

the Collegian

Wednesday, April 23, 1980
Vol. 52, No. 15 24 pages
University Park, Pa. 16802
Published by Students of The Pennsylvania State University

Kennedy's early lead diminishes

Carter refuses to concede defeat with race so close

From our wire services
Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's early lead over President Carter in the Pennsylvania presidential primary dwindled to near deadlock early this morning, hours after the Democratic challenger claimed to have won "a narrow victory." George Bush gained a Republican upset over Ronald Reagan.
Before midnight when he led by 100,000 votes, Kennedy said he had scored a "narrow victory." But his huge margins in the economically hard-hit coal regions of the state were countered by a large and late reporting Pittsburgh vote which brought Carter within 30,000 votes of the lead early today.
Kennedy won big in Philadelphia, the dominant Democratic city. But Carter votes carved into his margin as the ballots were counted in Pittsburgh and rural Pennsylvania.
"Tonight, it appears, we have a narrow victory," Kennedy told cheering supporters shortly before midnight in Philadelphia.
But White House News Secretary Jody Powell said Carter wasn't conceding defeat. Powell, at the White House, said if the challenger could win, "it would certainly be a boost to him."
He said that even with Pennsylvania, Kennedy would

have to capture almost 70 percent of the Democratic delegates yet to be chosen in order to overtake Carter.
Bush beat Reagan 54 percent to 45 percent in the popular vote. But Reagan said he had won the majority of Pennsylvania's nominating delegates — elected separately — while losing the preferential election.
The vote and percentage for the leaders in the state Democratic primary as of 3:15 this morning with 82 percent of districts reporting:
• Kennedy 628,180 votes, 47 percent, 93 delegates;
• Carter 597,829 votes, 45 percent, 92 delegates;
In the Republican race with 82 percent counted it was:
• Bush 493,214 votes, 54 percent;
• Reagan 413,955 votes, 45 percent;
Kennedy battled hard to beat Carter in Pennsylvania, spending 10 days in the state over the last two weeks. Even on primary day he blasted the Carter administration's economic policies after another round of government statistics showed inflation was continuing at a level of above 18 percent annually.
There was a surprisingly strong turnout in Pennsylvania — a state known for apathetic voting in presidential primaries. Excellent weather throughout the state aided, and voting was heaviest in the coal and

steel cities and towns where the downturn in the economy has been felt for some months.
Former Pittsburgh Mayor Peter Flaherty, a two-time loser in previous statewide bids but boosted by his widespread name appeal, trounced seven rivals yesterday to capture the Democratic U.S. Senate nomination.
The early vote totals were as follows:
Democrat:
Flaherty 115,563; Joseph Rhodes Jr. 39,987; C. Delores Tucker 19,273; Tom Anderson 9,281; Peter Liacouras 13,428; Craig Lewis 8,728; Ed Mezvinsky 9,004, and John J. Logue 1,083.
Republican:
Arlen Specter 49,327; Bud Haabsted 43,644; Edward L. Howard 8,989; Lewis C. Richards 4,035; Norman Bertasavage 3,979; Andrew J. Watson 2,998; Warren R. Williams 1,517, and Francis Worley 1,336.
Sen. Michael O'Pake, a crusading anti-crime lawmaker, was leading veteran prosecutor Walter Phillips as early returns emerged in the race for Pennsylvania's first elected attorney general. With 27 percent of the vote tallied, O'Pake was ahead of Phillips by a margin of 170,812-121,108.



Photo by Chip Connelly

Our house

Through his warm personality and inspiring performance, Graham Nash built a home for a capacity crowd in Eisenhower Auditorium last night. See related story on Page 16.

Carter and Bush win in 6 student precincts

By PETE BARNES
Daily Collegian Staff Writer
George Bush and Jimmy Carter won the most votes in six student-dominated precincts in yesterday's Pennsylvania primary elections, according to unofficial results.
Voter turnout in those six student-dominated precincts was 1,842 of 4,101 eligible voters, or 44.9 percent.
Among Republicans, Bush received 501 of 1,069 votes, or 46.8 percent, followed by John B. Anderson with 381 write-in votes, or 35.6 percent. Ronald Reagan took third with 158 votes, or 14 percent.

An estimated 9,700 students, about one-third of all students, are registered to vote in Centre County, according to Undergraduate Student Government department of political affairs figures.
High Republican preference for Bush and Anderson apparently reflected each candidate's campaign efforts in the area. Bush was the only major presidential candidate to visit State College, and local Anderson campaigners pushed hard in a write-in campaign.
In State College as a whole, nine of 18 precincts, including the six student-dominated precincts, had reported by 3

a.m. Turnout in the borough for those nine precincts was 3,007 of 5,919 registered voters, or 50.8 percent. About one-third of all registered voters in Centre County are registered in State College.
Among Republicans, 1,768 of 3,139 eligible voters, or 56.3 percent, turned out. Breakdown by candidate was as follows: Bush — 871 votes, or 41.4 percent; Anderson — 466 votes, or 22.2 percent; Reagan — 347 votes, or 16.5 percent. A handful of votes were cast for minor candidates and candidates who have dropped out of the race but whose names remained on the ballot.

Among Democrats in the nine precincts, 1,239 of 2,780 voters, or 44.5 percent, turned out. Breakdown by candidate was: Carter — 945 votes, or 60.5 percent; Kennedy — 473 votes, or 30.3 percent; Anderson — 79 votes, or 6.3 percent. 44 no preference votes were cast, and Brown received 19 votes.
Following the statewide results, the nine reporting State College precincts went overwhelmingly for Republican Arlen Specter of Philadelphia and Democrat Peter Flaherty of Pittsburgh in the race for nomination for the U.S. Senate race.

Centre County favors Carter and Bush

By PHIL GUTTS
Daily Collegian Staff Writer
Centre County Democrats voted more conservatively than their statewide counterparts as President Carter received 3,833 votes to Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's 2,111 with 58 of 82 county precincts reporting at 3 a.m.
Republican candidate John B. Anderson received 195 Democratic write-in votes.
However, Centre County Republican voting was indicative of statewide trends as George Bush was leading Ronald Reagan by a margin of 3,680 to 3,242 at 3 a.m. Anderson had received 1,132 write-in votes.
In the Democratic nomination race for the 77th district state House seat, last-minute write-in candidate and University student Bob Brazill (7th-division of undergraduate studies) appeared headed to victory over another last-minute write-in

candidate, former University doctoral candidate William McConnell, by a margin of 171 to 98.
Incumbent 77th district freshman Rep. Gregg Cunningham (R-Centre Region) — who ran unopposed — received 3,101 votes and 32 Democratic write-in votes.
Cunningham said he had no knowledge of a democratic write-in campaign on his behalf.
"I stayed completely out of the Democratic primary race against the urging of many Democrats," Cunningham said, "because I genuinely believe in the two-party system."
Incumbent U.S. Rep. William F. Clinger (R-central Pa.) received 2,547 votes in his bid for the Republican nomination to the U.S. House. Democratic counterpart Peter Altigen of McKean County received 1,579 votes.
Republican turnout appeared to hover around 60 percent throughout the night and Democratic turnout around 55.

Shaffer reflects on achievements, difficulties of year

Editor's Note: Former Undergraduate Student Government President Hal Shaffer's term in office was marked by his abolishment of JEM Productions and the resignations of JEM employees, Ernie Hicks' unauthorized spending, including a safe cemented in Sparks Building, and the breakdown of the USG Senate after its constructive beginning.
Daily Collegian staff writers Lorraine Capra and Larry Gallone interviewed Shaffer on the problems and highlights of this year. The following is a transcript of the interview, edited for length and clarity.

decision.) But I think that looking back at how the senate has handled this decision afterward, it's evidence that 36 senators cannot come to a decisive decision on something as important as this. There's no way that you can let 36 people have input and come to a good decision as a smaller committee can, and the senate has been bogged down in issues concerning JEM Productions.
COLLEGIAN: But how do you decide which senators to choose and how do you pacify the others?
SHAFFER: What should be done is that the senate should decide itself which senators will represent it... In those



Photo by Janis Burger

Hal Shaffer

Interview

COLLEGIAN: This year's USG will be known for merging JEM Productions with the department of programs and services. You received criticism from the senate for not telling them about the merger before it was made. Looking back on it now, would you change anything?
SHAFFER: I would say that the only thing I would change with the merger of JEM Productions with programs and services is having senate input into the decision that was made even though it was a good decision, as they (the senate) took offense to the executive order.
COLLEGIAN: You would do this before the decision?
SHAFFER: Yes, I would have asked a couple of senators to come to the meetings.
COLLEGIAN: Why a couple of senators? That was the problem this year in that only a few senators were involved in the decision. What they wanted was for the entire senate to be told before hand.
SHAFFER: It's not necessarily a few senators; I'd say more than a few senators (would be consulted in the

meetings (before the merger was made), I assumed that Senate President Mark Berg would represent the USG Senate as he is president of the senate.
COLLEGIAN: Some senators have criticized you for not attending senate meetings when they discussed something that needed your input. According to USG's constitution, the president does not have to attend the meetings.
SHAFFER: That's correct.
COLLEGIAN: Do you think that a lot of this year's problems could have been avoided if you had gone to the meetings when the senate had questions?
SHAFFER: I'd have to say that I have attended at least half of the senate meetings.
COLLEGIAN: But you left before a lot of the major discussion came up.
SHAFFER: Well, in the senate meeting you have executive reports and I gave my presidential reports in the beginning of the senate meetings throughout the whole year.
I have been accessible to any senator who had any questions, and if they had anything to ask me they would have

come to me personally. I gave my reports to the senate — it's not like I totally snubbed the senate at all.
COLLEGIAN: Paying people in USG was a big issue this year. What about the stipends for USG president and vice president? Do you think it's good? Should it be continued? Is it enough?
SHAFFER: I think it's a good idea. I think it should be continued. I cannot make a value judgement on how much it should be — that's up to the committee that votes on that.
However, let me put it this way. An RA gets paid half tuition and full room and board, which is a hell of a lot more than the USG president gets. I would say that the amount of time that the USG president puts in is equivalent to what an RA puts in, at least. And there are a hell of a lot more RAs than USG presidents on this campus.
COLLEGIAN: Ernie Hicks was the center of controversy this year. Vicki Sandoe said you would not tell her about Ernie's spending, especially the \$5,000

movie equipment and later the \$900 safe. Vicki said you would tell the treasurer but you would not tell her ahead of time. Why?
SHAFFER: It had nothing to do with Vicki. The treasurer is in charge of all money relating to the organization, so I would think that the treasurer is the one you would be in contact with if a financial decision was being made.
COLLEGIAN: You don't think you should have told her as vice president?
SHAFFER: I did not purposely withhold that information from her.
COLLEGIAN: What about the role of president and vice president working together or working separately? Should there be a dichotomy?
SHAFFER: I think there should be a dichotomy. For example, this year there has been a definite dichotomy between the two persons. Number one, I've been in charge of the representative nature of USG, dealing with the administration. Vicki has been in charge of programs and services for the organization.

I would say that these are our fortes and what we are best suited to handle because I don't think the USG president can handle both the representative nature and the programming nature of the organization... it's just too much.
COLLEGIAN: What about an extra position, an extra vice president?
SHAFFER: That is a very good point. I've been talking to Joe Healey about that point in the transition period that's been going on. I've mentioned to him that an executive vice president would be a good move in that that person would be in charge of the internal workings of the executive branch because there is definitely another dichotomy in the nature of the USG president's role.
You have the internal and the external parts of the job — external meaning you deal with the administration and local, state and federal government. Internal where you're talking about the executive departments. Now you always have to have a balance, a trade-off in this, and sometimes you have to give a little for one part to get something for another...
By getting an executive vice president to run the internal workings, the USG president then could worry more about representing students instead of worrying about the internal workings of every little detail of the organization. I've suggested this to Joe.
COLLEGIAN: Some of the senate meetings this year have turned into screaming battles — mainly between the candidates who were running for president. Monday night (April 14), another battle took place. How can the senate avoid these personal differences and work together?
SHAFFER: I think that's something you should ask the senate.
COLLEGIAN: As a former senator how would you answer that?
SHAFFER: I would have to say that many of the senators in the senate this year have been extremely biased in their viewpoints. Their objectivity has been nil in certain issues throughout the year, and this has clouded their earlier efforts which were successful with the ad hoc committee system.
COLLEGIAN: Why the breakdown?

Well, the breakdown occurred in January when the JEM and programs and services controversy started. I think the breakdown was due to one, sensationalism of the coverage of the Collegian, and number two, there's no way 36 people in one body can come to a consensus on certain things and that is how they have gotten bogged down in the last few months.
I think a good step was taken when Mark Berg and I think it was (Senator) Dave Winkler started that sub-committee to look at the whole idea of the structure of the business operation of USG. Since then it's been proven that a smaller committee can work much more effectively than 36 students.
COLLEGIAN: In your representative duties, did University administrators and the Board of Trustees show respect?
SHAFFER: I would have to say the Board of Trustees was probably the most enjoyable forum I had to speak in this year — they did listen. They would not always change their minds, but when I got up and spoke as a student representing students, they definitely listened.
COLLEGIAN: What about administrators?
SHAFFER: When I have seen a problem that has arisen on campus, most of the administrators that I have dealt with have been accessible — they would listen to me. A lot of times they would not agree with my position but at least they would have the courtesy and respect to hear me out.
Continued on Page 14.

Downhill from here

This afternoon will be mostly sunny and continued warm, despite the morning cloudiness. Today's high will be a pleasant 71. Tonight will be partly cloudy and somewhat cooler with a low of 44. Gentle Thursday's outlook is not that encouraging, for we will have partly cloudy skies in the morning, with afternoon and evening showers and some not-so-gentle thundershowers likely. Tomorrow's high will be a much cooler 61.