

No '10 White House right move

A mob of 110,000 standing together dressed in white means something.

It means giving the Nittany Lions that edge in a close match up.

It means pulling fans together to sing "Hey Baby."

It means striking fear in the hearts of that opposing team.

It's the reason Penn State fans have been called the best in the land.

And this season, the Penn State Athletic Department made the right call by not having a "White House" game.

A White House, which is on its way to becoming a tradition at Beaver Stadium, is a designated game

that calls on all who attend to wear white in support of the Nittany Lions. At last year's White House, the Iowa Hawkeyes defeated the Nittany Lions in a disappointing evening-game loss.

The athletic department chose not to cheapen the tradition this year. There is no reason to have a White House game if the home schedule does not warrant it. Yes, the team does have some exciting match-ups ahead this season (Alabama, anyone?). Unfortunately, though, student fans will have to pack a bag and jump in their car to see those games in person.

Beaver Stadium will still strike fear, it will still be loud. But no need to pull out the big guns at home this season.

This decision ultimately shows that the athletic department is not pushing the White House game just as a marketing tool. The decision-makers have realized that not only does the promotion bring in money, the White House effect gives the Lions a 12th man on the field.

And if nothing else, the long wait for another White House will surely be paid off in the 2011 season.

The Crimson Tide won't be able to see anything but white.

blog lines

ABOVE THE NET

MVB rules change coming

Soon, every point will count just a little bit more.

At its annual summer meeting, the NCAA Men's Volleyball Committee voted to make the number of points required to win sets 25 points instead of 30, effective in the 2011 season.

The rule is not officially implemented yet — it still needs final approval from the NCAA Playing Rules Oversight Panel (PROP). However, in an e-mail, committee chairman Brian Summers said that approval will "likely come later this summer."

The proposed change comes in response to a coaches' survey the committee sends out each year to all Division I, II and III institutions.

This year's survey was e-mailed to 89 coaches shortly after the conclusion of the 2010 season. ... Of the 65 coaches who responded, 64.6 percent voted in favor of 25 points, while the remaining 35.4 percent opted to stay with 30 points. ...

Emily Kaplan
Men's volleyball reporter

BLOGGING, KICKING AND SCREAMING

U.S. U-20 team advances

The United States is moving on.

Just like the men's national team, the U-20 women's team defeated South Korea 1-0 to win its group in its final game of the World Cup and will advance to the next level of play in Bielefeld, Germany. The United States will face Nigeria at 5:30 a.m. Sunday.

Christine Nairn, a sophomore midfielder at Penn State, got her third straight start for the Americans while incoming freshman Maya Hayes got her second consecutive starting nod. The United States scored on a 21st minute Sydney Leroux goal.

... The win helps the United States' path to the finals as they avoid a quarter-finals match with rival Mexico. Should they advance, the Americans would also avoid Germany and North Korea. ...

Andrew Robinson
Sports co-editor

Read more of The Daily Collegian's blogs at psucollegian.com/blogs.

The Daily Collegian

Elizabeth Murphy
Editor in Chief

Kelsey Thompson
Business Manager

About the Collegian: The Daily Collegian and The Weekly Collegian are published by Collegian Inc., an independent, nonprofit corporation with a board of directors composed of students, faculty, and professionals. Pennsylvania State University students write and edit both papers and solicit advertising for them. During the fall and spring semesters as well as the second six-week summer session, The Daily Collegian publishes Monday through Friday. Issues are distributed by mail to other Penn State campuses and individual subscribers.

Complaints: News and editorial complaints should be presented to the editor. Business and advertising complaints should be presented to the business manager.

Who we are

The Daily Collegian's editorial opinion is determined by its Board of Opinion, with the editor holding final responsibility. The letters and columns expressed on the editorial pages are not necessarily those of The Daily Collegian, Collegian Inc., or The Pennsylvania State University. Collegian Inc., publishers of The Daily Collegian and related publications, is a separate corporate institution from Penn State. Editorials are written by The Daily Collegian Board of Opinion.

Members are: Kevin Cirilli, Jenna Ekdahl, Bill Landis, Elizabeth Murphy, Laura Nichols, Edgar Ramirez, Andrew Robinson, Heather Schmelzlen, Jared Shanker, Katie Sullivan, Alex Weisler, Steph Witt and Chris Zook.

Letters

We want to hear your comments on our coverage, editorial decisions and the Penn State community.

■ **E-mail**
collegianletters@psu.edu

■ **Online**
www.psu.collegian.com

■ **Postal mail/In person**
123 S. Burrowes St.
University Park, PA 16801

Letters should be about 200 words. Student letters should include class year, major and campus. Letters from alumni should include year of graduation. All writers should provide their address and phone number for verification. Letters should be signed by no more than two people. Members of organizations must include their titles if the topic they write about is connected with the aim of their groups. The Collegian reserves the right to edit letters. The Collegian cannot guarantee publication of all letters it receives. Letters chosen also run on The Daily Collegian Online and may be selected for publication in The Weekly Collegian. All letters become property of Collegian Inc.



Economical city living tops wasteful suburban life

By Andrew Metcalf

It's fairly undisputed that the suburbs aren't particularly green places.

Heating and cooling costs, which make up the lion's share of utility bills, are far higher in a self-standing house than in an apartment or row house. Lawn maintenance requires an exorbitant amount of water and runoff from fertilizer pollutes our streams and rivers. Public transit is practically non-existent, especially in outer ring suburbs. Cars are required to get anywhere useful, because suburbs typically exist away from commercial and community centers. The sheer amount of land required is absurd and wasteful given the population density.

So why do people choose to live there? Though the perfectly tamed lawns and unnaturally silent soundscape of suburbia creeps me out, I suppose I can see why it appeals to some.

Living in suburbia means you get a big house and a big lawn, something you could never afford in a city. It means you're less likely to

encounter an insane homeless person walking down your block screaming epithets. It means that whenever you choose to go to sleep, you probably won't be interrupted by noise. Essentially, it means you get a lot of space to yourself.

But there are tradeoffs for your space. Your commute to work is far longer than if you lived closer to a city. The amount you save by living away from the city quickly vanishes paying for utilities and gas. Shopping for groceries more likely entails driving to a strip mall or a big box store than walking down a nice pedestrian boulevard. Coordinating the transportation to go out for a night on the town requires logistical heavy lifting.

You'll notice I've excluded rural living from this critique, the reason being that people who live in rural areas, such as farmers, usually do because their livelihood also takes place there. The notion of suburbia seems to have developed as a way to keep your work life far away from your home life. I suppose this is designed to make being at home feel like a relaxing place where your boss can't reach you, but today's technology has made that notion completely unreal.

This column may be slightly behind the times. Many young professionals see accessibility, conven-

ience and sustainability as more important than private space and are choosing to live in cities. But what about when these professionals grow older and start families?

Many see suburbs as a better environment in which to raise children. I'll admit, I've always appreciated the perhaps overly cynical "American Beauty" vision of suburbia — a pristine and perfect appearance covering up a dark and depressing reality. That's probably overly grim, but at the same time suburbs certainly have not managed to avoid as many urban vices — drugs, crime, bad influences on children — as they set out to.

And really, what is so bad about raising children in a city? Yes, they might encounter our aforementioned screaming homeless person, but they also can experience so much more by simply walking or biking near their home. They don't have to wait until they're old enough to drive to explore their neighborhood and see restaurants, museums or movies. It's possible they'll witness a fight or get involved in drugs, but those same risks are involved in simply sending them to school. I grew up in a city, and I don't think I turned out any worse than my suburban friends.

Perhaps suburbia isn't the horrible place that auteur Hollywood

directors portray, but it's no social Mecca either. Given its incredibly negative environmental ramifications, I think it's an unrealistic and shortsighted part of the American dream. We can't keep converting unused land into low-density suburbs: It destroys the natural beauty of the land, requires large amounts of resources to landscape and build and feeds into an unsustainable and expensive lifestyle.

Obviously, not everyone can live in the core of cities. They're already crowded and the upfront costs are often prohibitively expensive, even if they're cheaper in the long run.

But why can't we develop in a similar high-density transit-oriented fashion directly outside of cities, encouraging pedestrian traffic and attracting interesting businesses? Why, instead, do we choose huge, car-dependent suburban developments far away from cities with a density too low to attract anything but large stores with huge surface parking lots?

It makes no sense, and it's a trend I hope to see reversed not just by young professionals, but by people of all ages.

Andrew Metcalf is a senior majoring in computer science and is the Collegian's Thursday columnist. His e-mail address is adm5129@psu.edu.