The short time remaining becomes more and more harrowing when one considers that most of these exhibits for the day will still be far from being ready for public ogling.

Next week will mark the beginning of the summer's theoretical coursework. The students have billed it as the 'serenity' of the summer. And despite the absence of complete exhibits, the Open House Committee decided that April 27, a high spot in History's glory.

To do this, the members of the Committee need the immediate and full cooperation of every student, every professor, every department, every student.

There is a serious danger, however, in an atmosphere of enthusiasm where the Open House could easily degenerate into a three-ring circus as a result of well-intentioned efforts.

For the Tech submarine, the technology museum, the Van de Graaff generator, the presentation of its work, and not a sensitized chaos of scientific melodrama, it is necessary for every member of the student body to be in enthusiastic cooperation with the Open House Committee.

DIVERSITY OF IDEAS

In our present system of higher education it is as functions in the universities and colleges of this country the professor is the keystone in the educational arch. From college the student obtains ideas which are usually held by that man alone and which shape the course of the student's learning.

We can gain a clear insight as to what we know it today is in the diversity of ideas to which a student is consciously and unconsciously subjected while he is in college. In any particular field a student has the opportunity to study under several different men and to profit from the differences of their interpretations of a certain subject.

Moreover, the very attractiveness of a course should be in its diversity of concepts as displayed by the men in the department. To many students it is merely an appeal of personal interest, which makes it particularly interesting, whereas the intellectual unlikeliness in thought and opinion should determine the worth of a course.

The Silver-conjurer, the drama lecturers, the eccentric professor may afford interesting variations of character and personality, but the educational value of their courses can only be determined in their intellectual diversity.

But how does one profit from this diversity? One cannot accept all of these conflicting viewpoints. There are cases where a student decides that one man presents a more interesting standard than another and sides with the former. Such a method of decision is absurd. The real profit from the faculty's ideas lies in the elimination of any of these interpretations, subsequent confusion, and finally in the formation of one's own opinion on, possibly, any given subject.

—The Amber Staff
February 29, 1940

THE READER SPEAKS

April 8, 1940

Editor, The Tech:

Your attention to the lack of thought and common sense which is evident in the letter of Dennis N. L. Larcher and M. E. Groundwater, which appeared in the Tech of April 2nd and April 5th, shows that all the vigorous progres against your editorial stance and Without were written exclusively by persons of the Open House Service.

I think it only natural that those men directly concerned with the Dingler Service—men who really realize the difficulties of efforts to accept different tastes and know of the smiling, serene efforts of the Dingler Service to satisfy everyone—feel somewhat that the construction of a bulletin would include the duties of the Dingler Service in the face of gross inaccuracies and mistakes of fact.

Your friends, Larcher and Groundwater are axious for more future comment on the Dingler Service from people who have been in contact with the authors of Brooks and Without. If they need to only observe these men who specialize in "knowledge" in any, this is only because they lack communication with other people who take pride in being the best informed. Men specializing in Dingler's "Is just plain no good."

Sincerely yours
P. F. WALKOWSKI, Jr.