

Daily Nebraskan Editorials:

Last Stand

The University's budget comes to the floor of the Unicameral this week if the calendar of the legislative body does not get bogged down on unforsen business.

Of course the budget has taken a great amount of space this semester in the Daily Nebraskan and the big dailies of the state. It is natural that there should be much discussion of the amount of money the University will receive during the next two years since the future of the institution depends so greatly on receiving the "right" boost for the University.

The Daily Nebraskan has held that the bulk of the responsibility for supporting the University should not be directed towards the pocket-books of the students. Certainly a state University can no longer give free education as it might have dreamed of in days past.

The fact remains that the University needs a substantial increase over the amount which we were given by the Legislature two years ago.

If the University fails to receive the figure which the chancellor so desperately called for last semester it will not alter the facts.

We believe in a fair sense of play for the University. That is why the Daily Nebraskan supported the proposal of senator John Adams of Omaha who suggested that the Chancellor and the Regents appear before the Legislature and discuss the problems the school is facing and the need for an increase in tuition as well as the overall legislative appropriation.

That the Legislature was willing to listen to the officials of the University is no indication that the men who are representing the people of Nebraska are blind to the needs of the institution.

It might have been an indication that they would rather wait until the budget comes before the floor and debate it at that time.

On the other hand it might indicate that the representatives have made up their minds on the issue.

The Daily Nebraskan observes that since the colleges in Iowa received another tuition increase this year over and above the one which they so recently were hit with the thinking of legislators in general might be that state universities should be self-supporting.

We would prefer to think that the theory behind the land grant university—that of giving to the greatest number of people the best education at the lowest cost to the individual is still alive.

Little can be done by the Daily Nebraskan at this time to change the thinking of the Legislature. The Student Council spoke with the individual senators and outlined the problems of the University. The chancellor had repeated sessions with the budget committee and the governor attempting to explain the situation the school is faced with.

Now we must lay our case before the Legislature and pray that our needs will not be met by deaf ears.

It is essential that the University, if it is to survive the crisis in five major fields, must have a substantial increase in its budget. We looked closely at the figures the chancellor charted prior to giving our outright support to the budget. We trust that the legislators will observe and sympathize with the crisis in higher education.

Graduation

In three short weeks a large part of the University's student body will be graduated. Many will leave the school and even the state for good, and will never be seen or heard from again. Others will settle here, putting to good use, for the most part, the knowledge and training provided for them by the taxpayers of this state.

How many of these graduates will remember their University? It has become unfashionable in this age, perhaps, to be influenced by "old school ties," and to become nostalgic about the ivy that is slowly pulling apart the old brick buildings at dear old Siwash.

Most college students look to graduation as the welcome end to four or more years of toil and unaccustomed hard work. Many will never use their brains again—they are through with college and what it stands for—they have their degrees.

Only a few, perhaps, realize what they owe to their "alma mater." First, and to many this is the only meaningful thing, a university is the source of the coveted degree that is expected to open the doors of opportunity. True, but the degree is only a certificate indicating the individual has been exposed to a certain amount of knowledge. What is retained is up to the student.

Secondly, college life opens to those willing to be receptive a new scope of human relations. Here you must prove yourself to be capable of adapting to a somewhat intellectual society.

Finally, college gives the student the foundation for knowledge and skills he will apply later in life in his job or profession, and in his life.

No one can learn all he has to know in college: he only learns what there is to be known, and how to go about finding it out for himself and applying this knowledge in some useful, constructive way.

So, graduates, there is a lot you owe to the University. It is not perfection in intellectual achievement—that would be ridiculous to claim for any university. It does, however, give a student a start in life for which he will be eternally indebted.

It is up to him to do something about it.

Registration

The Daily Nebraskan observes that special checkers at the registration are looking carefully at the worksheets presented to them and asking the students who have not scheduled two-fifths of their classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays to rearrange their schedules.

During the last week we noted that one way to enforce the rule as it is written in the class calendars would be to scrutinize the worksheets with care.

Whether the Daily Nebraskan had any part in reviving this dying practice the fact remains that the registrations are leaving more of the valuable classes open to those who need to go to class at a specific time because of work or families.

We commend the rebirth of this ancient practice with vigor and encourage the checkers to take with pride the chides which sharpshooters fire when they are caught at schedule padding.

From The Editor's Desk:

A word or two

before you go...

By FRED DALY Editor

The re-birth of the Interfraternity Ball was a success, according to those in attendance. The crowd was large, the band good and the atmosphere adhering strictly to social standards set down by the University.

The reason the Ball was banned after the 1955 affair, and why it was not returned before this year, was because those same social standards had been violated overwhelmingly. This year fraternity presidents signed a pledge, inuring they would be responsible for the conduct of the members of their respective houses.

Apparently the signatures of those 24 presidents represented the good faith of every fraternity man attending the dance.

In putting on this dance the IFC relied upon and received the support of the fraternities. In allowing the dance to be held the Office of Student Affairs relied upon and received the same support.

The success of the 1957 Interfraternity Ball proves at least two things: fraternity men at the University are willing and able to uphold University rules on drinking, and

are capable of such responsibility; and secondly, you don't have to drink to have a good time.

Graduation comes in less than three weeks. It doesn't seem possible, after slugging it out academically and extracurricularly for four (or five, or etc.) years. It is something you have looked forward to as the logical conclusion of college, but when you get there you aren't quite sure what to do about it.

Is it for real—honest?

There is still the system to go through, of course: caps and gowns, speakers, hot June morning (it is always hot and sultry on graduation day, as a matter of tradition), relatives to see, etc. And, for some, there are commissioning ceremonies.

Now, son, you are graduated. You have the whole world ahead of you. And if you don't do a better job handling that world than your predecessors have done—tough.

So I'm graduated. Now what?

The service, that's what. Well, I suppose you're right. Only \$1 kickback on this cap and gown? Tough, again.

Look, everyone, I'm a College Graduate!

Good—now get to work and prove you are worth what is written on that little piece of paper.

Hey, look, I'm a college grad...

Son, you've only just started.

Remember when it used to be Springtime in May? The birds would yell around your window at dawn, and the sun would come out, and you could go swimming and picnicking and boating?

Remember when? It must have been great.

Note for posterity: The creator of the 13 Mystics which decorated the May 3 issue of the Daily Nebraskan has been found! Once known as an athlete, scholar and statesman, this brilliant figure has now invaded the realm of the arts.

He is none other than Robert Melville Cook, known to friend and foe as Bob.

He is not, however, 11 feet tall, as impressionable people insist after meeting him suddenly at dusk.

Weather reports say rain. Not really!



round the prickly pear...

—bruce brugmann

The views expressed by Daily Nebraskan columnists are their own and do not necessarily reflect the views of this paper.

Note: The Nebraskan has been told that the author of and all professors concerned in the following column will, if necessary, substantiate all statements of fact under oath. This column has been recently brought to the attention of Chancellor Clifford M. Hardin, Dean of Faculties Adam C. Breckenridge, and Dr. Harry Lloyd Weaver, chairman of the University Liaison Committee.

As the University Liaison Committee apparently plans to forego further investigation of the rumors of faculty discontent, and the academic community prepares to receive the verdict on the Mitchell case, it might be well to review a typically distasteful incident in which three ranking administrators sought to protect a subordinate dean who had intemperately maligned a group



Nebraskan Photo Brugmann

of nearly 30 professors — in particular, one prominent and respected professor who has served the institution for more than 25 years.

This is the unpleasant story, until now known only to a small group of students, faculty members and administrative officials.

Late last spring Associate Dean Frank M. Hallgren of the Division of Student Affairs discussed the demotion of Dr. Mitchell in conversation with me in the dean's office.

The Dean of Men directed particular attention to those professors who wrote to The Nebraskan on behalf of Dr. Mitchell, singing out several for critical comment, and those faculty members who were associated with a banquet in honor of last spring's Nebraskan.

He characterized the latter as "malcontents" and "troublemakers," professors with whom the University has been having difficulty for some time and the type which would support an "anti-administration" campaign. (Over 20 professors, representing 12 different departments, attended the banquet.)

The associate dean spoke disparagingly of several in this group, pointing in particular to one professor, who is about two years from retirement at the University, as being "neurotic" and "schizophrenic," and under the care of a psychiatrist for some time.

Did you know, Associate Dean Hallgren asked, in effect, that this was the reason this professor was relieved of the administration position which he once held? He asserted further that the professor was retained on the University staff only at the "pleasure of Dean Miltzer."

I received the disturbing impression in talking with Dean Hallgren that the remarks which he made were neither impromptu nor impulsive.

Following this conversation, I talked with two professors who personally knew the faculty member most severely criticized by Dean Hallgren. Both assured me in no uncertain terms that the dean's comments were completely untrue, and received my permission to relay them to the professor whose reputation had been impugned.

On June 20, 1956, I received a long distance phone call from Associate Dean Hallgren at my home in Rock Rapids, Ia. He said the professor concerned had come to him, reported what I had been told and was then in the office with him. He said he did not remember any of the comments which he had made earlier to me.

I later learned that Dean Hallgren had asked the professor if the student concerned had been me, and then insisted on calling me to get the matter straightened out. After this incriminating revelation, and the subsequent telephone call, he admitted the entire incident under further questioning.

Upon Dean Hallgren's request for that which he could do to make proper restitution, the professor suggested that he write a letter to me admitting the falsity of his (Hallgren's) accusations, and to send carbon copies to Dean of Faculties Adam C. Breckenridge, Dean Walter E. Miltzer of the College of Arts and Sciences, another professor and himself.

On June 21, 1956, I received the following letter from Dean Hallgren: "This letter is the result of a conference which I had with Professor X this afternoon. A part of this conference was a long distance telephone conversation with you.

"There are two points which I should like to make. The first is that I urge you to discuss with no one any comments on the mental health, the character or the professional status of Professor X. Such discussion as has taken place is a source of great distress to both Professor X and me. Both Professor X and I agree that further discussion would worsen the situation.

"The second is that I have no knowledge nor do I believe that Professor X is neurotic, a split-personality, is under or has been under the care of a psychiatrist, or is retained on the University staff at the pleasure of Dean Miltzer."

On receipt of the letter on June 21, 1956, the professor called Dean Hallgren and objected to the wording in the letter, pointing out that the language used did not place the responsibility of the incident where it belonged — on the associate dean.

Associate Dean Hallgren asked the professor if he would be willing to meet with Dean Breckenridge, Dean Miltzer and himself and iron out the matter. The professor agreed to the proposal, and Dean Hallgren asserted that he would call Dean Breckenridge.

Within the hour, the professor was summoned to the office of the Arts College. Upon arrival, he found Dean Miltzer and Assistant Dean Walter F. Wright, and not Dean Breckenridge and Associate Dean Hallgren, waiting for him. The two deans sharply upbraided the professor, telling him, among other things, that he was believing stories circulated by a troublemaker and trying to make trouble for the University.

The professor pointed out that Dean Hallgren had admitted to him that he (Hallgren) had made the statements to me. Dean Miltzer said he refused to believe this. The professor asked that Dean Hallgren be called into the conference, and declined to discuss the matter further until this was done.

Finally, at the insistence of the beleaguered professor, the associate dean was brought into the discussion, whereupon he not only readily admitted but apologized for making the statements about the professor.

After this apology and admission of guilt, the professor said he would press the matter no further.

Associate Dean Hallgren's guilt was formally confirmed five days later on June 26, 1956, when he replied to a letter which another interested faculty member had written him in support of this professor and myself.

"I assure you that I believe to fail to correct a serious wrong only compounds the original misdeed. For this reason I was eager to do anything I could to correct my error."

The point of this disturbing episode, but one of a long series, is that certain ranking administrative officials of the University not only failed to penalize, but acted, in effect, to protect a subordinate dean who admitted his guilt of recklessly maligning the reputation, character and professional ability of a University professor to an undergraduate student.

These facts would seem to strongly suggest that several of our administrators are more concerned in protecting themselves and their own positions than in maintaining the professional integrity of the members of the faculty, particularly those with faithful records of long and meritorious service.

This sorry state of affairs confirms three main points: (1) the type of whispering campaign and administrative pressure of which Dr. Mitchell is but a typical victim; (2) but one of the many rumbles of faculty discontent which the Liaison Committee should have investigated long ago, and (3) another little-publicized reason why a number of our more prominent professors have left and will continue to leave the institution, and why as many more will hesitate to come to University of Nebraska.

It is with these points in mind that I urge an immediate, representative investigation into the rumors of discontent in the Colleges of Agriculture and Arts and Sciences, if not by the Liaison Committee, by a faculty group which has the courage, resources and purpose to get the job done.

Today's Chuckle

A father of two teenaged children was heard to remark, "I only want to get my kids out of their teens without them doing some of the things I did when I was their age.

A former student returning to the campus for a look-see while the ground was still too wet to plant commented in the crib the other day that he didn't miss school so much but he sure got restless around ten o'clock coffee time.

Nebraskan Letterips

To The Editor:

I feel that English is over-emphasized in colleges.

It may be true that every person in every occupation should be able to express himself in both speaking and writing, but when English is forced at people until they develop a violent dislike for it, it is a bad thing. This is true of anything—so isn't it also true of English?

My major complaint deals with over-emphasis on the writing of themes. Every student at this University, no matter what college he is in, finds himself writing approximately one theme a week or possibly four semesters.

For students who enjoy writing and who do it well, this is a fine arrangement — although many of these students are even inclined to tire of such a drudgery. But for students who have trouble with writing anyway, the set-up becomes extremely hateful.

In many schools the technicalities of composition are over-stressed and this makes the horror of writing themes even worse. At some schools the grade is dropped by as much as one whole point simply because of one error in punctuation, capitalization, or spelling.

Certainly college students should guard against careless errors and should do their best to use proper mechanics, but is it really that important? I don't think so.

Students who are planning to make some form of writing their career should write many themes; but students who are going to be engineers or executives should not have to emphasize theme-writing that much.

After all, what are stenographers for? They have been specially trained to handle letters for instance. If their bosses can give them a general idea of what they want said in a letter or written report, the secretaries should be able to put the ideas into proper composition, using good mechanics.

I feel that students who have a faculty for writing well should be able to take as many composition courses as they wish in order to have every opportunity to develop their talents.

They should especially be encouraged to write about things they're interested in and to develop a style of their own. But students who do not have particular interests or talents in composition should certainly not have to take more than two semesters of composition, and these two semesters should be devoted to a practical use of composition — to writing things like letters and technical reports on their own particular courses and interests.

This plan, I feel, would be more satisfactory and beneficial to more people.

INTERESTED

To The Editor:

This past week end, the University was host to a Big Seven track meet. It was a good meet, and competition was keen; however, there were some serious blunders made which caused comment from even the most ignorant of sports fans.

Generally at any sports event the Star Spangled Banner is played before any action gets under way. Why then were several events run before the national anthem was played? To my mind this was in very poor taste!

Less serious was the fact that in the pole vault, broad jump, and other field events there were no markings to tell the audience how high the jumper jumped, how far

the javelin was thrown, or anything of this sort. And the spectators would kind of like to know these things!

I cannot help but think that there was something amiss in the organization of the meet. We want our school to be known for its athletics, but not for pulling such boners as these at its athletic affairs! Let's hope that these errors are remedied at future track meets!

Patricia Flannigan

All letters to the Daily Nebraskan must be typed double space on 8 1/2 by 11 inch papers. Letters must be signed, but if the writer wishes, the Daily Nebraskan will not publish the signature.

ACP: Students Offer Views On Love

(ACP) — Recent surveys have shown that boys and girls of today tend to marry at an earlier age than did their parents and grandparents. Thus, colleges and universities find themselves with increasing numbers of young, married students. The students themselves are divided upon the question of whether or not being married helps or hinders college students believe being married helps them believe being married helps a student in his studies while another third are undecided. About a quarter of the students think marriage hinders studies.

Associated Collegiate Press gathered collegiate opinion on this issue by asking the following question of a representative national cross-section of college students: Do You Think Being Married Helps Or Hinders A College Student In His Studies?

The results:

Table with 4 columns: Helps, Hinders, Undecided, Men, Women, Total. Row 1: Helps 42%, 29%, 37%. Row 2: Hinders 20%, 33%, 25%. Row 3: Undecided 38%, 38%, 38%

The figures indicate a substantial gulf between the men and coeds, with men holding more to the opinion that marriage helps college studies.

Students believing marriage helps college students in their studies generally feel that it has a stabilizing influence and gives the student more of a psychological "A married student is more settled and is ready to study rather than find 'a date for tonight.'" A Barnard College (New York City) freshman coed simply says: "Marriage is a stabilizer."

Vic Vet says THE NEW SURVIVOR BENEFITS ACT DOES NOT CHANGE THE RIGHT TO CONVERT GI TERM INSURANCE POLICIES WHICH HAVE BEEN CONVERTIBLE UNDER PREVIOUS LAWS. Includes an illustration of a man with a dog.

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS by Dick Bibler



Well, I do have a final tomorrow but...

The Daily Nebraskan

Publication information including FIFTY-FIVE YEARS OLD, Member: Associated Collegiate Press, Editorial Staff list (Fred Daly, Jack Pollock, Dick Shugra, etc.), and Business Staff list (George Madison, Larry Epstein, etc.).