

OPINIONS DIFFER . . .

Does NU Need \$37 Million?

One again the University faces the state—represented by their legislators—in the biennial difference of opinion between what the school feels it needs in money to operate during the next two years and what the people of the state think it should have.

In 1961 the difference of opinion was striking—amounting to a \$8,895,987 difference. In 1959 the difference of opinion amounted to \$5,605,893. In 1957, \$5,894,160.

These figures do not represent the differences in total operating budgets for the University, but only the differences in the amount of money the University has requested from the state's general fund, which is what the legislature has control over. Another \$10 million is included in the budget for the next two years from tuition, University hospital income, federal funds and other funds to make the total operating budget—proposed for the 1963-65 biennium as \$47,083,905.

This part of the budget usually doesn't change and is of no concern of the legislature which has no control over it—in other words, the legislature cannot reduce this amount. It is the money requested from the state's general fund that suffers from the difference of opinion.

This year's increase of \$8.9 million represents the difference between what the University was given in 1961 and what it is asking for from the state in 1963. What about the difference in what the University is asking this year and what it asked for in 1960 which resulted in the \$28 million allocation? The University is asking for a great increase in the next biennium, but how does it compare with what it asked for prior to the biennium ending this year?

In 1960 the University sent a budget request of \$30,701,893 from the general fund. The legislature, after hearing the tight fist recommendations of their budget committee and after hearing the unrepresented complete support given by the Governor's office (it was the first time in state history that the governor went before the legislature in person and asked that they give the University just exactly what it wanted), followed the committee's recommendations cutting the budget by \$3 million. This was called severe at the time and it was for it represented a decrease of the requested increase of \$5.6 million to an actual increase of \$2.8 million—right in half.

Now the University faces the same budget committee with the same governor in office with a requested increase over the last biennium of \$8.9 million. In comparing with the requested increase in 1960 with the requested increase made last week, it seems the University's budget makers figure the situation has changed enough to warrant another try. Let's look at the figures. In 1960 the University requested \$30,701,893—it got \$28 million. Last week the University requested \$36,991,987 from the state's gen-

eral fund: an increase over the 1960 request by \$6,260,094.

Why would the University submit a budget request which topped by some \$6.3 million a similar request made two years ago which the legislature trimmed by \$3 million? They must face the same legislature, committee and governor. And besides, every state institution wants more and more money each year. What makes the University think it will be one of the few who has their request only slightly trimmed. In 1961 it was hacked in two. Why?

No one would ever suggest that the legislature rubber stamp the University's request. The senators have the obligation to their state to scrutinize the requests of all its institutions closely for inflated importance in some areas. This it does, mainly through the budget committee, which holds lengthy sessions with interested parties and public hearings. However, the budget requests should not be scrutinized too closely as was the case in 1961. When a University is left for two years without adequate funds to improve salaries of its faculties and offer salaries respectable enough to attract top educators to the University then this can be called too tight of control over the state's purse strings. Notice the word "respectable" was used in connection with salary, not "high enough." No educator expects to make a fortune teaching, otherwise they wouldn't stay in the field of education very long. They feel their are other ways to be rewarded. But they do need respectable salaries to live.

The budget request has been made. It has been called high by some. It is, but not in respect to the beating the present budget took in 1961. Would this year's request for general funds show such a high increase if in 1961 the legislators would have been more liberal. We doubt it. The University is trying to, or hoping to, gain lost ground; or attain the place it hoped to reach in this biennium but couldn't because the funds given to it were not adequate. They weren't even close. Yet the University has continued to grow and expand. It has done well with the funds given it. It has earned more. The question is not will the University grow, but at what rate. The explosion of this year's enrollment has shown that the rate has been too slow.

Now that the request is in to the State Tax Commission a long hard process of getting an approved budget begins. Hearings, reports, conferences outside the legislative chambers cram the calendars of educator, administrator and legislator alike. When the budget committee presents its recommendation to the legislature in session next summer the difference of opinion becomes acute. The only thing that can help is to be sure all facts are known and understood.

This last consideration is where students can really play a big roll. In groups they can take an interest in the state legislature and its senators. As individuals they must act as students of a fine University.

A Staffer Speaks Out

Just what is the administration's attitude toward sub-rosas? After reading the "official statement" in the Monday issue of the Nebraskan, I am more confused than ever.

The administration outlined six areas in which the sub-rosas do not conform with University standards.

Number 1—"Creation of suspicion among students and faculty." This is certainly a clear statement of policy. This statement could be applied to the Innocents Society or Mortar Boards in their selection of members just as easily as to sub-rosas.

Number 2—"Division of student groups precipitating the loss of student leadership." According to this, a student might assume that student leaders could be members of sub-rosas. For if it divides student groups with a loss of leadership, leaders of such a group must come from sub-rosa members as well as non-members.

But I thought the administration didn't want any sub-rosa member to be a leader—certainly this can be inferred from their recent actions. Yet they seem to recognize by this statement that this type leader does exist and that this is not wrong in itself (that these leaders are sub-rosa members) but rather the idea that they are responsible for a division.

This is indeed interesting. Certainly Young Democrats and Young Republicans are responsible for a "division of student groups, individuals or opinion." Student Council also divides leadership—take, for example, last year's resolution on the National Student Association in which the final vote was 19-10; thus splitting leadership, Dean Ross?

Number 3—"Acts of dishonesty." Naturally, if we infer correctly, the administration feels that only sub-rosa members are guilty of lying? No one would support such an absurd interpretation. No student on this campus can claim his record is free of "acts of dishonesty." Surely, to suppose that sub-rosa members should be dealt with so strongly for a common fault is also absurd.

Number 4—"Acts of vandalism." Obviously, this must refer to the "sign painting" episodes of recent concern. I'm rather sure that most every student on the campus has sometime in his life committed a "minor vandalism" of some sort. What student can say he hasn't done it?

windows on Halloween (some of the more adventurous may have also had a hand in moving certain small, wooden houses . . .) or "T-P-ed" some friend's home. Sign-painting, it appears to me, also fits in this class. Again the punishment is too harsh.

Number 5—"Unlawful consumption of alcoholic beverages." Off hand, I can think of approximately 6,000 University students, who have some time in their college career, been guilty of this offense. Furthermore, I cannot believe the administration is no naive as to think only sub-rosa members are guilty of this violation. Yet why—why—are they so harshly dealt with?

Granted, it is against the law. And granted, a punishment is appropriate. But ruining an entire college career and possibly a lifetime, is simply just too much.

Number 6—"Failure to assume responsibility for acts or statements." I suppose this refers to such things as vandalism (covered in the above paragraph) and the Pixie Press.

A few words concerning this infamous newspaper. The statements are libelous—supposedly. Does this mean that I think those same statements are true?

Perhaps a better word would be satire. The Pixie Press is, by most of its "readers", considered to be very clever and an instrument of real worth—if taken with a grain of salt, as I'm sure most readers do take it.

Granted, viewed from the outside, some of the statements could be construed as libelous. But this is a college community—one in which we attempt to live (somewhat unsuccessfully, by the way) a forthright life—in other words, we try not to be "phony." Perhaps this paper helps us to see ourselves and our campus in true perspective. Perhaps not. But it certainly does make us all stop and think. And thinking, to my knowledge, has never been punished on any college campus.

It may be argued that, taken together, the violations are serious enough to warrant suspension. For my part, I refer to a letter that appeared in the Nebraskan a few days ago from a noteworthy professor in the University Faculty: He felt that we all do silly things, and furthermore we have the right to these idiosyncracies. Suspension from the University, however . . . (J.M.)



Nebraskan Applauds

New members of Orchesis: Nancy Risler, Linda Ledingham, Marty Greenhou, Susie Anderstrom, Karlyn Ebner, Billie Smith, Linda Stadheim, Elizabeth Menne, Susie Gabies, Jane Reeder, Gayle Luff, Gwen Luff, Sandy Stefanison, Judy Heilig, Susie Ayres and Donna Block.

Pre-orchesis members: Lynn Jiracek, Kathy Duff, Molly Dow, Kathy Cochrane, Karen Hoppee, Connie Sharpe, Roberta Kriz and Carol Darnall.

The following 23 girls who were recently initiated into Aquaquettes: Linda Batt, Judy Baxter, Shirley Bottorff, Camie DeVriendt, Beth Droskin, Lynn Eden, Judi Hellig, Debby Holden, Sandy Lane, Margie Larson, Gayle Luff, Gwen Luff, Sandy Palmer, Marilyn Petersen, Ann Pierce, Ellen Reifschneider, Susan Skarda, Janet Southwick, Cindy Tenhulzen, Barbara Trites, Jean Wagner, Charlotte Walter, and Greta Woodward.

The new president and chairman of Phi Beta Lambda, a national fraternity for college students majoring in secretarial and business education.

Mary Sellentin will serve as the new president, while the committee chairmen are: Susan Wood, historian; Judy Gant, publicity; Ann Bartholomew, publications; Corrine Newton, photographer; and Sharon Macley, membership.

Dorothy Hazel, assistant professor of business education will act as chapter adviser.



Buzz, Buzz, Buzz Sub Rosa Rumors Fly About Campus

Interspersed among us The sick, ever destroying Plot of the underground, Unseen, but strongly There— Psychologically Destroying the faith of Human beings in one Another. Destroying integrous Organization, Loyalty And friendship. One accuses another, And he in turn accuses Another.

Who can say? Who can accuse? With what proof? Flagstone, slate And Cement Painted yellow— Red— Minor destruction, Compared to the wieldy Psychological destruction Of the unity of people Gathered together To live. Now, to live In constant strife, Suspicion And hate There being no concrete basis Usually

How can one, who Only the psychological Belief That everyone is a guilty One. These are the forces that destroy men. They have destroyed And they will destroy more, Whether they know it or not. Says he is not Ever expect belief When suspicious whisper: "They're built on falsehoods, They thrive on falsehoods, They lie, They're interspersed among us."

Sincerely, Sue Blevens

SPECIAL STUDENT DISCOUNT
SANTA SAYS HURRY TO
KAUFMAN's Jewelers
Your Credit is Welcome
1332 O
★ Diamonds ★ Watches ★ Jewelry
• KEEPSAKE • LONGINES • BULOVA

NEBRASKA vs. O.U.
Nov. 24 at Norman, Okla.
Reserve your room NOW at
PLANET INN MOTEL
6821 S.E. 29th., Oklahoma City
PRIVATE CLUB—FINE FOOD
25 Minutes from the game

Cliff's
gifts unlimited
come and browse
toy shop for men 13th & m
trend shop 1204 o st.
dolphin shop 9th & p st.

COLLEGE SPECIAL —
YOUR KEY TO SOCIAL SUCCESS
5 HOURS PRIVATE INSTRUCTION
(COLLEGE CLASSES \$5 PER HOUR) NO CONTRACTS **\$1950**
DON'S SCHOOL OF DANCING 4009 A ST.
PHONE 489-2581
LESSONS AT FRATS AND SORORITIES UPON REQUEST

SATURDAY NOV. 17th TICKETS—\$1
KOSMET KLUB PRESENTS "REEL RIOTS"
PERSHING AUDITORIUM 8:00 P.M.

Quotable Quips

Editor's note: The following "daffynitions," quotes and song dedications are a conglomeration of material from other collegiate newspapers and the unlimited minds of the editorial staff. (Thank you.)

Honor student: Any freshman who has not taken his first mid-term exam.

Exchanges: A social way of doing what nature would get around to sooner or later anyhow.

Drop slips: Small slips of paper which can save students, frustrate instructors, and keep some publisher happy.

Local bank account: An imaginary bottle which has a small hole at the top for use by parents, and a large hole at the bottom for use by the student.

The chance of finding a good parking place: Roughly equivalent to catching a tiger shark in Omaha's Carter Lake with a flyrod.

Rock-and-roll on stereo: Overlapping nausea.

The freshman: An intelligent young person whose desire for knowledge is a shining beacon in the dark.

The sophomore: A somewhat more worldly individual whose beacon has developed a flicker.

The junior: A cynical youth who enjoys an occasional non-intellectual beer party in the twilight.

The senior: A somewhat worried individual who sits in the dark writing application letters.

The pipe: First thing the freshmen buy. Their trouble usually comes when they try to use tobacco in it.

Victory party: Responsible, according to some authorities, for at least half of the support given to the team.

Price of books and supplies: The only thing presently higher than the Russian astronauts.

Quarter break: An official time-out designed to allow professors a sanitarium treatment, groundsman a chance to repair the damage to the campus, and students a chance to get their eyes uncrossed.