COLUMBIA — **MU's search for a new provost will continue with the help of an executive search committee.**

Consultants from the Isaacson, Miller firm will meet with MU faculty, staff and students at 5 p.m. April 30 in Monsanto Auditorium in the Bond Life Sciences Center to hear ideas about the search for a new provost, according to an email sent Tuesday from MU Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin.

According to the email, consultants from the Boston-based firm — Michael Baer, Elizabeth Ramos and Amy Segal — will seek feedback in three categories:

- What do faculty, staff and students want the provost's objectives to be and what they would like the new provost to accomplish?

- What qualifications and experience should the provost have based on the previous objectives?

- What are the most important personal qualities that MU faculty, staff and students would like the provost to display?

The search firm will **synthesize the information into a position profile** after meeting with MU’s campus search committee, headed by Judy Wall, curators’ professor of biochemistry, molecular microbiology and immunology, according to the email. Wall will lead the forum.

When the search committee has reviewed and approved the profile, the firm will share it with prospective candidates and sources, according to the email.
MU spokesman Christian Basi said there was no timeline in hiring a provost. Former MU Provost Brian Foster retired in December. As chief academic officer, the provost has traditionally been the No. 2 job on campus.

Campus sexual assault hearings planned by McCaskill

By John Lauerman, Bloomberg News Bloomberg

11:20 p.m. CDT, April 22, 2014

Sen. Claire McCaskill, who is surveying 350 colleges on their sexual-assault policies, says she's planning to hold hearings later this year when she'll call victims, administrators and college presidents to testify.

Colleges, their police forces as well as municipal law enforcement should be called on to explain why so few campus sexual-assault and rape cases are prosecuted, McCaskill, a Democrat from Missouri and a former prosecutor, said in a telephone interview.

Students across the country have filed complaints alleging that their universities have violated Title IX, which prohibits gender discrimination in education, by failing to prevent and respond to sexual assaults. Many administrators may be incorrectly telling female students that they're unlikely to obtain rape convictions in cases where there's a dispute over whether sex was consensual, McCaskill said.

"I prosecuted a lot of cases where consent was the defense, and there are a lot of ways you can build these cases," McCaskill said. "It's rare that you can't find corroborating evidence if you try."

The investigation of Florida State University quarterback Jameis Winston for sexual assault last year is one where law enforcement officials may have missed opportunities to determine whether sex was consensual, McCaskill said. Newspaper accounts have said that police
investigating the case in Tallahassee, Fla., failed to look at video and interview some potential witnesses.

The U.S. Education Department is reviewing the college's response to the incident. Florida State is one of 40 universities being looked at by the department's Office for Civil Rights, said Browning Brooks, a spokeswoman for the university. He declined to comment further, citing privacy rules.

David Cornwell, an attorney with Gordon & Rees in Atlanta who's advising Winston's family, didn't return a call seeking comment. Dave Northway, a spokesman for the Tallahassee Police Department, didn't return a call seeking comment.

Sexual-assault cases involving college sports figures may be glossed over by administrators, McCaskill said. She cited a case from the University of Missouri at Columbia, where a female student who committed suicide in 2010 may have been raped by members of the football team months earlier.

An independent report commissioned by the university and performed by an outside law firm found that while the school didn't break the law, it "acted inconsistently with the Department of Education's guidance about the requirements of Title IX."

The university has said it's reviewing its policies and practices in light of the report.

"There have been many allegations that universities have looked the other way when the perpetrator was a member of an athletic team," McCaskill said.

McCaskill said she also plans to investigate how some states' laws interfere with sexual-assault investigations. For example, some states don't allow universities to share information about sexual assaults with local law enforcement officials, she said.

While the criminal justice system's handling of sexual assaults needs improvement, students' rights to educational opportunity under Title IX also need continued attention, said Nancy Cantalupo, an adjunct professor at Georgetown Law in Washington. Cantalupo has proposed that schools be required to regularly survey their students to determine how frequently sexual assaults occur and how victims' needs are met.

The data would be anonymous and give colleges an incentive to work creatively to reduce assaults and respond effectively, said Cantalupo, who said she has discussed her proposal with McCaskill's staff.
If such data were public, "there's not a president of a school in the country who's going to shrug their shoulders and say we're not going to do anything," Cantalupo said.

McCaskill, a senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, helped bring about sweeping changes in how the military adjudicates alleged sexual assaults after holding hearings in which she grilled leaders of the armed forces. McCaskill said that, working with New York Democratic Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, she will likely hold hearings this summer, following a series of roundtable discussions and work with the Justice and Education departments.

Colleges that violate Title IX are subject to fines and loss of eligibility for federal student grants and loans. McCaskill said that the hearings will be held by the Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, of which she is chairman.

Wright files bill to boost college giving

By Ashley Jost

Tuesday, April 22, 2014 at 2:00 pm

A growing student population and tighter state budgets motivated Rep. John Wright, D-Rocheport, to file a bill that would, as he said, "encourage the private and public partnership" for the betterment of higher education.

House Bill 2122 would allow public colleges and universities to apply for a transferable tax credit worth as much as 100 percent of a private contribution to the school that is earmarked for student scholarships. The bill essentially would double the effect of the contribution.

Wright created a cap of $10 million a year in the amount of authorized tax credits, and the credits would be available on a first-come, first-served basis, according to the bill. The Missouri Department of Higher Education would be responsible for the application process. Individual schools would be responsible for filing the application during the same calendar year the donation was received.
If passed, the bill would take effect starting Jan. 1. It would automatically sunset in 2020, giving the General Assembly time to evaluate the program.

"State funding for public colleges and universities is down by more than 30 percent in the last 15 years," Wright said. "That is alarming. It puts pressure on college tuition and threatens to make college unaffordable for a lot of middle-class families. We have to think creatively about keeping the costs low."

Wright said he is being reasonable about the odds this first-time bill has to pass.

"I appropriately learned that many proposals take a couple of years to move," he said. "We had a very good hearing in the Higher Education Committee last week. I think we'll know more" about how much support it has "within a week or two."

So far, Wright said he has had positive conversations with Republican and Democratic education leaders and has heard "no push back or no objectives to the policy proposal."

John Fougere, chief communications officer for the University of Missouri System, said the bill would provide an incentive for donors to contribute to scholarship programs.

Tom Hiles, vice chancellor for advancement and alumni relations, said he thinks anything that leverages public and private resources is good for the university.

"With the dramatic decision to not increase tuition rates, there is even more of a need to provide encouragement and incentives to our donors," Hiles said. "We are very supportive of that."

UPDATE: Missouri Senate panel adopts tuition restriction, renews Bright Flight scholarships

Tuesday, April 22, 2014 | 5:19 p.m. CDT; updated 6:26 p.m. CDT, Tuesday, April 22, 2014
BY JORDAN SHAPIRO/THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

UPDATE: This article has been updated with additional details.

JEFFERSON CITY — A Missouri Senate committee adopted a state budget provision Tuesday to prevent public colleges and universities from offering in-state tuition rates to students living in the country illegally.
The action essentially guarantees the prohibition will take effect when the state's next fiscal year begins July 1. The Senate Appropriations Committee adopted the provision as it worked to finalize its budget proposal. The House included the language in its spending plan in response to a St. Louis Community College's decision to offer cheaper tuition rates for those students.

Senators softened the House version and opted to target only institutions that "knowingly" offer local tuition rates. Senators said the House's outright ban put a burden on a university in vetting student applications.

"There is a policing factor that they really can't do," said the panel's chairman Sen. Kurt Schaefer, R-Columbia.

The change didn't alleviate the concern of Democrats, who argue the state shouldn't stand in the way of people seeking an education.

"The more Missouri residents that can pursue higher education and the more that can do so affordably make us by-and-large better off," said Sen. Scott Sifton, D-St. Louis.

**John Fougere, a spokesman for the University of Missouri System, said universities are currently bound by a 2009 state law that prohibits them from offering financial aid, grants or scholarships to students living in the country illegally.**

That same law also requires universities to annually certify to state officials that they have not knowingly offered one of those benefits to unlawful residents. It asks them to use student loan applications, driver's licenses, birth certificates or federal documents to confirm an applicant is living legally living in the country.

If the full Republican-led Senate adopts the prohibition, the slight change in wording would be up for discussion between budget negotiators as lawmakers come up with an identical spending plan. But the broader policy on denying in-state tuition for people living in the country illegally wouldn't be up for debate because both chambers have agreed on the principle.

Other items stemming from actions made by the Senate budget-writing panel on Tuesday will be on the table during those negotiations.
The committee voted to fully fund the Bright Flight scholarship program for top high school students who attend colleges in Missouri. The scholarships are awarded based on ACT or SAT scores.

Under the Senate plan, those students who score in the top 3 percent would receive $3,000 per year, while those who score in the top 4 percent and 5 percent would get $1,000. There is only enough funding in the current program and in the House proposal to award the top 3 percent of students with $2,500 annually.

But Senate budget writers didn't go along with a House recommendation to add a forgivable loan component to the Bright Flight program. Schaefer said it was unclear if legislation to authorize that component would pass in time to include it in next year's budget.

In another difference with the House, the Senate panel included $6 million for the state to refurbish an old hospital site in the state capital. Sen. Mike Kehoe, R-Jefferson City, said St. Mary's Health Center is allowing Missouri to take over the site for college programs and office space, but wants the state to foot the bill for remodeling.

This Wednesday, the Senate committee plans to vote on the entire operating budget, which is estimated to be $26 billion. It would then head to the Senate floor for approval.

Undocumented student tuition language remains in budget bill

By Alex Stuckey astuckey@post-dispatch.com 573-556-6186

JEFFERSON CITY • Language prohibiting public higher education institutions from giving undocumented immigrant students in-state tuition remains in the fiscal year 2015 budget after vetting from a Senate committee.

While the Senate Appropriations Committee opted to keep the language in the bill this afternoon, many members were concerned about creating an unfair burden on universities to police student applications.
Their response was to add the word "knowingly:" public higher education institutions cannot knowingly offer these students in-state tuition.

Committee Chairman Sen. Kurt Schaefer, R-Columbia, said this would prevent universities or community colleges from recruiting students from a foreign country by offering in-state tuition.

Undocumented students already cannot receive state or federal financial aid.

If this amendment remains in the budget, Missouri would be bucking the U.S. trend when it comes to educating these students.

Across the nation, at least 16 states, including Illinois, Kansas and Nebraska, allow certain undocumented individuals to receive in-state tuition, according to the National Immigration Law Center.

The University of Missouri-St. Louis allows these students to receive in-state tuition if they graduated from a Missouri high school. St. Louis Community College also created a similar policy for the semester beginning in January, however the college withdrew its policy change Jan. 16 to wait for state direction.

Sen. Scott Sifton, D-Affton, spoke up today for making higher education available for more Missourians.

"I think we have a public policy interest to make education available to Missouri residents," Sifton said. "The more Missouri residents who can pursue higher education ... the better."

High court upholds Michigan affirmative action ban

By MARK SHERMAN and Sam Hananel

NO MU MENTION
WASHINGTON • A state’s voters are free to outlaw the use of race as a factor in college admissions, the Supreme Court ruled Tuesday in a blow to affirmative action that also laid bare tension among the justices about a continuing need for programs that address racial inequality in the U.S.

The 6-2 decision upheld a voter-approved change to the Michigan Constitution that forbids the state’s public colleges to take race into account. That change was indeed up to the voters, the ruling said, over one justice’s impassioned dissent that accused the court of simply wanting to wish away inequality.

The ruling bolsters similar voter-approved initiatives banning affirmative action in education in California and Washington state. A few other states have adopted laws or issued executive orders to bar race-conscious admissions policies.

Justice Anthony Kennedy said voters in Michigan chose to eliminate racial preferences, presumably because such a system could give rise to race-based resentment. Kennedy said nothing in the U.S. Constitution or the court’s prior cases gives judges the authority to undermine the election results.

“This case is not about how the debate about racial preferences should be resolved. It is about who may resolve it,” Kennedy said.

He stressed that the court was not disturbing the holding of a 2003 case from Michigan — which gave rise to the 2006 constitution change — permitting the consideration of race in admissions. A Texas affirmative action case decided in June also did nothing to undermine that principle, Kennedy said.

In a separate opinion siding with Kennedy, Justice Antonin Scalia said Michigan residents favored a colorblind constitution and “it would be shameful for us to stand in their way.”

Strongly dissenting from the majority, Justice Sonia Sotomayor said the decision trampled on the rights of minorities, even though the Michigan amendment was adopted democratically.

“But without checks, democratically approved legislation can oppress minority groups,” said Sotomayor, who read her dissent aloud in the courtroom Tuesday. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg sided with Sotomayor.

Michigan voters “changed the basic rules of the political process in that state in a manner that uniquely disadvantaged racial minorities,” Sotomayor said.

Judges “ought not sit back and wish away, rather than confront, the racial inequality that exists in our society,” she said. She is one of two justices, along with Clarence Thomas, who have acknowledged that affirmative action was a factor in their college and law school admissions. Sotomayor attended Princeton University, and Thomas is a graduate of the College of the Holy Cross. They both attended law school at Yale University.

At 58 pages, Sotomayor’s dissent was longer than the combined length of the four opinions in support of the outcome.
Chief Justice John Roberts and Justices Stephen Breyer, Samuel Alito, Scalia and Thomas agreed with Kennedy.

Responding to Sotomayor, Roberts said it “does more harm than good to question the openness and candor of those on either side of the debate.”

KAGAN RECUSES HERSELF

Justice Elena Kagan did not take part in the case, presumably because she worked on it at an earlier stage while serving in the Justice Department.

University of Notre Dame law professor Jennifer Mason McAward said the opinions by five justices point “to a much more nuanced and heated debate among the justices regarding the permissibility and wisdom of racial preferences in general.”

In 2003, the Supreme Court upheld the consideration of race among many factors in college admissions in a case from Michigan.

Three years later, affirmative action opponents persuaded Michigan voters to change the state constitution to outlaw any consideration of race.

The 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals said the issue was not affirmative action, but the way in which its opponents went about trying to bar it.

In its 8-7 decision, the appeals court said the provision ran afoul of the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution’s 14th Amendment because it presented an extraordinary burden to affirmative action supporters who would have to mount their own campaign to repeal the constitutional provision. The Supreme Court said the appeals court judges were wrong to set aside the change as discriminatory.

But Sotomayor took up their line of reasoning in her dissent. She said University of Michigan alumni are free to lobby the state Board of Regents to admit more alumni children, but that the regents now are powerless to do anything about race-sensitive admissions.

Breyer parted company with other liberal justices Sotomayor and Ginsburg, voting to uphold the Michigan ban because it effectively took power from faculty members at the state colleges and gave it to the voters, “from an unelected administrative body to a politically responsive one.” Unlike the conservative justices whom he joined Tuesday, Breyer said he continues to favor “race-conscious programs” in education. Black and Latino enrollment at the University of Michigan has dropped since the ban took effect. At California’s top public universities, African-Americans are a smaller share of incoming freshmen, while Latino enrollment is up slightly, but far below the state’s growth in the percentage of Latino high school graduates.
The case was the court’s second involving affirmative action in as many years. Last June, the justices ordered lower courts to take another look at the University of Texas admissions plan in a ruling that could make it harder for public colleges to justify any use of race in admissions.

**LAW ON CAMPAIGN LIES**

The Supreme Court appears to be highly skeptical of laws that try to police false statements in political campaigns, raising doubts about the viability of such laws in more than 15 states.

Justices expressed those concerns repeatedly Tuesday in arguments in a case challenging an Ohio law that bars people from recklessly making false statements about candidates seeking elective office.

The case has attracted widespread attention, with liberal and conservative groups saying the law tramples on the time-honored, if dubious, tradition of political mudslinging. Critics say free speech demands wide-open debate during political campaigns, including protection for negative speech that may sometimes twist the facts.

The high court is not expected to rule directly on the constitutional issue because the current question before the justices is only a preliminary one: Can you challenge the law right away, or do you have to wait until the state finds you guilty of lying? But the justices couldn’t resist going after the law itself, pointing out that the mere prospect of being hauled in front of state officials to explain comments made in the heat of an election has a chilling effect on speech. “What’s the harm?” Justice Stephen Breyer asked Eric Murphy, attorney for the state of Ohio. “I can’t speak, that’s the harm.”

Justice Anthony Kennedy said there’s “a serious First Amendment concern with a state law that requires you to come before a commission to justify what you are going to say.”

The case began during the 2010 election when a national anti-abortion group, the Susan B. Anthony List, planned to put up billboards accusing then-Rep. Steve Driehaus of supporting taxpayer-funded abortion because he voted for President Barack Obama’s new health care law. Driehaus, a Democrat who opposes abortion, claimed the group’s billboard ads distorted the truth and therefore violated the false speech law.

Driehaus filed a complaint with the Ohio Elections Commission, an action which prompted the billboard owner to decline posting the ads. The commission found probable cause that the ads violated the law, but Driehaus later withdrew his complaint after losing his re-election campaign.

The Susan B. Anthony List then challenged the state law as unconstitutional, but a federal judge said the group didn’t have the right to sue because it hadn’t yet suffered actual harm. The 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati agreed.

Murphy argued that the Susan B. Anthony List has not shown a credible threat of harm because the Driehaus case was ultimately dismissed before it was referred to a prosecutor.
But Justice Elena Kagan wondered why a probable cause determination didn’t count as harm. For the average voter, “they think probable cause means you probably lied,” she said.
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Supreme Court Upholds Bans on Racial Preferences in College Admissions

By Peter Schmidt

Washington

NO MU MENTION

The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld voter-passed bans on racial preferences in public-college admissions in a case involving a challenge to Michigan’s 2006 adoption of such a measure.

In a 6-to-2 decision handed down on Tuesday, the court’s majority rejected the argument that a voter-approved amendment to Michigan’s Constitution discriminated against that state’s minority residents by precluding them from lobbying for the same admissions advantages routinely sought by other constituencies, such as university alumni.

A majority of the justices not only overturned a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, which had struck down Michigan’s measure, but also made clear that they would reject any similarly argued challenge to the bans on race-conscious admissions adopted by voters in Arizona, California, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Washington.

The court’s controlling opinion, written by Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, said the Sixth Circuit’s decision had called into question "other long-settled rulings on similar state policies," including the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit’s upholding of a ban on race-conscious admissions passed by California voters in 1996. Were the Supreme Court to affirm the Sixth Circuit’s decision, Justice Kennedy wrote, it
"in essence would announce a finding that the past 15 years of state public debate on this issue have been improper."

In overturning the Sixth Circuit’s ruling, Justice Kennedy was joined by the four other members of the high court’s conservative wing—Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. and Justices Samuel A. Alito Jr., Antonin Scalia, and Clarence Thomas—and by Justice Stephen G. Breyer, who is generally considered a liberal on matters related to race.

Justice Sonia M. Sotomayor wrote a dissent, signed by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, in which she argued that the amendment to Michigan’s Constitution had created "two very different processes through which a Michigan citizen is permitted to influence the admissions policies of the state’s universities: one for persons interested in race-sensitive admissions policies and one for everyone else."

Justice Elena Kagan recused herself from hearing the case, which she had dealt with in her former capacity as U.S. solicitor general. The justices’ leanings in the case, Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action (No. 12-682), had been fairly evident in when they heard arguments last fall, and only Justices Ginsburg and Sotomayor voiced sharp criticisms of the Michigan measure.

Deciding Political Advantage

The Supreme Court’s decision on Tuesday has no bearing on the general legality of race-conscious admissions policies, which the justices most recently considered last year in a case involving the University of Texas at Austin. In its Texas ruling, the court’s majority left intact the use of race-conscious admissions to promote diversity, but held that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit had failed to apply strict scrutiny to the policy at issue and ordered the circuit court to evaluate the policy again.

In the ruling on Schuette, named for the Michigan attorney general who defended the amendment, Bill Schuette, Justice Kennedy wrote: "This case is not about how the debate about racial preferences should be resolved. It is about who may resolve it." His opinion concluded: "There is no authority in the Constitution of the United States or in this court’s precedents for the judiciary to set aside Michigan laws that commit this policy determination to the voters."

Much of the debate between the justices focused on the applicability of the court’s precedents in cases involving laws that appeared to put members of minority groups at a political disadvantage. In its 8-to-7 decision striking down Michigan’s ban, the Sixth Circuit majority had cited a 1969 Supreme Court ruling,
in *Hunter v. Erickson*, that overturned an Akron, Ohio, ballot initiative requiring voter approval of any city ordinance regulating real-estate transactions based on race. The Sixth Circuit also had cited a 1982 ruling, in *Washington v. Seattle School District No. 1*, in which the court struck down a state ballot measure that prohibited school districts from voluntarily adopting busing policies to promote school desegregation.

The controlling opinion handed down on Tuesday held that the Michigan case differs from the cited precedents in that the measure at issue did not seek to remedy any specific acts of discrimination against minority members.

Justice Kennedy’s opinion, signed by Justices Alito and Roberts, also expressed reservations about the *Seattle* precedent’s assumption that members of certain minority groups have distinct political interests. The task of trying to determine where their interests lie risks "the creation of incentives for those who support or oppose certain policies to cast the debate in terms of racial advantage or disadvantage," potentially giving rise to new racial conflicts, the opinion said.

Justice Scalia argued in a concurring opinion, signed by Justice Thomas, that the court should have gone further and overruled the precedents cited by those challenging the Michigan ban.

In a separate concurring opinion, Justice Breyer rejected assertions by Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and Wayne State University that their state’s ban on race-conscious admissions had reordered the political process to the detriment of minority members by stripping authority over admissions decisions from the universities’ elected boards.

Justice Breyer argued that the boards had already shut minority members and other citizens out of the process by delegating admissions decisions "to unelected university faculty members and administrators." The ban on race-conscious admissions adopted there in 2006, he wrote, "took decision-making authority away from these unelected actors and placed it in the hands of voters."

In dissent, Justice Sotomayor wrote: "We are fortunate to live in a democratic society. But without checks, democratically approved legislation can oppress minority groups."
Protests Planned

The Supreme Court’s Schuette decision was denounced as "terrible" and "racist" by George B. Washington, a lawyer for one of the groups that had challenged the Michigan ban, the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration, and Immigrant Rights and Fight for Equality by Any Means Necessary.

Mr. Washington said in an interview that the decision "turns over to the states the right to decide what political rights blacks and Latinos have," and "will mean the resegregation of higher education" in states where such measures have passed. He predicted student protests over the decision, at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor and elsewhere.

Molly Corbett Broad, president of the American Council on Education, issued a statement declaring her group’s disappointment with the Supreme Court’s ruling. She said: "All colleges and universities, in Michigan and every other state, should be able to seek to create the most challenging possible academic environment and produce students fully prepared to function in today’s society—and a diverse student body is critical to that pursuit."

The council had been joined by 48 other higher-education organizations in submitting a brief that urged the court to strike down Michigan's constitutional amendment, which, they said, "distorts the political process against racial and ethnic minority voters in Michigan, thereby violating the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution."

On the other side of the issue, the decision was praised as "a victory for the voters of Michigan and for the issue of equality" by Jennifer Gratz, who successfully challenged the University of Michigan’s race-conscious undergraduate-admissions policy in a case decided by the Supreme Court in 2003. She later helped lead the campaign for that state’s ban on preferences.

Roger Clegg, president of the Center for Equal Opportunity, a group critical of affirmative action, called in a statement for new efforts to abolish race-conscious admissions policies. "Where ballot initiatives are not available," he said, "state legislatures should act; where state legislatures won’t act, then action should be taken at the local level."
Status Quo on State Bans on Affirmative Action

April 22, 2014

By Scott Jaschik

WASHINGTON -- The U.S. Supreme Court on Tuesday upheld the constitutionality of a measure approved by Michigan voters in 2006 to bar public colleges and universities from considering race in admissions.

The ruling leaves in place not only the Michigan measure, but also similar ones in California, Washington State and elsewhere that have made it more difficult for public colleges to recruit and admit black and Latino students. While the measures survived legal challenges when they were approved by state voters, an unexpected challenge to the Michigan measure had given new hope to those seeking to overturn the state bans. That challenge (and most of the opinions released Tuesday by various coalitions of justices) focused not on the appropriateness of affirmative action, but on when statewide votes are legitimate tools to set policies that have an impact on minority citizens.

The justices upholding the Michigan measure had a variety of reasons (some conflicting) for doing so. The plurality opinion -- written by Justice Anthony Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice John Roberts and Justice Samuel Alito -- stressed that the court was not ruling on the constitutionality of the consideration of race in admissions, only on the right of states not to exercise their right to have such consideration at their public colleges.

"This case is not about the constitutionality, or the merits, of race-conscious admissions policies in higher education. Here, the principle that the consideration of race in admissions
is permissible when certain conditions are met is not being challenged," the opinion summary says. "Rather, the question concerns whether, and in what manner, voters in the states may choose to prohibit the consideration of such racial preferences. Where states have prohibited race-conscious admissions policies, universities have responded by experimenting with a wide variety of alternative approaches. The decision by Michigan voters reflects the ongoing national dialogue about such practices."

Among the other justices backing the outcome, two -- Justices Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas -- wrote an opinion saying that the key question was whether the Michigan measure was discriminatory. And they said it was not. "The question here, as in every case in which neutral state action is said to deny equal protection on account of race, is whether the challenged action reflects a racially discriminatory purpose. It plainly does not," they said.

Justice Stephen Breyer also backed the outcome of upholding the Michigan measure, but for different reasons. (Fuller explanations of the various opinions are below in this article.)

Justice Sonia Sotomayor wrote a dissent -- joined by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg -- saying that the Michigan measure violated the rights of minority individuals in the state. "We are fortunate to live in a democratic society. But without checks, democratically approved legislation can oppress minority groups. For that reason, our Constitution places limits on what a majority of the people may do," the dissent says.

"This case implicates one such limit: the guarantee of equal protection of the laws. Although that guarantee is traditionally understood to prohibit intentional discrimination under existing laws, equal protection does not end there. Another fundamental strand of our equal protection jurisprudence focuses on process, securing to all citizens the right to participate meaningfully and equally in self-government. That right is the bedrock of our democracy, for it preserves all other rights."

Justice Elena Kagan recused herself from the case, as she has from many cases in which she played a role prior to joining the court.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit -- in two rulings, one by a 2-1 vote and one by an 8-7 vote -- found that Proposition 2 (the measure passed by Michigan voters) was
unconstitutional. But those rulings had been stayed, pending the Supreme Court's ruling, which now has reversed them.

Tuesday's Supreme Court ruling does not invalidate last year's ruling that, under certain circumstances, it is constitutional for public colleges and universities to consider race in admissions. That decision -- *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin* -- found that there is a right to consider race, but not an obligation to do so. The new decision -- in *Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action* -- says states can reject the use of that right.

The names in the ruling refer to Bill Schuette, the attorney general of Michigan, who has defended the 2006 vote, and the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration and Immigrant Rights and Fight for Equality by Any Means Necessary, an organization known as BAMN (the acronym for the end of its name), which brought the case to challenge the 2006 referendum.

Most leaders of public colleges and universities in Michigan and other states that have barred the consideration of race have opposed such bans. But most also have been leery of BAMN's legal challenge, finding it awkward to argue against the right of their states' citizens to decide such matters. But after the Supreme Court agreed to take up the case, most higher education groups backed the challenge to Proposition 2.

The argument advanced by the civil rights activists who filed the challenge to the Michigan referendum is not, strictly speaking, on the merits of affirmative action. Rather, they argue (and the appeals court agreed) that Proposition 2 effectively denied minority citizens the same right to influence the policies of public universities that other groups have. So, for example, if rural Michiganders want to encourage the public universities to adopt policies that would help rural students, they can do so.

But under Proposition 2, those who believe that consideration of race is important can no longer try to get the public universities to do so in admissions. Proponents of Proposition 2 have said that the referendum is a race-neutral tool of democracy, and that states have the right to use referendums to consider policies with regard to public college admissions policy.

**Initial Reactions**
Critics of affirmative action were quick to respond to the decision. Roger Clegg, president of the Center for Equal Opportunity, which has released numerous studies critical of the consideration of race in admissions, said that he hoped the ruling would lead other states to follow Michigan. "Where ballot initiatives are not available, state legislatures should act; where state legislatures won’t act, then action should be taken at the local level," Clegg said in a statement.

Jennifer Gratz, who is CEO of the XIV Foundation -- which opposes the consideration of race -- and who sued the University of Michigan over its affirmative action policies and was a key figure in the campaign to pass Proposition 2, also issued a statement praising the Supreme Court.

"Much progress has been made over the past 15 years in challenging discriminatory policies based on race preferences and moving toward colorblind government,” Gratz said. “Today’s ruling preserves this foundation and is a clear signal that states are moving in the right direction when they do away with policies that treat people differently based on race, gender, ethnicity or skin color.”

George Washington, a lawyer for BAMN, said in an interview shortly after the Supreme Court ruled that it was "a terrible decision ... equivalent to Plessy v. Ferguson," the 1896 ruling that upheld the doctrine of "separate but equal." Washington said that the Supreme Court has "turned over to the states what rights minorities have," and that measures like Proposition 2 "have already led to the resegregation of the University of California and the University of Michigan."

In a state like Michigan, where the electorate is overwhelmingly white, the Supreme Court has given the white majority "veto power over the political rights and educational futures of black citizens, and that is not acceptable," he said. "Frankly, our sense is that they have taken off the gloves, and now we have to take off the gloves, and go back to the sit-ins and strikes and all the things that won the civil rights movement."

The major associations representing college presidents filed a brief with the Supreme Court on behalf of BAMN, but without endorsing many of the arguments made by BAMN. Ada Meloy, general counsel for the American Council on Education, said Tuesday morning that the key thing about the opinions was that they did not make new law on affirmative action.
"Our main concern ... was whether it would detract from the Fisher decision, which allowed the continued use of race," Meloy said, referring to the 2013 Supreme Court ruling involving the University of Texas at Austin. "We were very pleased to see that was not shaken by the decision issued today."

Michael A. Olivas, director of the Institute of Higher Education Law and Governance at the University of Houston, is a supporter of affirmative action, and he criticized the justices who upheld the Michigan measure for "a very flawed world view" in which they believe that race is no longer a powerful force in American society.

But Olivas said that the decision should also motivate academic leaders -- regardless of their views on race or affirmative action -- to think about the impact of having statewide votes on how colleges make decisions.

Public colleges and universities, Olivas said, have trustees who are either appointed or elected and who are charged with making "nuanced, institution-specific, public interest oriented decisions." State voters either elect trustees, or elect governors who appoint them -- so they are connected to the process, he said. But it is trustees (and those they hire) who truly understand the issues. "Why are those officials hamstrung by ballot measure that are not nuanced, but that are blunt axes on divisive issues?"

While Olivas personally disagreed with the votes in Michigan and California to bar public colleges from considering race and ethnicity, he said his concern wasn't related to the outcome of those elections. He noted that some think California voters today (who are more diverse) might reverse that state's ban. While he would applaud that outcome, he said that the fact that state voters might go one way on affirmative action one year, and then switch sides, "shows how silly it is" to have voters determine these issues.

**Who Gets In?**

Proposition 2, like affirmative action, affects those public colleges and universities with highly competitive admissions. In Michigan, that means that the impact has been most clear at the University of Michigan (in just about every program) and in professional schools and selected programs elsewhere.

While the University of Michigan's leaders have repeatedly criticized Proposition 2 and pledged to do everything they can to recruit a more diverse student body, they have faced criticism for not doing more. Just last week, a rejected black applicant to the university of
Michigan participated in protests, charging that the university could increase its black enrollment by admitting students like her. Brooke Kimbrough, the student, has a 3.6 grade-point average and an ACT score of 23.

While supporters said that she could succeed at Michigan, critics said that the university was correct to turn her down, given that her academic record wasn't superior to those getting in. According to the university, the average high school G.P.A. of those admitted to Michigan is 3.85 and the 50th percentile of admitted students have ACT composite scores of 29-33.

Kimbrough's protest set off considerable debate, and she was challenged to a debate by Gratz.

This academic year has been one of considerable debate about race at Michigan. In the fall, black students organized a #BBUM Twitter protest attracted nationwide attention, as students used the hashtag to describe their frustrations with "being black at the University of Michigan." Students described hostile or ignorant comments as everyday events in their lives, along with the reality that their numbers are small (not even 5 percent of the university's enrollment, though the state has a black population of more than 14 percent). Then in January, black students demanded that the university double black enrollment. While university officials have pledged to do more, they have repeatedly noted the limitations placed on them by Proposition 2.

On the #BBUM hashtag Tuesday, some said that they believed their protests had drawn more attention to the needs of black students, but that the Supreme Court ruling had undercut that progress.

**Why the Justices Ruled as They Did**

Tuesday's opinions (none of which attracted majority support on the court) were based on very different perspectives.

The Kennedy-Roberts-Alito opinion stressed that the Supreme Court's willingness to let colleges consider race (sometimes) was never a requirement, and that states and colleges were free to decide not to consider race and ethnicity.

"This court has noted that some states have decided to prohibit race-conscious admissions policies. In *Grutter* [a 2003 ruling upholding the consideration of race by public colleges],
the court noted: 'universities in California, Florida, and Washington State, where racial preferences in admissions are prohibited by state law, are currently engaged in experimenting with a wide variety of alternative approaches.' Universities in other states can and should draw on the most promising aspects of these race-neutral alternatives as they develop."

Michigan's Proposition 2 was one such experiment, the opinion suggested, and so should not be disturbed.

The two justices who are most consistently critical of any consideration of race -- Scalia and Thomas -- wrote that they considered it "bizarre" that there was any legal question about a state barring the consideration of race, given that the Constitution bars racial discrimination. "Called upon to explore the jurisprudential twilight zone between two errant lines of precedent, we confront a frighteningly bizarre question: Does the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment forbid what its text plainly requires? Needless to say (except that this case obliges us to say it), the question answers itself."

The votes of the five justices noted in the above paragraphs were expected. Many supporters of affirmative action were more surprised by the vote of Justice Breyer, who, as he noted in his opinion, believes that colleges do have the right to consider race in admissions.

He rejected the idea that black citizens (or those favoring the use of affirmative action) were being disenfranchised by Proposition 2. He said that it was not the elected or appointed trustees who lost power to the voters, but rather "unelected faculty members and administrators," to whom trustees had delegated authority. He said that, in this context, he could not object to the state's electorate deciding that it disagreed.

Breyer repeatedly stressed that he was ruling on a very narrow set of circumstances. He said, for example, that he would have viewed the case differently had the consideration of race in Michigan been linked to past discrimination.

**Creating Two Classes of Michigan Citizens?**

Only the dissent accepted the BAMN argument that Proposition 2 limited the political rights of minority groups. "There are now two very different processes through which a Michigan citizen is permitted to influence the admissions policies of the state’s universities: one for
persons interested in race-sensitive admissions policies and one for everyone else. A citizen who is a University of Michigan alumnus, for instance, can advocate for an admissions policy that considers an applicant’s legacy status by meeting individually with members of the Board of Regents to convince them of her views, by joining with other legacy parents to lobby the board, or by voting for and supporting board candidates who share her position," said the dissent, by Justice Sotomayor.

"The same options are available to a citizen who wants the board to adopt admissions policies that consider athleticism, geography, area of study, and so on. The one and only policy a Michigan citizen may not seek through this long-established process is a race-sensitive admissions policy that considers race in an individualized manner when it is clear that race-neutral alternatives are not adequate to achieve diversity. For that policy alone, the citizens of Michigan must undertake the daunting task of amending the State Constitution."

And that, the dissent said, was unconstitutional. "While our Constitution does not guarantee minority groups victory in the political process, it does guarantee them meaningful and equal access to that process," said the dissent. "It guarantees that the majority may not win by stacking the political process against minority groups permanently, forcing the minority alone to surmount unique obstacles in pursuit of its goals — here, educational diversity that cannot reasonably be accomplished through race-neutral measures. Today, by permitting a majority of the voters in Michigan to do what our Constitution forbids, the court ends the debate over race-sensitive admissions policies in Michigan in a manner that contravenes constitutional protections long recognized in our precedents."
Gov. Nixon raises new concern about income tax cut

By DAVID A. LIEB

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo. (AP) — Democratic Gov. Jay Nixon raised new concerns Tuesday that a tax cut passed by the Missouri Legislature could have "cataclysmic" consequences for state revenues, but Republican legislative leaders responded that he was manufacturing a crisis to justify a forthcoming veto.

Nixon asserted that the legislation could eliminate taxes on all income over $9,000, busting a $4.8 billion hole in the state budget and forcing the closure of public schools, prisons and mental health facilities.

Although he didn't veto the bill Tuesday, Nixon made clear that he will do so in the coming days.

The tax cut "would devastate our economy, bankrupt our state, cripple our schools - and it cannot become law," Nixon said in remarks delivered at a series of news conferences across the state.

House Majority Leader John Diehl called Nixon's new criticisms "utterly ridiculous," "laughable" and "absurd" and accused him of engaging in "a pattern of scare tactics and deception."

He said legislators would attempt to enact the tax cut by overriding Nixon's expected veto before the annual session ends May 16. An override would require a two-thirds vote in both chambers, meaning Republicans would need to vote as a block and pick up the support of at least one House Democrat.

Republicans received the vote of one Democrat — Rep. Jeff Roorda, of Barnhart — when they passed the tax cut last week. Roorda said Tuesday that he is reconsidering his support as a result of Nixon's concerns, adding: "I want to get all the information" before voting on an override.

About 50 GOP lawmakers stood behind party leaders at news conference Tuesday to show their support for the tax cut. House Speaker Tim Jones and Senate President Pro Tem Tom Dempsey both accused Nixon of generating a "manufactured crisis."
"It's a complete and utter fabrication in his own mind," Jones said. "This bill will do nothing except encourage more growth, investment and opportunity in the state of Missouri."

Nixon held his own Capitol news conference moments later, asserting: "The direct language of this bill crashes a giant hole in the future of this state."

The governor's barnstorming campaign against the tax cut is similar to the tactics he used last year to defeat a more sweeping version of an income tax cut. After lawmakers passed that bill, Nixon said the hit to state revenues could have been over $1 billion in a single year. Republicans' support for the bill faded, and the House ultimately fell 15 votes shy of the 109 needed to override Nixon's veto in September.

**Official legislative projections, based on research from the University of Missouri-Columbia, estimate that this year's bill eventually would reduce state revenues by $620 million annually.**

The main provisions of the legislation would gradually reduce Missouri's top individual income tax rate and phase in a new 25 percent deduction for business income reported on personal tax returns. The incremental tax cuts would start in 2017 but are contingent on annual state revenue growth of at least $150 million over the high mark from the previous three years.

Missouri's top tax rate of 6 percent currently is charged on all income over $9,000. The legislation authorizes an annual one-tenth of a percentage point reduction in that top rate until it drops to 5.5 percent, which is the rate currently charged on income between $8,000 and $9,000.

The legislation states that once the top tax rate is lowered to 5.5 percent, "the bracket for income subject to the top rate of tax shall be eliminated." Nixon said that means a tax no longer would be charged on any income over $9,000, which was previously the top tax bracket.

He said that would wipe out 97 percent of Missouri's individual income tax collections and about two-thirds of the state's general revenue budget, "ultimately pushing Missouri into fiscal chaos."

No one else previously had interpreted the legislation that way.

Nixon's office provided a memo from Washington University law professor Cheryl Block backing up his interpretation.

But Republican legislative leaders countered with a memo from former Missouri Supreme Court Chief Justice William Ray Price Jr. rejecting that interpretation. Price said he believes courts would rule that the legislation sets a new top tax rate of 5.5 percent on all income over $8,000.

He pointed to a sentence in the bill immediately preceding the one Nixon singled out. That wording says the Department of Revenue director "shall, by rule, adjust the tax tables" to carry out the provisions of the bill.
Republican legislative leaders said their caucus is more committed to this year's bill, which is less complex and less aggressive in the scope of its tax cuts.

"The governor is grasping at straws," said the bill sponsor, Sen. Will Kraus, R-Lee's Summit. "I think the bill on his desk will be overridden and it will become law."

___

Tax cut is SB509.

Online:

Senate: http://www.senate.mo.gov

Missouri House panel endorses bonding plan

NO MU MENTION

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo. (AP) — A Missouri House panel has endorsed a bonding proposal that calls for spending at least $200 million on a new state mental health facility in Fulton.

The measure would authorize a total of $400 million of bonds subject to voter approval later this year. The House Budget Committee advanced its measure Tuesday.

Senators earlier approved a $600 million bonding plan for the Fulton State Hospital, higher education institutions and other state facilities. The Senate version would not require voter approval.

Projects in the Senate bonding measure would be for repair or renovation of existing facilities — except for the Fulton campus. The House version doesn't have that restriction.

___
Occasionally, we wish we weren't so prescient. Last December, for example, as the 2014 legislative session was getting ready to start, we said this about the prospects of meaningful ethics reform being passed:

"It's hard to believe that lawmakers who benefit from sleazy ethics and campaign finance laws can summon the integrity to enact serious reform. Ultimately, voters probably will have to do it for them by passing a ballot measure."

You rarely lose any money betting against good government in the legislature.

Despite many sincere and meaningful bills from both Democrats and Republicans being filed to reduce the pernicious influence of money in the legislative process, legislation to undo Missouri's status as the only state in the nation with no limits on either lobbyist gifts or campaign donations appears stuck in mud.

A Senate debate ... over a proposal from Sen. Brad Lager, R-Savannah, intended to reduce lobbyist gifts and end the revolving door between lawmaking and lobbying, gave a strong indication that state lawmakers just don't have the courage to police themselves.

Some still want their free lunches and dinners. Others, like Mr. Lager, want to continue collecting six-figure checks from mostly anonymous donors. Some, knowing their time
in the legislature is almost up, don't want to give up the possibility of sliding into a lobbyist gig or a gubernatorial appointment.

The sweet lure of quick cash is hard to ignore.

Here's what should also be hard for those reticent lawmakers to ignore: Missourians want ethics reform. Badly.

A new poll conducted by The Wickers Group on behalf of the Missouri Liberty Project shows broad-based support, among Democrats, Republicans and independents, for serious ethics reform in the Show-Me State.

The poll, conducted in March among likely general election voters, found that between 70 and 80 percent of likely voters supported five different elements of ethics reform:

- Banning free tickets from lobbyists for professional or college sporting events, hunting and fishing trips and golf outings.
- Limiting the number of meals lawmakers can accept from lobbyists.
- Barring lawmakers' staff from working as paid political consultants.
- Requiring lawmakers to wait several years after retiring before becoming lobbyists.
- Creating a new unit in the attorney general's office to fight abuse and corruption in state government.

In each question, the support was highest among Democrats, but similarly high among both Republicans and independents.

A huge majority of Missourians support ethics reform. It ought to scare lawmakers unwilling to deal with the problem themselves; if a private group like the Missouri Liberty Project is willing to spend money polling on the issue, it's an indication that ethics reform will be eventually coming to a Missouri ballot.
Keep in mind, the Liberty Project is run by Josh Hawley, a conservative MU law professor who is involved in the Hobby Lobby lawsuit against contraception mandate in the Affordable Care Act.

We don't agree with him much. And we would point out that in using a 502-c-4 to obscure his organization's funding (he would not tell us who funds the Missouri Liberty Project), he is part of the greater problem in national politics.

Dark money is allowing a select rich few to control the nation's political system with little to no transparency. But that doesn't mean he's wrong on ethics.

He rightly, if ironically, points out that as lawmakers are improperly influenced by money, there is a real deleterious effect on the political system.

"It's about the right to participate in one's government," Mr. Hawley told us. "It's a vital part of what it means to be free."

Missourians want ethics reform because they want to believe in their government again. That is true of liberals and conservatives, city-dwellers and farmers, Democrats, Republicans, and everybody in between.

What is the Missouri legislature waiting for?

Copyright St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Reprinted with permission.

Former newspaper executive Bunting dead at 65

COLUMBIA, Mo. (AP) — Kenneth Bunting, a former newspaper executive and free press advocate, died while playing tennis. He was 65.
His death on Sunday from a heart attack was announced by the National Freedom of Information Coalition, where Bunting was executive director from 2010 until earlier this year. The free press group is based at the University of Missouri’s School of Journalism.

The Houston native and Texas Christian University graduate spent 17 years at the Seattle-Post Intelligencer, working as its managing editor, executive editor and the associate publisher.

He was also a senior editor at the Fort Worth Star-Telegram and spent nine years with the Los Angeles Times.

Bunting also worked for the San Antonio Express-News, the Cincinnati Post, the Sacramento Bee and the Corpus Christi Caller-Times.

Job market for college grads better but still weak

WASHINGTON • With college commencement ceremonies nearing, the government is offering a modest dose of good news for graduating seniors: The job market is brightening for new grads — a bit.

But finding work — especially a dream job — remains tough for those just graduating. Many are settling for jobs outside their fields of study or for less pay than they’d expected or hoped for.

The Labor Department on Tuesday said the unemployment rate for 2013 college graduates — defined as those ages 20 to 29 who earned a four-year or advanced degree — was 10.9 percent. That was down from 13.3 percent in 2012 and was the lowest since 7.7 percent in 2007. The drop reflects the steady recovery in overall U.S. economic growth.

But unemployment for recent grads was still higher than the 9.6 percent rate for all Americans ages 20 to 29 last October, when the government collected the numbers.
“I’m finding that all these entry-level jobs are requiring experience I don’t have or degrees that are just unattainable right out of college,” says Howard Rudnick, 23, who graduated last year in political science from Florida Atlantic University and wound up earning $25,000 a year working for an online shoe company.

“The worst part is that I’m afraid at some point I may have to go back to school to better myself and take on more debt just so I can get a better-paying job.”

Americans who have college degrees are still far more likely to find employment and to earn more than those who don’t. And while opportunities for new college grads remain too few, they’re increasing.

“It really is getting better,” says Jean Manning-Clark, director of the career center at the Colorado School of Mines in Golden, Colo. She says more automotive and steel companies are now looking at the school’s graduates, joining energy and technology companies that have been actively recruiting for several years.

Last year’s women graduates fared better than men: 9 percent were unemployed as of October last year, compared with 13.7 percent of men. Analysts note that the economy has been generating jobs in many low-wage fields — such as retail and hotels — that disproportionately employ women.

“It seems like the jobs that are growing fastest are jobs that are low-wage jobs, service jobs,” says Anne Johnson, executive director of Generation Progress, an arm of the liberal Center for American Progress that studies youth issues. Other fields that attract women — including health care — weren’t hit as hard by the recession.

Philip Gardner, director of Michigan State University’s Collegiate Employment Research Institute, says women also “have skill sets that employers want... They have better communications skills. They have better interpersonal skills. They are more willing to work in teams.”

Alexa Staudt’s job search lasted just three weeks. Before graduating from the University of Texas last spring, Staudt, 23, had landed an administrative position at an online security company in Austin.

“I had marketable skills from my internships” in event planning, marketing and copy-editing and experience working as a receptionist for a real-estate firm, Staudt says.

She’s happy with the job and the chance to stay in Austin.

Yet the McKinsey & Company consultancy last year found that 41 percent of graduates from top universities and 48 percent of those from other schools could not land jobs in their chosen field after graduation.

Even in good times, many college graduates need time to find a good job. But researchers at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York concluded this year that “it has become more common for underemployed college graduates to find themselves in low-wage jobs or to be working part time.”
The Labor Department reports that 260,000 college graduates were stuck last year working at or below the federal minimum wage of $7.25 an hour. That’s down from a peak of 327,000 in 2010. But it’s more than double the 127,000 in 2007, the year the recession began.

“Every way you cut it, young college grads are really having trouble — much more trouble than they used to have,” says Heidi Shierholz, an economist at the liberal Economic Policy Institute. “The labor market is not producing decent jobs.”

In a study last year, economists at the University of British Columbia and York University in Canada found that college graduates were more likely to be working in routine and manual work than were graduates in 2000; technology was eliminating some mid-level jobs that graduates used to take. The result is that many have had to compete for jobs that don’t require much education.

Their sobering conclusion:

“Having a B.A. is less about obtaining access to high-paying managerial and technology jobs and more about beating less-educated workers for the barista or clerical job.”

---

**Panelists recount Vietnam War-era protests on MU campus**

By Alan Burdziak

**Tuesday, April 22, 2014 at 2:00 pm Comments (2)**

Men involved in peace movements and social protests on the University of Missouri campus in the 1970s and '80s participated in a panel discussion Monday night about the effects of the protests on the university.

Bill Wickersham and Paul Wallace were MU faculty members in May 1970, when huge rallies drew thousands of students to MU's Francis Quadrangle. The two gave firsthand accounts of a May 11, 1970, protest.
Musa Ilu, who was a graduate student at MU in the '80s and involved in the anti-apartheid movement, and current MU graduate instructor Curtis Edwards spoke about the legacy of nonviolent opposition on campus. A lecture hall filled with about 100 people listened to the group for about two hours last night.

Wickersham, an adjunct professor of peace studies at MU, began the discussion by summarizing events that led to the May 1970 protests. He said protests around the country increased after President Richard Nixon announced military actions in Cambodia in late April 1970 and after Ohio National Guard soldiers shot and killed four students and wounded nine others May 4, 1970, at Kent State University.

Wickersham said young people despised the Vietnam War, which he called "illegal, immoral. ... It was very costly and very deadly."

University administrators, including the MU chancellor and UM Board of Curators, worked to halt the protests, and 30 students and faculty members, including Wickersham, were arrested and briefly detained, he said. However, Wickersham and others were able to persuade the chancellor at the time to meet and negotiate, and Wickersham also organized several "teach-ins" on nonviolence and fought to ensure student protesters' voices were heard.

Also in May 1970, sociology professors voted to cancel classes, which drew administrators' ire. Several professors were reprimanded and their salaries cut, an unpopular move that was remediated years later.

Ilu, a professor at the University of Central Missouri, said coaxing the administration to negotiate was a major win and shows the impact that nonviolent opposition can have.

"I think ... once academicians can really work together," Ilu said, "they can force administrations ... to act and behave in a rational way."

Wallace said protests against the war had been going on around the country and in Columbia for several years, including a seven-day protest at the post office in the mid-1960s.

"So when Kent State came about, we had not been in a vacuum," Wallace said.

Ilu said MU dealt with the effects of the protest and the administration's response to it until 1978, when the university sent a $1,000 check to a faculty member who had been docked pay for participating.
MU department to host lecture

Tuesday, April 22, 2014 at 2:00 pm

The University of Missouri Department of Religious Studies is hosting its sixth annual Distinguished Lecture on Religion and Public Life next week.

The guest speaker at this year's event is Edward Linethal, history professor at Indiana University, who will present a lecture called "The Predicament of Aftermath: Oklahoma City and 9/11." Every year, the lecture features religion scholars or those presenting on general interest topics.

Linethal’s presentation will be at 7:30 p.m. Monday in Fischer Auditorium inside of Gannett Hall, 802 Elm St.

The event is free and open to the public.

Wal-Mart heiress Paige Laurie Dubbert’s new arena: divorce court

April 22

BY LISA GUTIERREZ
The Kansas City Star

Well look who’s back in the news.

Ten years after having her name ripped from a new arena at Mizzou, Wal-Mart heiress Paige Laurie Dubbert is making new headlines with her divorce.

TMZ reports that Paige has filed for divorce from her husband of nearly six years, Patrick Bode Dubbert, the guy she married in a super-secret wedding in Columbia in June 2008.
She’s divorcing him over irreconcilable differences.

Translation: She’s hoppin’ mad.

A civil lawsuit she also filed accuses him of taking thousands of dollars out of a retail center in Malibu they operated.

According to TMZ, the lawsuit alleges that Patrick convinced Paige to let him hire a friend as co-manager, then the two men made themselves general contractors and paid themselves $70,000 a month.

She charges that Patrick also paid himself $250,000 a year to manage the project on top of other fees.

A twist to all this: She’s agreed to pay him spousal support under their prenup.

 паїг became infamous in these parts in 2004 when the University of Missouri named its new arena after her when her parents, Bill Laurie and Nancy Walton Laurie, donated $25 million toward the $75 million arena's construction.

Nancy Laurie is the daughter of the late Bud Walton, co-founder of Wal-Mart.

The move infuriated Mizzou fans, like the one alumnus who called the move “dad buying the biggest dollhouse.”

Paige Sports Arena wasn’t meant to be, though. Paige’s former roommate at the University of Southern California – yep, she didn’t even go to Missouri – told ABC’s “20/20” that Paige paid her about $20,000 over 3 1/2 years to write papers and do college assignments for her.

Once the story broke, Paige’s parents agreed to let the school rename the arena, the building now known as Mizzou Arena. In 2005 Paige also voluntarily surrendered her USC communication degree.

So much scandal, which possibly explains why everyone who worked her over-the-top celebrity wedding a few years later reportedly had to sign a confidentiality agreement pledging not to discuss the affair publicly.

STORY CONTINUES: http://www.kansascity.com/2014/04/22/4974822/wal-mart-heiress-paige-laurie.html#storylink=cpy