

Required courses make UNL bus fare unfair

Editor's note: The following is the opinion of Chip Lowe, Mary Sokolik, Audrey Schropfer and Henry Nuxoll.

Once upon a time there existed a university split into two separate campuses, one being called City Campus and the other East Campus. It so happened that it was a far journey between the two, so far that it required a busing system to transport students from one campus to the other. Some of those students had required courses on both sites and unwillingly accepted the cost of a bus pass and the inconvenient bus ride. But then one bad thing happened. Somebody decided that you should pay a quarter every time you rode the bus.

Here is where the fairy tale ends, right in our front yard. The university is having problems with its intercampus busing system. And as most problems do, they deal with money. The UNL busing system is currently in debt and is looking for a way to cover approximately \$70,000 of operating expenses (excluding management) for next year.

The current recommendation is a 25 cent charge per ride next year. This would supposedly pay for the operating costs (excluding management), but in the process would be putting the brunt of the support into the laps of the bus riders. The sad fact is that the 25 cent fare could cost many of the bus riders as much as \$50-\$150 extra per year. This is where our opposition comes in.

First of all, as was mentioned before, the campuses are split. Seldom is it the option of the student to take required courses at either location. Certain majors only offer some required classes on one campus. Many times scheduling difficulties cause the split campus semester. What this boils down to is that the busing system is essential to a sizable number of people studying here at UNL.

On the basis that intercampus busing is essential to the academic program, we think that the university should support it. Busing is as necessary as sidewalks, class rooms, heating and school desks. The university does not charge us for the preceding as we have paid tuition and taxes. It also should provide us with a transportation system.

The University of Nebraska has expressed feelings of equality of all students. One pays standard residence hall rates whether he lives in Harper or Burr Hall. One pays \$18 per hour of credit whether he is in the College of Pharmacy or the College of Agriculture. The implementation of the 25 cent charge would utterly refute the ideals of equality. If it were the student's option to take classes offered on both, the fare could be considered. This is not the case and it would be unfair to charge the bus rider \$50-\$150 extra a year.

One can see having to buy a slide rule for a math class. You've still got the slide rule when the class is over. The bus rider is penalized enough merely by the inconvenience of waiting for and riding the bus.

An informal committee is working on the matter. Authorities in the administration are being notified about the situation. This Friday, April 18, at 8 p.m. busing will be brought up at the Regent's meeting, Regents Hall on East Campus. This is when the students can help by coming and showing their support. Writing your Regent will also help. Many people won't be able to attend the meeting or write a letter.

The choice is yours. Spend \$100 for busing next year. Drive your car and walk from the fairgrounds. Or write and go to the regent's meeting this Friday. Don't bitch next year when you pay your quarter when you didn't do a blasted thing about it this year.

guest opinion



'Burned fingers' need not cause U.S. isolation

The foreign policy disaster and emotional anguish that the United States has experienced over the last two decades seems to have left the government and people confused about the United States role in world affairs. Reassessment seems to be the word that best describes the present U.S. stance, and it will probably be a couple of years before the nation once again has a clear sense of direction in foreign affairs.

While the United States hopefully has learned from its past experiences, we should also be wary of an overly isolationist reaction to past "burned fingers."

American foreign policy has tended to view foreign institutions (such as communism) as an absolute evil which we have correspondingly responded to with a policy of absolute opposition. A major criticism of U.S. foreign policy has been that instead of looking at a threat in relative terms we have tended to view it as a central evil that is morally wrong, and must, according to our idealistic outlook, be opposed.

Kenneth Thompson has commented that: "If communism is the sole threat, we run the risk of making dyed-in-the-wool crusaders against communism who historically have been demonic figures like Hitler or Mussolini, or shadowy figures like Franco, our staunchest coworkers in building resistance to Communist expansionism." The implications, of course, is that a peril arises when we support allies because of what they oppose, instead of what they propose.

This line of criticism fears that by committing ourselves to absolute opposition to a foreign nation or institution simply because we believe that it is morally wrong, leads us to support other nations or institutions that may be just as bad. Also, in all likelihood, no matter what the commitment of our idealism, the nation or institution will continue to exist so we might as well learn to deal with it peacefully.

Of course, this line of argument has much for it. Doubtless, the United States has been driven to support some shady characters because they were willing to help in the fight against communism.

The United States, must recognize that the nation state will be the dominate power structure of the foreseeable future, and thus international law and multinational organizations will remain relatively powerless. Faced with these realities, the United States must take the time, place and general state of international affairs into account when it makes its foreign policy decisions. Kissinger has made a substantial contribution to U.S. foreign policy by recognizing the realities of world affairs and by moving the United States toward a more practical evaluation of world affairs away from total opposition to Communism.

rick johnson

rhymes and reasons

But in taking a more practical view of the world—in realizing that Communism and other distasteful phenomenon cannot be absolutely opposed at every turn in the road—the United States must not abandon a visionary view of the world.

It is necessary that the United States have an idealistic conception of what the world should be like in order to justify its own existence. Every nation has idealism inherent in its policies. Every nation must justify its existence as a separate political entity—it must have some concrete system of values and goals that it regards as desirable in order to formulate attitudes toward other nations and systems.

If the United States is not trying to protect its ideals, if it is not trying to move the world toward

some ideal state that it values, what is its reason for existing? No doubt other systems, including those of the Soviet Union or the Peoples' Republic of China, can provide the basic fundamental physical needs of its citizens. The United States does the same, so what should make it intrinsically different?

It would seem that ideals must be of the utmost importance in both domestic and foreign policies. The shadowy field of "national interests" is a far too ambiguous pursuit for it to be the sole criterion by which our policies are judged. Walter Lippman once said that, "The whole vast labor and passion of public life would be nonsense if we did not believe that it makes a difference what is done by parties, newspapers, books, broadcasts, schools..." It seems to be impossible to escape the fact that there is such a thing as a good idea and a bad one—and that it is important which one wins out.

Of course we must recognize the realities of the modern world, that we have limited resources and that there are situations in which we cannot and should not have any hope of affecting the outcome. Neither, however, should we de-emphasize our ideals and conduct ourselves solely on the basis of dog-eat-dog real-politics.

Ideals must remain vital in U.S. foreign policy. Economic conditions change over the years and world leadership roles change, but ideals if they are to have any effect on the society of man must remain vital.

Lippman perhaps best expressed the danger of over reaction to our disillusionment in world affairs: "The ancient world, we may remind ourselves, was not destroyed because the traditions were false. They were submerged, neglected, lost. For the men adhering to them had become a dwindling minority who were overthrown and displaced by men who were alien to the traditions, having never been initiated and adopted into them. May it not be that while the historical circumstances are obviously so different, something like that is happening again?"