

# editorial opinion page

A discussion with University lobbyist Gene Budig and Public Relations Director George Round produced some interesting comments on changes that have occurred in the last 10 years at NU and tentatively point to some things we can expect within the next few years as well.

**1) More Student involvement:** The Student Power Movement has quite successfully marshalled students into a cohesive, definable group with political punch. Today's student deals with problems of greater import than the student of the past.

Budig noted that our generation has been strongly influenced by the television set: "People who see an assassin murdered in front of their eyes and who see Vietnamese children dying are more likely to involve themselves in other people's problems."

Although students sometimes feel they have no power whatsoever, they have considerably more than they had five years ago. The University Advisory Council, made up of 15 students, advises President Varner on vital decisions. During Legislative budget hearings concerning the University, students packed the hearing room, a fine example of grassroots energy. Three students and three faculty members testified before the Legislature's Budget Committee. Students have a say in search committees, and curriculum committees.

**2) Resource allocation:** University resources are being used to help solve social problems. Nebraska Opportunity for Volunteers in Action (NOVA) has about eight people working on community service projects. Omaha medical students are working on badly-needed community health projects across the state. The ag campus has long been involved in extension work, and has also long been helping with ecological problem-solving like soil conservation. The PACE program attempts to solve financial difficulties of minority students.

**3) Programmed budgeting:** The Legislature's method of allocating money to the University means that instead of a lump sum, specific amounts are earmarked for specific programs.

Last year the money was divided into 13 separate sections—providing more control, but severely reducing the Administration's flexibility. A good way to lose your best faculty members: somebody else offers them more money and you're so tightly controlled that you lose them for a few hundred dollars.

State Sen. Fern Orme said Wednesday that programmed budgeting appears to be on its way out, at least this year. The University budget has been consolidated into five general areas, allowing administrators to shift money more easily to programs that need it. Flexibility is vital to keep the University competitive and of high quality.

**4) Job proposals:** the University is and will be more concerned with job placement. With unemployment soaring, and the job market glutted with college graduates, the University Placement Service is getting more emphasis. Individual departments, too, have their own placement services that are being given more attention than before.

**5) Statewide:** the University is moving toward a statewide system: perhaps at the expense of UNL and UNO, vocational and technical schools are popping up all over the state. There is a trend away from large schools to more personal junior colleges and small colleges. A new program being set up, may bring college into outstate homes through television, making it unnecessary for students to congregate in the eastern half of the state.

It looks like the turbulence of the frantic 60's, with upheavals in every direction and amazing changes in every field, is only a preview of the decade to come.

Sara Schwieder

## editorial

Does he or doesn't he? That is the question people and politicians alike are asking these days with regard to Maine Edmund Sixtus Muskie's quest for the Democratic Presidential nomination. And the answer must now be a cautious but emphatic "maybe." About the only persons really confident of Muskie's "inevitable" nomination are himself and his staff.

To be sure, he is the admitted fron-runner according to the nationwide Gallup and Harris polls, albeit by no commanding margin. He is also getting endorsements right and left (no pun intended) from such key politicians as Governors John Gilligan of Ohio and Milton Shapp of Pennsylvania, and Sen. Adlai Stevenson III of Illinois and California's John Tunney. But as we look to individual state contests, we find that the people who really count—the voters—simply are not buying him in the quantities he has hoped for.

The results of neighboring Iowa's recent Democratic precinct caucus elections, if not a sharp setback for the Muskie camp, certainly gave it no new impetus. Fresh from the endorsement of Sen. Harold Hughes and the United Auto Workers, Muskie hoped to get over 50 percent of the vote, and came away with only 35.6 percent. McGovern placed second with an unexpectedly strong 23 percent. Arizona was the same story, with the combined Lindsay and McGovern slates capturing 44 percent to the Muskie's dismal 38 percent.

Less than three weeks from now comes the March 7 New Hampshire primary, and a big win—55 per cent plus—is essential for Muskie to maintain his leading status. Although he is still expected to win, Muskie could easily wind up with something less than a majority, and with that a crippling blow right in his own back yard.

In the first place, the candidacy of Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty is taken more seriously there than elsewhere. Yorty has a well-deserved reputation as a spoiler of California elections and a winner in his own town against great odds. They mayor is working the populous southwest corner of the state exhaustively, and he has the enthusiastic backing of William Loeb, publisher of the *Manchester Union Leader*, the state's only daily and read by two-thirds of the voters.

Loeb, fond of labeling his neighboring senator "Moscow Muskie," is unofficially credited with being able to deliver from 15 to 20 per cent of the vote to anyone he endorses (he is also supporting Ohio Congressman John Ashbrook in the Republican primary). Furthermore, Yorty is an amiable and energetic candidate in his own right, and shows a strong grasp of national issues.

An unknown factor is the intense \$200,000 write-in effort on the behalf of House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills, an Arkansas conservative. Mills will probably capture up to five per cent of the votes, votes which probably would have otherwise gone to Muskie or Yorty.

Some delegates have entered themselves for Hubert Humphrey, Henry Jackson and Edward Kennedy, indicating write-in votes for them since they did not formally enter the N.H. primary.

Two other factors which must be considered are the 40,000 likely new 18 to 24-year-old voters, and the state's numerous

Independents, who can choose which party's primary they wish to participate in. Both groups are giving most of their support to the underdog candidates, unfortunately for Muskie.

So with the big candidates, the little candidates, the semir-candidates and the non-candidates, Muskie will very likely poll below 50 per cent of the votes in a neighboring New England state he was supposed to own.

Why the gradual decline in the senator's fortunes? Alternative candidates are only part of it—the other problem is the senator himself. Muskie has promised to give us a "New Beginning" (as if there were such a thing as an "old" beginning), but because of his intimate association with the Johnson-Humphrey administration with its record of war, inflation and domestic turmoil, it is apparent that, should he gain the White House, the much-heralded "New Beginning" would wind up having the same old ending.

Muskie is also wooing us with his so-called "Politics of Trust." A more apt name would substitute "bust" for "trust." He is an expert at evading issues. On a January "Meet the Press" appearance, Muskie was shallow and indecisive, a master of obfuscation.

When asked how much and in what areas he would reduce defense spending, Muskie said, "I don't think you can specify a number that fixes the line between national security and national insecurity." Questioned if he thought that the voters had a right to know just what type of defense budget he favored, Muskie dodged, "Well, elect me President and I will try to present one."

Coinciding with this is Muskie's distorted reputation. While the press and his campaign staff, sensing where most of the votes are, insist on calling him a "moderate," a "centrist," and a "middle-of-the-rode" Democrat, the facts show clearly that the senator is just another creature of the liberal left. His National Youth Director Lanny Davis is going around the campuses saying, "I don't see how George McGovern is to the left of Muskie on anything," in a desperate attempt to cut into McGovern's college support and show that he is not really what he appears to be.

The ultra-liberal Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) regularly gives Muskie a liberal rating comparable to Kennedy, Mondale, Harris, Proxmire and other leftists. His 1971 rating of 85 per cent puts him only 11 points behind Sen. McGovern, 4 behind Hubert Humphrey and 29 points ahead of Washington Sen. Henry Jackson, the true centrist Democratic candidate. His liberal quotient would no doubt have been even higher if he had been there to vote more often.

Muskie's absentee rate of 41 per cent was the fifth highest of all Senate Democrats for 1971. All these items are certainly not very good talking points for the "Politics of Trust!"

As of now, Sen. Muskie has fallen on very hard times. What with the patent hypocrisy of his gimmicky "New Beginning" and "Politics of Trust" going hand in hand with his disastrous image problem, coupled with electoral difficulties, it looks as if the distinguished senator from Maine might soon just fade away into the land of also-rans.

john  
vihstadt  
different  
drummer