

# Ticket heaven's manna should fall on walk-ons

Being governor is a tough job. In addition to preparing budgets, making speeches and working from morning to night, he has to decide what to do with the 14 free season tickets given him by the UNL chancellor's office.

Whoever said all men are created equal forgot to read the fine print in the Constitution. Somewhere in there it apparently says that certain individuals, by virtue of being in a position to help a university, have an inherent right to free football tickets.

And so former governors, regents, former regents, news executives and a host of government officials all receive this manna from heaven each fall. That free tickets go to those most able to afford them says something for the American system.

According to a Lincoln Journal article, the chancellor's office gave away 3,119 complimentary tickets last year at a cost of \$5,374 to the taxpayers.

Had those tickets been sold to the public at regular prices instead of to the chancellor's office at \$1.50 apiece, the athletic department would be about \$20,000 richer.

If it is any comfort, there are inequalities within the inequality. Each of Nebraska's U.S. senators gets two complimentary season tickets. The state's three U.S. representatives have to fend for themselves.

Members of the NU Board of Regents get two season press box tickets and 10 season stadium tickets. If that doesn't motivate students to run for ASUN president/student regent this spring, nothing will.

And right in at the trough with the rest of the hogs are the newspaper executives to whom a total of 1,428 individual game tickets were given last year. There is nothing wrong with free passes for journalists actually covering the games. But nonworking journalists who take the cheap way in are reading

something into freedom of the press that the Founding Fathers didn't put there.

There is talk in the chancellor's office about limiting the number of complimentary tickets—a move worth commendation if it were being prompted by something more than the tight financial situation.

While the university probably can't be expected to entirely do away with complimentary tickets and their intrinsic public relations value, it could make the practice more palatable to those who still pay their way into the games. Let's earmark the money spent on complimentary tickets for use in athletic scholarships, perhaps specifically for walk-ons who come in time to play but too late for a scholarship.

This way the athletes would benefit, the university would benefit, the officials would still get their free tickets and the taxpayer's money, at least indirectly, would do what it was intended to do—aid education.

Wes Albers

"The University of Nebraska chancellor's office distributed 3,119 complimentary Cornhusker football tickets to government officials and news executives in 1974.

The tickets, sold to the chancellor's office at a reduced price (\$1.50 each), cost \$5,374 and were paid for out of the university's general expense fund.

That fund represents taxpayer dollars.

On the market, the tickets would be valued at almost \$24,000. The public prices are \$7 for a stadium seat and \$11 for a seat in the press box. —The Lincoln Evening Journal 2-21-75



# Enlightenment dead; more introspection needed

Toward the end of the 18th century, the most revolutionary intellectual movement since Christianity burst onto the European scene.

The Enlightenment began the dismantling of 1,600 years of Christian heritage and a Western tradition stretching back through Plato and Moses. Progress—that ineffable belief that the world is getting better—became the idea that shaped the intellectual climate of the Western world throughout the 19th and into the 20th century.

The intellectual foundation of Western thought traditionally was based in a conception of man as "creature, and not creator." Man was seen as a finite being with limited capabilities.

Thus, prior to the Enlightenment, humans lived in the world passively, believing that the essence of reality was beyond this world and therefore could not be affected by man in his finite and limited capabilities.

During the Enlightenment the belief in a finite man died under the same blow that killed the infinite God. For Voltaire, Condorcet and the other philosophers, God, if he had ever existed, no longer played an active role in human affairs.

Since a transcendent God had been denied, the rational life became the measure of human existence. Through the application of reason, man was to have the capacity for improving the human condition. No longer was man passively at the mercy of his environment. He now knew that he could actively work for a better world.

Beginning with the Enlightenment, man was seen for the first time solely as a child of his environment. Environmental factors such as the Church, governmental institutions and other social conditions came to be viewed as the major influences on human behavior. Depraved human behavior was no longer blamed on a depraved soul, but on depraved institutions. If such corrupt institutions could be reformed or destroyed, then man could be made

better—man was seen as a reflection of his environment.

These basic assumptions of the Enlightenment led to a belief that reality could be molded to the infinite will of man. Man could be made something other than he was through his own efforts. Instead of being limited, man was proclaimed to be limitless. Given the application of sufficient intelligence, social conditions could be changed to such an extent that man could ultimately be perfected.

Man is perfectable—the world is getting better—what an incredible legacy of optimism the Enlightenment brought to Western thought.

Beginning with the Enlightenment a strong progressive current developed in the Western view of

rick johnson

## rhymes and reasons

the world. Man can control the reality that affects him and thus create himself anew, which ultimately leads to a qualitatively superior existence.

Superior? Perhaps not, because such an intellectual framework is a short step from the horrors of modern totalitarianism.

If, as the philosophers, Robespierre, and Marx (all of whom are men of the Enlightenment) would have us believe, reality is nothing but material forces to be exploited and manipulated by man, then there would seem to be nothing wrong in any notion designed to exploit these forces with maximum efficiency. If bringing heaven to earth is the goal; if man's perfectability is limitless; is there any limit to what can be done to attain this goal?

While most Americans continue to believe that progress in human affairs is being made—that the Enlightenment ideals are still valid, I believe that such notions are bankrupt, given the experience of the

20th century.

We have examined the development of Enlightenment ideas and have ended with totalitarianism.

It seems impossible to believe that progress is being made in human affairs when we discover that a humanity, which entered the modern age with such optimism and an unprecedented outburst of activity, is committing suicide.

The horror of modern war leaves little doubt that man is capable of barbarity and slaughter on an even grander scale than his forebearers dreamed possible.

The ever-present threat of nuclear holocaust, impending mass starvation, the death of the cities, racism and increasing environmental strangulation are evidence that the world is not getting better through our efforts.

It seems that for every advance made by man in the 20th century, there has been a corresponding degeneration.

If the Western experience has proved anything, it is that political and social order is a reflection of the order within man himself. Systems have tried to impose order and perfectability from outside and have failed.

The Enlightenment is dead, or dying. To continue to believe in limitless human moral and social progress seems to speak of a pride that borders on foolishness.

If Western civilization, and America in particular, is to come to grips with its problems and survive, each individual must look within for the principles on which that survival must be based.

A society is no better than the individuals that make it up. No amount of social control or reorganization of institutions will bring about justice or an abundant and significant experience for all. Nor will legislation make moral men. Principles of justice and moral judgment must be individually recognized and believed before they will govern action.