

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

The Daily Collegian

Successor to THE FREE LANCE, est. 1867

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

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

DAVE JONES, Editor

VINCE DRAYNE, Business Mgr.

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Night editor, Dick Anglestein; Copy editors, Ann Leh, Bill Ollendike; Assistants, Jeannine Vandeuken, Ann Saylor, Dave Bronstein, Don Shoemaker. Ad staff: Eli Arenberg, Cindy Manarin.

A Prominent Visitor: Let Him Relax

Today is the first time the campus is graced with the presence of a President of the United States. We would like to see it happen more often.

The attitude of the student body can be a major factor in deciding whether or not he will return or how often he returns. The students should remember that the President decided to come to State College for relaxation. State College as well as the rest of Centre County is a good place to relax. Students can help to keep it that way in the President's mind.

He is not coming to the College to make public appearances. Curious crowds, however, can turn a relaxing trip into a situation most nearly representing a public appearance.

The man with the most responsible job in the world is human, despite the ideas presented by political cartoonists. He is not a public curiosity, but a man who honestly desires the peace and quiet of private relaxation.

We are not trying to discourage interest in our government. To have that interest, par-

ticularly with the added stimulus of the head of that government in our presence, is natural and commendable. However, we must not let that interest drive us to making the President uncomfortable.

He has the right to walk about the campus and town without a crowd following him just the same as any resident. If he is seen, a simple greeting such as would be given to any respected person will undoubtedly help him feel more at ease.

By using the simplest of common courtesy, the students can go a long way toward making the President's visit a relaxing and happy one.

If the President is allowed to relax, he will probably feel more inclined to return to State College. This possibility becomes closer when it is thought that he may be having his farmhouse near Gettysburg renovated to provide him with a summer White House. If that is the case, he will be spending more time closer to State College than in the past.

If students restrain themselves now, the chances for having the President with us more often undoubtedly will increase.

—Dick Rau

Compensation System Should Be Studied

The dispute over the \$15 compensation for student council presidents proposed in All-College Cabinet's 1953-54 budget has brought the entire question of student compensation to the fore.

All-College officers, class officers, committee chairmen, and even committee members are paid out of students funds. The latest proposal—that of compensating council presidents—was protested, and not because that particular group does any less work or puts in any less time than other compensated leaders. Rather, the protest was against the idea of payment where payment is unnecessary.

The budget includes \$15 for student council presidents. It also includes a similar amount and more for some committee chairmen. We wonder how the salaries are evaluated when considering that a council president's job runs constantly through the year, and a committee chairman's work burden falls within a period of a few weeks or months.

Students who are paid are obviously not always the ones doing the most work. For instance, the Junior Prom committee members last year were paid \$10. The Junior Class Week committee, fully responsible for the week's activities, received nothing. One committee was willing to work without money. And there's every reason to believe that the other group would have done the same.

It has been argued that compensation will

encourage a higher caliber of leadership. This seems hardly plausible, since some students don't realize their chairmanships are paid jobs until after they accept them. Most people in activities aren't looking for monetary reward, and would stick with their extracurricular interests just as much without it.

Those looking for the monetary reward are hardly the leaders wanted. Compensating student leaders could very well put a monetary value on their positions to the point where they might forget their original goals. Jane Mason, Home Economic Student Council president, posed the question of whether these positions would be considered "activities or employment."

Activities, obviously, offer many advantages other than monetary. The personal satisfaction, contacts, reference value, and prestige would certainly be enough to hold the best people to the biggest jobs regardless of salary.

By the time a student reaches a compensated position, he already has held other responsible non-paying posts. And his accepting further salaried responsibilities was hardly determined by the money that goes with them.

Student money is going into the pockets of some leaders without justification. Before it is expanded the compensation system should go over the coals until a standard, answerable system is established.

—Baylee Friedman

V. Supreme Court Would Hear All Appeals

(This is the last in a series of five editorials designed to outline and explain the proposal for a Supreme Court in Penn State's judicial system.)

To understand the proposed procedure for the revamped Penn State judicial system, picture first a diagram with the Senate committee on student affairs and student government on an equal plane at the top, with authority coming down to the proposed Supreme Court. Under the Supreme Court extends the judicial system with Tribunal and Judicial foremost, and under them the Joint Customs Board, the Freshman Regulations Board, a traffic court, the Interfraternity Council Board of Control, and the Board of Review of the Association of Independent Men.

One of the most important points to remember when considering this new plan is that all cases except those of purely routine nature, such as traffic violation, customs violations, and violations of women's freshman regulations, would be screened through the offices of the dean of men and dean of women. This is an important factor in providing for a continuity of procedure so badly needed by the current judicial system.

The deans' offices would handle privately all cases of mental and moral nature, but with the right of appeal permitted. All other cases would be directed by the deans to the proper court, depending on the nature of the violation, its severity, and the place in which it occurred.

Under this setup, the AIM Judicial Board of Review would handle individual and group dormitory regulations, while the IFC Board of Control would concern itself with individual and group fraternity regulations.

Tribunal would handle appeals from the AIM and IFC bodies, appeals from the traffic court, appeals of men from the Joint Customs Board, and violations of All-College regulations. Judicial would take jurisdiction over appeals of women from the Joint Customs Board, appeals from the Freshman Regulations Board, and violations of women's dormitory regulations.

The Supreme Court would hear appeals from the offices of the dean of men and

women, appeals from Tribunal and Judicial, and cases of a more severe nature not given to the lower courts. These would include cases of dishonesty, academic and otherwise, and violations of borough ordinances.

The current plan proposed that the Supreme Court be composed of the chairman of Tribunal, chairman of Judicial, chairman of the AIM Board of Review, chairman of the IFC Board of Control, dean of men, dean of women, director of student affairs, and chairman of the Senate committee on student affairs. In addition, the dean of the school in which the student was enrolled and the student's counsel would be present at the Supreme Court sessions, but would have no vote. In cases of appeals, the chairman of the body from which the appeal was being made would have no vote.

The report of the judicial investigating committee is still in the working stage. Undoubtedly some changes will be necessary before the final plan can be put into operation. But from the point of view of all concerned, the Supreme Court idea is needed and desirable. It can be one of the greatest things to hit Penn State in a long time.

—Dave Pellnitz
Retiring Editor

Gazette...

May 9, 1953

FENCING CLUB, 1 p.m., Rec Hall.

May 10, 1953

COLLEGIAN BUSINESS STAFF, senior board meeting, 7:30 p.m., 8 Carnegie.

COLLEGE HOSPITAL

James Beatty, Octavio Cano, Richard Dempster, Ariana Dickson, John Epler, Joanne Frazier, Joseph Gower, Benjamin Kreider, Lee Kummer, June Larson, Abing Sorriatmadja, Ward Wheatall and Donald Ziegler.

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Lillian Taylor Camp, Pittsburgh, will interview men and women May 14.

Men wanted for waiters.

Men wanted for garden and lawn work, house cleaning and odd jobs.

Little Man on Campus By Bibler



"Class—Mr. Harrison, here, tells me someone is slugging the phone with wooden nickels."

Intellectual Reviewer

The Citronella Circuit

By CHIZ MATHIAS

With the opening Thursday night of Will Shakespeare's "Merry Wives of Windsor," one of his less notable works, we rebelled and decided to hang up our Playbill for awhile and let the younger generation take over. Now that we've got a full time job—copy editor—we've decided to devote our time to copy reading and writing columns (it says here in tempo medium ital). So we put our dissecting needles back in formaldehyde and made up our minds to see this show, not as the cynical critic, but as the naive playgoer seeking escape and a few hours relaxation. Ha!

Reading Ed Reiss' review brought back memories of not too long ago when we sat in the audience waiting sadistically for someone to miss a cue or else scrutinizing scenery for cracks and costumes for missing buttons. The part of "Drama Critic" is a fascinating game, a chess match in which the Player knocks himself out in a vain attempt to score, while the Critic sits back non possumus until the Player is prostrate and then rallies forth like a triumphant ghoul to scream, "Checkmate, the king is dead!"

Actually the reviewer's lot is one of pure martyrdom. It is impossible to please everyone. The critic becomes a scapegoat for both the disillusioned actor whose dreams of stage glory are often shattered and the disappointed audience member who may feel his time and money have been wasted. If one says the play is good he is patronizing. Dare to criticize it and it's not safe to venture out alone at night. Be indifferent and you're called stagnant.

Players are a clever bunch. Over in the upper levels of Schwab everyone of any consequence is referred to by initials. Its really quite bohemian and very chic. Mr. Cloetingh is Mr. C. and Mr. Reifsnider is Mr. R. Players' retiring president Fran Stridinger dubbed us IR—the intellectual reviewer. To other cast members of plays we reviewed we were usually more affectionately termed the SOB.

After the opening of "Amphitryon 38," an ex-Queen Bee of Players called us up around 8 o'clock the next morning to inform us she didn't like our review, or us either, as a matter of fact. Then we had to drag out the old standby and explain how reviews are not written to please anyone in particular, especially ex-Queens of Players.

Too often newspaper readers jump the throttle and complain that Daily Collegian reviewers suffer from a bad case of "sour grapes." One hackneyed bit of misinformation repeated among victims of the critic's ax is "Don't pay any attention to Collegian writers. I hear they tried out for Players and didn't make the grade."

A reviewer has no cause for bitterness. He gets to see plays even celluloid fights back!

gratis and can even take his date to boot. Of course it's sometimes difficult explaining to her why you have to leave in the middle of a show to make a printer's deadline, and if she becomes absorbed in the play it might be necessary to drag her out bodily or abandon her.

Sometimes we run into a sympathetic soul who agrees with us—at least partially. One girl told us she lost interest in "A Phoenix Too Frequent" and when the play bogged down in the middle as we said it did (collapses like a punctured balloon—Mathias, Collegian) she counted the pearls on the heroine's dress and got only 372 instead of the 500 we wrote about in a previous story!

And then there was the great "Lute Song" controversy in which we received the usual poison pen letters, extortion threats, and even a pat on the back (although we were accused of writing it ourselves under a pseudonym.) We were all perplexed by the play, but a letter from a "Super Messiah" shed the light and told us the score. The Collegian editor hadn't received so much fan mail since Robert (Sealing Wax and Cabbages) Landis wrote an editorial on religion. Safety Valve had a field day, fraternity men bet on the outcome and everybody looked forward to the next day's installments like a Captain Video serial.

It all started when we saw Elsa Lanchester make a fool of herself in "Private Music Hall" when we were covering Community Forum. We remember dashing down the steps of Schwab at 10:15 to make a 10:30 deadline. Then the city editor sent us out to the Splinterville Review, which we covered without any savage letters to the editor. Then we learned that when you travel with the crowd you become lost in it and no one knows you exist, but throw a monkey wrench into the works, defy society, and soon everyone is screaming your name.

Reviewing is an intriguing sport, but at the end of the semester we find we've got battle fatigue. So we decided to give it all up and stick to the movies. But what happens? The first thing we see is "House of Wax" filmed in the third dimension—even celluloid fights back!