



"We ARE showing them the letter, Mr. President . . .  
But, the Viet Cong can't read English!"

THE DAILY ILLINI

## Editorial Page

(Editorials are the opinion of a majority of The Daily Illini's editorial board)

### Candidates

An article in Thursday's Daily Illini pointing out that there are still no candidates for student body president may be a very good indicator of the problems now facing Student Senate.

Usually by this time, it is clear who most of the candidates will be, but this year no one is willing to commit himself to running, even though elections will likely be held within the next six weeks. Part of this may be due to the uncertainty of the future of Senate.

Many senators are currently working on proposals to reorganize Senate's structure to provide a more representative and more powerful body, and because no one knows how Senate will be structured next year, possible candidates are staying out of the race. This, however, can only contribute to a decline in Senate's prestige and influence on the campus.

Various persons in Student Senate have indicated that Senate will

never be able to accomplish things, so they will not become involved in it. Instead, they will shift their efforts to ad hoc groups like the Educational Reform Committee, which is more flexible because of a more informal structure.

But Student Senate does have a vital role to perform on this campus, and if potential candidates shy away from active candidacy because they feel Senate's influence is declining, then Senate's influence will decline.

But the effectiveness of a student body president is determined by what a candidate does, and he can allow Senate to hinder him only if he does not have the courage to break from some of the traditional methods of student politics.

It is essential that qualified student leaders realize their responsibility to run for student body president. It would be better for someone to rebuild Senate through his own strong leadership than to allow the uncertainty of Senate's future to hinder him from running.

### Chapter 7

The proposed Chapter 7 of the Undergraduate Code is every student's dream.

Its content — room visitation, 2 a.m. weekends for freshman women, no more signouts for overnights and out-of-town trips except for freshmen — contains items students have been fighting for years to get.

The only hitch is that it must pass the Committee on Student Affairs and the dean of student's office. Technically, it must pass Student Senate also, but it can be hoped Student Senate will approve.

But the CSA-Dean of Students route will be more difficult, with the heat being directed toward room visitation, especially since Chancellor Jack Peltason and Dean of Students Stanton Millet have said they cannot deliver on it this year.

The proposal, as worded in the suggested revision, is quite simple. "Students may entertain guests in their rooms or in clearly defined public areas . . ." The administrative

details, such as when and how long guests will be permitted, is left up to the residents of the house.

The set-up is similar to lounge visitation where residents were permitted to establish their own rules. And residents tend to set up sensible enough rules so other residents are not unduly inconvenienced or annoyed.

The proposed Chapter 7 is beautiful. Students want it and it is up to them to apply enough pressure to force the measure through.



### Why?

(Editor's Note: This is the text of the speech delivered at the Centennial Convocation Monday by Paul C. Schroeder. Schroeder was a representative of the Educational Reform Committee.)

By PAUL SCHROEDER

Why?

Why did those students walk out, so quietly, from this place? You must be able to see that there is something wrong.

Why are we students forced to walk out on our University, on the society that produced us? Our University is simply not listening to the critical questions of our age. Our educators were schooled before Hiroshima, before Watts and Detroit, before automation and anonymity, before university education was provided for all facets of society, except the Blacks.

Governor Kerner sits with us today. His commission only repeated the obvious: our society is diseased. I and thousands of students question the priorities of a nation that devotes to a senseless war resources badly needed to cure the disease at home.

Students chose me to come today to talk with you. They did not pick me because I follow a party line, or because I am a radical, or because I know the answers. I am simply a student who spent four disappointing years at the University of Illinois.

The University has not fulfilled its responsibility. It never taught me how to ask a question. I was told; I was lectured to. I was asked to accept the answers to yesterday's questions. In some rare instances teachers have looked at me, expecting something new to come out of my head. I failed them, and myself.

By the most important standard, the development of critical minds, this University has failed us. It has led many students to really believe the recent industrial recruiting ad which said: "College is a waste of time unless you find a job that turns you on." But I am not looking so much for a job as for some guidance in solving for myself the critical questions of my duty to my society and to myself. This is a people's university, and it must fill the needs of Illinois and the nation. Are the technicians produced here really the men with vision who are needed to lead our country?

Formal classroom structures are out of phase with reality, and we students are painfully aware of this. You teachers feel that the questions of your era are important today. It isn't so. We students want to be heard, we cry out to you in our need, and we see no one is listening.

The duty to teach the future generation how to question has been neglected for a long time. What has been the result? The United States suffers from a crisis in criticism. Society is full of people conditioned only to the acceptance of authority. Thoreau told us of the existence of unjust laws, and asked why the government "does not encourage its citizens to be on the alert to point out its faults?" This principle was affirmed when American self-righteousness led to the condemnation at Nuremberg of Germans who unquestioningly obeyed the orders of their government. What is the status of these principles today? It is clear: The man who questions is a dissenter, a "Nervous Nellie," the man who obeys is a patriot.

Secondly, we are in a crisis of direction. Technologically we accomplish the possible, regardless of its rationality. We use more and more sense to do the more and more senseless. Who is directing our progress?

Someone today must accept personal responsibility to build a more sensible so-

ciety. One hero of students today is Regis Debray, a man who lives his ideals. He says: "To judge an intellectual it is not enough to examine his ideas; it is the relation between his ideas and his acts which counts." Students must begin to act. We are members of the University, and are capable of analysis of its flaws. We must begin revolutionizing the educational process. Without our participation the faculty, the administration, and the government will continue to be unable to provide for our needs.

Following this Convocation I invite all students to meet outside the Assembly Hall to walk together to the Union. There we will join with others in trying to decide how to build education for a new century. We want to humanize the University, to introduce critical thought, to restructure the University into units which are vital and personal. We want to learn with our teachers, and not merely from them. The pleasure of creative scholarship must be found.

Students must join together. We can not bring about changes by asking the administration or the faculty to do the job for us. We must build for ourselves. We can create in our own lives the relationships and critical attitudes the University is not providing. Only then have we accepted our responsibility.

Faculty and administrators, join with us, and listen to us. We have needs, and we will begin to satisfy them. The urgency of the moment is the result of past frustrations. We can not wait. The drift from the sterile academy has begun. The gowns of dead tradition are being shed. Let us all work together not so much to liberalize the present order, as to gain our liberation from it.

### Pentagon frees army from food service

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Pentagon has decreed an end to KP for most servicemen.

The "emancipation proclamation" is a new Defense Department directive requiring the armed services to use civilians to prepare and serve food for the troops "unless there are military essentiality requirements which dictate the use of military personnel."

The objective is to free more servicemen for military tasks and to upgrade the quality of the food service.

The order requires the changeover by mid-1970.

"With limited exceptions, the instruction . . . eliminates the use of military personnel as KPs," the Pentagon said.

There will be exceptions — such as in combat areas.

"Military personnel will continue to be used in those positions that require a military incumbent for reasons of law, training, security, discipline, rotation or combat readiness," the Defense Department said.

This means, among other things, that a man can still be placed on KP if his unit commander decides to punish him that way for some infraction.

The food jobs — cooks, bakers, meatcutters, food service attendants, food supply people — will be drawn from civilians either hired directly by the armed services or provided by contractors.

Sources said that, in addition to releasing more servicemen for military duties, the switch to civilians in food service work should lead to more jobs for civilians in relatively unskilled groups.

POGO . . . by Walt Kelly

