

Nebraskan Editorials:

The Proposition: Either/Or

Saturday morning, the Board of Regents will discuss the recent demotion of C. Clyde Mitchell as chairman of the department of agricultural economics.

Usual procedure is that such an administrative action is officially approved with little or no discussion—and no questions asked.

However, the consideration of Mitchell's replacement should be another matter.

First of all, the eventual announcement of his demotion was one of the most shamefully mis-handled "administrative matters" in its history. After deftly playing off reporters for two weeks with a variety of half-truths and manicured press releases, the administration finally announced—to the surprise of no one—that they were "seeking a replacement for Mitchell."

Secondly, Mitchell's reputation and performance as a professor and as an administrator has been top rate—as attested to in letters by his own colleagues Kris Kristianson, Ernie Feder and Clayton Libeau; physics professor Herbert Jehle, and such men as Lauren Soth, editorial page editor of the Des Moines Register; Leon Keyserling, former chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, and Don

Murphy, associate editor of the widely read "Wallace's Farmer."

Moreover, Mitchell is a nationally recognized authority on agricultural economics, having written in nationally circulated publications, testified before several Congressional committees on farm policy and related subjects and now lecturing to a select group of agricultural experts in a United Nations program in Rome, Italy.

Certainly, Mitchell can return as a professor, but the effect of his demotion is an official discouragement of his actions and his views and will in turn encourage him—as it will other fine professors of his caliber—to look for a job elsewhere.

Further, it adds to the ever-growing argument that the University is weakening to the pressures of conservative political elements in the state.

In the interests of the students, faculty and people who support this institution, in the interests of academic freedom, fair play and common decency, in the interests of responsible University administration, the Board of Regents cannot overlook the student petition which has been submitted to them in the cause of Mitchell. —B. B.

An All-Student Decision

The all-student election Monday will decide the possible future of a student tribunal and an honor system at this University.

No matter how much research went into the endorsement of the tribunal by the Student Council, nor how many editorials have been run on the subject in The Nebraskan, the final decision has been put into the hands of the student body. A tribunal and/or an honor system would most directly affect the students; thus they are given the right to decide if anything further should be done.

Only two possible results can come out of the election Monday—either the student body votes in favor of a tribunal, thus giving the Council the right to draw up a plan to be offered to the Administration, or the whole idea will be voted down and dropped.

For the last three weeks The Nebraskan has run a series of editorials explaining the tribunal system, and the honor system. These editorials include the functions, purpose and administration of such systems, according to information received from other schools.

Essentially this information boiled down to a student tribunal authorized by the school to try cases of encroachment of school regulations by students. All decisions of punishment can be appealed to the school administration. The main purposes of tribunal systems, and honor systems, are to give students a bigger hand in their own affairs, and a greater sense of pride in their school and its rules.

For these reasons, The Nebraskan would like to see next year's Council have the opportunity to draw up plans for a student tribunal for this University. It would mean an expansion of student government, and a healthy one. When students have more of a hand in their affairs, they are less likely to object to how they are governed.

This election would not definitely establish a tribunal on the campus, it would only allow further steps to be taken toward what looks to be a good thing.—F.T.D.

First Time For Everything

The University embarks today on its first "All University" weekend—Spring Day and Ivy Day.

Although Ivy Day has been a tradition on the campus for more than half a century, this year is the first time its scope has been widened to the point where every member of the University community can be involved, if he wishes.

The coming of the carnival to the Union parking lot Thursday was the first tangible evidence to students that there would be a Spring Day. With a ferris wheel and other points of interest rising above the campus landscape, there could hardly be any student that didn't know what was happening.

The bleachers have already been erected on the hallowed Ivy Day grounds, and men's and

women's choruses are in the last stages of practicing their songs. Ivy Day is pending. As a sign in the Crib says, "It's later than you think."

The athletic events have been organized by the N Club and the championship trophies have been on display in the Union lobby all week. Campus organizations footed the bill on the trophies and ribbons, thus saving the Student Council money.

The Union has scheduled its annual Birthday Party Dance, and prices will be lowered in the Crib. A barbeque will be held on the Mall at noon.

The stage is set. The props are all in place. The only thing remaining to make the weekend successful is the cast—the University. The University, in this case, is the student body.—F.T.D.

'Administrative Suppression'

Challenge Faces Nebraska Faculty

By BRUCE BRUGMANN Editor

Edmund Burns once said that he was confronted with a situation "upon which it was difficult to speak and impossible to remain silent."

Such is the situation in which many University department chairmen, former department chairmen and professors find themselves.

In talking with close to 50 professors—representing a cross-section of 15 departments at the University—The Nebraskan has learned that the Mitchell case is not an isolated instance but part of a definite pattern which seems to discourage the liberal, independent professors, especially those who hold administrative positions, from discussing issues of a controversial nature.

These faculty members have told us that: (1) the morale of the Arts and Sciences College has never been lower; (2) the spirit of academic freedom and the right of free expression has been gravely endangered in many cases; (3) the professional competence of many fine professors has been purposely slandered; (4) many excellent instructors have left and will

be leaving the University for more freedom; (5) Nebraska is rapidly gaining the reputation in professional circles as a conservative institution which not only fails to encourage its more liberal professors but does not stand behind them when their views or positions are under attack. These are serious accusations, but they are all the more serious when they come from so many directions, when they can be applied to so many individual cases, when they are attested to by nearly 50 individual faculty members—all of whom point to specific cases where tenure privileges have been manipulated, where certain salaries have failed to increase, where departmental appropriations have been cut back, where impossible work loads have been assessed, where qualified candidates have been denied admittance to the graduate faculty, where speeches and articles have been specially edited, where a certain professor is called "difficult; hard to get along with; radical," etc. The problem which remains before us is: "What can be done?"

The answer is simple. When Dr. David Riesman visited the campus, he told me that this kind of situation had developed in many other universities, which he had visited. "There's only one way to beat it," he said. "When a chancellor is faced on one side by outstate pressures and on the other by mass retaliation of the faculty, there is but one way he can turn." And he's right. The strength of a University lies in its faculty; and if it cannot be kept strong, alert and active the lifeblood of its curriculum slowly ebbs away. One faculty member told me recently that even though he had several job offers from other schools—at twice the pay—he had stayed at Nebraska because he thought he would have freedom. "Now that that's gone," he said, "there's nothing left here for me." This chilling remark typifies the toughest challenge with which the faculty at the University has been faced in recent years. The future and integrity of the University of Nebraska depends on how it is met.

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS by Dick Bibler



"I WISH HE COULD BE LIKE OTHER PROFS AN' JUST LAUGH AT THE WRONG ANSWERS"

Lowell Vestal

Vestal Endorses Fusionist Party

Monday is the day. Monday is Student Council Election Day. On Monday you will go to the polls (I hope) and vote for one, two or three persons to represent your college on the Council.

In years past it has been done this way: If you belong to a Greek organization you will vote or be fined if you do not. If you are independent you will not vote and then complain all year that you are being persecuted, discriminated against, etc.

Will it be done that way this year? It is up to you. The usual independent excuse has always been: "My vote won't make any difference since the independent vote is hopelessly split."

You cannot use that one anymore. With the coming of the Fusionist party there is now a selected group of candidates which represents the best persons regardless of affiliation.

The Fusionist party is not an independent party; nor is it a Greek party. It was founded by a group

of independent leaders who feel that Council members should be elected on personal qualifications and issues instead of IFC backing.

For several years the IFC has presented a slate, assumedly made up from the best that Greekdom has to offer. The Fusionist party feels that Greekdom's best is not good enough for the University.

The Fusionists do not say that all IFC candidates are bad choices; if they felt this way they would not have endorsed two men already on the IFC slate.

But a good slate is not enough. The best slate is worthless without enthusiastic voters to support it. That's where you come in. Whether you are Greek, organized independent or "independent independent," it is your duty to vote for the best candidate.

If you are tired of a "do-nothing" Council, the Fusionist party invites you to give it a try; the results may much better. In case you have forgotten, here



Roger Hahl Ellen Smith Wins War With Council

I've been walking under the shadow of the gibbet all week since my last column "sniping at the big boys." I have worked up a public statement saying it was all "ridiculous"; it's a lie; I never said nothin'; the paper put me up to it.

Then I found out that I didn't need those things, since everybody I've talked to—the downtrodden

My Bootless Cries

students in the sewers—has agreed that the Administration deserves it.

I have been doing a lot of research since last week, as I always do for these columns, and it has come to my attention that the Student Council was recently gelded by some faculty organization. The "older boys" decided that there was no sense in encourag-

ing high standards in scholarship—it would be unseemly around this school—so they denied the Student Council the right to demand a 5.7 average for activity officers. Since that is practically all the Council has done this year, it leaves them about as helpless as a jellyfish on a basketball court.

This is, my many spies tell me, an important victory for Ellen Smith Hall. They have been worming against the Council authority for several weeks now, tilting gallantly by insulting several girls and generally proving that chivalry had died of an excess of bile.

It seems a little odd to me that the IFC is interested in putting themselves directly under a faculty committee which has been notoriously hostile to fraternities.

It may be advisable to avert student politicking by avoiding the Student Council, but it's a step into the fire to put the IFC under faculty politicians.

Further, I imagine that the University will have to be nicer to the Council now, since any campus without a Student Council looks like one in which there is no effective student government.

And that, of course, is not at all the case here. I think.

It Happened At NU

The editor of the Lincoln Journal devoted his column Thursday to refuting a Nebraska letterip written by a former University agricultural extension economist.

However, he talked about a poultry specialist who left the University because he was told "... the University didn't have funds enough to have one man in agricultural economics exclusively on poultry."

The editor refers here not to Dr. Clayton Libeau, former associate extension specialist in marketing organization and author of the letter, but to Dr. Paul Clayton, assistant extension economist and poultry specialist, who left the University at the same time.

Obviously, the poultry specialist—Paul Clayton—"made none of the accusations he makes now." He didn't write the letter.

Nebraskan Letterip—Challenging Point Of View

To the Editor: I was surprised to learn that Dr. C. Clyde Mitchell is being replaced as head of the department of agricultural economics at the University of Nebraska.

You have asked for my opinion of Dr. Mitchell's professional stature. I consider Dr. Mitchell exceptionally well qualified professionally. I have known him and his work for a number of years and have a great deal of respect for his ability, integrity and understanding of his fields.

I think Dr. Mitchell has brought a challenging and stimulating point of view to the field of agricultural economics in the Midwest. Though I do not agree with Dr. Mitchell on many issues of economic policy, I respect his point

of view and the scholarly basis for his position.

You also asked me to comment on the effect of the University administration bowing to outside pressure in this case. I know nothing of that and so am not competent to comment.

I know nothing of the reasons which the university administration may have had for removing Dr. Mitchell from the chairmanship of the department of agricultural economics.

However, if this action should result in Dr. Mitchell leaving the University, I think it would be a serious loss to the Nebraska and to the state of Nebraska. Lauren Soth Editor of the editorial pages Des Moines Register.

No Qualified Comment

To the editor: I have been closely associated with Professor Clyde Mitchell for a number of years in the agriculture committee of the National Planning Association.

In that group, Mitchell has been notable for his stimulating ideas and for the remarkable volume of work he has turned out in his particular field.

It has seemed to me that Nebraska has been fortunate in having a man like Mitchell to keep farmers and college people aware of new problems and of the need of new methods to deal with these problems.

In economics, a man who has new ideas is always bound to get into trouble. Unless an economist is careful to lag behind the average attitudes of his state, there

will be some who will be offended by suggestions which may be orthodox and respectable in 10 years time but are not so now.

Some groups are always likely to say: "This man doesn't agree with us. Therefore, he should be demoted or fired."

My own feeling is that there will always be an oversupply of conservative economists. We need to cherish the independent spirits who look for new ideas and who aren't afraid to go against the current.

Incidentally, the bitter joke in this situation is that probably Clyde has more support out in the country for his ideas now than in any time since he came to Nebraska.

Donald R. Murphy, Associate Editor of Wallace's Farmer

Independent Spirit

To the Editor: I have received your letter of April 23rd. While I have the very highest regard for Clyde Mitchell, both as an economist and as a person, and while I would not like to see him removed from the splendid contribution that he is making as a teacher to the better understanding of agricultural economics,

I do not feel that I am in a position where I can participate in the discussion of whether or not he should be chairman of a particular department at a particular university.

I note from the materials which

you have sent me, if they are correct, that the current issue does not involve Dr. Mitchell's tenure as a member of the faculty or his independence as a teacher.

Personally, as a friend and admirer of Clyde Mitchell, I hope that he is retained as chairman of the department, but I would not feel qualified to participate in a controversy on this particular issue.

Leon Keyserling, Former Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers

ME's Win E-Week

To the Editor: Although Wednesday's Rag made no mention of the fact, the mechanical engineering students won the overall Engineers' Week competition last Friday.

Months of effort in several fields, including the building of a downtown window display, sales of banquet tickets, E-Week ribbons and athletic competition contributed towards the winning of this plaque.

The ME's earned the most prized award of Engineers' Week and they deserve recognition for it in our campus news sheet.

The winners of fellowships and

scholarships which were announced in the same story had no connection with Engineers' Week or the Engineering College. It was not fair either to the scholarship winners or to the E-Week participants for these two stories to be combined into one.

However, The Nebraskan seems so preoccupied with the fate of a convicted murderer and a demoted professor that it is no longer able to report campus news accurately or thoroughly.

Crusades are a fine thing, but how about squeezing some news space in between them. A Disgruntled Engineering Student

The Nebraskan

FIFTY-FIVE YEARS OLD Member: Associated Collegiate Press Intercollegiate Press Representative: National Advertising Service, Incorporated Published at 15th & B University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska

EDITORIAL STAFF Editor: Bruce Bruggmann Assistant Editor: Fred Daily Managing Editor: Sam Jones News Editor: Judy Reed Sports Editor: Max Eastman Copy Editors: Don Clark, Arlene Strick, Barb Sharp, Langston Switzer. As Editor: Wilfred Sebaste Night News Editor: Barbara Sharp Nebraska Staff Writers: Chas. Yacka, Walt Stone, Sam Jones, Walt Switzer, Bob Marler. Reporters: Nancy DeLong, Marianne Thompson, George Meyer, Bob Witz, Dick Falsoner, Jelle Doreth. BUSINESS STAFF Business Manager: George Madson Ad's Business Manager: Mark Neff, Bill Redwell, Charles Hoop, Don Bank Classified Manager: Elizabeth Standen