

Fees finale

When Ken Bader, vice chancellor for student affairs, released the Student Fees Administration Task Force report nearly two months ago he said that he wouldn't forward the document to Chancellor Zumberge or to the regents "until I have received reactions from the students and other persons concerned." Bader has received considerable feedback from "students and other persons concerned" on the fees administration document.

ASUN has established a special committee to review the report. The committee has not made any final recommendations but the recent ASUN election campaign made it clear that the current ASUN administrators and many senators disagree with some important sections of the Student Fees Administration Task Force Report.

Last week, two other campus governing bodies made public their assessments of the fees administration report. The Nebraska Union Board, which oversees the operations

of the Nebraska Union (a major fees user) recommended that the fees administration report be invalidated. The Union Board, in a letter to Bader, listed several reasons for its total rejection of the task force proposals.

The task force members seemed to have "a basic lack of knowledge of the present student fees distribution," the Union Board said. "Little or no background study into the present system of student fees and their allocation" was done by the task force, the letter continued. The Union Board appears to have focused on one of the major shortcomings of the entire approach taken by the administration task force, i.e., that there is something inherently wrong with the current fees system and that their job, therefore, was to propose something new and different and naturally better. In the eyes of many student groups, the assumption that the new system would be better is totally false.

The Council on Student Life (CSL) also released its evaluation of the fees task force reports which have thus far been made public. CSL and the Union Board criticized many of the same points in the fees administration

report. Both groups took issue with the "zero-based budgeting" proposed by the task force, and with the appeals process outlined in the report. CSL and the Union Board both said that a majority of the voting members of the fees allocations board proposed by the task force should be students. CSL suggested that guidelines should be established concerning money generated by organizations in addition to allocated student fees.

Vice Chancellor Bader has indicated that he will ask the regents to consider the Student Fees Administration Task Force report at their meeting this Saturday, April 14. Presumably, Bader will be formulating his recommendations on the report in the next few days. Based on the reactions from students closely involved with the fees allocation system, Bader should recommend that the task force report be invalidated, and that the student fees issue be studied further by a body with fewer predispositions about the adequacy of the current fees structure, and in an open atmosphere more conducive to knowledgeable student input.

Tom Lansworth



to the editor

Letters appear in the *Daily Nebraskan* at the editor's discretion. A letter's appearance is based on its timeliness, originality, coherence and interest. All letters must be accompanied by the writer's true name, but may be submitted for publication under a pen name or initials. Use of such letters will be determined by the editor. Brevity is encouraged. All letters are subject to condensation and editing.

Senators for SVO

Dear editor:

As members of ASUN we deeply regret the recent action taken by the senate. It involved the rejection for funds to be used by the Student Veterans' Organization (SVO) for attendance at an upcoming conference. In our estimation the action displayed a lack of insight and sensitivity by the senate.

We recognize that SVO represents the largest minority on campus, 1,500 students. And in view of the potential benefits to be derived for our campus from attendance at the conference, we feel that ASUN made an unfortunate mistake. By denying the request the University faces a possible loss of \$250,000 granted on behalf of SVO by the government. These funds would be used in the University for general funding purposes.

We hope that the denial of this request does not discourage SVO and other organizations from further interaction with ASUN or inhibit the continuance of their services to the student body at large.

Concerned Senators

Concern for ASUN

Dear editor:

I read the *Daily Nebraskan* on April 5 and within it I found inspiration. I saw myself called apathetic and my shame knew no bounds. So, Sherry Cole and Marcia Stewart, I will attempt to save myself from this horrible fate.

Concern for a subject, if sincere, implies that the subject merits concern. For ASUN to merit concern, it would have to have some potential beyond infinite impotence. ASUN is and always will be that "great junior high in the sky," where adolescents play at governing nothing.

Like it or not, Marcia and Sherry, ASUN, as is the rest of the University, is at the hands and whims of the Legislature and the Board of Regents. Anything that ASUN could propose worth caring about has little chance of enactment.

The student body would do well to heed the suggestions of "joke" parties (SLPP, Grease and Freedom, YIP) and abolish this childish toy. Collegians now possess the right to vote in real live elections for real live things, just like mommy and daddy.

If one cares about the University, he would do better to vote outside the University where it really counts.

Richard Allen DeWitt

ASUN satire

Dear editor:

As is my custom with any newspaper, I opened the *Daily Nebraskan* to the middle on April 5 and read the funnies first. I must say, you folks really let a farce, considering seriously our favorite fun loving anagram: ASUN (arrange the letters as you see fit).

But Sherry Cole and Marcia Stewart get my vote



for best satiric work of the year (don't be modest girls, you deserve it). By their clever use of hyperbole, they brilliantly state the case for the opposite of their tirade.

This letter is merely an attempt to interpret the subtle intent of their words so that those apathetic to great literary devices may be aware of their genius.

I quote: "Did you spend that absurd amount of money on tuition just so that someday, at that magical moment of graduation, you could become a thinking, 'expressing contributor to human society'?" (The quote is admittedly taken out of context, but it is so brilliantly written that it can stand alone.) Note how they point out their belief that ASUN is a farce by purporting it to be something real. What hyperbole!

Get this one: "Didn't you come here to get involved in your own lives?" Everyone knows that parties, sorority balls, fraternity balls and general hijinx are the real reasons for attending college.

It is appalling that people read great literature such as Sherry's and Marcia's only superficially. It is to "all of you who, incidentally, probably aren't reading this letter anyway because you just don't give a damn" that this exposition is directed.

Steven J. Winston

Wild-eyed activism

Dear editor:

This letter is in response to Marcia Stewart, Sherry

Cole and the handful of wild-eyed activists who went to the polls on ASUN election day.

To vote or not to vote—is that the question? Who are GOYA and UP? They are serious, of course. They are dedicated, perhaps. They are ineffectual, beyond doubt. Beyond this, they are nothing, running for nothing, in a nothing election. It makes no difference who won or who lost, except, perhaps, to Ann Henry's parents and dear friends and the miscellaneous leeches who grovel for whatever limited privileges and funds ASUN is capable of bestowing upon them.

What difference whether 13 or 100 per cent of the student population participated in the farce? The substantive results are the same, no matter who wins or loses, whether the election is unanimous or anonymous. With GOYA or UP, there was not even the dubious value of choosing between the lesser of two evils. A vote for either was the same as a vote for neither—namely zero.

But at least abstention from the polls has a tidbit of value in demonstrating that most students will not join in the charade of electing a pathetic excuse for a governing body. It follows that the only meaningful course on election day was to vote for SLPP or stay on your apathy.

W. Brian Miller