

Election '80 Endorsements

President

Ronald Reagan must not become the next President of the United States.

And since the waning campaign of John Anderson seems unable to seriously challenge Reagan for the presidency, President Jimmy Carter is the only rational choice for president.

Carter, although not an ideal president for the last four years, offers continuity and experience to the office — traits which our country desperately needs.

Carter has managed to keep the United States at peace during the last four troubled years, and the hostages in Iran — now in their sixth day of captivity — are still alive, if not free.

In addition, Carter's noticeable increase in minority appointments to judicial and other high-level government positions — especially since five Supreme Court seats could become vacant in the next four years — is a factor in his favor.

If re-elected, however, Carter should consider some changes in his administration. Many of his Georgian advisers should be replaced with more knowledgeable and competent people, and Carter should learn to seek help in areas where he is obviously unformed.

Carter has now had the same amount of Washington experience that Carter had four years ago — as a governor. Do Americans need four more years of on-the-job training?

But most important, the election of Carter will mean that Reagan does not bring his hawkish attitudes and questionable political experience to the White House.

U.S. Senate

In the race for the U.S. Senate, former Pittsburgh mayor Pete Flaherty is the best choice to fill the seat vacated by Sen. Richard S. Schweiker.

Flaherty, the Democratic candidate, has consistently voiced more reasonable and

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS	
(Vote for the candidate of one party for President and Vice-President or leave the name of candidate)	
For Ronald Reagan	President/Republican
For John Anderson	President/Democratic
For Jimmy Carter	President/Democratic
For George McGovern	President/Democratic
For John D. Dingell	President/Consumer
For Barry Commoner	President/Consumer
For John B. Anderson	President/Consumer
For Patrick J. Leahy	President/Consumer
For Ed Clark	President/Libertarian
For David Koch	President/Free Enterprise

UNITED STATES SENATE	
(Vote for not more than one)	
Arlen Specter	Republican
Pete Flaherty	Democratic
Linda Mohrbecher	Socialist Workers
Lee Pissell	Consumer
Frank Kline	Communist USA
David K. Walter	Libertarian

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS	
23rd District	
(Vote for not more than one)	
Bill Clinger	Republican
Peter Altian	Democratic
Douglas M. Mason	Consumer

REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY	
77th District	
(Vote for not more than one)	
Robert C. Brazill	Democratic
Michael G. Day	Free Day Committee

realistic ideas than his Republican opponent, Arlen Specter.

For example, Flaherty favors a 5 percent personal income tax cut to curb runaway inflation. Specter has advocated a 10 percent personal income tax cut — an unrealistic proposal in light of rising inflation and increasing demands for government services.

Specter also calls for the continued use of nuclear power, while Flaherty believes nuclear power plants that do not meet strict safety requirements should be closed, and a moratorium should be placed on the construction of new nuclear plants.

Nuclear power is still too dangerous and unstable an energy source for anyone to advocate its continued use. In a state whose economy is so dependent on coal, Specter's call to expand nuclear power sources is at odds with the state's best economic interests.

U.S. House

The choice in the race for the U.S. House of Representatives is clear cut — Republican incumbent William F. Clinger should be returned

to Washington.

As a freshman legislator, Clinger has represented his constituency well, consistently supporting higher education and usually presenting understandable and justifiable reasons for his voting record.

Clinger's experience and effectiveness leave Democratic candidate Peter Altian and Consumer Party candidate Douglas M. Mason a poor second and third.

State House

State Rep. Gregg L. Cunningham has been effective during his first term in Harrisburg — too effective, Cunningham's tireless attack on legislative morality made independent candidate Michael G. Day a more attractive alternative.

Day has consistently presented well-thought stands on issues ranging from University funding to solutions for Pennsylvania's anemic economy. His liberal stands on social issues (abortion and the equal rights amendment) and his call for a unified state budget — which would help the

University secure its yearly allotment — are also factors in his favor.

Cunningham did work hard to get the University fully funded this year, but no proof exists that the money would not have come without his intervention.

Democratic candidate Robert C. Brazill — whose eligibility to serve in the state House is still in question — is not only unqualified but also is totally unacceptable as a candidate for the office. Not only his eligibility but his experience and expertise are minimal. A state legislator should not have to rely on others' advice in most situations.

Attorney General

In the race for the state's first elected attorney general, Democrat Michael O'Pake tops the list of candidates.

Cunningham did work hard from Reading, fought continually for consumers and against corruption as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. As a Democrat, O'Pake will serve as a watchdog on Gov. Dick Thornburgh's Republican administration.

But Democratic incumbent Al Benedict, sporting a record of mismanagement, which I have provided for my constituents. I also operate two conveniently located offices, one at 412 S. Allen St. in State College which is open from 9 until 5 Monday through Friday and one at the Nittany Mall open from 7 p.m. until 9 p.m. on Friday.

No lawmaker can evade your way on every issue but I believe that no lawmaker has ever done more to give you back your government by working so aggressively to include you in the decision-making process.

Although ruled legal yesterday, O'Pake's simultaneous candidacy for the state Senate and attorney general is still disturbing. But more disturbing is his Republican opponent's close association with Gov. Dick Thornburgh. Republican Leroy S. Zimmerman, who has known Thornburgh since childhood, would not be an effective and reliable check on the present administration.

Treasurer

Republican R. Budd Dwyer, whose record in state government illustrates his concern for the Commonwealth's fiscal matters, is the best choice for state treasurer.

Dwyer, a state senator and member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, holds a bachelor's degree in economics and accounting — vital knowledge for any state treasurer.

Democratic candidate Robert E. Casey performed adequately in his first term as treasurer, but his campaign tactics leave something to be desired.

Once again, Casey has tried to confuse himself with former auditor general, Robert P. Casey, to secure votes. Casey's lack of a college degree sets him behind his Republican opponent.

Auditor General

James W. Knepper, a 19-year member of the state House of Representatives, is the best pick in the race for state auditor general.

Knepper has consistently supported open government and was a sponsor of the state's Sunshine Law — which opened government meetings. His experience as a newspaper publisher gives him the needed business background. But his attendance record in the House has been less than spectacular.

But Democratic incumbent Al Benedict, sporting a record of mismanagement, which I have provided for my constituents. I also operate two conveniently located offices, one at 412 S. Allen St. in State College which is open from 9 until 5 Monday through Friday and one at the Nittany Mall open from 7 p.m. until 9 p.m. on Friday.

No lawmaker can evade your way on every issue but I believe that no lawmaker has ever done more to give you back your government by working so aggressively to include you in the decision-making process.

State House competition keen among candidates

Incumbent makes PSU a priority

By GREGG L. CUNNINGHAM
State representative, 77th district

During the two years of my service in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, Penn State has been one of my highest priorities. In 1979, I proposed and secured passage of legislation increasing Penn State's 1979 appropriations by \$1.8 million.

This year I proposed and won Gov. Dick Thornburgh's approval for a plan delaying the scheduled \$12 million cut in funding until we successfully secured full funding for Penn State. In addition, I worked to secure passage of my legislation appropriating \$8.5 million to equip the University power plant with an air pollution filtration system, secured passage of my proposed legislation which appropriated \$700,000 to eliminate barriers to the access of handicapped persons to main campus buildings and assisted in securing \$4.5 million in state funding for completion of Penn State's "living filter" sewage effluent treatment system.



Gregg L. Cunningham, Robert C. Brazill, Michael G. Day

In 1978, I was one of 47 first term members elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Since that time, I have introduced more legislation from the floor of the House than any of my 46 freshman colleagues. But more significantly, I have steered more of that legislation to passage than any first term member. In fact, no one else has even come close.

I have also reached out to my constituents in an effort to draw them into the decision-making process in a variety of ways. I have held weekly town meetings in every community (campus and penitentiary included) in the district to better understand the concerns of the district and to provide information on the issues being dealt with in Harrisburg.

I have provided the news media with pro-voice legislative agenda each week, listing every bill before it is debated by the legislature to enable my constituents to consider it and express their views to me while there is still time to influence the outcome, after which I provide post-vote legislative reports detailing the outcome of each vote and how and why I voted in the way I did.

On reserve in Schow Memorial Library is a copy of my voting record and a complete transcript of floor debate which I have provided for my constituents. I also operate two conveniently located offices, one at 412 S. Allen St. in State College which is open from 9 until 5 Monday through Friday and one at the Nittany Mall open from 7 p.m. until 9 p.m. on Friday.

No lawmaker can evade your way on every issue but I believe that no lawmaker has ever done more to give you back your government by working so aggressively to include you in the decision-making process.

Student candidate Brazill will work for state

By BOB BRAZILL
State House candidate

The Daily Collegian has asked me to submit a paper stating for the voters why I should be elected. Instead of patting my own back by proclaiming myself to be a "great guy," I will state what I feel are the important issues, and how I stand regarding them.

PENNSYLVANIA: I feel that it is relevant that I am a Penn State student. I, too, pay increased tuition. A tax levied on Pennsylvania's energy producers, and earmarked for higher education, will greatly alleviate the state's funding problems. A one-half of 1 percent tax on coal alone last year would have generated \$150 million.

This tax would be deductible from the coal companies' federal tax bills. Penn State benefits the industry as well as the community by providing research into the energy field, as well as providing training of personnel. One-half of 1 percent of the energy producers' profits is a small price to pay for services that benefit them as well as the University.

I also feel that PHREA loans and grants must be made to keep abreast of the rising cost of living.

ECOLOGICAL vs. ENERGY: Because of the energy crisis, the environmental

movement has suffered. Cash deposits on cans and bottles, removing them from the "throw-away" category, will conserve energy and protect the environment. This plan has worked in other states, and will save the enormous amount of energy expended in the production of these articles, which will conserve the natural resources used in their production, and most importantly, will clean up Pennsylvania.

LOCAL CONTROL: I will work to allow county commissioners to veto the siting of hazardous wastes in Centre County. These elected officials live here, and as more responsible than Harrisburg bureaucrats who presently decide where poisonous chemicals shall be dumped. My opponent voted against this measure.

THE DRINKING AGE: I will work to lower the drinking age.

MARIJUANA: I will work to decriminalize marijuana, and to legalize it for medical use.

UNEMPLOYMENT: The best way to fight unemployment is to help small business through the expansion of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority. Small business consumes 60 percent of Pennsylvania's employees, and needs our help more than the big corporations.

Day clear choice for an alternative

By MICHAEL DAY
state House candidate

This election offers the voters of the 77th district a clear and distinct choice between two candidates of vastly different political philosophies. Consider for a moment some of the issues that have dominated the campaign:

Not surprisingly, abortion has become the most hotly contested issue of this election. Cunningham has vowed to do everything in his power to stop all legal abortions in Pennsylvania.

Toward that end, he has proposed legislation to stop funding of abortions for the poor and has suggested that he would require photographs of fetuses to be shown to all women who seek abortions and that birth and death certificates and funerals be required for all aborted fetuses.

And finally, he supports the so-called Right to Life Amendment. I have stated my opposition to all these proposals and stand firmly committed to a woman's right to choose, in consultation with her physician, whether she will carry her pregnancy to term. This is a decision to be made by each individual. The state cannot impose any particular moral or religious code on our community.

Cunningham claims he has represented Penn State with "unprecedented effectiveness." Yet, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education, Pennsylvania's support of higher education has risen at a far slower rate over the last two years than any other states. In fact, after inflation, Pennsylvania has actually cut its support of higher education by 10 percent with Cunningham in office.

The result has been higher tuition and fewer faculty promotions. Still, Cunningham is quite satisfied with the status quo. I have proposed a unified budget for Pennsylvania to eliminate the problems associated with Penn State's non-preferred budget status, while allowing the University to retain its autonomy.

Pennsylvania businesses were hit hard by the recession. Yet, last year, Cunningham voted to increase taxes on Pennsylvania employers by \$400 million. The result has been more jobs leaving Pennsylvania for the South and West.

I am the only candidate that has proposed a general tax reform with specific tax incentives designed to help create new jobs here in Pennsylvania. A college degree does little good unless you can get a job with it.

The great deal is at stake in this election. And students can make a real difference. In 1978, Cunningham received less than 9,000 votes. There are more than 9,000 students registered to vote in this election. If the incumbent does not represent your views in Harrisburg, it is your duty to vote him out of office. Vote for the only eligible alternative: Michael Day.

Letters to the Editor

Think again

Before stepping into the voting booth today, take one last look at the candidates. There is only one who addresses the issues and doesn't resort to "dirty" campaigning to get his message across. That candidate is John Anderson.

The reasons abound why neither Jimmy Carter or Ronald Reagan are deserving of a vote. As Congressman Anderson said at the outset of his campaign, "The candidates of the two traditional parties have simply failed and refused to accept the responsibility of discussing the most important issues of the campaign."

As a result, a choice between Carter or Reagan is a choice between gross ineptitude or simplistic naivety.

Just as the reasons abound not to vote Republican or Democratic, there are a number of reasons why you should vote for Anderson. He is a refreshing choice for a thinking electorate and has demonstrated the courage to make difficult and often unpopular decisions both as a congressman and as a candidate.

The argument many see against voting for Anderson is that he can't win. This is an illogical and narrow view. As Thomas Jefferson said, "The idea that institutions established for the use of a nation cannot be touched or magnified, even to make them answer their end... is most absurd against the nation itself."

We have been led to believe that our choice is restricted to the candidates of both parties and this is just not true. The can-win vote for a Carter or Reagan is both unfulfilling and wasteful. We must declare our independence from the restrictive organizations which are no longer effective action coordinators.

Your vote for president should not be determined by mere perceptions of electability. A vote for Anderson is not wasted. Rather a vote cast out of fear or in the heat of anger is wasted because it is not a rational decision.

A vote for Carter is not a vote against Reagan, it is an indication that you want four more years of weakness and incompetence. In the same manner, a vote for Reagan is not a

Effective?

vote against Carter. It is a vote for dangerous policies that run the risk of confrontation and economic disaster.

Think here about the choice you make and whether the two parties are really offering what this country needs: Anderson can win. Take a good look at Carter and Reagan and you will see why he must win.

William MacBlane, 1st-foreign service and international politics
Paul Manley, 10th-communications studies
Nov. 3

Rational choice

Why should one vote for Barry Commoner, Doug Mason and the Citizens' Party tomorrow? Carter, Reagan and Anderson offer the same approaches to the issues. Anderson also wants to increase military spending, for more hydrogen bombs, as if we didn't have enough already.

I believe the only rational choice is to vote for Barry Commoner and Doug Mason and the Consumer Party, who want to stop the arms race, ratify the ERA, ensure the basic human rights of all people, and develop solar energy, etc.

A vote for Commoner and the Consumer Party is not a vote thrown away. If the number of votes the Consumer Party gets is equal to two per cent of the total number of votes, the winner goes on any statewide ballot, and if we get two per cent of the winner's vote in 10 of the 67 Pennsylvania counties, then we will get Statewide Ballot Status.

Statewide Ballot Status means we will no longer have to waste lots of money, time and energy petitioning to get on the Pennsylvania ballot. If we get 5 percent of the vote for any race in Centre County, we will get Centre County ballot status.

If the Consumer Party gets 5 percent of the national vote, then we will get up to \$3 million dollars from the federal government to pay for our 1980 campaign and millions of dollars for future campaigns.

The Consumer Party plans on being active for a long time,

Letters to the Editor

unlike John Anderson, who has no party. Our stand on the issues will always be the same. For example, equal rights, solar energy, mutual disarmament, rebuilding the railroads, etc., and we need your support now.

Craig McManus, 10th-geology
Oct. 30

Effective?

After seeing Gregg Cunningham's advertisement in the Oct. 30 issue of The Daily Collegian, I am forced to comment on Cunningham and his achievements while in office. Since Cunningham has become our local representative in the Pennsylvania State University has become the second most expensive land grant institution in this country (as far as tuition is concerned). Is this his unprecedented effectiveness? Possibly, if he had spent more time working on funding for Penn State and less time on trying to legislate his "morality" on the rest of us, tuition might not be as high.

Why did a member of his own party vote against the Penn State funding legislation in the house? The answer turns out to be that this other representative was disgusted by Cunningham's performance during the last two years. Is this his unprecedented effectiveness?

When asked what he will do about future funding for Penn State, Cunningham replies he will do what the University administration tells him to do. Is this the type of response one receives from an intelligent, creative and active legislator?

Cunningham has specifically left out of his advertisement the fact that he is attempting to legislate his religious beliefs on all the citizens of the Commonwealth. He wants all of us to accept his particular religious view of when human life begins and his particular view of the place of women in society.

Cunningham takes great pride in saying how much he has done for women. However, he fails to realize that a person committed to equality does not want to be in a position of granting women their rights. The important thing is to finally

Letters to the Editor

establish the fact that we are all equal and that no individual shall be discriminated against.

Cunningham is opposed to total equality and his opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment establishes this point. In fact, his ramblings on women's issues sound vague, similar to the Ayatollah Khomeini's ramblings on there being a special place in society for women (barefoot, pregnant and walking 40 feet behind their men).

The 77th district needs creative leadership. We need effective leadership. We need intelligent leadership. We need a representative who will speak for the majority but yet also try to respect the beliefs of the minority. We do not need a religious leader.

We do not need a local Ayatollah. We do not need Gregg Cunningham. We need the independent candidate Michael Day. And, we need the student vote. This vote can and will make the difference.

Ronald E. Yasbin, Class of 1988

Letters to the Editor

the daily Collegian
Tuesday, Nov. 4, 1980—Page 2
Editor
Business Manager

BOARD OF MANAGERS: Sales Manager, Marc A. Brownstein, Assistant Sales Manager, Tony B. Kunkin, Office Manager, Kim Chichir, Assistant Editor, Michael F. Fetter, Marketing Manager, Jonathan Sontz, Circulation Manager, Terri Gregus, National Ad Manager, Peter J. Gorman, Assistant Ad Manager, Ted Davis, Assistant Business Manager, Chris Arnold, Creative Director, Mona Salina.

BUSINESS COORDINATORS: Layout, Cathy Norris, Michelle Farnes; Mary Francis; Donna Pongor; Copy Advertising, G. Cochran; Special Projects, Elizabeth Moog, Larry Kerker.

Letters to the Editor

the daily Collegian
Tuesday, Nov. 4, 1980—Page 2
Editor
Business Manager

Letters to the Editor

Another, more important way to expand production is by increasing employment and, therefore, adding to the number of people engaged in producing goods and services. Obviously, solving the unemployment problem helps solve inflation.

The Reagan/Bush administration will combat unemployment with two pro-job programs. The first provides tax incentives to encourage businesses to locate in areas hardest hit by unemployment. When new industry establishes itself in an area, employment necessarily increases.

In addition, the Reagan/Bush administration will advocate a combination tax cut and spending restraint plan that cuts individual taxes by \$3.1 billion and business taxes by \$1.3 billion. This program would not reduce tax bills, but merely slow the increases passed by the Democrat-dominated Congress, and would not cause an inflationary government deficit.

Increased economic situation is the gravest it has been since the last great depression, but that does not mean the situation is insurmountably hopeless. It is time to stop standing idle while the economy grows steadily worse, and begin to take positive steps to correct the situation. The most effective way to do this is to elect a Democrat and George Bush is the first such step.

Anderson's road clear for new decade of politics

By STEPHEN F. REEVES
Students for Anderson

The 1980 Presidential Election presents a unique opportunity to depart from the stale proposals of the Democratic and Republican parties and chart a fresh course for the new decade. There are problems facing the country and only by facing up to them will we be able to overcome them. John Anderson and Patrick Leahy are being speaking out on the issues and offer a clear direction for the nation.

On the subject of energy, Anderson and Leahy believe:

- Decentralize production of gas and oil prices should be coupled with a 50 cent per gallon tax on gasoline to stimulate conservation. The revenues of the tax being returned to the public through the social security system.
- No new nuclear plants should be built until a permanent disposal location is found and safety of the plants can be insured.

• It is time to correct the underemphasis on preventive medicine.

On the subject of discrimination, Anderson and Leahy believe:

- It is time to actively work for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment.
- It is time to end discrimination against pregnant women.
- It is time to expand services for prevention of domestic violence and for assistance to its victims.
- It is time to allow women to make the decision about abortion between themselves and their God without the state's interference.

As registered voters it is your responsibility to decide how you wish to be governed. Can you look forward to four more years of a Carter administration with inept management of the economy and no indication of a foreign policy? Are you encouraged by the possibility of a Reagan Administration? With the possibility of Reagan naming a majority to the Supreme Court?

John Anderson speaks for a patriotism greater than party. Join him in facing up to our problems. Join him in shaping a government that can shape the future. It won't be easy, but it will be worth it. Vote Anderson/Leahy.

Editor's Note

Members of the College Democrats chose not to submit any forums for this election op-ed. That is why Jimmy Carter, Pete Flaherty and Michael O'Pake are not represented on these pages.

Inflation biggest issue GOP key is growth

By JAMES L. DeLONG
Reagan/Bush committee chairman

Inflation is the most serious problem facing the United States, not only because of its economic effect, but also because it destroys the values and hopes on which our society is based. Yet inflation itself is only the largest link of an intricate chain of current economic problems: recurrent recession, chronically unbalanced budgets, declining productivity, and unacceptably high rates of unemployment. Ronald Reagan believes the key to solving each of these problems is a bold new commitment to real economic growth.

Inflation is caused by too much money chasing too few goods. If the money supply expands without a corresponding increase in real goods and services production, then prices rise. There are two solutions to inflation — hold down money supply increases, and increase production. Money supply increases can be reduced by eliminating deficit spending by government.

Increased production, the second approach in combating inflation, can be accomplished by two economic development programs. The first is to reduce the government's increased productivity and reduced unemployment. Supply side tax cuts, advocated by the Reagan/Bush administration, will provide an incentive for increased production and development that yields a stronger technological base.

Letters to the Editor

Another, more important way to expand production is by increasing employment and, therefore, adding to the number of people engaged in producing goods and services. Obviously, solving the unemployment problem helps solve inflation.

The Reagan/Bush administration will combat unemployment with two pro-job programs. The first provides tax incentives to encourage businesses to locate in areas hardest hit by unemployment. When new industry establishes itself in an area, employment necessarily increases.

In addition, the Reagan/Bush administration will advocate a combination tax cut and spending restraint plan that cuts individual taxes by \$3.1 billion and business taxes by \$1.3 billion. This program would not reduce tax bills, but merely slow the increases passed by the Democrat-dominated Congress, and would not cause an inflationary government deficit.

Increased economic situation is the gravest it has been since the last great depression, but that does not mean the situation is insurmountably hopeless. It is time to stop standing idle while the economy grows steadily worse, and begin to take positive steps to correct the situation. The most effective way to do this is to elect a Democrat and George Bush is the first such step.

Candidate travels for votes Specter offers wide experience



Arlen Specter

By SHAWN WAGNER
1st-political science

After 12 productive years working for Pennsylvania's state and federal governments, Arlen Specter, U.S. Senator, Sen. Richard S. Schweiker announced that he would not seek re-election. Instead, he has given his unyielding support to a candidate who is equally qualified — Arlen Specter.

Specter's outstanding career in public service remains unmatched. As two-term district attorney in Philadelphia, Specter fought for the people. When he saw citizens being ripped off by businesses, Specter proposed specific legislation to protect consumers and presented six large supermarket chains for dishonest advertising.

His initiatives to combat crime produced increased conviction rates for murder and rape. The result: while Specter was district attorney, Philadelphia was the safest big city in the country.

Specter's experience, however, reaches far beyond the boundaries of Pennsylvania. He was appointed in 1964 to serve on the Warren Commission to investigate the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and was instrumental in forming the single-bullet theory.

Traveling throughout the Keystone State, Arlen Specter has been in all 67 counties and his stands on the issues represent a keen understanding and a firm commitment to Pennsylvania residents.

Health Care: Specter supports an immense health insurance plan to protect all Americans against the staggering costs of catastrophic illness.

Unemployment: Specter supports a new tax policy that will encourage capital recovery in the private sector and cut back on regulations that stifle productivity. In addition, he favors greenlining — targeting federal jobs programs to those areas where the private sector is not capable of providing jobs.

Inflation: Specter supports a 10 percent personal income tax cut as a way to encourage productivity, personal savings and investment. He also opposes wasteful federal spending and overregulation of small business.

Nuclear Power: Specter does not support closing existing nuclear plants nor stopping new ones from being built. He does favor locating them in low population areas, reorganizing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and setting new, tougher safety controls.

Energy: Specter thinks we should seek independence from foreign energy suppliers and seek coal as the keystone to the solution. He supports tax credits for the industry that will make mining and transportation affordable.

Our interest in the Keystone State. The Individual in a Complex Society, chose the topic of politics by a vote, an important individual action for effective democracy.

But, we are worried about the quality and quantity of voting which will decide who will be our leaders on into the '80s.

Quite often on our floor one hears partisan political discussions. "I decidedly negative viewpoints: 'I don't want old Governor Reagan to win.' Once-governor Carter 'hadn't done anything.' 'Anderson will only take votes from Carter.' We all know about the 'lesser of two evils.'"

So we have the negative vote phenomenon. In the extreme, this simplicity becomes NO VOTE; we hear dire predictions that this year's voter turnout will hit post-World War lows.

For a presidential election, a record low would be under 50 percent of the vote public. We have had a record low democratically choosing our leader. The winner, then, is the man who receives the "majority" of votes, one-fourth of that vote.

YES! Clearly, the Democrats and Republicans who have been the winners for over a century, are not now majority parties. Quoting the Citizen's Party presidential candidate, Barry Commoner, who was interviewed on campus by The Daily Collegian, "Clearly they (Carter, Reagan) can't be relied on to do what the country needs."

Is this why independent John Anderson has shown impetus? He may try to draw votes from more "progressive"

Commoner choice for interest house topic

By DOUGLAS VINCENTI
1st-foreign service and international politics

Our interest in the Keystone State. The Individual in a Complex Society, chose the topic of politics by a vote, an important individual action for effective democracy.

But, we are worried about the quality and quantity of voting which will decide who will be our leaders on into the '80s.

Quite often on our floor one hears partisan political discussions. "I decidedly negative viewpoints: 'I don't want old Governor Reagan to win.' Once-governor Carter 'hadn't done anything.' 'Anderson will only take votes from Carter.' We all know about the 'lesser of two evils.'"

So we have the negative vote phenomenon. In the extreme, this simplicity becomes NO VOTE; we hear dire predictions that this year's voter turnout will hit post-World War lows.

For a presidential election, a record low would be under 50 percent of the vote public. We have had a record low democratically choosing our leader. The winner, then, is the man who receives the "majority" of votes, one-fourth of that vote.

YES! Clearly, the Democrats and Republicans who have been the winners for over a century, are not now majority parties. Quoting the Citizen's Party presidential candidate, Barry Commoner, who was interviewed on campus by The Daily Collegian, "Clearly they (Carter, Reagan) can't be relied on to do what the country needs."

Is this why independent John Anderson has shown impetus? He may try to draw votes from more "progressive"

groups, since as Commoner states, "... the two parties don't provide an adequate vehicle for these groups."

But if two organized parties, one of which rejected Anderson's bid, cannot cater to such needs, how can a pseudo-independent, one-time candidate do it? For the election as the main event does not settle the issues facing political groups; it will only "show" who leads in the attempt to resolve them.

Four more years will decide and in many ways precipitate the progressive character of the very issues. The leading campaign issues may be unreachable, insurmountably complex and cynically reversible as incumbent Carter might better admit.

Admitting apprehension over the probability that an "independent" candidate will be elected, the negative vote Democrat votes should make one question such a Democratic platform. Reagan not only has difficulty with progressive issues, he still has trouble with any sort of evolutionary process.

In monkeying with a Republican platform, he should ask his cronies what the Republicans did for the farmer of the '20s; who shut him at Kent State; what do Cambodians think about our military inferiority complex; why should even Henry Kissinger agree that the executive office is waning since Nixon?

Our votes become the starting point for accountability. Commoner strongly promotes active and concise public accountability. If we are about to concede to the notion of a "three-man race," it should be you running to the polls, Commoner (a citizen and consumer) running your government, and our local Consumer party candidate running with our economy.

Letters to the Editor

the daily Collegian
Tuesday, Nov. 4, 1980—Page 2
Editor
Business Manager

IF I ONLY HAD

