Students Favor Popular Election Of SG Heads

In the past, the President of Student Government has been elected by the members of this governing body. A recent column in the BEACON proposed that in the future the President ought to be chosen by popular election. Out of the twenty-six students interviewed in a recent BEACON survey, sixteen favored popular election, while the remaining ten opposed the idea.

Students favoring election by the student body included: Neil Reinhard, freshman: "The election should be taken from the floor to let the student body know who is running." A student may have voted for two certain people for Student Government representatives from his class, but he may have a preference as to which of the two he would like to see as president.

A recent column, junior: "Nominations by Student Government with popular elections for president of the governing body is desirable. Such a procedure can increase student interest in their government and yet provide Student Government with some control in the selection of their president."

Sylvia Christensen, freshman: "The student body should choose the president for two reasons. First, such elections would arouse student spirit as the students could choose their own leader. Second, the United States Congress doesn't elect the national President; why then should the representatively elected people elect the president of the Student Government?"

Anonymous: "Of course the student body should choose the president. Then, the president would not only be elected but would also be elected by the student body."

Those opposed to popular election included: Gary Ehrich, senior: "I feel that research of the campus population should be done to find out who should be elected by the class representatives rather than by popular vote."

Carolyn Kovalski, freshman: "The representatives should choose the president of Student Government, if the students elect him, the candidates should first appear before student body to explain their platforms and qualifications.


Senior English Major Selected In Glamour’s ‘Best Dressed’ Contest

The local preliminaries for Glamour Magazine’s annual Best Dressed Girl Contest were held recently at the college. Miss Barbara Gallagher was chosen best dressed girl from a field of six. She has the right taste and fashion sense by modeling on-campus, off-campus, and event ensembles. She was praised by DeHaven, Jane Edwards, Ruth Fried, Hulda Nygma, Leo McCrosky, Ann Marie Persue, Jo Smith, and Regina Watkins.

Miss Gallagher’s on-campus selection was a white and blue V-neck shirt (complimented by a blue silk crepe skirt). She chose a dark blue three piece suit for off-campus wear. The collarless jacket, tailored in white, was paired with a white blouse, and the tan skirt. Miss Gallagher’s evening dress was a white crepe with the bodice forming a V in front and back. The bronze peau de soie overkirt accentuated the slim skirt. A topaz dinner ring and silk clutch bag completed the evening ensemble.

A bouquet of American Beauty roses was presented to Miss Gallagher by Dr. L. E. Warren. She received a silver charm and bracelet from AWE. The other cords also received silver charms as a memento of the contest. Judges for the contest were Mrs. Carolyn Michelin, Charlotte Lord, Welton Farrar, Alfred Groth, Arthur Hoover, and Dr. Francis Michelin.

Juniors Elect Ungelah To S G

Cinderella Ball Reelection

by Carolyn Kaplan

Student Government announced at its last meeting that the Administration has asked the possibility of re-localing the assembly hall. The Administration has been so far unsuccessful in this endeavor. The 1967 Scholarship Fund was discussed, and the idea of such a fund was approved. The fund was established to provide scholarships for outstanding students.

Several suggestions in circulation have been made as to the format of the Scholarship Fund. The fund is to be open on a regular basis. The purpose of the fund is to provide financial assistance to outstanding students who need financial aid.

The library is open an extra hour daily and for three hours on Sunday. The library is open during the summer, and the library is open on Saturdays.

As a side-light, Mrs. Vujosevic was happy to announce a new addition to the library staff. On February 1, Mrs. Vujosevic joined the staff. She is now working in the circulation and reference department.

A native of Brooklyn, Mrs. Vujosevic received her B.A. degree from the New School for Social Research in New York.

Don Ungelah, and Judy Rock

Close Elections

In a recent Student Government election, vacancies were filled in the offices of Freshman Class Treasurer and Junior Class Student Government Representative. By a relatively good margin at the polls and tight competition, the juniors elected Don Ungelah, education major, to fill the position of class representative. Judy Rock was elected to the position of Freshman Class Treasurer. Both these representatives and their respective responsibilities of their offices.

Through the opinions on silver design expressed by college women competing for these scholarships, Reed & Barton hopes to compile a valuable collection of designs by American artists.
Dear Editor:

I would like to take this opportunity to suggest that in the future the Associated Women Students look into the possibility of obtaining judges for the Glamour Magazine contest for the best-dressed coed from among the population of Wilkes-Barre outside of the College Administration. These people could be chosen from the local store managers and other individuals having a knowledge of current styles of clothing as well as modeling techniques. This move would render the best choice possible and would eliminate any implication of bias in the choice of the contestant most qualified to represent our school in the national contests.

Sincerely,

ROGER SQUIER

Editorial

Is Freedom of Speech An American Myth?

Revolio P. Oliver, classics professor at the University of Illinois, tested the principle of freedom of speech recently, and the repercussions were violent. A torrent of comments, vitriolic, pungent, biting, and the like have been unleashed at the unright-wing professor who attacked President Kennedy in a lengthy treatise in American Opinion, the official monthly of the John Birch society.

In the midst of this whirlpool of criticism, Oliver staunchly maintains, "What I have given was fact." His "facts" describe President Kennedy as a communist agent who promoted President Johnson's "back to the slums" program and who was assassinated last year because he bolstered his assigned role to capture the U. S. He also charges that Kennedy collaborated with Khrushchev on a "take invasion" of Cuba to strengthen the Communist stronghold on the island and concludes that all the late President's activities were aimed at subverting and sabotaging our defenses.

As might be expected, the college press throughout the nation responded vigorously to Oliver's onslaught. Some implied that Oliver should be immediately dismissed and persecuted for his "outrageous charges."

One editorial in particular scored the naivete of belief in free speech. Concluding that freedom of speech is restricted and that peace is non-freedom, this editor berated people who wasted time arguing the point and inferred that they should instead calmly accept the fact and face reality.

In our opinion, this attitude is far more dangerous than the professor's extremist charge. Each case demands consideration. For example, the fact that this passive attitude is becoming an accepted tenet of the youth of today.

Numerous polls by sociologists, psychologists, and others have told us that our youth, surprisingly conservative, favor restraint and conformity in many areas -- including freedom of speech. Unfortunately, to modern Americans, the abstract ideal of freedom of speech is upheld only if what one says is socially, politically, and culturally correct. When the dissenting voice is quickly smothered by the majority who see a threat to their security.

This frightening, insidious tendency to smother the "unpopular" is incompatible with the democratic ideal we proclaim to the world. It implies a distrust of the masses. It implies that the "ordinary person" is too weak to be trusted to the fire of a dangerous idea. It is an insult to the basic integrity and intelligence of Americans.

To say that this freedom is a basic tenet of our way of life is to reiterate a well recognized fact. To remind our readers that the ideas of the "other side of our country" were not only "unpopular" but treasonous. It is not necessary. To recount the innumerable times our countrymen have fought for this freedom. Socialism is the fact of this basic freedom but we are too comfortable, we too cynical, and we too sophisticated to bother about it. As long as it doesn't involve us personally, we are disinterested.

This is as ridiculous as calmly watching a fire burn down each house on our block and then excitedly yelling "fire" when it enters our back yard.

What Where When

FORTH OF JULY POP Commons Tonight 9-12
DISTRICT WRESTLING Gym -- Tonight and Saturday
BASKETBALL Juniora Away Friday 8 p.m.
SWIMMING MAC TOURNAMENT Saturday Lehigh University

STUDENT TEACHING begins Monday

FORUM MEETING Chapman Hall Tuesday 8 p.m.
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Within the past several years, a strong movement has emerged, bent on securing home-rule for the citizens living in our nation's capital. In fact, this week we are privileged to attend the session of the Wilkes College Forum. Yet despite all the propaganda in behalf of home-rule, there are important reasons why such a course is not feasible. The District of Columbia is a federal city, like no other cities. Washington did not grow at a geographically favorable site; it was deliberately chosen. In addition, its boundaries are fixed by law and cannot be increased. Washington has no specific industrial complex within its boundaries and its revenues are limited to levies on light consumer and service businesses, a real estate tax, a levy on come, and sales and excise taxes.

Fifty percent of the District's area has been retired from the tax rolls because so much of its land is either federal owned or under federal trusts. Each year, more of its land area is included. Average Income Fell

Most important, in recent years, the conditions have become even more inauspicious, as some of the city's functionaries have grown more and more conscious of the lack of tax revenue sources. Washington has little opportunity to increase its tax base because it has been almost wholly Negro and it has no own city limits.

III

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WERE GRANTED AUTONOMY. IT WOULD IMMEDIATELY BECOME BENEFITTED.

The only remaining untapped revenue source then would be a payroll tax on residents of other areas who work, but do not live, in Washington. This tax could hardly offset the substantial federal payments now made to it. In fact, this would tend to discourage expansion of facilities within its boundaries such as new service industries, consumer installations, and perhaps federal offices. A fully autonomous Washington, D.C. would have no more legitimate right to demand money from the federal government than would any other place that has a post office, a military installation, or a federal building within its boundaries.

The District of Columbia were to receive such a payment, every concession could be successfully made that his district or any municipality in it also should receive such a payment for every acre of land owned federally and therefore not on its tax rolls. The Constitution, in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, states that, in Congress shall have the power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases, whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square although enlarged to 70 miles square by a retroactive act in 1846) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States.

And even if the word "exclusive" and the phrase "in all cases whatsoever" had been left out, in the above quotation, there would be no question concerning the authority and the necessity of Congress to govern and rule the District of Columbia. But the very fact that they are used seems to emphasize that the Framers were determined that there should be no eneral interest in and control over the District.

In Hands of Congress

Until 1871 the District was governed by mayor and legislative council chosen by the people, and between 1871 and 1874 the District was represented in the House of Representatives by a delegate chosen by the voters. But due to inefficiency and corruption, the district government was created in that year, whereby residents of the District elect none of the officials who run the government under which they live. To insure the greatest good to the largest number of people, authority for running the District's affairs is placed exclusively in the hands of Congress.

Let there be no misunderstanding. There is no quarrel with the desire to grant all citizens a maximum of self-government. But, actually, the status of our nation's capital does not differ from that of any military post, federal reservation, park, or federal installation anywhere in the United States. Persons living in federal complexes outside of the District of Columbia have all the rights of other citizens, but they do not have the right to govern the affairs of the places where they live. In these areas, federal interest and control are predominant.

By the same token, residents of the District of Columbia also are for tax purposes. Not only is the federal interest in affairs of the District dominant, but the federal revenue law, must not be relinquished or redefined.

The advocates of home-rule have an evident desire to have a separate government. Not only is the federal interest in affairs of the District dominant, but the federal revenue law, must not be relinquished or redefined.
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Gettysburg Forces Squad To Settle For 15-15 Tie

ADAMS’ DEFAULT SEEN AS DECIDING MATCH; WILKES ENDS WITH 5-2-1 RECORD

The Colonel grapplers ended their season last Saturday on an unexpected note when Gettysburg forced John Reese’s matless to select a 15-15 tie.

Although Brooke Yeager’s absence might have made some difference, Bob Zebrowski, piloting the injured Colonel captain, did an excellent job in whipping the Buller’s 10-5.

Zebrowski’s win and Ned McGinley’s lead-in of 4-0 enabled Wilkesman an early lead, but Gettysburg came back to take the lead when Barlowo decided the Colonals’ Bob Westman in the 147-pound division.

As well as Gettysburg handed Dave Hall his second straight loss to add a sour touch to Hall’s otherwise excellent season. The former Wyo-

ing Seminary wrestler has been a definite asset to the Colonel’s team and shows prospects of developing into a tough match grappler.

The 167-pound and 177-pound classes produced two draws to give the Buller’s an 8-10 edge into the final match.

Bill Thrulcy, another freshman and likewise valuable addition to the squad, turned in a thrilling performance over a tough foe. After two seconds of the final buzzer to knot the meet at 12-12, L. A. Agnew of the current resident of Butler Hall, is also gaining valuable experience which should develop into a asset.

The Colonals suffered a telling blow when Tim Adams had to give, up his heave and lead the men back to dominate all four eyes in the competition.

The Colonals are idle this week and will be preparing to make their bid for MAC honors a week from today—morning at Bucknell.

Last year was the first in many years that Wilkes was unable to gain an individual title at the MAC meet; the closest was from 4th to 6th place. John Gardner was able to clinch only as high as 3rd place, but he was a victim of championship two years ago. Gardner, however, is no longer a member of the squad.

It had been hoped that Brooke Yeager might be able to give some guidance to the team this year, but he was unable to suit up this season due to injury incurred weeks ago against Ly-

coming. Yeager was rung up last year’s Rose Bowl of Wrest-

ling.

Ned McGinley appears to be the only other wrestler from the squad who might go all the way. McGinley lost out in a tough overtime decision in the quarter finals of the ‘Rose Bowl’ in a tournament held at Bloomsburg last year.

LEWIS-DUNCAN Sports Center

11 E. Market St. - Wilkes-Barre

For Your School Supplies

GRANDMARIS' 96 Main Street

PHONE: 265-5625

Chuck Robbins

SPORTING GOODS

Ready to Serve You

With a Complete Line of Sweaters, Jackets, Emblems, Sporting Goods

28 North Main Street

Mermen Edge Drexel Tech 48-47; Barnes and Hesch Cop 2 Firsts

Last Saturday the Y.M.C.A. pool was the scene of one of the most exciting swimming meets that the Wilk-

eses have engaged in all season. The excitement was heightened by the fact that a win would give the Wilkes-

men the best record since the swimming team was organized. The victor was not decided, however, until the last event was finished. When the event was completed, the Wilkemen were victorious, resulting in a tight 49-43 edge over the Drexel Dragons of Phil-

adelphia.

The Wilkemen opened the meet with an unexpected loss in the 400-

yard medley relay, after being hope-

ful of setting a new record in this event. They quickly recovered, how-

ever, and were prepared for a setback in a first place in the 200-yard fre-

estyle with Jon Canias following with a second place. Following this, captain Jack Barlowo produced a first place in the 50-yard freestyle to put the Wilkemen out in front.

The Wilkemen dropped the next event, however, leaving the score deadlocked 17-17 going into the div-

ing events and the 200-yard butterfly, the Wilkes swim-

mers were at the short end of a 22-

30 score.

The Wilkemen soon regained their lead, however, as Jack Barnes and Ken Wissal produced a first and third in the 100-yard free event. After that Chuck Petrollo and Peter Motronow came through with a first and third in the 200-yard backstroke, and Harry Hesch and Jon Canias scored a first and third in the 500-yard free event to bring the Wilkemen team out in front of a 40-39 score. The Dragons dropped the 200-yard butterfly event after losing in a 41-47 last event.

During the season, the Wilkemen set six Wilkes records: 200-yard free-

style; Harry Hesch; 200-yard indi-

cidual medley, Ron Daggett; 100-

yard freestyle and (tie record set by Captain Jack Barnes); 200-yard back-

stroke, Chuck Petrollo; 500-yard fre-

estyle, Harry Hesch; and the 400-yard freestyle relay, Sochley, Daggett, Barnes.

This year’s meet was held at a Chester Y.M.C.A. pool record in the 200-yard freestyle event.

Ned McGinley Picked As ‘Athlete of Week’

by Ivo Smith

This issue, Ned McGinley has been selected as the Beacon’s ‘Athlete of the Week.’ Ned, a junior, defeats the 123-pound division on the Wilkes Wrestling squad and usually sparks the team to a fine performance.

A graduate of Kingston High School, Ned ranked third last year in the 115-

pound class of the NAIA Wrestling tournament at Bloomsburg State Col-

lege, and was the only Colonel to enter the finals in the Wilkes Open Wrestling Tournament.

So far this season, Ned has per-

formed admirably and has chalked

numerous victories for the Colonals. Ned was Past suffered defeat at the hands of the Colonel grapplers, with

Ned McGinley

POMEROY’S BOOK SALE!

$1.00 to $2.98

Originally published at 2.50 to 18.00 Fabulous Savings on publishers overstock. Medical - Technical - Religion - Mathematics - General Save as much as 75% on many books!

Last Price

POMEROY’S Price

FICTION

5.95 The Goup-Mary McCarthy 3.99

4.95 The Game of the Camel’s Eye 4.59

6.95 The Living Reed-Pearl Buck 5.99

4.50 On Her Majesty’s Secret Service-Ian Fleming 4.95

4.95 A Trap on the Isthmus John Cheever 3.96

4.95 Profits in Courage John F. Kennedy 2.99

6.75 Mandate for Change Dwight D. Eisenhower 4.95

4.95 The American Way of Death Milan Kundera 4.95

10.95 The Game - By Tchoua Milford 8.80

POMEROY’S BOOK DEPT. - THIRD FLOOR