

# Minority strike?

Teamsters Union Local 8 last week authorized its leader to call a strike this fall, and University students have nothing to gain and much to lose no matter how it is resolved.

The union members rejected the University's offer of a 5 per cent wage increase. The union leadership had demanded an 8 per cent hike, saying its members cannot maintain their standard of living with just a 5 per cent increase.

If the University gives in to the 8 per cent wage boost in order to avoid or end a strike, then students may expect a room and board, and tuition increase Winter Term.

If the union of 2,600 University maintenance and technical employees follows through with its strike threat, students

can expect countless inconveniences such as poorer dining hall service and unrepaired and uncleaned dorms.

The union leadership has said it expects students to be sympathetic to the striking Teamsters, to understand their cause to seek a decent living.

Perhaps many students would not object strenuously if their room and board bill increased to pay the Teamsters' demands. Perhaps many students will not fill maintenance positions vacated by striking workers. Perhaps many students will sympathize with the Teamsters as long as their demands are justified.

But last week's strike vote raises doubts as to how justified the demand for an 8 per cent increase is. Only one-

third of the union's membership bothered to show up for the strike vote.

More than 1,500 Teamsters stayed home. Apparently, they do not feel that their livelihood is threatened by just a 5 per cent increase.

Such apathy over something as important as one's salary is not going to lend credence to the need for an 8 per cent increase.

Most students face enough financial hardships without having to support higher salaries for Teamsters who are not concerned enough to participate in the strike vote.

A strike called for by a minority of the members does not seem justified and students will know it.



# Political comment caught General

By WALTER R. MEARS  
AP Special Correspondent

More often than not, commencement addresses are good occasions for a nap. Lt. Gen. Donn A. Starry would have been better off if the graduating class had slept through his.

Instead, part of the audience paid attention, and he became embroiled in a new installment of the old argument over the proper boundaries of political and foreign policy comment by military officers.

Starry's indiscretions were political and diplomatic — or undiplomatic. Officially, his error was that he failed to get Pentagon clearance for the speech he made to graduates of the American High School in Frankfurt, Germany.

It didn't cost him much, just a day's inconvenience to stop by the Pentagon for a half-hour lecture from the boss. He was admonished, then sent on his way to a new job and a promotion to four-star rank.

Both were arranged before he gave the speech that stirred the trouble. He is to take charge at the Army Training and

Doctrine Command, which runs the service's schools. The promotion to four stars awaits Senate confirmation.

In the offending speech, Starry told his young audience that within their lifetimes "the Soviets will fight the Chinese, possibly simply continuing their 10-year-old border conflict, but more probably in a major war." He said it is likely the United States would become involved.

He also took out after "the liberals," saying they had tried to bury God, and that they dominate a press "which is not interested in the truth, only in the 5 per cent or so of the news that deviates from the norm."

Starry thus made the 5 per cent.

His case hardly ranked with that of Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub, ordered home from South Korea after saying President Carter's planned withdrawal of U.S. ground forces would lead to war there. Singlaub contradicted the policy of his civilian commander. There isn't any policy on the issue Starry raised, although it is reasonable to assume that the United States would prefer not to see,

let alone become involved in a major war between Russia and China.

So the issues raised by Starry's scolding are more difficult. "If our generals are slowly silenced to the point that they cannot discuss with young people matters that do not come under announced policy of the commander in chief, then we are in real trouble," said Sen. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz.

But the Pentagon has told U.S. military commanders that even before policy is set, it may be contrary to the national interest for top military men to discuss it publicly.

That message went out with a reminder of the requirement that speeches and statements be submitted for advance clearance by the Defense Department's Directorate of Security Review and Freedom of Information.

If Starry had sent his in, a Pentagon official said, it probably would have gone back to him with a letter suggesting that he reconsider the implications of his statements on war between Russia and China, and that he also consider whether he should involve himself in domestic

politics with his comments about liberals.

In other words, it doesn't take a censor to make the point to a general. Over the right signature, a suggestion is enough.

There's nothing new about the system, and it has caused controversy before. Fifteen years ago, a Senate investigating committee said it was appropriate for the Pentagon to check and clear public statements in advance.

Despite the controversies over Singlaub and Starry, the Pentagon's civilian managers still are urging military men to speak to the public and to reporters. They want it done with care, and in keeping with policy, and with clearance for the speeches.

That's a tall order, but Secretary of Defense Harold Brown tells military commanders it is part of the job. It will be a difficult part, especially now that they have seen two of their colleagues called on the administration carpet for saying the wrong things.

For a while, at least, a good many top military men may decide that silence is the better part of valor.

# Letters to the Editor

## Ha ha

We of the newly organized SLA (Silliness Liberation Alliance, etc.) have noted your paper to be lacking in proper coverage of silly affairs. True, silly people may be, at this moment, in a minority on this campus, but such is not the case at progressive universities and homes. If PSU and its student newspaper do not wish to fall behind the Times (or the Washington Post, for that matter), it should immediately remedy the situation. For example, the recent Martian invasion of the Garden Theatre (last Friday night I believe) was photographed by your people, was applauded by the lines for Star Wars, and was absent from the next Monday's Collegian. Obviously a case of prejudice against silly people on the part of the editorial staff.

So far, violence has not been tried... successfully. There was the attempt to kidnap Jeff Hawkes' pet rock, but that fell through (those things are vicious). And the attempt to steal Sparks Building for ransom. Wouldn't fit in the paper bag — we're new at this, you understand.

Anyway, even now as you look about you, you may notice silly people. You may walk faster and try to avoid us, but we are organizing and soon we will be too powerful to ignore! (Whew. Hot stuff, huh?)

I suggest that you, and others like you, submit to silliness now before you find yourself on the wrong side of insanity. It may be the most sensible thing you do.

Perhaps.

Mike "Mick" Mahan  
town resident

## Squeeze play

I note with some interest that a spokesman for the Florida orange growers has indicated that Anita Bryant will not be removed from her advertising position unless it appears as though her involvement in the campaign against human rights is negatively affecting the industry. I think that it would behoove all those concerned with the cause of human rights to make this a self-fulfilling prophecy.

A boycott against all Florida orange products and by-products would be the best way of achieving this. Hopefully, this gesture will not be seen as one whose purpose is to deny this woman a job; rather, an attempt to focus attention on an industry which benignly tolerates a denial of human rights.

Paul H. Stevenson  
State College resident

## Radically angry

I would like to answer Mr. Jeffery Imm. Let me point out, Mr. Imm, that while your letter made me angry, it has improved my impression of you. Imagination, courage, and conviction of values are admirable qualities; Modern revolution looks out for people of these characteristics to fill its ranks.

"Revolutionary," and "Crusader," — Yes, I guess I will accept those titles; they fit me accurately enough. But then, they describe more and more people these days. I repeat, Mr. Imm, you do not understand the purposes or the extent of revolution. You have been exposed to too much SLA craziness. There are more dimensions to revolution these days than you have imagined. And I won't try to define doctrine; that would take hours of discussion and accomplish little.

Think large, of human issues. We are entering a new phase of life on this planet. We cannot continue using up human life and potential, energy, and resources as we do. We have to pay closer attention to economics, over-population, food production and agribusiness, government corruption and bureaucracy, big business, ecology, education, and more. The human race cannot for long use its home and its members as it has and survive. Humankind has to learn to take responsibility for itself.

The revolution operates to provide method for forward-reaching and visionary people to learn and teach, to explore new sciences, arts, political ideas, and social systems. Some of us classify what we do as working for the development of human potential. New ideas shock a society, but often turn out to be worth the shock. Examine revolution carefully, understand it, before you judge it.

"Fight in any way you know" means exactly that, Mr. Imm. If your way is peaceful political action, I applaud you and wish all power to you. Gandhi is one of the greatest of revolutionary heroes. If you are a writer, write; a scientist or an artist, think and create; if you are a businessman, do business; just direct yourself towards revolution. Do what you do best, in whatever way you devise, to fight.

The ecology movements, feminism, and the NAACP and black movements are responsible and ideal parts of revolution. You don't have to carry a gun to be a revolutionary — some of us loathe the damned things.

Then again, freedom and growth are only possible when people are willing to fight to guard them.

It is not my intention to convert you. I just wanted to explain.

To close, let me remind you of the tar-baby principle, "You become attached to that which you attack." Welcome to the revolution.

Fight in any way you know.

William Carl Eichman  
11th-general arts and sciences

# the Collegian

JEFFREY HAWKES  
Editor

SCOTT R. SESLER  
Business Manager

BOARD OF EDITORS: EDITORIAL EDITOR, Bob Frick; NEWS EDITOR, Dave Skidmore; COPY EDITORS, Ivy Goldberg, David Colborn; SPORTS EDITOR, Joyce Tomana; ASSISTANT SPORTS EDITOR, Brian Miller; PHOTO EDITOR, Randy Woodbury; WIRE EDITOR, Laura Shemick; FEATURES EDITOR, Diana Younken; GRAPHICS EDITOR, Mark VanDine; OFFICE MANAGER, Anita McKelvey

BOARD OF MANAGERS: Sales Coordinator, Alex N. Barenblit; Office Coordinator, Judy Stinson, National Ad Manager, Patty Bartlett; Layout Coordinator, Terry Dolinar

## Letters policy

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 will be withheld on request. If letters are received by mail, the Collegian will contact the signer for verification before publication. Letters cannot be returned.

# Press might promote violence

Two weeks ago, three Girl Scouts were found murdered in their tent in an Oklahoma camp. Last week, another Girl Scout, this one in Florida, was dragged from her tent by the hair — fortunately, she escaped her captor without being harmed.

Although the two crimes may not have been committed by the same person, there still may be a connection between them.

In March, when a group of Hanafi Moslems seized three government buildings and held more than 100 hostages, U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young placed at least part of the blame for the incident on the shoulders of the news media.

He claimed that this country's newspapers, radio and television usually over-publicize incidents of kidnapping and violence, thus inciting other sick or frustrated individuals or groups to perpetuate this type of activity.

Since then, Andrew Young has become famous for his rather brash statements. But in this case, perhaps he hit on something. Perhaps the publicity attained by the Oklahoma Girl Scout murders planted the germ of an idea in a man's head in Florida — the idea that it wouldn't be difficult to remove a girl from an unguarded tent in the woods.

And perhaps the news media should consider altering the way in which news concerning violence is reported.

Of course, there is much to be said for freedom of the press and the "public's right to know." I can't imagine any significant act of violence or kidnapping being completely ignored by the media. The people want and need to know that a radical group is terrorizing an area of the country in which they live or that a kidnaper of a certain description is "on the loose."

And yet, the media have a great deal of power. For example, many noted

sociologists and psychologists have done studies which show that violence on television can cause violent behavior in human beings. And nightly news programs are sometimes as full of violence as police shows and documentaries on violence in America.

There are two possible ways in which the media could perpetuate violent behavior. By describing an act of violence or terrorism in detail, the media could serve to suggest a new type of violence to some frustrated individual.

Mary Ellen  
Wright

Or, if an oppressed group wants to bring its cause to the attention of the public, it need only perform some act of seizure and it will win instant publicity via the media.

For example, during the recent two-week siege of a Dutch train by Moluccan terrorists, the story made the top of the broadcast news for several days, and also often made the front page of America's newspapers.

And when a New York news show reported on the recent Croatian seizure of the Yugoslavian Embassy to the U.N., one of the reporters on the station talked for five minutes on "Who are the Croatians and what do they want?" As I said before — instant publicity!

The pinnacle of publicity was reached earlier this year by an Indianapolis kidnaper. He called a press conference and spoke to several reporters while he held a sawed-off shotgun to the throat of a real estate agent. He got his face on TV

and aired his gripes because he made big news through his stunt. That stunt might appear to be appealing to someone else looking for an outlet for his frustrations.

Who knows, perhaps the media can even help a criminal-at-large remain at large a while longer. For all New York's 44-caliber killer has to do is turn on the local news and he will see how many policemen and cars are on his trail and the exact amount of progress being made towards his capture.

I think this proposed connection between media coverage and violence can be most clearly seen through the example of Lynette "Squeaky" Fromme's attempt on then-President Ford's life. When the attempt was made, newsmen threw themselves full-force into the story. Television recreated the scene of the crime several times a day; and it was not unusual to see three articles on the subject on the front page of one newspaper. When it was discovered that Fromme was a member of the Manson family, the publicity rose to a fever pitch. Fromme's picture even made the cover of Time magazine.

Soon after all of this occurred the number of threats on Ford's life increased three-fold — from 100 to 300 per week.

Surely the entire blame for incidents of violence and kidnapping does not belong to the media, and yet, perhaps it is time for the media to take a long hard look at the way they cover such incidents. They might take some cues from experts in the social sciences, for it must be determined as soon as possible whether the media are doing more harm than good in the way they handle certain stories.

For if our bad news is either altered or cut back to some extent, perhaps the media will have more good news to report.

