

Masters Week

Masters Week is over with, but a few words need to be said about the program.

This year's Masters Week was one of the best events this University has ever sponsored. The returning alumni represented a diverse, yet dynamic group of individuals.

And the Masters were generous in spending their time with students in many classes and living units.

In addition to the Innocents and the Mortar Boards, perhaps some type of special appreciation should be expressed to Union Program Director Hal Smith and President Joseph Soshnik for their help in making the program a success and for making the event one in which many students had an opportunity to participate.

But despite the success of the program, there is already talk that the program may be underfunded or perhaps discontinued next year.

The prospect of discontinuation of the Masters Week program is disheartening. It is unfortunate that we face this type of attack at such a critical time, a time when there is such an acute need of having universities become more responsive to community needs. This possibility is also serious in that it may be discouraging further constructive action by men's and women's honoraries. If anything, the relatively recent phenomenon of having honorary societies perform meaningful functions should be embraced, not banished. If this is the upshot of Governor Exon's budget—that meaningful and relevant programs will be cut—then there can be no question on the effects of the new University budget. It's going to mean the students will be paying more and receiving less.

The FBI Story

Sen. George McGovern also should be applauded for having the guts to confront FBI director J. Edgar Hoover.

McGovern was recently attacked as being Un-American for publicizing a letter written him anonymously by ten FBI agents.

The letter strongly attacked the dictatorial policies of Hoover. And subsequently McGovern asked for a congressional investigation of Hoover's administration.

Hoover maligned McGovern for publicizing the letter, saying the action was "reprehensible" and "irresponsible."

However, in defense of McGovern's actions, it should be reiterated that if Hoover wasn't doing anything wrong he should have no fears of justifying the administration of the FBI in front of a Senate investigating committee.

The concerted attacks on McGovern by FBI officials, calling the senator Un-American and the rest should indicate that something is rotten in Hoover's state of Denmark.

The problem is that McGovern doesn't stand much of a chance in getting a congressional investigation of the FBI.

In fact, there will never be an investigation of the FBI until the people demand it, until the voters realize that in a democracy the government, hence the police, are supposed to be servants and not the tyrants of the state.

Mick Moriarty



Mankiewicz and Braden

The Pentagon counterattacks

WASHINGTON—"My center is giving away, my right is pushed back...I am attacking."

The words were those of Marshal Foch, at the Second Battle of the Marne, but they could have been spoken last week by Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, as the Pentagon counterattacked.

Bad Week

All week, it had been little sort of disaster. In Laos, the South Vietnamese, "hacking it"—in General Abrams' immortal phrase—on their own, with nothing to help them but 2,000 U.S. air missions a day in a battle area smaller than most American cities, were being badly mauled except when U.S. helicopters could pick them up and move them ahead.

Midweek, CBS moved in with a documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon," demonstrating the millions spent by the American people to convince themselves to spend more. Pentagon apologists like Rep. F. Edward Hebert (D-La.) was reduced to spluttering rage.

Next day, it turned out, a

large piece of pipe displayed earlier as having been severed from the Ho Chi Minh pipeline by the South Vietnamese, hacking it on their own in Laos, had been picked up somewhere else at some other time—no one was quite sure.

On top of all that, the My Lai court-martial of Lt. Calley ground on, amid mounting desire to hear from higher-ranking officers who covered up the horror, and Sen. Ribicoff's subcommittee was unfolding a comic opera of corruption among American brass in Saigon.

Into the breach on Sunday afternoon stepped Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington, the Pentagon's Old Reliable, with the revelation that the Soviet Union was starting to build a missile even bigger and more frightening than the SS-9.

Said Jackson, "The Russians are now in the process of deploying a new generation, an advanced generation, of offensive systems...the new developments are ominous indeed."

Lo and behold, immediately

following Sen. Jackson's revelation, the Pentagon backed him up. Their intelligence is apparently identical.

It was a double newsbreak, and it is hard to tell which is more important—the news that the Russians are advancing in their missile construction or that the Pentagon intends to use Sen. Jackson as its principal mouthpiece in the forthcoming presidential campaign.

Neither is unexpected. The United States is installing Minuteman III, a multi-warhead version of Minuteman II. We are also installing Poseidon, a multi-warhead version of Polaris, but with three times the payload. It is hardly surprising to learn that the Russians are advancing, too.

Politics?

As for Sen. Jackson, his ability to make Pentagon revelations is an indication that his candidacy is a serious one. There is not much chance that he can win the primaries he thinks essential to nomination, but his candidacy may force front-runner Muskie into a

strong stance for national defense. Muskie has twice voted against the ABM and has declared himself in favor of the McGovern-Hatfield proposal to set a terminal date for U.S. troops in Indochina. He may now try to find a strong pro-Pentagon issue with which to counter Jackson.

What the Jackson revelation ought to bring about is a re-examination of the U.S. position at the SALT talks, where we are asking the Russians to agree that they will halt the building of their SS-9s and equivalents in return for a promise on our part to cease deployment of ABM. The Russians cannot possibly buy such an arrangement, which leaves us free to develop offensive weapons while they are not.

But President Nixon has already put himself on record as opposing the Soviet countersuggestion, which is that each side cease the building of ABM. So the arms race will continue and Sen. Jackson, the conduit for Pentagon leaks, will justify it for us as we go.

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

To clarify

Dear Editor,

This is in reference to our letter that was published March 8th with a reply from Governor James J. Exon. As a member of the academic community of the University of Nebraska, we feel that our intelligence was insulted. Although the figures stated in Governor Exon's letter may be accurate, they are very misleading. As an example, there was a large percentage of increase when the University of Nebraska at Omaha was added to the budget. Also the fact of the continuing increase of new students each year on both campuses was not mentioned.

There has been increased interest in our concern about the budget proposal from various sources on campus. In a recent meeting with Vice-Chancellor G. Robert Ross and Dick Fleming from Public Relations Office, favorable comment was given to our organization for our concern with this issue.

Due to the way the facts were presented in Governor Exon's letter, we feel that a very untrue and misleading image of the University of Nebraska was given. We are therefore following up with a letter presenting the facts as we feel they should be presented.

Yours Truly,
Dan L. Cuda, President
Student Veterans Organization
University of Nebraska

More on the budget

Dear editor,
The following is a copy of the letter I sent to Governor Exon concerning the budget.
Dear Governor Exon,

In the past few weeks of controversy over the proposed University budget, you have continually referred to University officials as responding to your proposals with "temper tantrums" and have further alienated them by stating that "Nebraskans and students of the University of Nebraska have been misled by

information fed to news sources by handsomely paid employees of the University..."

Misleading remarks are plainly evident from your position also. First, from your letter to the Student Veterans Organization, the merge with UNO and its effects were hardly left out. Also no figures were included to show the percentage of increase of state aid as compared to the percentage increase in enrollment. The inclusion of these two figures would have done much to clarify your position. Second, in relation to your speech in Columbus in relating to the fact that 10% of the University's classes being offered have four or less enrolled, this is clearly misleading to the outside observer who has no conception of the fact that this ten percent of the classes offered actually effect probably less than one percent of those enrolled at the University, which was not brought forward in your speech. If the University professors were not fearful of the consequences, I believe that could sight many examples to the contrary. All that has really been proven is that anyone can manipulate figures to accrue to their own benefit.

These kind of responses are reminiscent of purely political speeches used primarily to degrade or default an opponent. Surely, these cannot be your intentions, can they? (Or have you not time to start working towards what should be a common goal, instead of traveling around the state defaming prominent appointed and elected officials.)

No truer words were ever spoken when Chancellor Varner stated that there was a lack of understanding involved. This is evident from your speeches and your letter to the Student Veterans Organization. Meaningful, discussion of all the facts involved would surely benefit all affected.

Jack Ford

Correction in tuition

Dear editor,

Though the budget outlook for the University may appear bleak to many students, it is not quite as bleak as the proposed student letter run in Wednesday's *Daily Nebraskan* makes it appear. In the Governor's budget a \$38.50 increase per semester or \$77 increase per year is recommended for those students carrying 12-16 hours, not a \$70 increase per semester as stated.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Mary Lynn James
Administrative Intern

Replies to Courier

Dear editor,

A reply to Mr. Egger's comments in the CUE courier No. 2, March 8 (ASUN Anxieties or How to Blow it Again) is necessary. Mr. Egger stated that ASUN entrusted IPA to provide "conflicting viewpoints about the War" for the ASUN Teach-in that was later cancelled. What he didn't mention was that we contacted members of various groups on campus and asked them to help us procure "conservative" spokesmen. We also contacted Republican National Chairman and Senator from Kansas, Robert Dole and the entire Nebraska Congressional Delegation asking them to appear. Thone and McCollister agreed to reply on tape to prepared questions which would be played back at the Teach-in. The Pentagon was also asked to provide a speaker on the ecology of Vietnam.

Mr. Egger also stated that Schlesinger, Lowenstein, and Halberstam "backed out" or "blamed that on ASUN." The facts are that we were relying upon the Association of Student Governments in Washington D.C. who had given their word that the three speakers were coming. After pressing ASG for specific details, they admitted that these speakers were not confirmed. We did everything

we could to confirm these speakers. The facts are that but one had never been contacted by ASG. They never "backed out", they were never "in". (It should be noted that ASUN is not a member of the ASG.) At that point, with little time left, we of the ASUN Teach-in Committee, did everything possible to go ahead as planned. The fault lies not in ASUN but in ASG, who, at the last minute, broke their commitment.

Ron Alexander
Tim Kincaid
Bill Tiwald
ASUN Teach-in Committee

Legislature politics

This letter is being written to all those who are truly interested in the proposed University budget, and the success or failure Governor Exon attains in accomplishing it.

The Budget Committee of the Legislature will discuss this segment of the proposed state-wide budget Thursday, March 11, at 2:00 P.M.

For anyone planning on attending this committee hearing, I would like to make one recommendation. If you go, and plan to testify in front of the committee in the behalf of the University, take solid evidence with you. Have facts with you that you can present for your cases. Do not, as so many people meaninglessly do in letters, attempt to gain sympathy by saying, for example, "How can they do this to a fine school?" or, "It's a number one school; let's be sure to keep it that way." These statements won't work—you must be very concrete and present facts and figures that will convince the lawmakers that we, the members of the University community are right, and that perhaps our Governor might be wrong.

Richard K. Sophir

Exon's Edsel

The following is an editorial excerpt from the *Omaha World Herald*, Tues., March 9, concerning the University budget.

"The governor used an automotive analogy which probably was not his most fortunate choice as a figure of speech.

"Isn't it possible for us," he said, "to accomplish our goals by traveling the road to

excellence in higher education in a Ford station wagon with more room for all than in a luxurious Cadillac complete with stereo music?"

We doubt that the university or its supporters are expecting a Cadillac. And we hope the budget doesn't turn out to justify a description as Exon's Edsel, a lemon of the vehicle that would take the university chugging down the road to educational mediocrity."



William F. Buckley Jr.

Revenue-Sharing II

Having scaled down the brokerage function of the federal government by relieving it of the responsibility for taking money from the richer states in order to return money to the richer states, what can it usefully do? Two things, one of which I alluded to in the first of this two-part series. Namely, to act as the agent through which money passes hands from the richer to the poorer states, as the philanthropic or redistributionist impulse moves the Congress.

Possible formula

A suggested formula might be based on the distance of any given state from the national median. Thus, for instance, Mississippi, where per capita income is \$2,218, presumably needs more help than Montana, where per capita income is \$3,130, close to the national median of \$3,406. Congress might reasonably decide to funnel \$100 per capita to the poorer states, and take it from there.

The second thing the federal government could usefully do

is to lease its tax-gathering facilities to the individual states. I do not see any substantial argument, based in theory or in practice, against such cooperation. Thus, on day X in the future, the resident of New York, having filled out his federal tax return, would go on to consult the table for New York; which would give him the exact sum of money he would need to add to his federal return in order to discharge his state obligation. Exit, with the single deed, all the state internal revenue agencies that occupy themselves with income taxes. The federal government, on receipt of the grand total, would put aside the indicated sum for the credit of the individual state, less a service charge.

Now ideally, the federal government would get out of the business of graduating the tax. As Professor Friedman has demonstrated, it could do so with no pain at all to itself, and with great benefit to the body politic.

Reforms needed
A very few reforms would be needed. Those Mr. Friedman has advocated are: 1) eliminate all deductions, 2) double dependency allowances; and, lo, you could raise as much money as the government now raises from personal income taxes, by having a set rate of 20 per cent. You could even throw in a \$1500 negative income tax floor, by increasing the flat rate to only 23%. The figures are suggestive of how relatively little is the money that is taken from the rich. They are simply not numerous enough to constitute a significant tax factor.

The states could then devise income taxes of their own choosing, setting the rates according to their fancy; and, dutifully, the tax would be collected by the single internal revenue agent, and remitted to the states. But the taxpayer would always be aware who it is that is taking his money. That nexus, so greatly stressed by Wilbur Mills, is indispensable to enlightened self-government. Under Mr.

Nixon's plan, the Congress of the United States ordains the tax, then remits a part of it to the state, whose legislators then assemble in order to discuss merely the matter of how the money should be spent: not whether it should have been raised in the first instance.

To separate the one function from the other is the device of those who wish to conceal from the taxpayer what are the economic realities. In his book *The Affluent Society*, Professor Galbraith, always on the prowl for means of substituting himself for the marketplace, suggested automatic increases, pegged to inflation and cost of living, for schools, and such, to spare the legislators the occasional agony of having to levy more taxes, or letting the schools run down.

Better the agony, I say; and surely all taxpayers would say as much, and would hope that Congress will address this opportunity to engage in revenue-sharing, by adopting genuine, radical, reform.

DAILY NEBRASKAN

MICK MORIARTY, editor
CONNIE WINKLER, managing editor
JOHN DVORAK, news editor
JAMES HILLMAN, advertising manager
JAMES HORNER, chairman, publications committee

EDITORIAL STAFF
Staff writers: Gary Secrest, Bill Smitherman, Jim Pedersen, Steve Strasser, Dave Brink, Marsha Bangert, Carol Goetschius, Charlie Harpster, Mike Wilkins, Jim Carver, Marsha Kahn, Bart Becker, Dennis Snyder, Vicki Pulos, Roxanne Rogers, Ann Pedersen. East campus editor: Marlene Timmerman. Sports editor: Jim Johnston. Sports writers: Steve Kadel, Warren Obr. Photographers: Mike Hayman, Gail Folds. Entertainment editor: Larry Kubart. Literary editor: Alan Boye. Artists: Linda Lake, Greg Scott. Design editor: Jim Grey. Copy editors: Tom Lanworth, Laura Wilfers, Don Russell. Night news editor: Leo Schleicher. Night news asst.: Rodney Wortmann.

BUSINESS STAFF
Coordinator: Sandra Carter. Salesmen: Steve Yates, Jane Kidwell, Greg Scott, Ray Pyle, Bill Cooley. Business assistant: Pam Baker. Distribution manager: Barry Pilger, John Waggoner, John Ingwerson.
Telephones: editor: 472-2588, news: 2589, advertising: 2590. Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Subscription rates are \$5 per semester or \$9.50 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.