

# Nebraskan editorial page

## Unsaid holds key

The right claimed by the Athletic Department to preclude selling of any concessions outside the football stadium on game days is roundly attacked in today's paper by Ken Wald and contributors to open forum.

It seems though, that two major fallacies of the arguments against the charity booth made by Bill Fisher, the department's business manager, have been ignored.

First, he contends that allowing one charity booth would open the field to such organizations as churches and charities. He overlooks the fact that any non-campus organization could easily be prohibited.

Second, he fails to recognize that the booth was planned as a small, one-shot operation that could in no way jeopardize the massive concession business run by the Athletic Department.

It looks as if the Athletic Department has developed a giant paranoia from a small incident. If this can threaten its operation, as it obviously believes it can, there must be something wrong with its operation that it doesn't want to talk about.

Holly Rosenberger

## NU trust breaking

## Conscience-Conscious

by Ken Wald

Everyone seems to be quite concerned these days about the growth of monopolies and their tendency to strangle every other institution in our society. It is about time that someone focused this same concern upon the University's own equivalent of the military-industrial complex — the Go Big Red Establishment, otherwise known as the Athletic Department.

Two recent actions by this monolith indicate that it sees itself as the center of the universe around which all other lesser beings must rotate.

The first incident, publicized in Monday's Nebraskan, saw the Campus Police shut down a concessions stand near the stadium on orders from the department's Business Manager, Bill Fisher. According to Fisher, there were three solid justifications for his storm trooper tactics.

First, if one charitable organization was allowed to cut into the business, fifty or sixty more would follow. That's good thinking, Bill. If you let all those people in, you and I both know what will happen to property values around here.

Then he contended that the purpose of the booth was solely to "destroy our business." This, in spite of the two houses' announced intent to donate the money to the Lincoln Indian Mission Center. Apparently Mr. Fisher has achieved some new Freudian insight that escapes the rest of us or he is the recipient of a divine revelation.

Lastly, he justified his conduct with that favorite phrase of Herman Goering and Adolph Eichmann that "We have our orders." It didn't work for Herman and Adolph.

Aside from the irony involved, there are some very substantial issues. For example, the sponsors of the booth had received permission for their enterprise from the Student Activities Office. By its very title, one would expect that branch of the University's administrative structure to have jurisdiction over such projects.

Yet Mr. Fisher claims that his mandate from The Comptroller and some anonymous "University authorities" overrides Mr. Eaglin's approval. Mr. Fisher should be informed that the University exists for the benefit of all its students, not just the preservation of his bailiwick.

Earlier in the year, Mr. Fisher tried to exercise his muscle in another way. He asked the Publications Board to direct the cessation of printing of the Husker Special, a football-oriented edition of the Daily Nebraskan which was distributed on Saturdays before home games. He claimed that the special was in competition with his overpriced official program and, by providing data that would be rejected in an elementary statistics class, accused the Nebraskan staff of significantly lowering his monopoly's sales.

His technique was even more specious than his arguments. The board members in attendance at the meeting asked him to send to them a short letter explaining all his demands. The request was made so that the issues could be weighed more carefully in private session with all members present.

Fisher did send the letter but not under his signature as asked — it bore the imprint of Bob "Win one for the Gipper" Devaney. It was a very subtle kind of pressure. If you're against the Coach, you're against the University (not to mention God, mother and apple pie as well). It reminds the cynic very much of President Nixon's futile attempts to draw an invidious analogy between opponents of his war policy and supporters of communism, and, by extension, totalitarianism. It has even less validity.

In sum, the Athletic Department needs to be controlled. It must learn that it is not a law unto itself nor the grace and salvation of mankind. It must realize that its presence is not a necessity for the efficient functioning of this educational institution.

If it cannot play fairly, it ought not to play at all. The government occasionally seeks to dissolve conglomerates. Maybe it should begin with a less conspicuous behemoth.

## DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. Telephone: Editor 475-2282, News 475-2285, Business 475-2290. Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$6 per year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods. Member of International Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

The Daily Nebraskan is a student publication, independent of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government. Address: Daily Nebraskan, 24 Nebraska Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68583

Editor Roger Evers; Managing Editor Kent Cockson; News Editor Jim Pedersen; Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt; Dave Filipi; Editorial Assistant Holly Rosenberger; Assistant News Editor Janet Maxwell; Sports Editor Randy York; Nebraskan Staff Writers John Overak, Bill Schirmerman, Sara Schneider, Gary Sacristan, Steve Silliman, Rachitter Singh, Diane Wank, Mike Barrett, Sue Palfrey, Sylvia Lee, Bob Whitten, Carol Anderson; Photographers Dan Lacey, Jim Dean, Howard Rosenberg, Mike Maynard; Copy Editors Dee Lashley, Jan Parks, Suzi Schickelmeier; Florida Adelman; Business Staff Business Manager Ed Tompkins; Local Ad Manager J. L. Schmidt; National Ad Manager Greg Brown; Bookkeeper Ron Swartz; Business Secretary and Subscription Manager Janet Kaufman; Circulation Manager James Slaw; Classified Ad Manager Jane Wagner; Advertising Representatives J. L. Schmidt, Joel Davis, Joe Wilson, Linda Robinson.



SILENT PARTNERS

## Open Forum

Dear Editor:

The recent Athletic Department vs. charity fiasco left me with a number of thoughts which served only to bring back hostilities obtained while participating in campus activities a number of years ago.

The first impression was that the Athletic Department had finally placed the straw to break the camels' back. It was now obvious that here was the voice of final authority on this campus telling us again of the dominance of athletics over rational decision making. The students had at last been given something to justify the existence of this institution of higher learning.

We could rest easy, the system was now in good hands — a coalition of the Athletic Department and the university police. This idea only tempted me to rationalize not issuing the charity booth sponsors a permit to sell. After all, it seems somehow unreasonable that one organization could "just wreck business for the Athletic Department" and the proceeds from the sale of the permit may have provided for one more athletic grant-in-aid.

After further analysis of the subject it seemed that in the end the final liability rests with the Office of Student Affairs. Here was a typical situation of one branch of administration giving permission where it had no authorization to give permission.

After all, selling at a football game, either before, during, or after is obviously out of the realm of student affairs. Selling implies profit orientation, therefore a function of the profit motivated — the athletic department and campus police (\$15 for a parking sticker?)

There is a serious side to this ordeal. Someone made a mistake, and thus messed up some very noble plans for a break in homecoming tradition. I feel that the subject deserves some student if not administration attention. The fact remains that some charity was denied some needed contribution because the Athletic Department cannot tolerate competition.

Jerry Andersen

Dear Editor:

There is much talk on campus these days of the "establishment" and how it controls our lives, a much cited example is the Administration. However, there is one powerhead on this campus that is being totally

ignored. That is the Athletic Department. I enjoy football and the other sports as much as anyone, but I feel that the right of the Athletic Department to have a monopoly on concessions covering all University property before and during a game is wrong.

The students "make" this campus, including the Athletic Department. I believe students have the right to express their concern for those in need and the right to set up projects to raise money for those areas. I do not believe that the Athletic Department should have the power to control this right. As long as these projects are not in the stadium I fail to see how this would seriously hinder the financial stability of the Athletic Dept.

I would think that concession booths and similar projects for charity during one football game, i.e. homecoming, would be encouraged by those who say that Nebraska students are apathetic and are not concerned about the problems of this world. I think that Saturday's incident with Farmhouse-Gamma Phi Beta was indeed a study in irony and hypocrisy.

Ronald Urwiler  
Cather Hall

Dear Editor:

"War, this monster of mutual slaughter among men, will be finally eliminated by the progress of human society, and in the not too distant future, too," said Mao Tse-tung.

He goes on to describe just and unjust wars. Can it be doubted that the U.S. in Vietnam is an unjust war? Its constitution was born of the American Revolutionary War which was a just war. By means of this constitution the present war can be ended, for it provides means to end unjust wars by the people through constitutional actions of free speech, free press, free assembly.

Puppet Thieu will fall because of his ignorance of constitutional rights. Nixon himself is ignorant of the basic powers given the people by the constitution, for he chooses to ignore public appeals. Very few Americans voted for Nixon; and few even bothered to vote. More participated in the Moratorium than have ever voted for any American President. It should be a sobering thought for the administration, for Nixon is afraid of the will of the people.

C. M. Dalrymple

Dear Editor:

"Give to football what is football's," an editorial which appeared in the Nebraskan Nov. 6, perhaps hit closer to home than most people would think. The crowning of the homecoming queen during PP&M was a prime example of cornfield tact. But then naturally the incident can be written off to the fact that we are in a "culturally deprived area."

This fact becomes painfully evident when one hermits himself in the corner of a party, and listens to exciting intellectual dialogue, such as "I thought she was going with an Alfa," or "Let's play pass-out."

If we journey to the "adult" world of parties in Nebraska, we may find, "Did you see the way Van Bronson scrambled?" or, for the more mathematically minded, "We gained 135 yards passing, not 132 yards." Football fervor is fine, and since it is perhaps the only way people in New York know of Nebraska's existence, we should support it.

Here is a test of sorts to evaluate the relative interests of NU students; first ask them the names of the NU quarterbacks; second, ask them the name of the Nebraska Lt. Governor, or if you really want to go out on a limb, ask them who wrote "The Tragedy of Doctor Faustus." Compare your findings.

There is a reason for the barren intellectual wasteland it can hardly be the instructors' fault; they only have the specimen three hours a week. The majority of the student's time is devoted to "peer-group placation."

Compare the number of students at a play or music recital with that of FAC or a football game. Sad, isn't it? It has always been my impression that college was an intellectual organism. The only thing college students support in Lincoln, besides the team, is the liquor store.

The reason why entertainers, speakers and the like tend to shy away from here is because they may suspect that their efforts will not be honestly appreciated. If you were an entertainer, would you want to play Lincoln, Nebraska? The earlier mentioned, smooth move is an example of why you might not.

But it takes more effort to read a novel, to go to a play, or do individual research, than it does to tramp off to the game or dig up a date for the party Friday. If we are to

pull out of the cow-path and up to the expressway, we must expend effort.

A writer in Playboy several months back had a rather valid insight into the nature of the midwestern university: "It's too bad we can't lick cancer the way we beat Iowa State." But then it's your world.

James R. Smith

Dear Editor:

There are on this campus a number of people who for one reason or another have approached the Tri-University Project staff offering their services in a number of capacities related to helping education serve our Indian brothers over academic hurdles. We at Tri-U are much concerned over the dropout rates in these and other cultures. As our contacts with these peoples widen our resources seem to get thinner; we simply cannot handle the requests and needs adequately without additional resourceful people.

Your help is needed — we need manpower. We plan to establish some sort of tutorial program for our Indian friends to strengthen their academic life and soften their problems of "making it" in school. As few or as many hours as you could give to a child during a week would be appreciated by Tri-U and most appreciated by those children striving to make it.

No matter what your area or degree of competence, or whether or not you know these kids' problems and-or cultures you can be of significant help. What these people learn from you can save many of them from a tortuous, tedious and too soon ending school life. What you may learn from them is no less important. We have some 30 volunteers for this kind of work now. We plan to give people some orientation in Indian life and culture and continuous discussion support.

On November 13 at 8:30 p.m. in Room 11 of Andrews Hall there will be a meeting of interested students and friends to discuss and plan for an active Indian tutoring program in Winnebago, Lincoln, perhaps Macy, and perhaps Omaha.

All travel expenses will be covered — all we ask for is your time, some of your mind, and a great deal of your soul. Paul Olson and students of The Tri-University Project

## Wait and watch

The confrontation this week at the University of Nebraska at Omaha between the campus president, Dr. Kirk Naylor, and the Black Liberators for Action on Campus (BLAC) poses a very real problem for concerned observers interested and for the media that will have to give them information from which to form opinions.

This, as any situation, has a foreground represented by those on either side of the problem.

That foreground tends to obscure the really important details, the background that led participants to a confrontation situation.

Naylor's remarks have implied that he had been completely unaware of the existence of the problems BLAC presented to him. They put him in the role of a conscientious administrator confronted with demands concerning situations he had not realized existed, expected to take immediate action without a chance to familiarize himself with these problems.

Statements by Robert Honore, president of BLAC, contend the opposite — that Naylor has been aware of a number of problems on the campus but has ignored them, even when students have tried to take steps through "the established channels" he suggested at first that they try.

Honore's representation of the situation has been supported by a number of students and faculty members at UN-O who are quoted on the front page of today's Nebraskan.

Such an attitude would justify BLAC's last resort, a sit-in to produce immediate recognition of the problems and opening of meaningful discussion toward defining and solving the problems.

Because of the murkiness of the situation and because the media, as a result of the pressures to get news out immediately which makes it necessary that any news event be covered in a piecemeal fashion, it is imperative that outsiders reserve judgment until they are satisfied they understand a very complicated situation.

Holly Rosenberger

## OUTSIDE the tower

by Michael Egger, David Pass and Tom Siedell

In recent years scholars and students alike have become aware of the gradual degeneration of our great universities and colleges. The trend has accelerated rapidly since World War II, as we plunge headlong into the abyss of a runaway technology that threatens mankind with destruction.

Universities and colleges have become glorified vocational training schools designed to channel skilled manpower into this technology, and are increasingly dominated by industrial research, government research, and business interests of various sorts, all technologically oriented.

As a result our institutions of higher learning have been emasculated of their traditional and still espoused purpose and intent, that is, to train and stimulate the intellect of their students and teachers to enable them to make rational well-thought judgments concerning the crucial problems we now face — moral, social, political, and technical.

It is not at all surprising that this situation should have arisen. The first seeds were planted almost a century ago as the blossoming sciences competed for a place in the educational system along with traditional humanist disciplines. The means of resolving the problem was the institution of a system of electives, which eventually evolved into an academic major and our ludicrous system of "group requirements."

No one questions the importance of scientific disciplines in a liberal education; their system of reason alone justifies their presence, to say nothing of their value in describing the world around us. Nor is the system of academic majors an evil in itself, but it opened the flood gates of increased specialization, particularly in the technical subjects, at the cost of the individual's education. However, the "group requirements" are but cheap lip service to the traditional goals of the university.

But outside interests are not entirely to blame for the plight of our colleges, for much of the trouble comes from well-intentioned students and faculty. Two groups who unknowingly compound the educational dilemma are the "social-action relevantists" and the "technical-specialist relevantists."

The former seek to do away with all requirements, including that of a sound education, to enable themselves to rush pell-mell and unprepared into current social problems of enormous complexity. They demand increased specialization in curricula at the cost of knowing how to use it.

Their cohorts in crime, the "technical-specialist relevantists" are even more to blame. They demand that their education be practical, that it train them as fast as possible for a technical vocation, and to hell with anything that gets in the way. These are the darlings of our industrial-technical complex. Such attitudes often coupled with lack of a truly liberal education, warns us of the uncontrollability of the technology they hope to run.

They also fail to realize that a few corporate technocrats are finally waking up to the fact that even they cannot control their own technological Frankenstein and are beginning to seek the help of individuals with the carefully developed judgment that comes only from a liberal education.

We do not condemn students coming to college to prepare for their life's work or the sensitivity of students and faculty to contemporary social problems. What we do condemn is the forfeiture of a liberal education to the technical-vocational curriculum, and the trend towards specialized, but often superficial, modern problems courses, which are unprofitable because students lack the background to appreciate them.

Fortunately this situation need not exist. It is quite possible to acquire in the space of four years a quality education in the Western tradition while at the same time fulfill an academic "major" satisfying contemporary vocational and social needs. The specifics of such a liberal education will be the topic of our next discussion.