

## EDITORIAL

## The Question We Must Ask

The Black Student Union called for the resignation of Dr. T. Sherman Stanford, admissions director of Penn State, at a meeting held Nov. 10 at University Park.

Members of BSU waited for the administration to appear at the public-ly announced meeting which they called. President Walker said he was unable to attend because he would be out of town on that date. The BSU then demanded the resignation of Stanford for the following reasons:

He is most responsible for the admission of all students into the Pennsylvania State University, hence he is directly responsible for the lack of admission of 1,000 black students into Penn State.

If he were professionally committed to this job, he would have made an early statement of his desire to attend the meeting which the BSU called. However, it is obvious that he lacks personal and professional commitment.

Dr. T. S. Stanford lacks the professional ability and responsibility to be competent in his position.

The question which we must ask is whether Mr. Stanford has refused to admit students because they are black or whether he has refused to admit students because they do not meet the university's admission requirements.

If you look at an application for admission, you will find that the university does not ask for a student's race. However, the applications do require a complete record of the student's high school grades and a record of the student's college board scores. Therefore, Mr. Stanford rejects or accepts students not by race but by ability. If a student meets the academic requirements of the university, he will undoubtedly be ad-

The BSU appears to be concerned with the admission of black students mitted.

and relatively unconcerned with the university's standards. If we are to maintain high academic standards at the Pennsylvania State University, we must insist that Mr. Stanford continue to admit students on the grounds of academic achievement, regardless of color.

Joyce Rupp

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

"CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH OR OF THE PRESS."

Dear Editor,

We are sure that you as an editor of a college newspaper, who has not yet had to buckle under to the requirements of a commercialized press, agree with these words most emphatically.

It is our feeling - and we are sure that you will agree that Rule W-20, either as it stands or in any other form, represents a violation of Article I of the Bill of Rights.

As you know, the Ogontz Campus News has made the first test case of W120. The Faculty Council here, after the Temple Free Press had been banned due to W-20, recommended to the Faculty Senate at University Park that Rule-20 be abolished. Last year, at this time, the Ogontz Campus News printed an objectional word but had to put it on a mimeo-

graphed insert because the printer refused to be involved.

What is needed now are more test cases so that the University can be pressured into abolishing Rule W-20.

If you are not familiar with Rule-20 it is now published in the new Faculty Senate Rules. As you will or have seen, the rule is purposely vague, and its overall purpose is to set standards - moral standards - for the students of this University. This too is an impingement of our personal liberties. We feel that no one or no group can impose their moral standards on anyone else. To do so is the first and prerequisite step toward fascist-pigism.

In light of these points we hope that you will join with the Ogontz News in a concerted effort to force the issue of Rule W20 on the Faculty Senate.

Such an action will have many benefits. First, it could succeed in abolishing W-20. Second, it

## To The Collegian

To the Collegian:

There was on this campus last year a sage who accused this school of lacking class. This promptly led all of the arid sage brushes in our halls to rise up in an attempt to rub him out. That made, his point. Part of having class is knowing how to accept & deal with well - intentional criticism. But that was last year, or was it?

For over a year now I have listened to the complaint of our "higher" class students that our faculty is apathetic, that it doesn't care about our students, that it doesn't offer its time to the students, or its skills outside the classroom. This criticism has a point, but not a sharp one. High-acres surely has some faculty who would not be caught in the SUB if it were Shangra-La, which of course, because many students think it is their own pig sty, it is not. And there are those faculty who, because of their apathy, will let Comeriety die. These, however, are not the whole faculty. Our school does have, in case the students haven't noticed, a history club, a basketball team, a literary magazine, a literary society, a drama club, a ping-pong team, a chess team, even a football team. All of these activities require the time of interested faculty who receive no extra financial compensation and little or no recognition for what they do. So let's be fair. Is it the faculty or the students who lack class? Who is it that is really apathetic?

It is my dubious pleasure to be advisor to the Collegian this term. Purportedly this paper is staffed by eager beavers - jazzy jumpers who work, work, work. The fact has been that where it is said to be staffed by many competent persons, from the so-called Chief Editor on down, it is run by about three or four persons in spite of the rest of the staff. The Collegian is too full of persons

may make the Park realize that the commonwealth campuses are alive and well in the State of Pennsylvania.

Sincerely,  
The Ogontz Campus News Staff

on its staff who think it is important to have a journalistic title, but who are not prepared to merit that title. They expect it as a gift. In this they are no different from those apathetic faculty who think they deserve praise for not doing harm instead of for making an outstanding contribution to the school, or who think that they deserve respect simply for having been born, even if they are now a dull teacher weilding a fossilized mind. But even the most disinterested faculty of this school, or its most incompetent teachers, make a contribution to the education of its students. Apathetic students contribute nothing. And the present situation on the Collegian, where the few carry the many, is not an exceptional example of the "I can not be bothered don't let me hear it." student who fill is the cracks in the SUB with what should be their expanding youthful hearts and mind but which is really so much warmed-over air.

I think back to last year the year of the "classy Highacres." I think of a chess club that never really started because students could not be bothered to send their class schedules to the potential club advisor so that he could get things organized. And I think of this year the year of the "classier" Highacres, the year of the "young Turks" and the "outside agitators" from points south and east and west. I think of a paper which is lucky to run at all. I think of a Comeriety that failed. I think of a ping-pong club again not formed. And I think of next year, the year of the "classiest" Highacres, the year when the faculty of this campus begins to see that their own indictment for apathy is the product of a studentry that wants it to be faculty and students, too. A studentry that is itself colorless, listless, lazy, trite. That shall be the year of the faculty "wise up and walk out," the year when our students get the effort from our faculty on their behalf that the students themselves are prepared to put out—no effort at all.

Richard A. Campbell  
Instructor in Philosophy