Daily Nebraskan

Property of
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln.

C. L. REIN
Editor-in-Chief

Managing Editor Kenneth M. Snyder
Associate Editor John L. Cutright
Associate Editor C. Neil Brown
Associate Editor Elizabeth Mason
Literary Editor.....Chandler Trimble

Business Manager.....C. C. Buchanan
Assistant Manager.....J. L. Driscoll

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE $2 PER YEAR
Payable in Advance
Single Copies, 5 Cents Each.

TELEPHONES
Office—B-1888. Night Phone—B-4204
Editor B-1518 Manager B-1821

Entered at the postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class mail matter, under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Tuesday, Feb. 11, 1913

REMOVAL.

When we took this job we promised favor of University removal. Now we go back on this promise. We find after reading practically everything that has been written on removal that the arguments on both sides are inconclusive. The arguments for removal are as plausible and encouraging to the removalistt as are the arguments for high tariff to the protectionist. The arguments against removal are as plausible and encouraging to the extensionist as are the arguments for a revenue tariff to the free-trader. The Report of the Board of Regents contains all the material allegations that have since been added to the plea for removal.

O. W. Miller's article, published in last Thursday's forum, is equally comprehensive in embracing all that can possibly be said against removal. For ought that we can see in the Productions of the Regents or Mr. Miller, the removal question is undebatable.

You can't prove that students will be better off or worse off a mile from O street—Miller's "outer world." You can't prove that any more students will work their way through school after removal than before removal. You can't prove that the total amount earned by students will be greater after removal than before removal. You can't prove that University students will love the beautiful and appreciate the aesthetic any more after removal than before removal. You can't even prove that business Lincoln will be any better or any worse off after removal than before removal. So far as concerns any of these points upon which both sides have joined issue, you cannot by rational means reach any but a purely theoretical conclusion. We still insist that removal is undebatable.

One thing is undoubtedly certain. Removal concerns neither University students nor University professors. A student's yea or nay on the question of removal isn't worth the paper it is written on. A professor's pure theory is equally valueless. It is money out of no student's pocket, and it is money out of no professor's pocket whichever policy prevails. It is a question for the tax-payers of the state; the tax-payers who support both student and professor. It is also a question for the decision of the people's representatives in the legislature and one the board of regents. No student or professor who can't prove the advantage of either policy should waste either time or talk debating removal.

For those who know that the University's chief need is more money, one argument for removal is tolerably conclusive. Nebraska is an agricultural state, and its people are farmers. Nebraska is an agricultural state, and the members of its legislature are farmers. Nebraska is an agricultural state, and the people and their representaatives are especially anxious to appropriate money for agricultural education. For the last five years of the time during which the State Farm and the University have been separate institutions, half the appropriation for purposes of higher education has gone to the State Farm. Despite the fact that more students attend this campus than go to the Farm, and despite the fact that the College of Agriculture is really located here, this part of the University is poorer today than the State Farm. To stop the splitting of our appropriation, and to secure for the academic and professional branches of the University their just share of University money, consolidation is the policy we want.

Elsewhere in this issue we publish an anonymous letter informing us that we know we are not allowed to say what we think. The stuff is well-written, spicy, interesting. We gave most of it front page space. The rest of it we burned. We like that kind of talk. It accomplishes two good purposes; it advertises the Common Rumor; it probably interests our readers. The only thing we could ask of the writer is that he give us his name, and that he addresses his criticism not to us but to the Daily Nebraskan. We don't want to call the Student Publication Board names that are really intended for us.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Convocation
Memorial Hall
11 A. M.
Mr. Charles Hampden
and
Miss Alice Butler
of the
Bluebird Company.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

They Must All Go!!

Hart, Schaffner & Marx, Hirsh-Wickwire and R. B. Fashion Clothes---at Record-Breaking Prices, as we must have room for an enlarged Spring Stock. Our loss in profit can be your gain if you act before the sale closes

$35 and $30 Suits ..... **now $19.50**
$27.50 and $25.00 Suits ..... **now $16.50**
$22.50 and $20 Suits ..... **now $13.50**

Odd Pants--

Worth up to $3.50 ..... **now $1.85**
Worth up to $5 ..... **now $2.85**
Worth up to $6.50 ..... **now $3.85**
Worth up to $8 ..... **now $4.85**

ARMSTRONG CLOTHING CO.

GOOD CLOTHES MERCHANTS

Home Made Bread Six Loafs for 25c
COOKIES PIES CAKES

Dalrymple's
PURE FOOD CO.

Give us your next order for Punch.
We know we can suit you both in quality and in price.

AWGWAN

"Its Live"

THAT FIRST ISSUE WILL BE OUT

NEXT MONDAY, *AND YOU WANT IT!*

28 PAGES—

STUDENT STORIES

POINTED ARTICLES

KEEN CARTOONS

8 Issues for 50c

"Satisfy That Longing"

English Welts, $2.95

It's Shoes I'm talking . . .
The $5.00 and $6.00 kind
Both Tan and Black, Rock Oak Soles

BUDD, 1415 O St.