

Nebraskan Editorials:

... Time To Quit

Pete Elliott had a reasonably successful season on paper and an even more successful season in terms of good will and confidence in better things to come.

The agenda of the board of Regents showed suggested increases for all members of the football coaching staff and for Athletic Director Bill Orwig.

Orwig is listed by the University as a full professor and Elliott is listed as an associate professor.

It was the University's Athletic Director who was responsible for bringing Elliott and Jerry Bush to Lincoln.

It is said that Elliott is being considered for coaching positions at other Universities, but if after an average season he is given a \$2,500 boost, what will the University have to do when he has a successful season and the competition becomes stiff?

It may be possible that it is necessary to give Pete Elliott a large pay raise. It may be that collegiate athletics have reached the point where football coaches—as a commodity—are worth more than college presidents.

The Nebraskan believes that Coach Elliott is an asset to the University of Nebraska, but we also believe that Bill Orwig, as Director of Athletics and as the man who bears responsibility for all athletic programs, should be paid more than any coach who is responsible to him.

It may cost money, but we believe that if

Pete Elliott is to be paid \$14,500, then Bill Orwig should be paid \$15,000. When the figure begins to approach \$17,500, then it is time to quit.

Regent J. LeRoy Welch, in making the motion to boost Elliott's salary, said that "Elliott's outstanding success during the first year should bring him a salary more commensurate with his service."

At the present time, Elliott is somewhere—no one is quite sure just where—possibly listening to offers of greener pastures.

It would appear that the University is trying to enter big-time competition which in itself is all right, but when it becomes necessary to offer large pay boosts and disregard any notion of academic privilege, then it is time to settle down and become accustomed to Big Seven competition.

This is not intended as criticism of our football coach nor is it a form of disrespect for the Board of Regents. We are proud of our University and this pride is built in the classroom—where we are taught by associate professors who earn upwards of \$5,000 each year—just as much, if not more so, as our pride is built by victorious football teams.

The editor of a college daily at a large university on the west coast recently suggested that the football team be paid openly and that what he believed to be professionalism be labeled as such.

Let us not close our eyes to the cost which has been paid time and time again for winning football teams. Let us not close our eyes to the disgrace for which many of us were responsible in connection with the departure of Bill Glassford from the Nebraska football scene.

There are more important things in this world than a salary increase for a football coach, but the tragic note is seen in that fewer and fewer people are able to name those more important things.

Unfair Taxation

State concern for the University's higher budget request has increased since the legislature has gone into session.

A few basic ideas must be remembered as we look at the problem in the light of need. Nebraskans, must, of course, look at every angle of the situation in order to understand just what Chancellor Hardin means when he said that we are faced with a major crisis in education.

People in the state got a practical view of the problem when it was announced Saturday that Dr. Colbert C. Held will leave the University to assume a better paying position.

Two choices remain for the state to make. The University can become a powerful influence in education and research. Or it can become a second-rate institution of higher learning.

An interesting article in the Chicago Sunday Tribune was entitled, "When you glide, you roll down hill." This might be very appropriate for Nebraskans who are willing to get along on hard tack budgets, little tax increase and little future for state educational expansion.

The Nebraskan realizes that the state has been plagued with drought too long to make an increase in taxes a favorable step.

But perhaps Nebraska has been too long burdened under a system of taxation which is

not as fair, not as equal as other systems are. Bills have been introduced in the legislature to increase such taxes as those on amusements. A push to obtain a sales tax, or an income tax is being contemplated. We see the broadening of the tax base as the only solution to the problems of the University.

After all, the economy measures which the state is striving to effect are measures which would ease government as well as make it more efficient. But Nebraska, in contemplating more office space for the capitol which was to be "sufficient for 50 years" realizes that this is no longer an infant state.

So where can the people of Nebraska turn for help in their struggle to keep their heads above water?

For one thing, they are turning to the income of fellow Nebraskans. Now, those who live in apartments are relatively free from the burden of a fair share of taxation.

It is easy to see, then, that as the state broadens its views, as it broadens its interests and as it broadens its ideas of democratic government, it must distribute the share of support for the government to the most people.

If the University is to survive, new funds must be obtained for the University. And if, as it appears, this is impossible under the present tax base in Nebraska, the people must be foresighted enough to assume a new tax.

Nameless Example

At a New Year's Eve party at Washington, a speaker noted that events in '56 were almost back to normal, "Eisenhower is back in Washington, Eden is back as Prime Minister, and Dulles is back and forth."

Bypassing "those men who would be remembered among the great names of the epoch" Time magazine named as its "Man of the Year" a man who was on no roster when 1956 began.

Chosen were those nameless men, women, and children—both living and dead—who had "shaken history's greatest despotism at its foundation," the Hungarian Freedom fighter.

Said Time of its selection, "The Man of the Year had many faces, but he was not faceless; he had many names, but he was not nameless. History would know him by the face, intense, relentless, desperate and determined, that he had worn on the evening of Oct. 23 in the streets of Budapest; history would know him by the name he had chosen for himself during his daimless contest with Soviet tanks."

Bypassed for the coveted award were several "makers of history" ranging from peacemaker (Dag Hammarskjold) to troublemaker Gamal Abdel Nasser, athlete (Olympic Gold Medal Winner Bobby Morrow) to entertainer (Elvis Presley), Communist hatchet-man (Nikita Khrushchev) to the People's Choice (Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon).

The Hungarian Freedom Fighter, said Time, demonstrated the profound and needful truth that humanity is not necessarily forever bound and gagged by modern terrorist political techniques. Thus he gave to millions, and specifically to the youth of Eastern Europe the hope for a foreseeable end to the long night of Communist dictatorship.

Ultimate effect of the fighters for freedom remain to be seen. Today the great world liberators, the Communist party in Hungary, are quietly rounding up those "oppressors of justice," those thousands who by their own bloodshed gave hope to the future of a world without Communism.

The Nebraskan

FIFTY-FIVE YEARS OLD
Member: Associated Collegiate Press
Intercollegiate Press
Representative: National Advertising Service, Incorporated
Published at: Room 26, Student Union
14th & E
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

EDITORIAL STAFF
Editor: Sam Jensen
Managing Editor: Fred Daly
Editorial Page Editor: Mack Lundstrom
News Editor: Bob Ireland
Sports Editor: Walt Blore
Copy Editors: Gary Frenzel, Sara Jones, Jack Pollock and Dick Shugrue
Ag Editor: Don Herman
Night News Editor: Sara Jones
Staff Photographer: Dale Lewis
Office Secretary: Julie Duvall
Staff Editor: Jan Farrell
Staff Writers: Nancy DeLang, George Meyer, Marjane Thygeson, Cynthia Zschau, Bob Martel, Bob Wira, Dave Herzog

Reporters: Carole Frank, Tom Wariowski, Judy Sieler, Marilyn Niles, Minnetta Taylor, Diana Maxwell, Sandra Whisen, John Gahorn, Eodley Hall, Diana Geese, Stan Widman, Art Blackman, Barbara Neston, Bill Wilson, Gary Peterson, Gary Rodgers, Mary Dee Patterson, Gretchen Saege, Deanna Barnett, George Porter
BUSINESS STAFF
Business Manager: George Madson
Circulation Manager: Richard Boudrix
Assistant Business Managers: Don Beck, Larry Epstein, Tom Noff, Jerry Sulistanski

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS by Dick Bibler



"YOU SHOULD HAVE SEEN HER DEMONSTRATION LAST YEAR!"

Voice of The Turtle

Ha! The fools—they've done it again. They have given us a new year to ruin. Now we can go out and start new wars, and complicate the ones we have already started, and hate people, etc.

Probably everyone had a good time over Vacation, with turkey and ham and prime ribs and mashed potatoes to surround, and ten hours of uninterrupted television every day.

Also, most likely everyone went home with cases of books and papers and everything, and proceed-

Fred Daly

ed not to get anything done. After four years I have developed a keen sense of not getting anything done. I can not get anything done for hours on end.

Sometimes one gets conscience qualms, but they can be lulled away by the TV tube. It is like taking dope.

New Year's Resolutions used to be a very big deal, but now they are pretty much left alone. We are becoming less and less a race of hypocrites, apparently.

The Christmas Holidays are a time for getting married, one is led to understand. I got my roommate married off out in Ogallala, and I owe around for wedding presents dating back to November.

According to whoever writes rules of social behavior, you have one year in which to send a present. So don't clutch, it will get there eventually, just as soon as money can be raised for postage.

Collegiate Poll: Adequate Preparation

Minneapolis — (ACP) — Educators, politicians, parents and many other interested individuals have discussed the kind of a job colleges are doing in educating the youth of this nation for the future. Much of the argument concerns the perennial issue of liberal vs. narrow, intensified study. Methods of teaching also come in for praise and criticism.

In order to get the collegiate slant on this issue Associated Collegiate Press asked the following question of a representative national cross-section of college students:

DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR COLLEGE IS DOING AN ADEQUATE JOB OF PREPARING YOU FOR YOUR FUTURE LIFE?

The results:
Men Women Total
Yes 72% 78% 74%
No 15% 15% 15%
Undecided 13% 7% 11%

In general, college students overwhelmingly support the kind of a job their present colleges are doing. When asked reasons for their decisions, most students reply in terms of their own individual situation, saying they are satisfied with their choice of program, etc.

One comment however, is repeated a number of times, and a Wake Forest College (Winston-Salem, N.C.) senior coed expresses it quite well: "Adequate preparation depends more on the person than the college." And a freshman at the University of Wyoming (Laramie) puts it this way: "What you put in is directly equal to what you get back."

A very satisfied sophomore attending Mississippi College (Clinton) has this to say: "I'm getting an all-around education and am growing mentally, spiritually, physically and socially." But a sophomore at Tyler Junior College (Tyler, Texas) states: "Scholastically yes; mentally and spiritually no."

A University of Denver sophomore qualified his opinion by ap-

proving the overall job colleges are doing but comments that "some majors are sometimes too confining in scope," while a freshman at the same school can find nothing wrong: "The University of Denver is definitely a wonderful institution, and the instruction received here may be considered as excellent."

With students who feel their colleges are not doing an adequate job the major complaint is an overabundance of petty details and den you too too many extra courses you don't need" is the way an Ohio University (Athens) junior expresses himself, and a Wake Forest College senior states: "I think the college program is unrealistic because it is too concerned with details that will never make any difference."

A Maryland University (College Park) senior feels that colleges should offer more "chances for experience" and take more "interest in the students." And a senior at the Rochester Institute of Technology (Rochester, N.Y.) believes that in some instances the "caliber of instruction and the courses do not have many things in common with preparation for the future."

"Bright now I don't feel as though I'm prepared for a thing" is the quizzical reply of a University of Maryland sophomore. And a freshman coed at Wake Forest College is worried because her institution doesn't "offer adequate preparation for married life."

Some students undecided on the issue feel the pros and cons equate each other, or as a junior coed at Syracuse University (Syracuse, N.Y.) puts it: "... adequate in certain phases—not at all in others." But in general, undecided students believe they just don't have enough information available in order to make a decision. But when asked the question a sophomore at Juniata College (Huntington, Pa.) states: "I'll tell you in about 15 years."



Pandoria

Sunday night Loretta Young put on a tall hat and gave the television audience a good look at the Hollywood conception of ancient Egypt.

The king was in his counting house, all right, but instead of counting out his money he was counting out the blessings which had been showered on his by the all loving sun god, Aton (the vowels are insignificant.)

I think that this program popped up at the right time. All during the holidays people were badgering me about what I do in this column.

"You write too deep," one friend said. "You fail to say anything but repeat the big words in Webster," coughed another. My own brother looked cross eyed at me and said, "Get down to brass tacks, boy!"

Just what this all has to do with the queen of Egypt is, in my estimation, very much . . . On one hand we have presented before us on the television screen a view of Egypt which is not an accurate reflection of Egyptian thought and life and on the other hand we have a conception of a columnist as opposed to the real motives of that person.

That's still too vague, I know. The thing is, we too often view others in the narrow scope of our own beliefs and don't take what they have to offer in the spirit it is offered.

Then, too, Loretta looked like Nefertiti. Her looks were the same as that statue which has been stuffed in a corner of the Berlin Museum for these past years. Ostensibly, my writing may look like a column to the few.

Yet to the many who are familiar with WW and BB, my work doesn't even look like the city's public notices. During the holidays I caught up on my old America's and read, what in my mind, are some good columns.

And it was a pleasure to see long sentences, tough words, and a dictionary at my side into the long hours of the night. But that still doesn't lop me over to the offensive side of the game of life (for that sentence I might be fired.)

I told my brother that what I was working for was an understanding of the basic problems all face when they start to live. He maintained that I should concentrate on those many problems which are facing the University so that I would be a positive force.

Then he said in the next breath, as he read the report of what student council representatives had to say in Kansas City, "Some guys just don't leave well enough alone. They're always looking for the spotlight but don't care what they say about the University." You can imagine which one of us began to laugh.

That's the picture as it flashes on my screen today. I'm sure our prejudices and our likes are very much found up in the sphere of influence we know. For those who saw Loretta and think that the Egyptians were finding the Pax Christi and for those who think that columnists should be short, sweet and funny, there are always movie houses and spigots.

For those who would rather solve a few basic problems, know a few basic facts about history and understand some of the elements of why peoples differ, we can still get Falernian wine and America's rates are but \$7.50 a year.

To the editor of The Nebraskan: The unfortunately misrepresented stories concerning the Big Seven Student Council convention's discussion of campus liquor policies prompts this letter.

The wire stories which ran in several local papers, obviously constructed from isolated quotes in the Kansas City Morning Times (Dec. 28), implied that the Nebraska delegation broached the entire subject of collegiate drinking. . . . originated a suggestion to revamp university rules which ban drinking" and supported this suggestion by criticizing the University of Nebraska's enforcement of campus drinking regulations.

These three embarrassing implications could not be further from the purpose and tenor of the discussion among the Big Seven student council presidents in Kansas City over Christmas vacation.

In the first place, the subject of campus drinking regulations had been placed on the pre-convention brochure at the written request of the University of Missouri, and was not presented by any member school for special consideration at the conference.

Secondly, the Nebraska delegation argued, against the direct opposition of several other Big Seven schools, that the conference administrations were all obliged by state law to enforce drinking regulations on campus. Further, our representatives pointed out that this jurisdiction could be legally extended to fraternities and sororities, normally privately owned, but nevertheless always chartered by the Board of Regents.

The suggestion which was informally agreed upon by the member schools in lieu of an official vote, was to the effect that Big Seven administrations exercise caution to see that legal boundaries are not overstepped in the enforcement of drinking regulations.

This was neither an attempt to "revamp university rules banning drinking" nor was it an effort to enlist sympathy for on-campus drinking, but was merely intended to strengthen our position of enforcing drinking regulations in accordance with state law by trying to insure, in so doing, that (1) the legal rights of the individual are not impaired (as in cases reported at Oklahoma University where locked cars had been broken into) and, (2) the legal rights of universities are not over-extended (as in cases at several schools, including Nebraska) where administrations find themselves in the legally indefensible and virtually unenforceable positions of supervising all impromptu gatherings.

Thirdly, our explanation of Nebraska's drinking policies came in response to a question by the K-State discussion group chairman, and were defined as enforcement of drinking regulations on campus and at university functions (which I interpreted by the Student Affairs Division as four or five students gathering socially.)

It may be pointed out that our delegations supported this stand strongly, and contended unequivocally that drinking regulations must be enforced on University, state-owned property, disagreeing only with the interpretation that the institution could legally and practicably enforce drinking regulations in all off-campus gatherings of more than five students.

It is unfortunate that the news stories did not adequately reflect the spirit and temper of the student council convention, and even

Nebraskan Letterips

Editor, The Nebraskan: This business of tuition for University students must arouse most universal interest throughout the state. It fits in well with our program for conservation and utilization of natural resources. The greatest shortage in the United States today is skilled manpower. Every young person graduating from college enriches the state and nation. Enriches it many times the cost to the state of education.

When the great GI Bill of Rights was passed I was aghast at the great cost to the government. And it was really enormous. Now we all look back and wonder what on earth the country would have done without the teachers, doctors, engineers, what have you who trained under that wise and generous legislation. No one will question that the progress of this nation was greatly accelerated by the contribution of these enthusiastic and well trained young people.

The funny thing about it is, the more educated people we turn out, the more we seem to need. It's like a great bon-fire that rises higher and higher the more it is fed. And so today, I think the most shortsighted thing the state or nation can do is take a parsimonious attitude toward education. The GI Bill boys proved conclusively that we have abundant material ready and willing to accept educational opportunity and make good on it any time it is offered. I do not speak here for the selfish welfare of individuals who want an opportunity to make money, although this is perfectly legitimate. I speak for the health, safety, and prosperity of the state.

Instead of increasing the tuition for our University students, we ought to reduce it.

The Federal Government ought to aid generously in education of every sort. During the campaign we heard President Eisenhower on TV promise not only to see that a bill to this end was introduced in Congress, but he promised to throw the influence of his administration actively behind it.

We are losing money on every dollar we "save" on education. Too many of us are shortsighted. I feel sorry for a college president with so little vision. It is far from characteristic. Chancellor Hardin is conservative. He is not asking for money for an eleemosynary institution. He is calling attention to an opportunity for accelerating the prosperity and spiritual progress of Nebraska.

W. T. Davis

What's in a Number? (ACP)—A University of Texas coed has been scaring away some of her dates lately, but entirely against her will. When going through enrollment, she wasn't sure of her new phone number . . . decided to list it on all her cards as she remembered it. Now men who call her get a masculine sounding husky-voiced answer. The Daily Texan advises date-seekers to hang up promptly and informs them the unknown voice is the Austin chief of police. The coed used the chief's unlisted number by mistake.

We Here . . .

What's in a Number? (ACP)—A University of Texas coed has been scaring away some of her dates lately, but entirely against her will. When going through enrollment, she wasn't sure of her new phone number . . . decided to list it on all her cards as she remembered it. Now men who call her get a masculine sounding husky-voiced answer. The Daily Texan advises date-seekers to hang up promptly and informs them the unknown voice is the Austin chief of police. The coed used the chief's unlisted number by mistake.

W. T. Davis

We Here . . .

What's in a Number? (ACP)—A University of Texas coed has been scaring away some of her dates lately, but entirely against her will. When going through enrollment, she wasn't sure of her new phone number . . . decided to list it on all her cards as she remembered it. Now men who call her get a masculine sounding husky-voiced answer. The Daily Texan advises date-seekers to hang up promptly and informs them the unknown voice is the Austin chief of police. The coed used the chief's unlisted number by mistake.

W. T. Davis