

United
we
stand

More often than not editorial writers, especially young college journalists, belabor issues of controversy. Usually the intent is meaningful but the results, insofar as getting the message across, often leave room for improvement.

Hopefully, the issue of the University budget will not fall into this syndrome. Or as Regent Koefoot said Saturday, the University budget should not become a political football.

More specifically, the University budget should not become another issue to be wrangled with by the various factions of the University. To the contrary, this is the issue that should bring members of the University community together.

This doesn't mean that those concerned about the internal problems of the University should forget their woes and neglect their efforts of bringing reform within the University. If that would happen the University would face a most acute and serious problem: the problem of apathy.

But the point is that no one has to compromise their principles to work side by side with others who are trying to help the University.

To maintain an attitude of refusing to work with the Regents on the budget because you may disagree with them on other issues can only be characterized as arrogance and impudence.

If a member of the Board of Regents, namely Dr. Robert Koefoot, is going to speak strongly in behalf of the University, then he deserves everybody's support. If students and faculty respond favorably to Regent Koefoot's concerns, they will be doing a service to the entire community. In effect, they will be encouraging further positive statements from other members of the Regents.

Don't shirk this opportunity to work together with the Regents. This may be one of the few times that we will enjoy the chance to develop and cultivate a cooperative, community spirit. Everyone can at least give it a try.

Editor's note:

Wednesday's Daily Nebraskan will outline effectively means students and concerned citizens can use to help improve the University's budgetary problems.

Mick Moriarty



William F. Buckley, Jr.

Revenue - Sharing

It sometimes happens—have you noticed?—that a subject gets so sliced up, one despairs of trying to pick up a piece of it that will not fragment; and, rather than start again from scratch, the temptation is to give up. It is so, for instance, with the disarmament proposals. And it is so with the revenue-sharing business. At this point so many people have been heard on the subject, often saying contradictory things, one has the feeling that the public simply turns the dial when the subject comes up, like the English and the Common Market.

State Statistics

Well, some recent figures are in front of me, from which, without very much coaxing, it appears to me that a story line emerges. First, one or two surprises—to stimulate the mind, and to break up the stereotypes. New York is the richest (highest per capita income) state in the union, right? Wrong. Connecticut is, right? It is the second richest; Nevada is third, and only then New York.

Mississippi—surely—is the poorest state in the union? Yes, it is. And socially the most backward? How do you usually define socially progressive states? By the size of state and local taxes. Mississippi takes, in taxes, \$117 for every thousand

dollars of personal income. By contrast, New York State taxes \$140. Inasmuch as New York is one of the very richest states, and Mississippi is the very poorest state, then the tax-strain on the Mississippians can be seen to be far greater than on New Yorkers: which collapses one old saw.

New York has the highest rate of taxation in the nation? No, the second highest. Hawaii's is the highest.

What is the spread between the poorest and the richest state? Alaska's per capita income is \$4,460. Mississippi's is \$2,218, so that the richest American state has about double the per capita income of the poorest American state. What state is closest to the median? Missouri, whose per capita income is \$3,458 (the median is \$3,406—almost three times Japan's).

How many states are poorer than Missouri? I.e., have per capita incomes less than the national average? Twenty-three. They are: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia and Wyoming.

Incomes affect welfare

How does Missouri, as the

mediar state, make out in the welfare game? Well, it pays over to the U. S. Government \$500 million per year in taxes. How much does the U. S. Government pay to the state of Missouri in welfare grants? \$502 millions.

Is that round trip really necessary?

The Congress of the United States has resolved that henceforward no state richer than the average, i.e., no state whose per capita income exceeds Missouri's, shall qualify for any federal grant.

What about the poorer states? Let Congress, which in 1969 put out \$24 billion in welfare grants, scale down its brokerage function, by addressing itself exclusively to the poorer American cousins. The poorest American state, Mississippi, has been getting federal aid at the rate of about \$200 per capita, compared to Missouri's \$125 per capita, and (inexplicably), New York's \$140 per capita. The parameters are suggested. Why not begin at \$100 per capita for the underprivileged states? The total population of the less-than-average states is 53 million. Times \$100, you have just over five billion dollars. If experience reveals that that is not enough, raise the figure. Meanwhile, the individual states are emancipated, and can look after their own welfare problems in their own way; and that is the true meaning of decentralization.



'I HANDLE GLOBAL STRATEGY... BILL HANDLES OUR ENTIRE FOREIGN POLICY STAND'

NEWSDAY
Distributed by L.A.
Times Syndicate



Frank Mankiewitz and Tom Braden

The balance of powers

WASHINGTON—There is a nasty temper behind the argument over whether the Senate has a right to hear directly from presidential aide Henry Kissinger; and if Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri showed it first, President Nixon upped the temperature sharply.

Symington said Secretary of State Rogers was a joke on the Washington cocktail circuit. It was an unkind remark toward a man who no one can dislike. But President Nixon called the remark "a cheap shot."

The exchange reveals what Washington has sensed for a long time: that on both sides of the Vietnam issue there is a feeling of helplessness and frustration and real-if papered-over-anger.

Senators powerless?

Senators such as Symington and J. W. Fulbright, who are senior in service and accustomed to wielding power, find themselves unable to have any effect on the policies of the nation which are most important and upon which they take pride in having an effect. To look in the mirror in the morning and greet the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee must give a man a certain self-esteem, and thus it must hurt him the harder when he discovers that despite the title he is impotent in the field of foreign policy, even to the extent of finding out very much about what it is. No wonder Fulbright complains on television; it is almost all that is left to him to do.

On the White House side, Mr. Nixon has fallen victim to the curious circular logic of this war. He can hold the

casualties down by keeping American troops out of battle, but when he keeps American troops out of battle, no progress is made in the war. So he too is frustrated. Under an elaborate facade of politeness to reporters and respect for senators who differ, his seething anger is visible.

In the argument over Kissinger, the President has all the logic on his side. Executive privilege is not only long-established but essential to government. If senators were permitted to question presidential advisers, it would soon be debating advice the President didn't take, and little honest uninhibited advice would be offered.

But being wrong—and knowing that they are wrong—does not ease the senators' frustration. In the sixth year of an undeclared war, senators cannot even find out how many troops the CIA deploys in Laos or what commitments the Pentagon has made to the defense of Thailand. When the President tells a press conference that he knows of no plans on the part of a wholly financed subsidiary to invade another country, but indicates that it would be the wholly owned subsidiary's decision, the entire Senate winces.

Balance gone

It is too late to do anything about restoring the balance of Executive-Legislative power in the Indochina war. There was a point—perhaps it was after the Gulf of Tonkin—when Mr. Nixon's predecessor might have asked for a declaration of war. Whether he had been refused or upheld, we would be better off.

But Sen. Thomas Eagleton

of Missouri has proposed just such a settlement for the future. He has introduced a resolution requiring an explicit act of Congress to authorize hostilities, giving the President unilateral power only to repel attacks upon the United States or upon its armed forces lawfully deployed abroad.

Eagleton is espousing his resolution as a return to the provisions of the Constitution, which specifies that Congress shall have the power to declare war. He argues that an indifferent Congress provided little or no restraint on presidential decisions which have entirely shaped the course in Indochina, and that Congress would not have been indifferent had it been required by law to act responsibly.

The Eagleton plan has at least the merit of logical action. It will be better for both branches of government to give it serious consideration than to continue, as now, to snarl at each other.

Sorry

Quite obviously, the Daily Nebraskan erred in headlining the editorial concerning Masters' Week (Monday, March 8). It should have read, "The Good Trip." Sorry!?

dear editor... dear editor... dear editor...

Dear editor—

I would like to comment on the letter of Robert Rauner which was placed in the Daily Nebraskan on Friday, March 5, 1971. It is my opinion that this letter was completely inane and that Mr. Rauner is obviously not aware of the consequences that will arise because of the proposed budget cut.

I am not being made a stooge nor a sucker by any instructors at this University concerning this issue. Instructors are concerned as am I (and rightly so) with the recommended University fiscal policy currently being propounded by Governor Exon. This University, without a substantial, let alone a minimal budget, will become

academically closer to the second rate institution than what it is now. University instructors are more aware of this than what most students seem to be, and totally more aware than what most residents of the state of Nebraska are. It is clearly evident that without adequate materials and facilities instructors will not be able to instruct nor will students have the means, even if they do have the initiative, for an adequate independent study program.

If people as Robert Rauner are willing to sit aside and watch the decay of this University without taking into account the consequences of this decay, I say that they are placing little value on their own education, and no value

on the education of future students at this institution and the progress of education in general in this state.

I for one do not want to see the installation of third and fourth rate instructors in this University for lack of sufficient inducement and poor facilities. I do not want to see limited enrollment for any in-state students wanting to come to this University because of a tuition hike or because he had graduated from an unaccredited high school. I do not want to see our finer tenured and untenured faculty members leave this University because of a reduction in faculty salaries. I do not want to see research being deterred in the College of Medicine,

the College of Dentistry, and the College of Agriculture, to name a very few, which could benefit the entire profession because of a lack of state funds which also influence Federal funds. I do not want to see the new engineering building, planning to be opened next fall, remain unopened because the University cannot afford the increase in utilities and maintenance on their budget. I do not want a degree from an institution that will soon be classed as second or third rate.

It seems illogical when comparing the University of Nebraska (all campuses) with all other members of the Big Eight, on

the basis of the relationship between gains in enrollments and state appropriations, (1959-69) that the University of Nebraska is the only institution that experienced less gain in State support than in enrollment. This fact is taken from Case For Nebraska by Chancellor Varner in his presentation of the University's biennial budget, 1971-73.

No, Mr. Rauner, University instructors are not making a stooge out of me, because I am graduating; but ask yourself if, because of Governor Exon's proposed budget cut, they will make a stooge out of you!

George Arthur Harris

THE DAILY NEBRASKAN



MICK MORIARTY
editor

CONNIE WINKLER
managing editor

JOHN DVORAK
news editor

GENE HILLMAN
advertising manager

JAMES HORNER
chairman, publications committee

Telephones: editor: 472-2588, news: 2589, advertising: 2590. Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Subscription rates are \$5 per semester or \$8.50 per year. Published Monday through Friday during the school year except during vacation and exam periods. Member of the Intercollegiate 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: The Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.