

Proposal unfair, discriminatory

State College is a college town. Most of the people who live in, work in and visit the town are here because of Penn State.

You can't have a college town without students, and you can't have students if you don't give them somewhere to live.

With a shortage of student housing as it is, we don't need any more regulations limiting where we can live. And yet, the State College Borough Council has proposed amending the definition of student housing to maintain a balance of student and homeowner residents — in other words, students might face limitation of where they can live.

That said, it's a mild limitation, and the practical application of such a proposal likely won't affect many students. It would

more heavily enforce the 225 feet — or two houses — offset regulation between student-owned houses. While some students purchase homes — or have their parents purchase them and put the student's name on the deed — most instead choose to rent from local Realtors.

In the grand scheme of student housing, it may not amount to much. However, a measure that limits students from housing opportunities in State College is unsettling. Students cannot control the population density in the borough and are crunched as it is. They're accepted to Penn State and are required to live on a campus for a year, sometimes choosing to stay longer. But Penn State simply cannot accommodate the number of students enrolled, and

students eventually look to live off-campus. If buying a home is the best option for that student or his parents, he shouldn't be discriminated against for being a student.

We understand if the Borough is trying to establish a tax base. They want people who pay taxes to move to State College and purchase homes, which in turn means keeping students out of these homes. But if the Borough wants to do this, it should take visible measures to address the other side — perhaps lobbying the university to add more student housing on campus or to control enrollment; working out the more-than two decade-old West End revitalization plan.

Living in State College as a student is expensive and crowded. It shouldn't be made harder.

Zero-tolerance alcohol policy counterproductive, misguided

In response to the Nov. 12 article "PSU alcohol stats on rise," it's bewildering to think that university officials are in any way shocked by the reports that alcohol abuse is getting worse. With the administration's strict enforcement of Pennsylvania's counter-productive, zero-tolerance underage drinking policy, this should come as no surprise.

Instead of Penn State officials realizing the blatantly obvious reality that students are going to drink regardless of the legal risk, Penn State believes the more under-ages they give, the safer students will be. The efficacy of this policy is in the numbers: kids are being set to the hospital with higher and higher levels of blood alcohol.

The reason for this increase in dangerous drinking is because Penn State officials continue the policy of, if you drink one beer, two beers, or 25 beers, you're breaking the law and should be punished the same amount. Instead of encouraging students to drink safely and modestly, the university gives students two choices: Do not drink at all, or since you're going to get in the same amount of trouble anyway, drink as much as possible.

Instead of targeting the students who are vomiting, stumbling, slurring or being destructive, Penn State police ask everyone for their IDs at parties and tailgates. If you were drinking responsibly, Penn State doesn't care. You're going to get in the same amount of trouble as "that guy" who is pale in the face, throwing up in the bush. Maybe next time you will learn not to drink modestly.

If Penn State wants to keep students from unsafe binge drinking, the policy needs to be changed. With the policy targeting everyone who is underage, there is no incentive for students to participate in safe drinking. With no change to the current policy, Penn State will show its commitment to student safety or at least lack thereof.

Steve Maggio
senior-health policy and administration

Thon has right to HUB space same as other organizations

The Nov. 12 letter "Thon-related event disruptive, monopolized common area" could not be more asinine and inappropriate. As stated in the letter, "The HUB is a common-use area," a true statement. Because it is common-use, though, student organizations promote and advocate their clubs daily. This is their way of recruiting students to become a part of what they do.

The HUB hosts events like this all of the time; Colin Cowherd of ESPN presented his radio show live from the HUB last Friday, and there were no complaints about it.

Thon is a major part of Penn State, and it is run for a great cause. It is an event that brings everyone together to celebrate life, and to bring courage to those who have been affected by cancer. If you don't want to be a part of something amazing like Thon, move your close conversations to somewhere that's a little quieter — try the library.

Maddy Pryor
freshman-kinesiology
Heal THON

Citizen dislikes wild parties but still opposes ordinance

In response to the proposed Nuisance Gathering Ordinance, I am a senior citizen and a staunch conservative and, unsurprisingly, I despise rowdy parties. Recently, my daughter's home on West Foster Avenue was intruded and trashed by an intoxicated student. However, I oppose a rule that would hold a homeowner or an apartment renter responsible for the illegal behavior of his or her party guests.

In Nazi Germany, the "Sippenhaft" law held relatives and friends responsible for offenses of persons who could not be arrested by the authorities, such as deserters to the enemy or people who fled the country. The former Soviet Union had a similar law.

It deeply saddens me that State College politicians would even consider such a fascist and communist idea in holding a person responsible for somebody else's misdeeds and I believe it would be irresponsible for the Borough Council to vote on this rule. As a conservative, I am not very fond of the American Civil Liberties Union. However, in this odd case, I appreciate their fight against this unconstitutional and un-American rule. As a naturalized U.S. citizen, I treasure the freedom and the constitutional rights in America. Such a rule has no place in our country.

Willy Kogelmann
Class of 1964

THE DAILY COLLEGIAN

Rossilynne Skena
Editor-in-Chief

Holly Colbo
Business Manager

About the Collegian: The Daily Collegian and The Weekly Collegian are published by Collegian Inc., an independent, nonprofit corporation with a board of directors composed of students, faculty and professionals. Pennsylvania State University students write and edit both papers and solicit advertising for them. During the fall and spring semesters as well as the second six-week summer session, The Daily Collegian publishes Monday through Friday. Issues are distributed by mail to other Penn State campuses and individual subscribers.

Complaints: News and editorial complaints should be presented to the editor. Business and advertising complaints should be presented to the business manager.

Who we are

The Daily Collegian's editorial opinion is determined by its Board of Opinion, with the editor holding final responsibility. The letters and columns expressed on the editorial pages are not necessarily those of The Daily Collegian, Collegian Inc. or The Pennsylvania State University. Collegian Inc., publishers of The Daily Collegian and related publications, is a separate corporate institution from Penn State. Editorials are written by The Daily Collegian Board of Opinion.

Members are: Chns Bickel, Ian Brown, Matt Brown, Adam Clark, Rich Coleman, Matt Conte, Abby Drey, Katherine Dvorak, Beth Ann Downey, Stacey Federoff, Mike Felletter, Stephanie Goga, Mandy Hofmockel, Patrick McDermott, Andrew McGill, Dave Miniaci, Elizabeth Murphy, Michael Oplinger, Dan Rorabaugh, Erin Rowley, David Rung, Alexa Santoro, Heather Schmelzen, Shannon Simcox, Rossilynne Skena, Danielle Vickery, Alex Weisler, Aubrey Whelan and Julie Wolf.

Letters

We want to hear your comments on our coverage, editorial decisions and the Penn State community.

■ **E-mail**
collegianletters@psu.edu

■ **Online**
www.psucollegian.com

■ **Postal mail/In person**
123 S. Burrowes St.
University Park, PA 16801

Letters should be about 200 words. Student letters should include class year, major and campus. Letters from alumni should include year of graduation. All writers should provide their address and phone number for verification. Letters should be signed by no more than two people. Members of organizations must include their titles if the topic they write about is connected with the aim of their groups. The Collegian reserves the right to edit letters. The Collegian cannot guarantee publication of all letters it receives. Letters chosen also run on The Daily Collegian Online and may be selected for publication in The Weekly Collegian. All letters become property of Collegian Inc.

RECESSIONONOMICS 101 "GRUMBLEEMPLOYMENT"

<p>THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS OVER 10%</p>	<p>BUT THE UNDEREMPLOYMENT RATE IS 17.5%</p>
<p>AND THE GRUMBLEEMPLOYMENT RATE SPIKES TO ALMOST 90%...</p>	<p>IF YOU COUNT EVERYONE WHO WANTS A JOB AT GOLDMAN SACHS AND CAN'T GET ONE.</p> <p>WILL WORK FOR MILLION DOLLAR BONUSES</p>



"IF YOU ASK ME... THE THANKSGIVING DAY PARADE'S JUST NOT THE SAME SINCE MACY'S FILED FOR BANKRUPTCY..."

Campus resource can shift outlook

By Chris Bickel

I don't know about everyone else, but racial topics have always seemed to be taboo where I grew up. I come from a primarily white school district and town just outside of Pittsburgh. In fact, most of the neighboring districts and boroughs were also primarily white families. So basically, I didn't grow up among a plethora of diversity, and I feel this is the case for a lot of students from the Quaker state.

So when I transferred up to the University Park campus, I found out that for one of my communication courses, I would be required to attend something known as the Race Relations Project (RRP).

For those who have never experienced this, the project is a closed-door, 90-minute session lead by two facilitators. With a group of fewer than 10 students, participants are given free reign to talk about any racial topic that they may not have been able to discuss openly before — whether it be the use of the word/classification "black," affirmative action, illegal immigration, personal experiences with prejudice, etc. The facilitators don't start the topics; the partici-

pants do (facilitators are there to guide us in a direction of a constructive conversation.)

Let's go back to my initial impression of the project. When I discovered that attending one of these sessions was required, I'll be the first to admit that I moaned and groaned about having to deal with something to had no apparent connection to the public relations course I was taking.

I felt this was the general consensus of the classroom — I saw multiple eye rolls and heard several sighs — so I was relieved to feel I was not the only one going into this with a bad attitude.

I finally signed up for a session, and I can honestly say I left that cramped room feeling as if a weight was lifted off my shoulders — a weight I never knew I was carrying around.

It helped me realize that I was not the only person who felt a similar way about a wide array of racial topics. I didn't even know the group of people in those sessions, but I felt as if I could communicate without reservation and without being judged.

And even though I can't talk specifically about what was said in the session, I've kept it with me, and it has helped me change my outlook on the modern day approaches to race relations.

I've had to participate in the RRP each semester since my first term on campus Fall 2008

— a total of three times — and each group talked about a different pool of subjects than the previous session. I felt better about myself every time I left.

It's extremely effective, and it works even better if you go into the project with an open mind — I know it helped me. It's hard to explain specifically how because I feel it's my general outlook that profited most. I just see people in a more fraternal light.

Danna Jayne Seballos, facilitator manager for RRP and Michelle Thiry, program coordinator for RRP, said they think these sessions are effective because the facilitators are required to go through semester-long training. They also touched on the fact that there is nothing else on campus like RRP where students can "speak freely."

And even though this program isn't widely spread and is not available at other Penn State campuses, both Seballos and Thiry laughed in affirmative union when asked if they would like to see RRP happen at the Commonwealth Campuses.

So next time you see a class that requires you to partake in the Race Relations Project, don't fret. I can definitively say the experience will always be memorable for me.

Chris Bickel is a senior majoring in public relations and is The Daily Collegian's Friday columnist. His e-mail address is cdb5067@psu.edu.



MY OPINION