

The Daily Collegian

Successor to THE FREE LANCE, est. 1887

Published Tuesday through Saturday mornings inclusive during the College year by the staff of The Daily Collegian of The Pennsylvania State College.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1934, at the State College, Pa., Post Office under the act of March 3, 1879

Collegian editorials represent the viewpoint of the writers, not necessarily the policy of the newspaper. Unsigned editorials are by the editor.

Dave Pellnitz
Editor

Franklin S. Kelly
Business Mgr.

Managing Ed., Andy McNeillie; City Ed., Dave Jones; Sports Ed., Jake Highton; Copy Ed., Bettie Loux; Edit. Dir., Jim Gromiller; Wire Ed., Chuck Henderson; Sec. Ed., Ginger Opoczinski; Asst. Sports Ed., Ted Soens; Asst. Soc. Ed., LaVonne Althouse; Feature Ed., Julie Ibbotson; Librarian and Exchange Ed., Nancy Luetzel.

STAFF THIS ISSUE

Night Editor: Dick McDowell; Copy Editors: Chuck Obertance, Chiz Mathias; Assistants: Len Goodman, Mike Feinsilber, Herm Weiskopf, Irv Weiner, Joe Obestor.

Ad Staff: Alison Morley, Virginia Bowman, Frank Kelly, Jack Harry.

Spies' Conviction Should Be Upheld

When New York Judge Irving S. Kaufman declined to review the case against convicted traitors Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, the only path left open to them was to appeal to the President for clemency. Right now, all over the country—indeed all over the world—demonstrations are being held on behalf of the Rosenbergs.

In Washington, pickets asking Presidential clemency for the atomic spies are marching back and forth in front of the White House. In Paris, London, and other foreign capitals, similar demonstrations are being conducted.

As far as the general public is concerned, Judge Kaufman was right when he said that Rosenberg's crime was "worse than murder." In New York City, the average man on the street took one look at the pamphlets titled "Save the Rosenbergs" being handed out, muttered something under his breath, and immediately discarded the paper.

In making his decision, Judge Kaufman said he had found no new evidence to warrant commuting the death sentence for the two spies. In addition, he said the Rosenbergs had shown no signs of remorse over their deed.

The judge also complained about the abuse to which he had been subjected because of the case. However, the judge did agree to stay the execution, which was scheduled for Jan. 14, in order to give the Rosenbergs an opportunity to petition the President for clemency.

We believe that Judge Kaufman's decision was the wisest one he could have made. Death for traitors is prescribed by law, and it's about time the United States began to crack down on such people as the Rosenbergs.

Just as those who want to "Save the Rosenbergs" urge citizens to write to the White House, those citizens who believe the traitors should die should inform the White House to that effect. We wonder what those people who are defending the Rosenbergs now will think if and when the first atomic bomb drops on this country.

Keep Chapel Fund For Local Project

Just before the start of the Christmas vacation the Chapel fund committee heard Leopoldo Ruiz discuss ways in which the Chapel offering could be used to assist Silliman University in the Philippine Islands, Ruiz will become president of the university April 1.

Under the Ruiz plan, the funds could be used to provide for a young instructor studying here a year, to help finance practical extension experience for some students from Silliman, or to buy books, laboratory equipment, audio-visual aids, or other equipment needed at the university.

These undoubtedly are very worthy uses for the funds, but in the minds of the vast majority of students the money should go toward a campus project, particularly the construction of a small chapel on campus. Late last spring, a vote was taken after a Sunday Chapel service as to what use the money should be put. The general category of a campus project received the largest number of votes.

The Chapel funds amount to approximately \$5000 a year. This amount seems small indeed to the vast amounts being spent abroad every year by the United States and the World Student Service Fund, represented on campus by the Campus Chest. On the other hand, the amount seems far more significant when considered from a local angle.

Much has been said about the poor state of Christian morals in the United States, particularly among college students. If this is the case, what better use could this annual \$5000 have than to be put toward a meditation chapel here at Penn State or for improvement of our present Chapel programs.

And with the current controversy over the percentage of Campus Chest being given to the Penn State Christian Association, perhaps some arrangement could be made so that the PSCA could get the use of some of these funds.

Students Evaluate Their Instructors?

If you're ever in need of a good topic for argument, try this one: "Should students be allowed to evaluate teachers?"

Quite a few colleges permit it, and they find such evaluations helpful in keeping close tabs on what goes on in individual classrooms.

We've heard only passing mention of it at Penn State to date, but it could become the topic of the day if one of the political parties would choose to stake its popularity on the issue.

At any rate, officially or unofficially, it's a broad topic for discussion.

The University of Nebraska has a system for grading instructors consisting of about 30 questions dealing with the ability of the instructor, his knowledge of the subject, personal appearance, etc.

In practically all cases, forms are filled out anonymously by students, then evaluated by department heads. Though anonymous ballots might seem cruel in some cases, a sensible analysis we would think could determine which criticisms to disregard.

What is looked for is a criticism by a large number of students on the same question. This eliminates individual prejudices which crop up.

But then there is the other side, too. There are arguments that an evaluation program of instructors would tend to make them more lenient, or would not consider teacher ability, but rather personality as a deciding trait.

An evaluation program could be helpful, but certainly not decisive. If nothing else, it would arouse department heads to investigate when instructors show up poorly.

One student from San Francisco summed up his feelings thusly: "The best way to grade a teacher is to think back on what one has gotten out of his course about a year after he has taken it. At that time, when one is free from the teacher's lectures, it is easier to give a more accurate evaluation." And certainly if a student has gotten nothing or comparatively nothing from a course, his opinions should be worth something.

Problems are not solved by turning a deaf ear.

—Jim Gromiller

Sullivan Award

One of Penn State's all-time great athletes had another honor heaped upon him and upon his Alma Mater as 1952 drew to a close.

Horace Ashenfelter, the FBI agent who copied the biggest upset of the 1952 Olympics, was voted the James E. Sullivan Memorial Award, the highest honor that can be won by an amateur athlete.

Ashenfelter, who never ran in steeplechase competition before 1952, received first choice of 154 out of 538 sports authorities voting, for his victory in the 3000 meter steeplechase event in the 1952 Olympics.

—J. G.

Observe Frosh' Rule

Fraternity preference lists are now in the hands of all fraternities, and freshmen who indicated an interest in a particular fraternity last fall can now expect to be contacted and rushed.

However, freshmen should remember to keep in mind regulations regarding fraternity pledging.

IFC will soon set a date after which first semester freshmen may be pledged, but until that time it is illegal and can result in social probation for a violating house.

There is a definite reason for this rule. It is designed to protect freshmen—to give them an opportunity to rush more than one house, and to avoid railroading.

The regulation was established to protect the freshmen, and the freshmen should realize that it is designed to protect them.

First semester freshmen cannot move into fraternity houses until their sophomore year, anyway. The few weeks from now until the legal pledge date will not do them any harm. Yet it will give them additional time in which to make their all-important decision.

—J. G.

Gazette...

Wednesday, January 7, 1953

CHESS CLUB, 3 Sparks, 7 p.m.
WRA BOWLING CLUB, White Hall, 7 p.m.
WRA MODERN DANCE CLUB, White Hall dance room, 7 p.m.

COLLEGE HOSPITAL
Audrey Austin, Donald Austin.

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT
Boy to work from 5 a.m. to 7 a.m. six days a week.

"Tis an old maxim in the schools,
That flattery's the food of fools;
Yet now and then your men of wit,
Will condescend to take a bit."

—Cadenus and Vanessa

"Knowledge is a treasure, but practice is the key to it."
—Fuller

Little Man on Campus By Bibler



"At home for two weeks Christmas vacation—you'd think they didn't have a smoke th' whole time."

WISE AND OTHERWISE

Old Enough to Fight But Not to Vote

By DAVE JONES

Senator Albert R. Pechan, author of Pennsylvania's infamous Loyalty Oath Act, plans to introduce to the state Legislature a proposal that would lower the legal voting age in this state from 21 to 18. If the Legislature, which convened yesterday, approves the proposal, a constitutional amendment would be necessary.

"I feel very strongly about our young people having a voice in their government," Senator Pechan said. And then he backed his strong feeling with a poorly arrived at, timeworn, and hollow logic: "If they are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote."

Senator Pechan, in his interest in youth's voice in government, has overlooked one important thing. Pennsylvania has no absentee voting law, so any fighting man away from his home on election day, regardless of his age, cannot vote. Since most fighting men in this state cannot vote without such a law, extending voting rights to those under 21 would only be extending an empty right. If Senator Pechan and his legislative colleagues are sincerely interested in youth's voice in government, they will enact such a law. Without this law, Senator Pechan's proposal is hollow.

But even if Pennsylvania had an absentee voting law, there would be no justification to lower the legal voting age to 18. Senator Pechan is proposing something which at first glance seems good, but which upon deeper investigation proves not only stupid, but dangerous.

The idea that a man old enough to fight is old enough to vote is completely wrong, primarily because the qualities of a good fighting man and an intelligent voter are of little, if any, similarity. And to send to the polls an unintelligent voter is bad business.

Those who share Senator Pechan's view on this question have failed to consider that, although it takes a good deal of courage to be a good fighter, it does not usually take a great deal of intelligence. In fact, the best soldier is the one who most willingly submits to the dictates of his leader, regardless of motives. In direct contrast to a good fighter, a good voter does not need a good deal of courage but does need a great deal of intelligence. And the voter who willingly and blindly submits to another's dictates, regardless of motives, is using his voting privilege to his detriment and the detriment of his countrymen.

To follow the logic that a man old enough to fight is old enough to vote would be folly. By that token, "old enough to fight, old enough to vote; old enough to vote, old enough to assume majority." And not only would an 18-year old be old enough to assume majority, but he would be obligated to assume all responsibilities of a voting citizen. A man cannot assume only privileges and leave others to assume his responsibilities.

The fact is, men under 18½ will not be drafted. Local draft boards have barely touched the 19-year old bracket to date. The sharp criticism afforded when 18½ was set as the draft age, along with draft boards' reluctance to draft men of that age, indicate the feeling that such men are not old enough to fight. Under Senator Pechan's logic then, this feeling also indicates such men are not old enough to vote either.

Regardless of the reasoning behind Senator Pechan's proposal, the idea is still bad. College men and women are generally considered above average both in intelligence and moral conduct. Yet, just last year men and women from 18 to 21, and many over 21, participated in a childish and disgusting wave of panty raids across the nation's college campuses. This action demonstrated these above average men and women are not yet ready to take on the responsibility of voting. Adult thinking is simply not present.

It is unfortunate the right to vote must be determined by chronological age. There are some 16-year olds capable of voting intelligently, and there are citizens 60 years old and beyond who are too illiterate or dumb to ever cast an intelligent ballot.

This situation of unintelligent voting is bad enough without making it worse. But if chronological age must be the standard for determining voting capability, as it seems it must, then that age had better be 21 and not 18. That will give the human animal at least three more years to ferret out a more intelligent decision—something this country could use once in a while.