



Photos by Lynn Dudinsky

Eye to eye

University President John W. Oswald and associates (left) confronted the senate appropriations committee, chaired by Henry J. Cianfrani (right), in Harrisburg yesterday. The University officials argued for an increase in Gov. Shapp's recommended appropriations which are \$15 million short of Penn State's request.

Increase in University appropriation not expected

By BOB FRICK
Collegian Staff Writer

HARRISBURG — University President John W. Oswald and other University officials were given dismal news concerning Penn State's state appropriation for the 1977-78 year at the Senate appropriations hearings in Harrisburg yesterday. The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Henry J. Cianfrani, said, "I would not be optimistic about the state raising Penn State's appropriation."

The University officials were at the hearings to try to increase Gov. Shapp's recommended appropriation which left Penn State \$15 million short of the amount it requested. See related stories, pg. 3.

In his presentation, Oswald said he was alarmed that the mix of Penn State students was shifting from the less affluent to the more affluent.

'I don't see where you would be doing any damage to the University if there was a \$75 to \$100 increase (in tuition)'

— Henry J. Cianfrani, appropriations committee chairman

Oswald said the tuition rate has increased at a faster rate than state appropriations so that now "our best estimate shows 52 per cent is paid by students and 48 by the state." More students seem to be applying to Penn State, rather than Temple, Cianfrani said. "If they can afford the \$1,300 for tuition at Temple (about \$150 more than Penn State for three terms), I can't see where we would have any problem raising the tuition at Penn State."

"I don't see where you would be doing any damage to the University if there was a \$75 to \$100 increase," Cianfrani said. In Oswald's prepared statement for the hearing, he said, "The facts are that Penn State's total appropriation, on a per student basis, is not large when compared with other institutions. The total appropriation for Penn State is less, on a per student basis, than that for all but one of the institutions in the Commonwealth System of Higher Education."

Rep. Helen Wise, D-77th District, said "it is too early to tell" the impact of Oswald's testimony before the Senate committee, but that there has definitely been a history of change in the budget after such testimonies. Sen. William J. Moore asked Oswald if the University planned credit cutbacks in baccalaureate degree programs so that students could spend less money and time in school. "There has been some talk, but nothing serious," Oswald said. "I think we're going to have to drop programs rather than lowering the over-all quality of education." Sen. Richard A. Snyder asked Oswald if any consideration was given to lowering faculty pay over summer months when there are less students and productivity decreases. Oswald said faculty members have research responsibilities over the summer and that in some cases they teach as many classes, but to fewer students.

Petition outlines aim to reorganize USG

By JOHN MARTELLARO
Collegian Staff Writer

A petition for a referendum to reorganize the Undergraduate Student Government that calls for the disbanding of the Association of Residence Hall Students (ARHS) and the Student Advisory Board (SAB) began circulating yesterday, according to USG Senator Tom Heitzenrater.

The petition requires 1,500 signatures to call for a special referendum vote on the issue, which the USG constitution states must be held within two to ten days after the petition is filed, according to Heitzenrater.

The referendum becomes binding on USG if it passes an election in which 40 per cent or more of the student body vote. In recent years, voter turnout for USG elections has hovered around 30 per cent.

The petition, which is similar to a bill introduced by Heitzenrater in the USG Senate, calls for the disbanding of ARHS, the SAB and USG in its present form, and replacing it with "a real student government."

The proposed new student group, according to the petition, would "petition the University on behalf of the student body for authority on such matters as the discipline system, co-ed housing, University calendar, physical landscaping, what courses may be accredited, the use of dormitory and student union facilities and the role of RA's."

Heitzenrater said he was trying to get the referendum because he was "sick and tired of beating his head against USG."

He said his original bill, which is in committee at the Senate, would "never make it out on its own."

Heitzenrater said he would not attempt to get an endorsement for the referendum from USG. "I'm not interested in courting opinions I don't really respect," he said.

The referendum would not be binding on ARHS or the SAB, Heitzenrater said, but he added that he hoped a 40 per cent turnout would be a sign to those groups that the reorganization was what the students wanted.

Heitzenrater said the next step after the referendum would be "an articulation by the student body" — the physical presence of a large group of students on Old Main lawn for an hour or two on an afternoon.

He said he was referring to communication, not violence, and that it would involve redress of grievances. "It's not working outside the system, it is the system," he said.

"It wouldn't take as much to coerce the University as everybody thinks," he added.

Heitzenrater said he hoped to get the 1,500 signatures in time to get the referendum on the ballot for the USG elections March 31 and April 1.

Muslims raid buildings, kill 1

WASHINGTON (UPI) — Black Hanafi Muslims armed with guns, knives and machetes raided three buildings in broad daylight yesterday, killed a reporter, wounded other victims and held scores of Muslim rivals.

The revenge raids — one on City Hall within sight of the White House — led to demands for delivery of six Black Muslims convicted of murdering seven Hanafis in 1973, and threw parts of the nation's capital into a state of siege. Their apparent leader was the father of four of the 1973 victims.

See related story on page 31. Playing a waiting game with police through the night, the raiders poured out their rage and their demands in a series of telephone interviews with reporters.

They said they were willing to die in this "holy war," and threatened to kill some of their estimated 50 to 100 hostages if their demands were not met.

They set no deadline. "Tell those people not to get smart!" a spokesman for the gunman commanded police by telephone from the B'nai B'rith headquarters, one of the three occupied buildings.

Police — held at bay by an estimated total of six to eight Hanafi raiders in three locations — bargained by telephone and bullhorn.

Cruisers blocked off sections of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts Avenues near the hostage sites, causing mammoth traffic jams, and police snipers manned rooftops.

President Carter ordered the FBI to investigate how a handful of gunmen struck terror in the very heart of the capital.

Attorney General Griffin Bell and FBI director Clarence Kelley visited police headquarters to keep tabs on the situation. Bell then briefed Carter's top White House aide, Hamilton Jordan, and presidential counsel Robert Lipschutz.

The raiders, striking in groups ranging from two to four, first hit the B'nai B'rith building on Massachusetts Avenue's Embassy Row about 11 a.m.

The second group raided the national Islamic Center, a mosque, farther along Embassy Row about two hours later and the third group charged into the District Building — Washington's City Hall, near the White House — about 3 p.m.

The third raid was the bloodiest. Police said the gunmen — believed to number only two — shot black radio reporter Maurice Williams to death as he stepped out of an elevator and wounded at least three other persons with gunfire.

One of the wounded was City Council member Marion Barry, who caught a slug in the chest and was

hospitalized in "fair" condition. City Councilwoman Wilhelmina Rolark said she was conducting a council meeting, "when the door opened and Marion Barry staggered in grabbing his gut. He said, 'I've been shot.' We were just paralyzed."

City officials, including Mayor Walter Washington, sneaked out of the building from locked offices once the gunmen settled down on the top floor.

Late yesterday, police described the situation at the three occupied buildings this way:

— At City Hall, two known gunmen held between seven and 13 hostages, including some women in the City Council president's office. The council president, however was not there. Some of the hostages were reported trussed up with cords on the floor. Police said the casualty toll here was one dead, the black radio reporter, and three wounded by gunfire, including Barry.

— At the B'nai B'rith building, apparent headquarters for the three-part raiding force, an estimated four gunmen were holding between 50 and 100 hostages behind papered-over windows on the eighth floor. Police were moving through the lower floors rescuing persons still inside, and other groups made their own way out during the day. Victims here during the initial break-in included at least five men wounded by gunshot, knife

stabbing, machete slashes or pistol-whipping. One man was hospitalized in stable condition with machete and gunshot wounds and a second was in serious condition with a stab wound in the chest.

— At the National Islamic Center on Massachusetts Avenue, an estimated one or two gunmen held 10 or 12 hostages. There was no violence reported here. They released an 18-year-old female employe from Bangladesh late Wednesday, saying they had "nothing against her."

Police spokesmen quoted Chief Maurice Cullinane as saying he had reason to believe the raids were all "connected." — as Black Muslim spokesmen familiar with the groups inside had told reporters from the outset.

The gunmen, in their angry telephone talks with reporters, refused to say so directly, but they made clear they sought retribution for the mass murders of their loved ones — two women and five children — in 1973.

Self-described leader of the attacking parties was Hamaas Abdul Khaalis, who lost four children in that slaying. Barricaded inside the B'nai B'rith building, he reeled off these main demands in a series of telephone interviews:

— Delivery to his siege group of the six rival Muslims serving life sentences for the Hanafi murders.

State College polarized on human rights ordinance

By JEFF HAWKES
Collegian Staff Writer

More than half of registered voters polled recently in State College said unmarried couples and homosexuals should not be discriminated against when seeking housing.

In a telephone poll of 65 randomly-selected State College residents listed in the phone book who said they are registered to vote in the borough, 59 per cent said gays and unmarried couples should be permitted to live where they choose.

Thirty-two per cent said landlords should continue to be permitted to refuse to rent to gays or unmarried couples, and 9 per cent were undecided.

Those polled were asked, "Should unmarried couples or homosexuals be permitted to live where they choose or should landlords be able to refuse to rent to them?"

Despite this apparent belief of State College's residents that discrimination because of marital status or sexual preference is undesirable if housing is involved, there is no state or local law to protect against such discrimination.

Even a mild anti-discrimination resolution was rejected by the Municipal Council last spring.

Discrimination because of marital status, sexual preference and other biases not outlawed does exist in State College, although it is not rampant.

Nittany Garden Apartments, for instance, will not rent to unmarried couples. Police Chief Elwood G. Williams Jr. has said he "would not knowingly hire a homosexual." Undergraduate students may not live at Alloway and Fairmount East Apartments.

The possibility of being discriminated against is a perpetual fear for perhaps as many as 10 per cent of State College residents who may be homosexuals or have homosexual tendencies. Because laws do not protect them from discrimination, they must keep their sexual orientation a secret from their employers and landlords. If they are discovered, they fear being fired or evicted. If discriminated against, they do not have a case.

One may not be jailed or fined simply for being a homosexual, but the com-

	POSITIVE REACTION	NEGATIVE REACTION	UNDECIDED
1. How do you feel about an unmarried man and woman who live together?	65%	28%	8%
2. How do you feel about homosexuality?	38%	43%	13%
	YES	NO	UNDECIDED
3. Should unmarried couples and gays be permitted to live where they choose?	59%	32%	9%
4. Should there be a local human rights ordinance?	42%	48%	11%

mission of voluntary deviant sexual intercourse is unlawful under state law with a penalty of up to two years in jail.

"You're an outlaw and you must get used to living an outlaw's life," said one homosexual who requested he not be identified.

State College gays found reason to hope when the borough council in 1974 was asked to consider an ordinance that would have protected homosexuals and other minorities not covered under the state Human Relations Act of 1955. But last year the council ended consideration of the ordinance proposal.

Last May, the council also rejected a human rights resolution, which would not have had the force of law but simply would have stated that the State College government is opposed to discrimination against gays and unmarried couples in its own hiring practices. The resolution was defeated, 4 to 3.

As far as the council is concerned, work on a State College human relations ordinance is history. Likewise, two student groups that proposed the ordinance, Homophiles of Penn State (HOPS) and the Association for Women

Students, are not currently working toward proposing an ordinance again.

Nevertheless, the issue is not dead and individual proponents of an ordinance say the issue is likely to re-emerge when new councilmen are seated following this November's election. These individuals still believe discrimination protection for gays and other minorities is essential. Several are bitter against people who testified against the ordinance and resolution and councilmen who voted against the resolution.

Why did the ordinance proposal fail to get off the ground?

Councilman Allen D. Patterson, who voted for the resolution, said he could not support an ordinance because he believes "that council has no right to force its own moral judgment onto the community. I learned long ago that a law must have the support of a majority of the people for it to be enforced."

"I think there is plenty of discrimination in this town and there always has been," he said. "But I also knew that a majority of residents would not want an ordinance."

Continued on page 31