes elsewhere.
- The commissioners changed the financial inability clause to excuse anyone who made under \$1,800 annually and was over 65 years old.

This left students in a dilemma. Although 98 per cent of the undergraduate student body made under \$1,800, not many were over 65 years old.

This one way to avoid paying the tax was to seek exonerations by claiming non-residency. And this is exactly what the commissioners had hoped the students would do. Their logic was, if students claimed to be non-residents for tax purposes, they couldn't vote here.

Although poll taxes went out with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the county commissioners established one here in Centre County. For the second time in two years, a class action suit was filed against the commissioners, this time by four students and two other State College residents. The entire tax was thrown out as a result.

Even though the commissioners lost the battle, they may have won the war. As a result of the confusion precipitated by the tax policy, students have been hesitant to register. This has happened, even though it has been clearly established that registering to vote, and

paying taxes, have nothing to do with each other.

Hopefully, this discussion will clear up some of the mystery surrounding the issue, and we can get on with the reasons for registering.

First off, and perhaps most obvious, you live here, at least nine months out of the year. And this benefits a lot of people. The merchants, landlords and businessmen in State College exist on the student dollar. And believe it or not, so does local government. When students were added to the census, Centre County went from a sixth to a fifth class county—entitling all county employees to a nice pay raise. This increase in the census has also doubled State College's revenue sharing funds. You should have some say in how these monies are spent.

Another point to consider is the nature of a transient population. There will always be 30,000 students living in this area. If they never participate in local government, students will always be second class citizens. When your little brother or sister comes to Penn State in 1984, students will still be taken advantage of just like they are now. A transient population needs representation just as much as a permanent population does.

Students have recently been, and are presently, running for local offices. They need the support of the student population. Only one student has ever been elected to Borough Council—Dean Phillips. In 1973, a student lost the mayoral primary by only 14 votes (to a man who has been in local and state government for 40 years). A stronger student voting bloc could have assured his victory.

By supporting student-oriented candidates, we can affect many local issues—rent control, the Human Relations Ordinance, bike lanes, mass transit, landlord-tenant legislation and consumer protection. Without the student vote, these issues will be decided for us or possibly never even be raised.

If you are registered to vote elsewhere, it's easy to switch. The registrars will inform your local courthouse and have your name removed from the rolls there.

If you are registered in State College, but have moved, file a change of address card with the registrars.

If you have no intention of doing anything, why not leave town? You're just dead weight for those people who really care.

To register to vote here is in your own best interest. And if enough of us do it, we might be able to do something about our lack of influence.

The potential of 30,000 student voters is overwhelming. Be a part of it. Register.

the daily Collegian

JERRY SCHWARTZ
Editor

ROBERT A. MOFFETT
Business Manager

Successor to the Free Lance, est 1887
Member of the Associated Press
Charter member of the Pennsylvania
Collegiate Media Association

Editorial policy is determined by the Editor
Opinions expressed by the editors and staff of The Daily Collegian are not necessarily those of the University administration, faculty or students

Mailing Address: Box 467, State College, Pa 16801
Office: 126 Carnegie

Editorial Staff: 865-1828
Sports Staff: 865-1820
Business Staff: 865-2531

Business Office Hours:
Monday through Friday
9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Subscription Rates
Off-campus — \$22.00 per year
\$6.00 per term — Fall, Winter, Spring — \$4.50 per Summer Term
On-Campus — \$13.00 per year
\$3.50 per term — Fall, Winter, Spring — \$3.00 per Summer Term

BOARD OF EDITORS: MANAGING EDITOR, Randy Woodbury. EDITORIAL EDITOR, Sheila McCauley. NEWS EDITOR, Jim Kuhnhehn. ASSISTANT NEWS EDITOR, John McDermott. COPY EDITORS, Jeff DeBray, Marie Green, Nancy Postrel. LAYOUT EDITORS, Robyn Moses, Pam Reasner. SPORTS EDITOR, Jeff Young. ASSISTANT SPORTS EDITORS, Dave Morris, Mike Rodman. PHOTO EDITOR, Eric Felack. ASSISTANT PHOTO EDITORS, Ira Joffe, Tom Peters. EDITORIAL CARTOONISTS, Bob Conn, Tom Gibb. WEATHER REPORTER, Paul Knight.

BOARD OF MANAGERS: ADVERTISING MANAGER, David Lang. ASSISTANT ADVERTISING MANAGERS, Rich Green, Joan Kirschner. NATIONAL ADVERTISING MANAGER, Kim Batey