

# The Daily Collegian

Successor to THE FREE LANCE, est. 1847

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 9, 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.

## STAFF THIS ISSUE

Editorial staff: Night editor, Bill Jost; Copy editors, Nancy Ward, Mary Lou Adams; Assistants, Shirley Musgrave, Dick Anglestein, Bill Snyder, David Bronstein.

Advertising staff: Virginia Bowman, Vince Drayne.

## DIR Can Be Proud Of Its Fine Record

Among the 390 students who were graduated from the College in January, 47 had formerly been enrolled in the Division of Intermediate Registration. A great deal of praise can be given to the division and the students enrolled there for attaining such a record.

Originally, 256 students were enrolled in DIR. Only 17 per cent were in the lower two-fifths of the class. The purpose was to give guidance and help to students who were having trouble deciding on a curriculum which would aid them after graduation.

Too often, backwardness and secrecy are associated with DIR. The aim of the DIR is still the same: to help those students who are having scholastic problems assimilate themselves.

A student is placed in DIR for various reasons: if his average drops below a certain point; if he is changing from one school to another, and if he wishes to have additional vocational guidance before deciding upon a curriculum. Special tests and interviews are given to determine where the student should be placed.

The Division of Intermediate Registration is doing a fine job in helping students who would not have been able to graduate without such help and guidance. It is an institution which can be looked upon with pride by everyone on campus.

—Al Munn

## Collegian Reviews Are Misunderstood

The Daily Collegian reviewed another two shows this past weekend, and once again much criticism is flowing into the office regarding the "Roberta" review in particular.

Although we do not pretend to be polished literary critics, the observing public (particularly those involved in the dramatic productions) should realize that a sincere effort is made, at all times, to be fair.

It is significant to note that if and when present actors and actresses on the campus enter the professional stage, they will be subject to the criticism of many more critics. There will always be areas in which the stage performer will disagree with what a critic has said.

The unfortunate thing regarding Daily Collegian reviewers is that it seems the students do have a certain amount of pity for the performers. All is fine until a review says something slightly critical.

It must be remembered, too, that like all signed columns appearing in any newspaper, Daily Collegian dramatic reviews are the opinions of the individual writers. This does not mean that the Daily Collegian is taking an editorial stand.

Opinions of any dramatic performance will vary. The Daily Collegian reviewers never have and never will seek to give unfavorable criticism unless they believe that it is in order.

It has often been said that those who have learned to take criticism—constructive criticism—have learned the real value of being an artist or a performer.

With these facts in mind, it is hoped that dramatic performers on the campus will soon learn to understand Daily Collegian reviews and reviewers in the proper light. Much time and effort go into the preparation of a review, which is done for the sake and experience for all persons involved.

—Mimi Ungar

## Beautiful Women

There must be beautiful women all over the place!

That's probably what John Wayne will be thinking when he starts trying to pick five finalists for the 1953 Miss Penn State contest. But then, looking at beautiful women is most likely old stuff to this long-time movie favorite.

With a record-breaking total of 72 entries in the contest, and with Mamie Eisenhower scheduled to crown the winner, it looks as though this year's Spring Week is well on its way toward topping all previous efforts.

All we need now is hope that the present spell of cold winds and snow flurries gives way to a week of warm, sunny weather in honor of the events and that John Wayne doesn't by some freak of nature get hold of a copy of "Modern Spleen."

## Safety Valve—

### Criticizes Fee Plan

TO THE EDITOR: In the light of the recent editorial shots exchanged by Linc Warrell and Dave Jones, I would like to clarify briefly the stand of the Engineering Student Council on the Interscholastic Council Board's fee proposal. The proposal, as it now stands, would assess each student 25 cents per semester, the funds to be distributed on the basis of the number of students enrolled in each school. The well-publicized purpose of the additional assessment is to equalize the student activity fee for all schools.

The Engineering Student Council, however, cannot comprehend the logic of a plan that would increase fees merely for the purpose of equalization with no definite projects of expansion for the programs of the various school councils. In other words, it seems as though the ISCB's plan advocates the collection of a new fee without first determining a use for the increased income.

It is realized that at least one school council consistently operates at a deficit and that all of the councils (including Engineering) would be able to use the money. Also, the Engineering Student Council has not been able to formulate a more equitable plan which would meet the needs of other councils as well as the requirements of the administration. However, it is still the opinion of the students of Engineering, who next year will constitute the largest school at Penn State, that the present proposal is putting the cart before the horse.

—Robert B. Watson, President  
Engineering Student Council

### Upholds Frosh Dinks

TO THE EDITOR: Since All-College Cabinet passed the resolution that incoming freshman women will wear green dinks instead of bows, many comments, pro and con, have been heard. Certain powerful factions on campus have taken a dim view of the situation and expressed definite opposition to dinks for women.

As ex-bow wearers, we would like to present a few arguments to help these proponents of the ancient status-quo realize that the bow went out with the horse and buggy.

Bows are very sweet and feminine if the wearer has the long curls or the upsweep of the Gibson Girl era, but for the modern, wind-blown coed, they are completely out of place. Many a green bow went flying with the wind as coeds trodded from Ag Hill to Mechanical Engineering.

In first grade, big bows and Mary Jane shoes were quite in vogue, but on skirt and sweated girls in their late teens, dinks and saddle shoes are more the fashion.

At the end of the first week, the crisp, feminine bows were a wet, dirty mess. Is there anyone who wouldn't admit that an unfeminine (?) dink would make a girl seem more lady-like than one of these messy creations?

We, who will always remember the three horrible weeks of green bows, hope that the reactionaries on campus will not be able to use their influence to change this welcome proposal.

—Names withheld

### Disagrees With Review

TO THE EDITOR: This letter is directed to your "critic" Edmund Reiss. After reading his review on "Roberta," I've come to the conclusion that he is unfit to be a reviewer of theatrical productions.

Mr. Reiss was most unfair to Joe Goldstein, who portrayed the role of Johnny Kent, American football player. If Mr. Reiss had carefully read and understood the "Roberta" plot, he would have realized that Joe's "fidgety" movements, "half-hearted gestures" and "puzzled cow-like looks" were a MUST in his role. The part called for someone who could portray the muscular football player who, when faced with a dressmaking business and several designing women, would be flustered. In this role, Joe did an exceptionally good job.

May I suggest that before a criticism of a show is written, the reviewer should become familiar with the story, the characters, and the characterizations entailed.

—Judy Koenig

## Gazette...

April 22, 1953

ALL-COLLEGE FOOD COMMITTEE, 7:15 p.m., Old Main.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERS, 7 p.m., 105 Agricultural Engineering.

CHESS CLUB, 7 p.m., 3 Sparks.

PENN STATE GRANGE, 8 p.m., 100 Horticulture.

PERSHING RIFLES, 7 p.m., Armory, Class A uniforms.

### COLLEGE HOSPITAL

Walter Back, Brinah Bank, Rogers Bender, Robert Dankanyin, Norman Fleekop, David Gayley, Marvin Goldberg, Basil Hadjiyannis, John Harapas, Patricia Hennessy, Fritz Pfefferkorn, Richard Pinney, James Seton, Jordan Smith, Abing Sorriatmadja, and Paul Wilson.

### STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Asbury Arlington Hotel, New Jersey, will interview women, April 24.

Boy to work on farm for room and board.

Boys wanted for waiters and dishwashers.

Boys wanted for counter work, evenings. Must have car.

Camp Nokomis, New York, will interview men and women, April 23.

Students' wives for evening counter work.

## Little Man On Campus

By Bibler



"Would you think it strange if I ask that we sit in th' back seat—it's just that that's the only place I can carry on a decent conversation."

## The Political Scene

By MARSHALL O. DONLEY

(This is the last in a series of five analytical articles dealing with student political organizations at the College and the current electoral race. The series is intended as an impartial discussion of a topic which touches on the lives of every man and woman at Penn State.)

### 5. Ballots, Machines, and Percentages

The 11-day election campaign for the spring offices at the College is ended, and the final tallying is underway as of today. This column has tried to cover the issues of the election and to point out the differences in organization in the two parties, with an eye toward benefiting both parties.

This last column will pick up a few last loose strands and make a few comparisons with elections of the near-past.

For one thing: this year students will be encouraged by the system in use to split their tickets when voting. As the voting machines are set up, it is not possible for a student to pull one lever and be done with the whole thing—he must vote for each office separately—president, vice president, and secretary treasurer, and AA officers.

In a national election, where voting machines are used, the levers on the machines are designed in such a way as to allow the voter to pull one larger handle which depresses all the smaller handles in a electoral row, thus permitting him to vote a straight ticket with one easy movement.

There are a number of reasons why this can't be done during College elections. Primarily, there is the difference in the eligibility of the voters. In a national election every person entering the voting booth is eligible to vote for every office in the election. This is not so at Penn State. Only sophomores, for example, may vote for the junior class president and other junior class officers. Juniors alone may vote for the officers to represent them in their senior year. The eighth semester senior is not eligible to vote for any but All-College offices.

Obviously, with this division of eligibilities, it would not be practical to establish a one-handle for all officers system. The system which is being used entails the use of three voting machines, one for sophomores, one for juniors, and one for eighth semester seniors. Thus the voters are broken down into eligibility groups and can vote only for their representatives.

The voting machines themselves present some interesting questions: What will their effect be on the voting? Will they draw a large vote? or, Will they hinder the speed of the election?

When the idea of voting machines first circulated around the political circles at the College, everyone was jubilant. Here, they

said, was the answer to the percentage vote dream. They were sure the machines would draw out a large vote, if only for curiosity's sake, for, after all, many Penn Staters have not used voting machines before.

But let's look at the records: in 1949 voting machines were used in the spring elections at the College. Two adverse effects of the machines showed themselves. We might wonder if the same effects might not show themselves this year.

For one thing, the machines could not handle the volume of voters fast enough; more people tried to vote than could push the levers at one time. The elections committee came up with a partial solution—one that might be needed again this year—they allowed voters to use paper ballots or the machines, whichever they wanted; especially at between-class rush hours when everyone wanted to vote at once.

The other adverse effect was in a way an outgrowth of this problem, for the lack of a chance to vote kept the vote down—only about 2700 students cast ballots in '49. The vote every year since then has been larger without voting machines: 3671 voted in 1950, 3602 in '51, and (a record) 4152 last year.

Percentagewise the figures have been 1950—42 per cent, 1951—41 per cent, and 1952—44.3 per cent.

Earlier during the campaign this year, politicians were talking glibly of 80 per cent vote. It has since trimmed down to a "hope" of 60 or 70 per cent. A more realistic figure would probably not exceed 40 per cent.

Let us hope the voting machines will not interfere with the desires of students to cast their votes. If the balloting process flows smoothly, Penn Staters will have a full opportunity to express their will—the heavier the vote, the more important and lasting the student government organization.

### Collegian Promotion

Mary Adams has been named to the new senior editorial board of the Daily Collegian which will take over publication of the paper Monday.