

Editorial Opinion

Missing Loop

University should not be without Loopbus service

As the University faces a tighter budget, people must face the grim reality that sacrifices must be made. Tuition will continue to rise and certain services will be cut back. The question is, which services are considered absolutely necessary and which are expendable?

The Campus Loop should not be considered expendable. Unfortunately, it is expensive and the University may not be able to operate it in the coming years. A subsidy of \$25,000 is required to run the Loop this year, because the 25-cent fare cannot cover all the expenses. The buses are getting old and will need to be replaced in the near future — a very expensive project.

University President John W. Oswald said the Loop is on a list of 25 to 30 items that are considered valuable, but that could be cut back or eliminated if a financial crisis should arise.

The Loop may not be an absolute necessity, but it is very close. If a public transportation system does not exist on campus, no one will survive up and down (except the people found frozen solid in Parking Lot 80), but people would be grossly inconvenienced. University Park is a very big campus.

The hike from Hammond Building to Shields Building takes at least 25 minutes. People on crutches, people carrying many pounds of

books, people in a hurry, people fearing frostbite and people just too tired to walk depend on the Loop to get them around. Also, the Loop provides a safe way for women to cross campus at night.

Everyone should agree the Loop is essential. But if the University simply cannot afford to run it, what can be done?

The most obvious solution would be for the Centre Area Transportation Authority to take over. The University would have to subsidize CATA for the service, just as other municipalities served by CATA do, but it would probably be much cheaper in the long run. Having just one bus system in the community has to be more efficient.

CATA Chairman E. Emory Ensore Jr. said CATA is willing to discuss with University officials the possibilities of a CATA-run Loop. University officials should take the discussion very seriously and make every effort to come to an agreement.

Ideally, the University should maintain Loop service. Students would be better off with an independent University bus, eliminating worry about CATA squabbles and strikes. But if it is a question of Loop or bust, CATA service would be a good alternative.

The lack of a Loop would be ludicrous.

Jim Morris '80



"GOODBYE MR. LIPS?"

PSU vets group provides information, activities

By JIM STULTZ
PSUVO president

As president of the Pennsylvania State University Veterans Organization (PSUVO), I strongly feel the need to comment on several misconceptions reported in the Oct. 17 Daily Collegian article about Veterans' Awareness Day.

One misconception was the name of our organization. In the article, PSUVO was referred to by several different titles and was confused with the University Office of Veteran's Affairs.

Please allow me to discuss the differences. PSUVO is a student organization. The purpose of the club is to provide a meeting place where student veterans can meet to socialize and receive information on such topics as where to find financial aid, current legislation on veteran's benefits, and University and Veteran's Administration matters and their effects on the student.

In its way, as the article implied, does PSUVO attempt to provide or obtain financial aid or counseling for veterans. This is a function of the Office of Veteran's Affairs.

As correctly stated in the article, the Office of Veteran's Affairs is located in 135 Boucke. This office is headed by Brian Clark, along with Davaine Hillon as the veteran's counselor. These individuals and their staff are responsible for providing counseling in the areas of financial and readjustment problems.

It is also this office, not the club, that hires

citizens; veteran's legislation, such as letter-writing campaigns; and a veteran's scholarship fund to name a few projects.

The club sponsors three annual events. A statewide softball tournament is held to promote contact with other Pennsylvania veteran's organizations, Penn State Veteran's Awareness Conference is held to provide important information to the Commonwealth campus veterans, and the Jack Swords Invitational Golf Tournament is held to raise money to establish a veteran's scholarship fund.

In no way, as the article implied, does PSUVO attempt to provide or obtain financial aid or counseling for veterans. This is a function of the Office of Veteran's Affairs.

As correctly stated in the article, the Office of Veteran's Affairs is located in 135 Boucke. This office is headed by Brian Clark, along with Davaine Hillon as the veteran's counselor. These individuals and their staff are responsible for providing counseling in the areas of financial and readjustment problems.

It is also this office, not the club, that hires

work-study veterans who assist in recruiting new students in the area of tutorial assistance and employment, as well as the performance of other general office duties.

The article also confused PSUVO with the Veteran's Administration (VA) which we are in no way connected with. The VA is a federal agency that provides funds for the GI Bill, work-study, and various other programs.

The Mayor Arnold Addison who signed a proclamation to declare Thursday, Oct. 16, as "Penn State Veteran's Awareness Day," would like to know why The Daily Collegian did not print the proclamation along with the article.

The intent of the day was to promote awareness among the University, the borough of State College, and the students of PSU about our veterans population, not just among the people present at the ceremony as the article implied.

Mayor Addison also offered, not presented, the use of a slide tape presentation of the community of State College and the University. He suggested that PSUVO might show the slide-tape

show at one of the Commonwealth campus conferences.

The Collegian article quoted a source as saying the conferences for the Commonwealth campuses are held to "help eliminate culture shock" for transferring students.

Even though this is one subject of the conference, the main purpose is to provide information on financial aid, legislation of veteran's affairs, V.A. news, PSUVO and other veteran's clubs in the Penn State system, and other information the Commonwealth campuses veterans may not be aware of.

The State-side Softball Tournament is much more than a large number of veterans spending a weekend playing ball as the article implied.

The purpose of the tournament is to provide a venue for veterans to exchange ideas and information about their schools and clubs and how they handle their problems.

With this exchange of information, student veterans are hopefully more easily able to try to obtain a college education.

Last year, PSUVO, not the Veteran's Administration Club, sponsored its first Jack Swords Invitational Golf Tournament to raise money to start a veteran's scholarship. This scholarship has nothing to do with the VA and will only be available to veteran students enrolled at Penn State. The tournament is named for one of our club's advisers, Jack Swords.

The reason I am writing this and mentioning these programs and misconceptions is to point out the carelessness of the Collegian in confusing the name of our organization and disregarding the importance of the programs' discussion in the mayor's office, not to mention the intent of the proclamation.

The Collegian is a student newspaper. What I am against is students themselves exercise this right every day.

How Paterno feels is not going to affect the way I vote any more than the views of students who, for the most part, have not raised families, paid \$1,000 in federal taxes, lived for more than 20 years, or experienced the real world for more than a few months at a time, are going to affect the way I am going to vote.

Don Grazal, 6th-business administration Oct. 28

Rights denied

Last week in The Daily Collegian, Joe Paterno was placed in the sinners column of that great weekly editorial that tells us who has been good and who has been bad.

If only Paterno would have endorsed John Anderson. Then, Paterno probably would have appeared in the winners column, and he could have slept well at night knowing that he himself had been endorsed by that politically, intellectually superior Daily Collegian.

The Collegian editorial on Tuesday claims that it is unethical for a famous individual to announce his choice for the presidency. But for the past seven weeks we have been bombarded with political advice from individuals of the Collegian. That this "advice" (scrap the Department of Defense, stop Reagan, etc.) reaches many thousands of students is a known fact.

I am not against students being able to express their views through a student newspaper. What I am against is students trying to deny the right of expression of another, when they themselves exercise this right every day.

How Paterno feels is not going to affect the way I vote any more than the views of students who, for the most part, have not raised families, paid \$1,000 in federal taxes, lived for more than 20 years, or experienced the real world for more than a few months at a time, are going to affect the way I am going to vote.

Don Grazal, 6th-business administration Oct. 28

Commoner plea

Good for the rest of the country and corporate wealth that will eventually trickle down to everybody is a philosophy Anderson has not rejected.

He has stated that the major economic problem of our day, inflation, is caused only by an unbalanced federal budget and a tax policy that discourages big business from capital investment.

His solution to inflation is Reagan's as well: tax incentives to encourage businesses to increase their investments. Nowhere in Anderson's "campaign of ideas" is the notion that big business is causing inflation by investing in the wrong things.

Examples include: economically disastrous nuclear energy and big automobiles instead of solar energy (including bicycles), small automobiles and extensive, regional railroad systems. Big business is interested only in short-term profit and not in the social welfare.

Because Anderson believes the basic organization of the economy is sound, he is not likely to make deep structural changes within it. He implies that Anderson will bring about these changes because he is a moderate, because he is above politics and will be pragmatic.

We have seen in the presidency of one such self-proclaimed pragmatic moderate, Jimmy Carter, that no deep changes in the economy result. Being above politics and being pragmatic means avoiding the real, fundamental causes of our economic woes and applying old solutions in a frantic, haphazard fashion, as Carter has done, and as Anderson will do once he is elected.

Heidt misunderstands Tom Ortenberg when he thinks pro-

Letters to the Editor

Anderson alternative

Joe Paterno recognizes that this is a crucial time for America. He criticizes Jimmy Carter for his vacillation on foreign policy. He then endorses Ronald Reagan because he thinks Reagan will have the guts to stick with his policies.

But Reagan's record as governor does not show this to be true. Dozens of times when asked about his stands on vital issues regarding a vote he would answer, "You caught me on that one. I don't know."

A prime example was the abortion issue. On May 2, 1967, he was asked, "Is there any possibility of a residency requirement in an abortion bill?" Reagan's reply: "I never even thought about that."

On May 9, the same question got the same answer. On May 16 the same question got this response: "I'm just as confused as I was last week."

And finally, on June 13, two hours before the legislature was supposed to vote on the bill, he was asked his stand and he

Joe's right

I am appalled, disgusted and disgruntled by the heavy-handed treatment The Daily Collegian has accorded Joe Paterno for exercising his freedom of speech.

This right is not reserved for an intellectual elite, or for that matter the press, but rather for all people. Let my point elude anyone, read the following quote from Tuesday's editorial:

"However, it is ethically untenable for a famous individual with no political experience whatsoever to call a press conference and announce his choice for the presidency."

Since when must people have "political experience" before they air their opinions publicly? Does the Collegian have "political experience" given its often one-sided editorial coverage?

What about the time the Collegian in its editorial page took one statement made by Gregg Cunningham and twisted it totally out of context? Was this responsible, did this constitute "political experience?" Or how about Eugene McCarthy — one minute he's campaigning for every third-party candidate and his sister, and the next minute he turns around and tells everyone he's going to vote for Reagan! Was this responsible?

Issues and answers

The campaign for the highest office in this land has been lowered this year to the lowest bout of mudslinging this country has seen in a long time.

When three men try to attain the presidency of the United States merely by abusing each other, it is a sad day for America.

It is time that the students of this university began really looking at the issues in this presidential campaign. The most important issue is energy.

Energy sources affect both the economic and foreign policies of this country. Everyone agrees that the United States must become independent of foreign oil, but to do this we must develop alternative energy sources. Currently the only viable alternative we have is nuclear power.

Other alternatives can be developed but in order to do this, money for these programs must be placed in the proper hands. Ronald Reagan proposes the elimination of the Department of Energy.

With a budget in excess of \$80 billion per year, the DOE has done absolutely nothing to enhance our energy situation. This money could be returned to private enterprises in the form of research tax exemptions or budgeted to NASA for investigation of solar power development in space.

The windfall profits tax has also taken money out of the hands of skilled, knowledgeable professionals and filtered it through the federal bureaucracy into areas that are, at times, totally unrelated to energy.

Unemployment is another major issue in this election year. The Democratic platform calls for a \$2 billion program to create 800,000 jobs. This will cost the taxpayer \$5,000 per job. If this money were distributed in the form of investment incentives, or as low interest loans for small businesses, more jobs would be created and the taxpayer would bear a smaller burden.

Women's rights have also created quite a stir. While President Carter continues to support the Equal Rights Amendment which would throw excessive litigation into the courts, Ronald Reagan has taken a more realistic stand. Equal rights for women should be achieved by legislators, not by high court judges.

Under President Carter, U.S. foreign policy has fluctuated drastically, leaving us in a dangerous position abroad. We must have a clear-cut foreign policy which assures our allies of full military and economic support if they ask for it.

Through petty hang-ups and full-scale turnabouts, Carter has pulled us much closer to war than a strong military presence and a firm foreign policy ever would.

The issues go on and on. The American people have essentially three choices. Anderson's lack of a political machine to carry out his policies, whether good or bad, narrows the choice to two. We must now ask ourselves, not do we want four more years, but can we survive four more years.

J. David Payne, 16th-English



McCarthy's syrup isn't serious

Eugene McCarthy is the pancake of politicians — lots of starch, lots of calories but little sustenance, a true flip-flop on issues who can butter up his audience as smooth as maple syrup.

McCarthy, described by The Associated Press as "the political darling of anti-war liberals," did the ultimate flip-flop on Oct. 23 by endorsing Ronald Reagan for president only a week after he blasted the political darling of the reactionary right in appearances here at University Park.

McCarthy not only "backstabbed" his support for third-party candidates, such as Libertarian presidential candidate Ed Clark and Citizen's presidential nominee Barry Commoner, but also betrayed his own convictions and ideals and killed his credibility.

In a forum on the presidency on Oct. 14, McCarthy said the choices for president are not easy. "Reagan doesn't read books," he said sarcastically. "Carter is a speed reader, which may be worse, and Anderson reads the dictionary."

However, his endorsement of a man who allegedly doesn't read books doesn't make the choices any easier at a time when this nation is groping for some leader to believe.

McCarthy, a former Democratic senator from Minnesota and an independent presidential candidate in 1968 and 1976, also ironically accused the media — especially television — state election laws and the apathy of Americans for accepting and solidifying the position of the two-party system.

Moreover, in a Daily Collegian interview on Oct. 20, three days before his dramatic born-again conservatism, McCarthy urged voters to support their third parties as a protest vote against the status quo and the beginning of a new political movement. Although McCarthy did not praise Jimmy Carter's administration, he said Reagan would be a mediocre president.

Why would McCarthy, a diehard liberal, support Reagan, a diehard militarist? McCarthy based his "enthusiasm" for Reagan on the candidate's stance against SALT II and for reducing taxes. However, in the Collegian interview, McCarthy said SALT II "is better than nothing, but it's pretty irrelevant."

But McCarthy is also a stern foe of the military-industrial complex and highest defense spending, the basis of Reagan's idealism.

Maybe McCarthy has a grudge against Carter, a fellow Democrat, and believes by picking Reagan, he is choosing the better of two evils. Some choice.

More importantly, why did McCarthy desert the cause of fledgling third parties in the last weeks of the campaign — a cause he had supported for months in favor of a traditional candidate whose views clash with his ideals? Maybe McCarthy, a man disturbed about the indifference of presidents to the stances and recommendations of their parties, had no loyalty or principles.

And maybe McCarthy is a hypocrite. David VanHorn is a 16th-term history major and news editor for The Daily Collegian.

David R. VanHorn

years we have flip-flopped our views on Vietnam? After Carter made his contentions about Reagan, he issued a list of statements Reagan made about touchy international situations. Among them was a suggestion Reagan made in January after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. "One option might well be that we surround the island of Cuba and stop all traffic in and out," Reagan said.

Another was his response this year to a question about whether or not the United States should establish a military presence in the Sinai to counter the Russians. "I think that this might be a very, very good time for the United States to show a presence in the Middle East. I don't think it looks like anyone bullying."

Reagan also suggested dispatching American troops to Lebanon during the civil war in 1976 and sending a destroyer along with U.S. tuna boats off the coast of Ecuador in 1975 after some boats had been seized.

Other statements Carter released showed Reagan considering similar measures in international difficulties.

What's so annoying about this is the downright contradiction. The Ronald Reagan who suggested blockading Cuba during the primaries is now stridently advocating peace. Reagan obviously trying to appear more moderate. He has made some political moves in this direction (most notably his decision, if elected, to appoint a woman to the Supreme Court), and he seems to be succeeding.

Nothing can be said of these moves except that they appear to be purely political and they make you wonder what kind of conviction Reagan has about them.

A political consultant's stand on the issues is important. But how strongly he supports his stand is also important, especially in matters of peace and war.

Steve Davis is an 11th-term journalism major and a columnist for The Daily Collegian.

Reagan's stands on war and peace shaky

The other day a friend of mine mentioned that he was registered for the draft. He told me that if he wasn't, he would consider voting for Ronald Reagan.

Why is it that Reagan gives the impression to many people of favoring military action? Undoubtedly, President Carter has encouraged this impression. During his campaign, Carter has hinted that Reagan might start a war if elected.

At one point, Carter said the election "will determine what kind of life you and your families will have, whether this nation will make progress or go backward, and whether we have peace or war."

Although Carter said he wasn't calling Reagan a "warmonger," and added that, "I'm sure that anybody who's in the White House as president would want to maintain peace," he also said Reagan had called "in eight or 10 different instances in recent years... for the use of American military force to address problems that arise diplomatically between nations."

Carter said: "I don't know what he would do if he were in the Oval Office, but if you judge by his past highly rhetorical calls for the use of American military forces in these altercations, it is disturbing."

Carter was right for bringing out this point because Reagan's past statements help define Reagan's attitude toward war.

Reagan called Carter's contention that he might start a war "beneath decency."

"I think like all of you that world peace has got to be the principal theme of this nation," Reagan said.

What is puzzling is that earlier in the campaign Reagan, when speaking to a VFW group, called Vietnam "a noble cause."

Was he talking about the same war that prompted protest songs like this? "And it's one, two, three, what are we fightin' for? Don't ask me, I don't give a damn.

Next stop is Vietnam. And it's five, six, seven, open up the peary gates. Well there ain't no time to wonder why. Whoopee, we're all going to die! —Country Joe and the Fish

Steve Davis

No doubt, the protest song is a more accurate appraisal of the war than Reagan's. Can Reagan actually believe that he attracted a majority of Americans by making that statement? Does he think that after only eight

"PRIME TIME"

Now is the time, the Arena's are the place, for roast prime rib of beef at its tender, juicy best. Or choose from one of many other menu specialties.

Choose from a tempting array of hot and cold vegetables, garnishes, dipping and cheeses as a beginning to dinner in a combination that is uniquely yours... and uniquely Skimont's.

SKIMONT
BOALSBURG
Rt. 322, East of State College
PHONE 466-6271

The University Concert Committee presents...

Tom Waits

FRIDAY
NOVEMBER 7, 1980
Eisenhower Auditorium
8:00 p.m.
Tickets: \$5, \$6, \$7
4/student ID card

ticket sales begin on Tuesday, October 28, 1980 9:00 a.m. at the HUB desk

Election Day Coat Sale

20% Off Coats
Monday & Tuesday Only

At The Carriage House
109 S. Pugh St.

and aleyat
135 Calder Alley

The Total Fashion Stores for Today's Woman

CHEAP THRILLS COUPON SPECIAL

15% OFF ALL FATIGUES AND CHINOS

Coupon must be presented with purchase. Offer expires 11/5/80.

118 W. College Ave.