Spruce Streets were announced yesterday by the Office of Coordinated Planning. The plan features rooms to be initially used by about 185 students in the medical school and a two-floor dining hall to be used by the freshmen. Along Spruce Street will be provision for commercial space on the first floor.

SPRUCE STREET VIEW of the new dormitories and dining commons, with commercial facilities on the first floor.

Plans for the freshmas dining commons and additional men's dormitories at the corner of 38th and Spruce Streets were announced yesterday by the Office of Coordinated Planning. The project, which was designed by the architectural firm of Geddes, Brecher, Cunningham, and Qualls, is mainly to be financed through gifts to the University.

There the students will enter the building and go into the rooms on the third floor. The stores along Spruce Street will be serviced by an underground passageway that will have its entrance at 38th Street. The stores along Spruce Street will be covered promenade along Spruce Street.

The commons will be in the center of the triangle formed by the new dorms. The stairway will go up to the second level of the building. There the students will enter the building and go into the rooms and the second and third floors. The stores along Spruce Street will be covered promenade along Spruce Street.

The commons will be based on a cafeteria style plan with tables in the center of the dining area. There is also provision for a dancing area.

By STEPHEN MARMON

Administration Ignored Faculty, UPSC Report on Research Charges

By WILLIAM MANDELL

Profest David R. Goddard was never consulted on the decision to extend Project Spruce, an UPSC report disclosed yesterday. The External Affairs Committee of the UPSC Assembly reported that the decision was made by the administration and not consulted with the faculty.

The report also stated that the UPSC Assembly is participating in the decision making process, but in reality it is not.

FACULTY TESTIMONY

The report records the testimony of Provost Goddard, Joseph Serudon, assistant professor of electrical engineering; Herbert Spiro, professor of political science; Carl Chambers, director of the Institute of Cooperative Research; Ken Neuber, director of Projects Summit and Spice Rack; Alfred Mann, professor of physics; Albert Hobbs, associate professor of sociology; Robert Putnam, professor of chemistry; and Albert Hobister, chairman of the Committee on Implementing Research Policy.

Most of the witnesses described a system under which the faculty is supposed to set research policy for the University. Hobister, of the faculty Committee on Implementing Research Policy, told the External Affairs Committee that his group had been bypassing his committee, the UPSC Assembly, in decision making.

COMMITTEE BY-PASSED

The Implementing Committee was formed on the strength of a Faculty Senate resolution of October 26, 1966. According to that resolution, the committee has advisory authority on the University's acceptance or rejection of all sponsored research. By bypassing his committee, the University administration is depriving the faculty of its right to participate in decision making.

Senior class president Jeremy Rifkin urged all students to speak out on the war, regardless of what other students might think.

Daniel Finnerty, former UPSC assemblyman, asserted the recent "paint-out," where a number of war proponents whitewashed anti-war slogans on the Fine Arts building fence, was evidence of the dangers the war was posing to traditional American ideals of free speech.

Speaking in favor of the war, one student said that those who don't want it should go to jail or leave the country. Another claimed that without the U.S. military effort in South Vietnam the Communists would take all Southeast Asia.

On the opposing side, graduate student Sherman Stitt accused President Johnson of violating his campaign promises not to escalate the war. Another graduate student, Jules Benjamin, said that the best support for American ideals would be to speak out about the war, whether one was for it or against it.

TEACH-IN AT IRVINE

In Irvine auditorium yesterday, a group of faculty members, students, and outside experts attacked the problem of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam before a constantly changing audience of about 150.

Dr. Charles Price, of the chemistry department, speaking as part of a panel of faculty members, advocated immediate curtailment of the bombing and a peaceful settlement through negotiations.

Most faculty speakers, however, concentrated on the prevention of future Vietnam, attacking the U.S. concept of itself as a world defender against Communism. Dr. John McDermott, editor of Vist Report, failed to appear. Dr. Robert Rutman of the chemistry department took the stage. He said that Vietnam was a "natural result" of the fundamental propositions of U.S. policy, and that it could continue in future unless those propositions are changed.

Harnwell Opens International Exhibit

Scott Nearing, former professor of economics at the University of Chicago, has been called a "radical" by the University administration. He is known for his left-wing views. "The United States is today the great world capitalist empire," he declared.

According to Nearing, the only difference between the two empires is the degree of technology, for "the more effective the tools, the more effective the weapons."

He also stated that "the technological defeat of the United States has been diverted from Europe to Asia.

Therefore, the struggle, if it takes place, will probably occur in Asia. World War III may begin in Asia.

"The situation is not hopeless," he said. "If you do not like to live in a world engaged in a knock-down, drag-out power struggle you can do something about it.

CONFERENCE

"You can call together a constitutional conference and get a good number of the people of the world to talk over their problems," he said.

Nearing also suggested that the structure of this new world organization should be "a federal system under which the faculty is sometimes cast in the same role in the student, the teacher, the professor.

"The situation is not hopeless," he said. "If you do not like to live in a world engaged in a knock-down, drag-out power struggle you can do something about it.

CALL CONVENTION

"You can call together a constitutional conference and get a good number of the people of the world to talk over their problems," he said.

Nearing also suggested that the structure of this new world organization should be "a federal system under which the faculty is sometimes cast in the same role as the student, the teacher, the professor.

"The situation is not hopeless," he said. "If you do not like to live in a world engaged in a knock-down, drag-out power struggle you can do something about it.

HUNDREDS JAM 'BITCH-IN' AS STUDENTS SPEAK OUT ON VIETNAM

A packed "bitch-in" at Houston Hall plaza and a sparsely attended "teach-in" at Irvine Auditorium highlighted yesterday's anti-Vietnam war activities sponsored by the University's Vietnam Week Committee.

Both supporters and opponents of the Vietnam conflict were out in force at the noon-time "bitch-in" at Houston Hall Plaza. Senior class president Jeremy Rifkin urged all students to speak out on the war, regardless of what other students might think.

Daniel Finnerty, former UPSC assemblyman, asserted the recent "paint-out," where a number of war proponents whitewashed anti-war slogans on the Fine Arts building fence, was evidence of the dangers the war was posing to traditional American ideals of free speech.

Speaking in favor of the war, one student said that those who don't want it should go to jail or leave the country. Another claimed that without the U.S. military effort in South Vietnam the Communists would take all Southeast Asia.

On the opposing side, graduate student Sherman Stitt accused President Johnson of violating his campaign promises not to escalate the war. Another graduate student, Jules Benjamin, said that the best support for American ideals would be to speak out about the war, whether one was for it or against it.

TEACH-IN AT IRVINE

In Irvine auditorium yesterday, a group of faculty members, students, and outside experts attacked the problem of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam before a constantly changing audience of about 150.

Dr. Charles Price, of the chemistry department, speaking as part of a panel of faculty members, advocated immediate curtailment of the bombing and a peaceful settlement through negotiations.

Most faculty speakers, however, concentrated on the prevention of future Vietnam, attacking the U.S. concept of itself as a world defender against Communism. Dr. John McDermott, editor of Vist Report, failed to appear. Dr. Robert Rutman of the chemistry department took the stage. He said that Vietnam was a "natural result" of the fundamental propositions of U.S. policy, and that it could continue in future unless those propositions are changed.
LONG LIVE WHEAT JEANS

Editor, The Daily Pennsylvanian:

I happened the other night to walk past the now famous, now painted, now whitewashed, now painted again fence—which was then undergoing a whitewash phase.

A fine, strapping, young fraternity man in wheat jeans and brown loafers (with no socks) was painting over a once sign whose only visible remnant was "... TEACH IN" Down the line a way an alcohol whose only visible remains were "..."

A fine, strapping, young fraternity man of our beer, subscribers to our Playboy, and the pathetically true statement that end, an overt advertisement for Budweiser only by directions "TO THE LIBRARY."" Your fine young paper you had offered a picture of four or five fine young men with the legend that they proudly had washed, now painted again fence—which appeared the creation of a jering mob from an audience of intellectuals.

The direction of this rally was no less of "intellectual intolerance" than the events which precipitated it.

R. E. Nevin
College '69

WHO ARE THE CENSORS NOW?

Editor, The Daily Pennsylvanian:

For the past two days there has been a barrage of articles and letters in the D.P. concerning the "indiscriminate obliteration" of the paint-out which blanked out the anti-war comments on the construction wall. I am in disagreement with the night riders who took this action, but I do feel that their victims have reap few a two-hailed as the intelligentsia of our campus, the determined upholders of free speech. The "Bitch-in" at Houston Hall plaza yesterday noon was, however, from the point of view of intellectuals and free speech, a good match for the white-washing. Proponents of the present War policy were asked to confront anti-war speakers directly, in broad daylight, and to express their views in the intellectual character of these self-made white knights. The sponsors of the event then proceeded to taunt the pro-war speakers with continual side remarks and mocking gestures. Whether by careful practice or by natural endowment, these people proved themselves at the creation of a jeering mob from an audience of intellectuals.

The direction of this rally was no less a display of "intellectual intolerance" than the events which precipitated it.

R. E. Nevin
College '69

HOW CAN ANYONE DISAGREE WITH PEACE?

Editor, The Daily Pennsylvanian:

L. B. J. smokers children; an American soldier with a swastika on his helmet; an American flag with the field of stars replaced by a swastika; these were some of the many signs and slogans painted on the wall during the anti-war paint-in last Sunday. This was not just an expression of old fashioned freedom, as it was called in Tuesday's issue of the D.P., but an example of an old fashioned smear campaign.

I was at the wall both Sunday and Monday nights. I did not participate in the blanket paint-out, though I did agree with the participants' technique. I did agree with their sentiments. Monday night I participated in a pro-war, spontaneous, paint-in. I painted several signs, including one which asked, "What about those Vietnamese civilians who were kidnapped by the Vietcong during the last elections?"

This sign was not painted over any of the anti-Vietnam war signs that were there at the time. Yet by Tuesday morning the peaceniks had smeared out every word of it. Was that all the answer they could produce to it? Further investigation showed that they had smeared out pro-war signs all up and down the wall. In Tuesday's paper the D.P. called the people who smeared out the anti-war signs censors. I would like to ask who are the censors now? The anti-war movement has once again shown its traditional hypocrisy.

Dennis H. WILEN
Managing Editor

Zelosopheic Society
and The Underground
present tonight and tomorrow
A Reading of Barbara Garson's MacBird
8:30 of The Catacombs

Heel the DP

Zachary Davis, "One In - Turn On - Paris Rive Gauche"

ROMANCE LANGUAGE CLUB
Antipathetic Alliance
functions the first and only Philadelphia showing of the sophisticated French Cabaret, La Contrescarpe.

An enjoyable Saturday night—part of Penn's International Week
SATURDAY, APRIL 15
8:30 P.M.
Tickets $2.50, 3.00, 4.00, 4.50
GROUP RATE AVAILABLE UNFORGETTABLE!
Penn Thinclds Meet West Chester

"I'm a little pessimistic about the meet on Sunday. I think I expect it to be very close," explained West Chester track coach Dr. Ed Youmans about today's meet between Penn and the Rams.

Youmans has every reason to worry. Last year West Chester squared up a 73-72 victory on the muddy Franklin Field track. Just as that track was a thing of the past at the old stadium, Penn's 1967 track team bears no resemblance to the 1966 edition.

The Quakers opened their sea-son last week with a 92-48 win over LaSalle, and West Chester has two dual meet wins to its credit, over the Explorers and Bloomfield State College.

Youmans' squad includes seven returnees, among them co-cap-tains Jerry Hollander and Pete Hunting, two hurdlers.

Penn will pit the meet with several veterans who captured firsts in last year's competition including Henry Smith, captain of this year's Quakers. Smith won the shot put with a toss of 46'6" in the meet.

Pete vaunter Dave Webb, quarter-ender Ernie Lieberman, and midler Dave Webb will all be back this afternoon for Penn.

"Penn is much stronger this year," Youmans added. "We're well balanced but our strength lies in the sprints and middle-dis-tances. We're rather weak in anything above a quarter-mile."

Last year's Penn dominated the field events only to lose vital points in the running events. With the improvement of this year's runners, this afternoon's meet could very easily bear out You-mans' pessimism.

Smorgasbord International West Lounge HH 4-6 Free

GOING ABROAD?

FORUM ON WORLD TRAVEL

... then go to Informed

WED. APRIL 12 — Bennett Union Lounge — 7:30 pm
Presented by: Council on Work, Study & Travel Abroad
All right, Dr. Fields, we've heard what you have to say, and we must admit that we like what we hear. Your plans for Penn are noble ones and your arguments for their implementation, persuasive. You promise to improve Penn's winning percentage without in any way sacrificing the University's academic integrity, and it's hard to dispute a formula like that.

However, we both liked and respected Jerry Ford, as did many others associated with Pennsylvania and the Ivy League. And Ford told us to beware of you, Dr. Fields, and the alumni you seek to lead. He prepared us for the alumni would work through you to dominate the athletic affairs of the University.

This charge puts you on the spot, because you are, so far, unproven. Your professed ideals are admirable, yet how can we be sure that the ends you strive for will be realized?

If you can build a winner without compromising Ivy principles, you'll be the great Penn hero since Benjamin Franklin. The path ahead is not an easy one, however; failure to achieve your goals will label you a charlatan and Ford a man of honor.

You expect to induce prospective college athletes to matriculate at Penn by offering high quality athletic and, as you say, competitive programs. But you're competing in a tough league, Dr. Fields. Does Penn have the faculty of Harvard or Yale? Do you have the overall prestige and facilities of Princeton? The green sprawling campus of Cornell or Dartmouth? Can your plans, even in the distant future, possibly match the attractions of these schools?

You intend to revitalize Penn's recruiting program with the same fervent enthusiasm that you use with your alumni and students. But how easy will it be to arouse the alumni from their current state of apathy? Is the dismissal of one man unpopular with the alumni? Will you have enough incentive to generate the same energy displayed by Princeton, Yale, and Dartmouth graduates? Will you be as well co-ordinated to implement a long-range plan for stepped-up recruiting?

And what about the students? (We will have more to say about this later). How certain can you be of enlisting their aid in recruiting? And how sure can you be, if you don't do so, of enlisting their aid, that their efforts will prove effective?

You are going to play a major role in the selection of a new athletic director. You promise that he will be a man of uncompromising integrity, yet one at the same time more compatible with coaches and alumni than was Ford. As Ford was, however, if the attitude of the alumni turns antagonistic to that of the faculty and students of the University, you don't necessarily allude to alumni aversion to illicit spring football practice or Ivy League withdrawal, but integrity can be vitiated by less radical policies.

The president of this university and most of its students stand by the principle that the NCAA-AAU and 1.6 issues; many Penn alumni did not. Will you and your athletic director succumb to the NCAA's selfish demands for conformity? Will you, like Ford, take a stand worthy of a principled institution?

Most of the questions here are rhetorical, Dr. Fields, because you already told us what you want to do for Penn. Action speaks louder than words, however, and our query is, will your plans be fulfilled; indeed, can they be fulfilled?

Of course, only time will answer these questions. The full fruits of your efforts will not be realized for many years, as Penn is starting its athletic ascent from a position of acute disadvantage in relation to other League schools.

You have given us no reason to doubt your sincerity, Dr. Fields, but, as in any new situation, we must be cautious. We are looking for you to show the student body as soon as possible, and with action, that you mean every word you say.

In light of the shaky relationship between the Ivy League and the NCAA, Penn's "new image" may be tested at any moment. And the university community will be watching the new athletic administration very carefully when that time comes.

Another key trial will take place a year from now when recruited athletes, future Class of '72, make their choices from among the Ivy schools that accept them. Will they see Penn in a more favorable light than have athletes of recent years?

We would be unfair to expect overwhelming results in a short period of time. We know that your program is one which needs many years to realize its potential. We want to make you and the alumni aware of your desire and ability to effect the improvements you promise for Penn.

Our attitude is not critical; rather it is one of optimism, accompanied by a questioning caution. We want, if we feel, by the circumstances of Ford's dismissal. We're looking to you, Dr. Fields, to prove that Penn, and the sooner we see them, the happier we'll be.