

Failing

It looks like students who want to make up "F" grades will have a hard time starting next fall.

Yesterday the University Faculty Senate got rid of the M-3b rule that allowed an F to be dropped from students' cumulative averages once a course was taken over.

That's progress. The guide to the rule confused everyone with vague references to rule E-1 and E-15 which had to be followed before the Course Repeat Notice, which had to be taken care of before students could use rule M-3b. Students without an academic map in front of them were lost.

The new rule will not allow students to drop F's from their cumulative averages. Instead, the new grade will be averaged with the F into the total average.

This may seem like something of a hardship for students who have extenuating reasons for flunking courses. But the Senate has given students a way to drop courses before the actual F's go on the transcripts, because the Senate also voted to extend the drop period to the eighth week of the term. It used to be that to drop a course in the eighth week of the term students had to sign away their firstborn children.

But the bad part of the revised

drop period is that transcripts will include student's grade status at the time they dropped the course.

The Senate has assumed, in doing this, that students who drop a course in the eighth week of the term are doing so only because they're flunking. What about a student failing a course, with a chance to pass with a good grade on the final, but dropping the course because of outside problems?

As long as it's now more difficult to make up a failing grade, the least the Faculty Senate could have done was to extend the drop period — without unfair grade status clauses on top of it.



OKAY... IF WASHINGTON STILL REFUSES TO BAIL US OUT, HECK WITH THEM! WE'LL JUST STAY AFLOAT BY OURSELVES!

The Daily Collegian encourages comments on news coverage, editorial policy and campus and off-campus affairs. Letters should be typewritten, double spaced, signed by no more than two persons and no longer than 30 lines. Students' letters should include the name, term and major of the writer.

Letters should be brought to the Collegian office, 126 Carnegie, in person so proper identification of the writer can be made, although names can be withheld on request. If letters are received by mail, the Collegian will contact the signer for verification before publication. Letters cannot be returned.

Letters to the Editor

Difficulties

TO THE EDITOR: This letter is for all those hopeless souls who have tried or will try to hitch a ride to or from campus. My advice to you is to forget it, or else buy a car. But if you are determined, here are a few things you will be up against:

1. The "late for work" drivers — these are the drivers who are really concerned about where they are going, just how late they get there (Who cares if you almost run down a hitchhiker?)

2. The "late for class" drivers — these are your friends who would pick you up, but then stopping for you may prevent them from arriving at class 20 minutes early.

3. The "I wouldn't pick you up if you were my mother" drivers — these are the scum of the earth drivers. They seem to get great satisfaction from passing you up on extremely rainy or cold days.

4. The "I'm turning" drivers — these are the ones that aren't sure where you are going, even though they do not know where you are going. These drivers usually shrug their shoulders, or put on their turn signals until they've passed you out of course, when they think they are out of your view, they turn off the signal, and go straight ahead.

Many students who were denied campus housing have had to get apartments far off-campus; many of these apartments do not provide bus service. And most students cannot afford to buy and run a car back and forth to campus, as well as pay for their education. So, in appeal to those drivers who continually pass up students (yes, you can usually identify the students — they usually carry books), please think before driving on by next time.

Rudy Massa
7th-pre-medicine

Hopeless souls

TO THE EDITOR: As a recent letter to the editor pointed out, there will be a major change in the University calendar system next year that is going to present some difficulties for students. It is not unusual that difficulties are presented for students at Penn State.

On March 4 of last year, the Faculty Senate voted over term break to recommend a six-day finals period. The thinking behind this appearing in a May 15 article in the Collegian was the improved integration of the courses. The subsequent mandatory requirement that professors must give their final

exam specifically during this period is apparently a further attempt to improve the academic quality of Penn State.

This curious logic in itself warrants an explanation as to how pushing ahead the finals currently given on the last day of classes to the following week improves the academic quality of the institution. However, there appears to be another reason tied up in the implementation of the semester system tentatively scheduled for the Fall of 1977.

The six-day finals period represents a transition to the two-term semester system in which an extended finals period of at least a week would be necessary. Thus, it was described last year as "the only way we can test the feasibility of the six-day exam period," in preparation for this switch.

Obviously, any degree of thinking reveals that one thing has nothing to do with the other. Trying to implement a finals period geared toward a semester system while we're still operating under a term system is going to cause some problems, the least of which will be financial.

Assuming money grows on trees, the added time residing at Penn State will cost an additional \$16 per term. In other words, on top of the tuition rise, a student can figure on paying another \$48 to cover the cost of room and board for the privilege of staying around to take finals on what used to be vacation time.

The planned extension of examination periods was hardly met with approval last year. Out of 197 students surveyed by student representatives, 197 voted against the longer finals period. This would appear to be an overwhelming majority against the proposal. The comments at that time included, "ill-timed, ridiculous, and term-system sabotage." No doubt these feelings haven't changed much since last spring.

Interestingly enough, a poll taken last year of the student body at large presented to the Collegian on Dec. 11, 1975, indicated that 82.7 per cent favored retention of the term system as compared to 16 per cent who preferred the two-term semester system. With over 80 per cent of the students against the semester system and a modest 100 per cent opposed to a six-day final period, it seems a little unusual that both may become a reality shortly. (It should be noted here that there were many faculty members opposed to both the six-day finals period and the semester system change.)

Regardless of public opinion, and of logic too, it appears that some major changes can be expected next year in the calendar system affecting current students with the exception of seniors and they are probably glad they will be missing all the excitement.

Ben Gelber
3rd-secondary education

Explanation needed

TO THE EDITOR: Three weeks ago the Star Trek society submitted to WDFM's Half A Radio Comedy Hour a script, "Lost In Star Trek," a comedy based on STAR TREK. Their leader, William "Doc" Holland agreed to talk it over at 7 p.m. Tuesday, Monday at 11:30 p.m. he called and said he wanted to do the final recording instead. Just like that, on 20 hours notice. Well, despite tests the next day we recorded it and were told it would be broadcast at 6 p.m. that Saturday.

It was not broadcast, which made us look bad since we had advertised it on WQWK. We were informed that the tape had been misplaced and that it would be put on Wednesday night. This time we advertised in the Collegian and told all our friends. It was not broadcast.

We were told by WDFM that Mr. Holland had decided the tape lacked sufficient fidelity. We were told unofficially that it was not Mr. Holland but some unknown official who, five minutes before airtime, decided it was technically unfit. We were also told that the show would have to be retaped and that they would handle the advertising next time.

Last Tuesday night a friend and I saw Mr. Holland personally; he informed us that the technical difficulties had been resolved and that it would be aired the next night at 10 p.m. We promptly told our friends and fellow members.

There was no Collegian announcement. It was not broadcast. The announcer at WDFM told us that during the recording one of the tape channels had failed. If this is true then how did it get within five minutes of airtime a week previously? Or was that the technical difficulty? But Doc said it was resolved.

How could Mr. Holland and his crew have had that tape for two weeks, readied it for broadcast twice, and still not know there was an unresolvable technical flaw in it? Or perhaps he simply misled us? Or perhaps there is nothing wrong with the tape and someone has been playing games with both Mr. Holland and the Star Trek society.

We no longer care. The society has been humiliated. We have invested time and money in an undertaking which has been grossly mishandled. If there is a sane, logical explanation for this fiasco, we challenge Doc or WDFM to give it. For further information please contact us or come to 265 Williard, 7:30 p.m. Tuesday.

Edward Rutkowski
10th-Aerospace Engineering
William Swallow
10th-Computer Science

Paranoia

TO THE EDITOR: In reply to Mr. B. David Schwartz's letter of 11-7-75.

First, I fail to see the need to politicize a simple dinner. It would seem to indicate a high level of paranoia. If anything, the meal was conceived with the intent of putting politics aside, to propagate international friendship. Symbolically, it indicated a sharing, the communal breaking of bread.

Secondly, while it might be true that the "masses" of the Third World are uneducated, this does not necessarily mean they are ignorant or incapable of thought. I happily note that you are 1st term, maybe there is still time for you to discard your narrow childhood prejudices. The people you seem to slander appear to hold a much more sophisticated view of Israel and Zionism. These are perceived as nothing more than a new rationalization for imperialism. Perhaps your studies will allow you to understand their abhorrence of this policy.

As to the "legitimacy" of these, while formal recognition by one state of another might constitute "legitimacy" in International Law, it does not constitute moral sanction. It is this which is debatable within a given culture.

Finally, being a student of both history and politics, and believing I have at least "moderate intelligence," I beg to differ with your closing statements.

1) While I agree that there has never been a "sovereign state of Palestine," as defined above, this has been due largely to the efforts of present and former imperialists. Also, the very concept of "state" is a fairly recent (1648) concept of Western origin.

2) Your apparent equation of "nation" and "state" seems to defy the way this term is used by contemporary political science. I believe most recognized scholars in this field (Deutsche, Verba, Schwartz, etc.) would agree with the definition of the first as a given group of people sharing a common culture. You therefore either imply that the Palestinians lack this, or don't know what you are saying.

3) Lastly, your statement dealing with the possibility of a

third world war reveals you believe "might equals right." This lack of morality in politics, domestic and international, has been used throughout world history to justify aggression atrocities, and so on. If this is the best argument you can base your thesis on, then I suggest you make an in depth, more objective investigation of the problem. Your only alternative is to wallow in the mire, with the supporters of Stalin, Hitler, Hiroshima etc. For by your logic their methods used are permissible.

James D. Donnelly
graduate-history

Relish

TO THE EDITOR: We are unaware, as to whether David Schwartz actually attended the dinner. If he did, we hope that, even though he did not relish the wording of the menu, he, nonetheless, found the substance palatable and agreeable to his constitution.

Upon reading David's letter of Nov. 7, we found it rather derogatory. We also felt that some clarification is needed.

The people involved in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict have strong feelings upon the slightest mention of this problem. Often, little reason is needed to trigger off powerful emotions. Seeing the item "Palestinian Rice" on the menu, David "discovered" the occasion as "another underhanded attack on the legitimacy of the state of Israel." He charged (implicitly) the International Council as being pro-Palestinian and attempted to create a political issue over the menu. The item "Palestinian Rice" had no other function than to provide variety on the menu and to reflect the cultural diversity of the international student community here at Penn State. It was prepared by a Palestinian according to a home recipe. Therefore, its name was well deserved.

The International Council is purely a cultural body, with an aim to promote understanding and relations among international students and Americans. Among the 900 international students at Penn State, there are both Israelis and Palestinians, and we have always existed as a harmonious group, never having held any political opinions or bias.

Finally, we hope David may learn in his curriculum of international politics, that Africa, Asia and the Third World consist of more than just uneducated masses. We also hope that rather than aspire to become a political venom, he would aim towards a broader horizon of international friendship.

Jigmi Thinley
graduate-public administration
Josef Blunski
graduate-geology

the Collegian

JERRY SCHWARTZ
Editor

ROBERT A. MOFFETT
Business Manager

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

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.

BOARD OF EDITORS: EDITORIAL EDITOR, Sheila McCauley; EDITORIAL ASSISTANT, Karen Fischer; NEWS EDITOR, Robin Moore; ASSISTANT NEWS EDITOR, Glenda Gephart; WIRE EDITOR, Paula Gochmour; FEATURES EDITOR, Cathy Cipolla; COPY EDITORS, Jean LaPenna, Diane Nottle, Leon Poliom; SPORTS EDITOR, Jeff Young; ASSISTANT SPORTS EDITOR, Dave Morris; PHOTO EDITOR, Eric Felack; ASSISTANT PHOTO EDITORS, Ira Joffe, Tom Peters; EDITORIAL CARTOONIST, Tom Gibb; WEATHER REPORTER, Tom Ross.

BOARD OF MANAGERS: LOCAL ADVERTISING MANAGER, John Kirschner; OFFICE MANAGER, Lynda Weiss; NATIONAL ADVERTISING MANAGER, Kim Batey; LAYOUT AND DESIGN, Peter Green, Peter Sichel.



OH... GEE, ROCKY, I'M REALLY SORRY YOU FEEL THAT WAY. IT REALLY BREAKS MY HEART TO SEE YOU GO!

Student voters

By KAREN FRANKOLA
Collegian Staff Writer

So few students are registered to vote in State College and even less actually bother to show up on Election Day that it's a shame to have to turn away students who do make it to the polls because they are ineligible to vote.

In the precinct which includes North and Atherton Halls 91 people voted in last week's election out of the several thousand students who live in these areas. About a quarter of these voters weren't students, but adult town residents.

As Judge of Elections for this precinct, I had to tell some 20 students who did come to vote that they were ineligible because of the residency requirement. State law requires that a

voter must reside in his election district at least 30 days before the election.

Centre County Commissioners define an election district as a precinct; so their official policy is one can't vote if he's moved into a new precinct and hasn't filed for a change of address.

There is something of a controversy occurring now about whether an election district should be defined as a precinct. It seems especially unfair to students since they move so frequently within the borough of State College, but from one precinct to another.

But while Centre County's interpretation stands, you are required to go personally to the courthouse in Bellefonte to file for your address change if you've moved to a new precinct. The next filing period opens Dec. 5.

Besides these students who had moved, there was another group that were unable to vote in my precinct. About 15 people came to the wrong polls and I hated to tell them they had to go to another precinct, figuring they might feel they had made enough of an effort and not bother to vote at all.

If you don't know where you're registered to vote, there's a very easy way to find out. Call the Commissioner's office at 355-5512; give them your name, and they'll tell you what precinct you should vote at and where it's located.

The office is open all day on election day if you have any questions about voting.

Because they were unaware of some facet of the election process 28 per cent of the people who came to vote in my precinct last Tuesday couldn't cast their ballots. This doesn't have to happen next spring if people know they have to file for their change of address or call the Commissioner's office if they need some information.

Waiting for doughnuts

By JOHN B. ROWLEY JR.
Collegian Columnist

When I first came to Penn State, I didn't understand the purpose of club breakfast. I had reasoned that the university could not understand why everyone wasn't up at 7 a.m. for breakfast. "They must think we're all at club meetings and so they're saving us a few snacks," I inaccurately concluded. Now, of course, I have been enlightened as to the real reason for club breakfast. Maybe there are still a few who don't understand, however. For those people please allow me to explain.

The phrase "club breakfast" first of all is a very deceiving word. It is neither designed for clubs, as I had once thought, nor is it a breakfast. Why is this? Simple. The university is punishing students for not getting up early. They

decided that the best way to get students up at 7 a.m. is to make fools of them if they don't. Think of the joy that the administration gets everytime it thinks about students getting up at 8:30 a.m. and, get this, waiting in line for a doughnut. It is pretty hysterical if one examines the situation on a full stomach.

In the interest of promoting this policy, I offer my own variations that will make the student look even more stupid.

1) Only serve club breakfast on even numbered days — how many students would remember if this were an even or an odd date. Very few would. Imagine then, students getting up, walking to the dining halls and we don't even give them their doughnut.

2) Only serve students with odd

numbered meal tickets on even numbered dates — this system would obviously confuse the student even more. They would probably see that their meal ticket is even and come on an even date. The variation adds to the confusion and as the administration well knows there is nothing quite so funny as a confused student.

3) Have students make breakfast for themselves — this suggestion appears to be quite different from the others. Indeed it almost looks constructive as if the university is saying "We want students to learn how to cook for themselves." Or even worse, "If students don't like club breakfast, let them cook it themselves." But don't worry, this isn't the case at all. The administration would only provide the ingredients for one substance. Doughnuts.