

A Change In Direction: Reducing General Fees (Part II)

EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the second part of an article by Albert J. Hoban, vice chairman of the Board of Trustees of State Colleges of Rhode Island, concerning the question of tuition in institutions of higher education. In the first part of this article (printed in Wednesday's Daily Nebraskan), Hoban explained that he was against not only a raise in tuition, but any tuition at all for a student's first two years in university. He pointed out that many students and their families can not afford tuition and that all students should have a chance to attend a university without being hindered by the high cost. Gov. Norbert Tiemann has recently said that his budget recommendation for the University will likely include a student tuition increase to be effective possibly next September.

Balance In Post High School Education
What I suggest is a balanced educational program beyond the high school level. We all agree that every child should be educated and trained to his potential. There will always be many individuals who can serve themselves and the community best by developing skills in the practical arts and sciences.

As we develop the excellent technical and vocational programs which the people of Rhode Island have already approved, the young man or woman who is not college material should have a full opportunity, irrespective of ability to pay, to exploit the talents and skills which he has been gifted and which are needed just as much as academic talents to build a strong community. No one has suggested that post high school vocational students will have to pay a tuition fee in Rhode Island.

We must recognize that it would be unjust and unfair to the boy with the aptitude for college work to tell him that he must pay tuition fees for his education while his brother obtains his post high school vocational and technical training free of charge. In our eagerness to remedy the double standard which handicapped the vocational student in the past, we must not create a new double standard in which the college student is at a disadvantage.

Traditional Principles Of Free Education
To my mind a policy of increasing tuitions is contrary to traditional principles of public education; contrary to the long range interests of the state and contrary to sound financial policy.

In 1959, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, of which the University of Rhode Island is a member, adopted a statement which begins with a quotation from John B. Bowman made in 1865:

"I want to build up a people's institution, a great free university, eventually open and accessible to the poorest boy in the land, who may come and receive an education practical and suitable for any business or profession in life. I want to cheapen this whole matter of education, so that, under the broad and expansive influences of our Republican institutions, and our advancing civilization, it may run free, as our great rivers, and bless the coming millions."

The policy of increasing the costs of public education to the individual is based on the false premise that higher education benefits only the individual. More than one hundred years ago, the people of Rhode Island rejected this premise and set forth the correct principle in Article XII, Section I of our constitution which still stands.

"The diffusion of knowledge, as well as of virtue,

among the people, being essential to the preservation of their rights and liberties, it shall be the duty of the general assembly to promote public schools, and to adopt all means which they may deem necessary and proper to secure to the people the advantages and opportunities of education."

Our forefathers not only adopted this principle, they acted on it. They provided free elementary and secondary education and they willingly approved the tax levies that were required to pay for it. Through a system of free education, they made it possible for us to enjoy the freedom and prosperity which makes our nation the envy of the world. I believe the people of Rhode Island have enough faith in free public education to move forward two more years at this time.

Need For Educational Qualifications
According to the report of the Columbia University study group to the Board of Education three basic changes in occupational patterns have far reaching consequences for Rhode Island:

"The first is that the need for unskilled labor in our economy is declining rapidly. Machines are replacing muscles. In 1930, 25 per cent of our labor force was unskilled; in 1965, only 5 per cent was unskilled. Herein lies a major reason for the human tragedy of one-fifth of our population living in poverty during an era of economic affluence.

"The second is the converse of the first. Jobs and occupations that will require larger segments of the labor force uniformly require higher degrees of skill, training and education. The most striking example is in the area of professional and technical occupations. Engineers, scientists, teachers, doctors, dentists and other professional workers, plus the technicians who support them are in short supply. It is estimated that these groups must increase twice as fast as employment as a whole between now and 1975. At a lower level the expanding clerical, sales and service occupations continually require higher degrees of skill and training. In the face of these facts jobs go begging for want of qualified personnel while the nation supports approximately 5 per cent of its work force who are unemployed.

"The third characteristic of the era that must be faced is the rapidity of change. No longer can a worker trained for a single craft or skill expect to remain competent for a life-time. Occupational obsolescence is the order of the day. New methods and new machines require new understandings and new skills; flexibility, adaptability and retraining become essentials to a career."

Rhode Island's Need For Educated Workers
Whether we like it or not, there is a fierce competition among the states for new plants and new industries. The rich states become richer and the poor states become poorer. We have acknowledged this competition in the redevelopment of our cities and our highways, by committing public credit to support plant construction and through the development of our natural resources. Today, education above the high school level is as essential to the public welfare as education at the high school level was 50 years ago.

Within ten years, the demand for unskilled and semi-skilled labor will drop by 25 per cent; the demand for professional and technical workers will double. The typical worker of 1975 will not be a bench hand or a press operator; he will be a computer operator or a junior engineer.

If other states, like California, have the people with

the education and training to staff the industry of the future they will get the plants and the jobs. Some people underestimate the importance of educational climate as a factor in plant site selection. To modern business, an educated work force and excellent educational facilities are much more important than low taxes.

In the world of tomorrow, there will be no escape from the judgment of science and business upon the uneducated individual and the community of uneducated people. In vain will Rhode Island spend millions of dollars for highways and redevelopment if its people lack the necessary education to meet the needs of automated industry. Either we spend the money now on free education or we spend five times as much in 1985 on unemployment compensation and relief programs in an economic wasteland.

Fortune Magazine quotes one expert as estimating that "between 1929 and 1957, the rising education of the labor force was responsible for 21 per cent of the growth in real national income . . . the increase in plant and equipment which is so commonly identified with growth contributed only 14 per cent." According to Becker in "Human Capital", the rate return on a college education as an investment in the human agent is substantially higher than the return investment in non-physical capital, running about 14 per cent per annum.

Free Higher Education As An Investment
The view that public higher education is only a benefit to the individual fails to recognize that expenditures for educating the youth of today is an investment, not a gift. Purely as a financial proposition the proposal to charge a student for the cost of his education sees the picture backwards. In the long run, the state treasury will get back not only what it invests in free tuitions, but a handsome profit.

The Bureau of Standards estimates that a college education permits a person to earn about \$180,000 more in his lifetime than he would otherwise have earned. If we waive tuition fees at the University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island College, and Rhode Island Junior College for two years, we invest approximately \$500 per individual. Is there any doubt that, during their lifetimes, the increased earnings of these students will produce more tax revenue than we invested? Consider our experience under the GI Bill of Rights. The federal government has received back in taxes based on higher earnings more than it ever invested and is currently receiving profit of an estimated \$5 billion a year.

We are not, therefore, confronted with the question of who will pay. It is clear the young people themselves will pay as they will pay for the college buildings and facilities which we are financing through bond issues. They will meet the principal and interest charges on these bonds by paying taxes during their earning years and they will repay, as taxpayers, what we invest by waiving tuition in 1966.

Writing in the Michigan Quarterly Review in April 1962, Eugene Power, Chairman of the Committee on Tuition of the Association of Governing Boards made the following summation:

"In conclusion, it seems appropriate to say that, rather than raising education fees, we ought to be striving to lower them and eventually to eliminate them entirely. We have seen that free public higher education is financially profitable to a state in developing its tax base; we all know the contributions it has made to our national welfare and to our happiness as individual per-

sons.
"We must ask ourselves whether we are trying to eliminate racial barriers to education only to erect economic barriers to admission. Certainly, as soon as state universities set up economic barriers to admission, they will lose the support of those economic classes to which the barriers are prohibitive—why should the poor pay their taxes to support schools that only the rich can afford to attend? Last but not least, there is the appalling waste of human talent that is lost when economic barriers close off any segment of our society from education. We long ago made education free because we had learned that genius and talent do not belong to any economic class.

"It has always been part of the great American dream that no student should be deprived of the opportunity for education because of economic poverty. This is the motive and basis for free public education. We believe that every human being is entitled to an equal opportunity for the development of his potentialities, that economic differences ought not to operate to discriminate against him. The least we can do, we have decided, to insure equal opportunity—which cannot be guaranteed absolutely because of many other factors over which we have no control, such as home and community environment and job opportunity—the least we can do is to give each young person a good start in life, and a good start toward the ideal of 'equal opportunity for the pursuit of happiness,' by giving him a good educational base from which to work. Hence, free public education. This is our responsibility and the responsibility of state legislatures.

Relatively Small And Temporary Expenditure
While, in my opinion, it is not a duty or function of the Board to base its decision upon an evaluation of tax sources, the Board may be of a contrary opinion. It would seem appropriate, therefore, for me as an advocate of a plan calling for an expenditure of money, to suggest what my proposal would cost and where the money should come from.

Since no more than 6,000 students would be involved during the academic year 1966-67, my proposal would require an increase of no more than \$300,000 over last year's budget. Eventually, the no-tuition principle for the first two years would cost about \$1.5 million a year until we begin to recoup from the original beneficiaries of the program.

Recently, our state budgets have been tight and subjected to cuts of doubtful wisdom, but within the next year or so the tax structure of Rhode Island must be revised to meet the realities of life. When this is done, expenditures to cover the cost of public higher education, along with many other critical needs, can be taken into consideration. Meanwhile, there is no reason why we cannot undertake a comparatively modest increase of a few hundred thousand dollars as an investment in the future of Rhode Island.

Lowering tuitions will be a capital investment for the state until the students of today are the taxpayers of tomorrow. I sincerely feel that the citizens of Rhode Island are willing and anxious to make the investment.

An Opportunity For Leadership
In this statement I have expressed some of the reasoning which has caused me to advocate a reduction in tuition fees. But the concept of free public education is a compound of faith as well as reason. We are trustees of more than bricks and mortar. We are stewards of a heritage handed down to this generation by those bold and lively experimenters who made Rhode Island a leader among the states in democratic government, in industry and in culture. Our ancestors did not wait to learn what other states had done. They were men of vision and action. Novelty was the constant companion of their daily lives.

If we are to set our feet once more upon the road to leadership and if Rhode Island is to share in the affluence we observe all around us we must first restore our faith in ourselves. The Board of Trustees of State Colleges has an opportunity to begin this great work of renewal by making higher education available to every boy and girl in Rhode Island without regard to ability to pay.

A few months ago, the President of the City College of New York, in discussing this aspect of the problem, said:

"In 1574, the people of the city of Leyden, Holland, succeeded in resisting with great courage the siege of the Spanish invaders. As a reward, William Prince of Orange, offered the citizens of Leyden their choice between perpetual freedom from taxation and the construction of a great university. The people made their choice. They accepted taxation in order to have a great university."

I believe the people of Rhode Island will make the same choice if we have the courage to present them with the opportunity to do so.

RON PEIFER'S A Handful Of Rain

The primary intent of this column will be, at first, to guide a tour for my readers through some of the lesser known areas on the University campus and to spotlight as best I can some of the unknown figures currently inhabiting this area.

I hope to throw some light on the appeal of these hidden places and personalities. My method of inspection is likely to vary from direct analysis to a semi-psychic jaunt into these somewhat uncharted areas. For some, the cruise will not be a new one; for others it may be one of surprise and perhaps even fright. In any event, the trip will be made.

I fully intend to introduce my readers to Desolation Row, Rue Morgue Avenue, Fourth Street, Juarez, and a few scattered lowlands in this vicinity. Some of the personalities begging to be introduced would include the Fat Man, the Little Squeaker, Achilles, Tom Thumb and a few nameless faces.

Interviews may be printed and reliable reports of the same are sure to be. Any University student at Nebraska who remains unacquainted with these people really has not seen the University and its area as it really is.

In short, I would hope that this column and its various tours will include some information of value, some humor from these sometimes-hysterical characters, and some ultimatums to someone in charge of something.

I am looking forward to these trips. I hope that I will be a suitable guide and some kind of a personable flashlight in the dark corners we're sure to enter. Nevertheless, we'll plan on going together and hopefully exiting the same way.

Daily Nebraskan

Vol. 96, No. 53 Feb. 2, 1967

Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
TELEPHONE: 477-2111. Extensions 2200, 2209 and 2206.
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$6 for the academic year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during vacations and exam periods, by the students of the University of Nebraska, under the jurisdiction of the Faculty Subcommittee on Student Publications. Publications shall be free from censorship by the Subcommittee or any person outside the University. Members of the Nebraska are responsible for what they cause to be printed.

Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Advertising Service, Incorporated, Published at Room 51, Nebraska Union, Lincoln, Neb., 68501.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor Wayne Kreschauer; Managing Editor Bruce Giles; News Editor Jim Ikin; Night News Editor Bill Miner; Editorial Page Assistant Susie Phelps; Sports Editor Ed Jernigan; Assistant Sports Editor Terry Graminski; Senior Staff Writers, Julie Morris, Cheryl Trill, Randy Irey, Junior Staff Writers, Mick Love, David Hamilton, Roger Bove, Jim Eninger, Dan Looker, Paul Eaton, Mark Gordon, Chris Carlson; News Assistant Eileen Wirth; Photographers, Mike Hartman, Doug Reister; Copy Editors Romney Reuter, Lynn Ann Gottschalk, Marty Dietrich, Jackie Glascock, Chris Stockwell, Diane Lindquist, Peg Bennett.

BUSINESS STAFF

Business Manager Bob Gino; National Advertising Manager Roger Boyer; Production Manager Charles Baxter; Classified Advertising Manager James Houston; John Fleming; Secretary Amy Bonaldi; Business Assistant Bob Carter; Glenn Friendl; Russ Fuller; Chris Lougee; Kathy Schooley; Linda Jeffrey; Subscription Manager Jim Hunter; Circulation Manager Lynn Rabjohn; Circulation Assistant Gary Meyer; Bookkeeper Craig Martinson.

Susie Phelps

'Nipped In The Bud'

Every state senator in the Nebraska Legislature is certainly free to verse any opinion he wants, but the Daily Nebraskan strongly questions the statements made by Bellevue Sen. Dale Payne Tuesday.

Sen. Payne called for "stern disciplinary action" against Wayne State College students who may have participated in any kind of demonstration.

He was quoted, "I say if there are trouble makers, let's get rid of them." He also stressed that campus protest movements must be "nipped in the bud."

The Daily Nebraskan questions Sen. Payne's use of the general term "trouble makers" and his suggestion that all student demonstrations are wrong. Often—although Payne may not realize it—student demonstrators no longer resemble panty raids nor are based merely on the desire to cause trouble.

Rather today student demonstrations and protest movements to a large degree demonstrate only a sincere concern and interest of the students in the quality of their education or other serious problems.

Granted demonstrations are not usually the best way to achieve the students' goals, but rather than worrying about "nipping" the students every time they begin to think on their own govern-

ment officials should be worried about what makes students become so concerned with certain problems.

Instead of speaking in reactionary terms, men in distinguished positions such as Sen. Payne should be proud that young people today are not as apathetic about their universities as they once were and are more idealistic than ever before about improving the world.

In the specific case of Wayne State College, it seems that rather than worrying about possible protest, the senator should have called for an investigation of the college's academic freedom and policies.

English Prof. Norman Hoegberg's letter is not the first example of someone questioning the freedom and academic atmosphere at Wayne State. It would seem that after the American Association of University Professors' censorship of the school in 1961 and the recent Hoegberg incident, someone should be interested in looking objectively into the Wayne College situation.

Certainly all Nebraska legislators would agree that an educational institution should be a place where the students and faculty can exchange ideas and opinions freely and learn in an inquisitive, vital atmosphere.

Whistle While You Walk

... Alan Barton

Small towns are delightful. In fact, I think everyone should live in one. I would even go so far as to say that each individual owes an obligation to society to preserve and extend this delightful aura beyond his realm wherever he goes.

We can use our school, the University of Success, as an excellent example of what I mean.

This is definitely a Midwestern small-town campus teeming with congeniality. Everything at the University seems to be conducive to a friendly atmosphere. Walking to classes, for instance, I cannot remember a day when I have not said "hi" to at least a hundred people and the marvelous thing about it all is that it's on a first name basis. Hi Bill, Bob, Judy, Sandy . . . most of the time I do not know their last names but that's not important anyway — I am always greeted by a broad, warm smile.

This feeling of friendliness extends into the union, our sanctuary of sophisticated leisure. People sit

down, talk, laugh, and are extremely cordial. Only the other day a complete stranger sat down at my table to eat his lunch. At various intervals between a hamburger, french fries and a coke he managed to tell me his first name, major and grade point average. Really a nice guy.

It makes no difference where one goes on the campus, he is always acknowledged warmly. He can whistle while he walks, sing, skip, run, wear what he wants; it doesn't matter, there are no class-conscious students here. Nobody cares, stares, points or pays attention to any deviation from the norm.

I particularly like the student-teacher relationship both in the classroom and off the campus. Here again, I think the friendly Midwestern heritage is a large determining factor. In most of my classes the instructor does not have a sufficient amount of time to complete his lecture, but rather than postpone his conclusion or clarification of the material he is usually whisked off by his stu-

dents to the union for coffee.

This rapport of communication between the faculty and the student body is truly one of the enlightening achievements at the University. Everyone is really interested in everyone else; and in school, particularly.

Another aspect of the social climate connected with the "U" reflects our Midwestern liberalism. Have you ever noticed how easy it is to discover the interesting parties? It's a snap. There is no underground social network at our University, as there is at other schools, which makes it difficult to find parties and meet other people. However, this does not explain why I meet the same people at the same parties every week — unless I am not friendly enough.

I can see why there is such a large faculty turnover at the University of Success — everyone wants to come here. This is certainly a pilgrim's paradise.



NOW RELAX. WE'RE JUST GOING TO CUT OUT ALL THE FAT.

Can Greeks Reform?

Discussion among Greek leaders at Tuesday night's seminar sponsored by the Junior Interfraternity Council may be an indication that at last fraternities at Nebraska are beginning to take a serious look at their role in the University community.

For once the Greek leaders publicly admitted that there is a serious intellectual gap between the fraternities and the rest of the University which must be closed if the system is to exist with any value whatsoever. The realization of this problem is essential to any future reform in the system.

It is the hope of the Daily Nebraskan that the new IFC president, elected last night, will provide the kind of dynamic leadership so badly needed to accelerate this type of introspection and self-criticism. He should plan panel discussions more frequently and involve an increasing number of Greeks in the dialogue, so that all fraternity members are aware of their weakening position.

Archaic methods of indoctrination into the fraternity spirit should be thrown out in favor of intelligent orientation into the university spirit. Only by stimulating

freshmen to actively pursue their individual talents, and then giving them adequate time to do so, can the fraternities integrate themselves into the University and at the same time build a respectable loyalty to the system which now demands loyalty to superficialities.

The participants in the discussion also realized that the students who they bring into the Greek system must be the ones who are informed, at an early age, of the necessities of change. They can no longer be entertained with the jargon that Greek is the only way and that it is essential to the happiness of their college careers. It is not. But if they wake up, they might be able to change things so that this belief would be more relevant.

Reconstruction of Greek Week, reorganization of the elections in Panhellenic, a greater emphasis on progressive pledge training and interfraternity cultural exchanges are just a few of the ways that the Greek system can pull itself up and become a vital link between the student and the University.