

Libraries consolidate; users will appreciate

Gerald Rudolph, dean of libraries, told the *Daily Nebraskan* last week that studies indicate a student's scholastic success is related to his success in using libraries.

If that is true, the intrepid students who have braved the maze we call the UNL library system and still managed to graduate deserve praise for not letting the experience force their grade point averages into negative numbers.

UNL has put together a system of libraries that would make Rube Goldberg jealous. Amid rumors about students who wandered into the Love Library stacks in the 1930's and haven't been seen since (probably because they're still looking for their books) are the all too real stories about students spending an afternoon there looking for a book that is in Morrill Hall.

All this and a Love Library elevator which, over the years, has stopped between floors as often as at them, combine to divide students into two classes: those who use the libraries grudgingly and those who won't go near them.

It is a bit surprising, then, what with all the student mumbling and grumbling about library inefficiency, to find that students are now complaining about a proposal that should improve the situation.

Rudolph sent a letter last week to A.C. Breckenridge, acting vice chancellor for academic affairs, recommending that the undergraduate library be closed and that the books stored there be moved to Love Library.

This action makes sense economically. There are 12 branch libraries in the UNL system. The undergraduate library has 55,000 volumes and a staff of eight. Service can be better provided at Love now that the new addition is nearly completed.

Combining the two libraries also would be more convenient. Putting those 55,000 volumes in the same building with the main collection of books will make the long, and sometimes hazardous, walk down 16th St. to Nebraska Hall unnecessary.

It's time to say goodbye to the undergraduate library and hello to a system that will put students and books together in the same place at the same time.

Wes Albers



to the editor

Dear editor:

I have just read Joe Dreesen's column on the threat to discontinue the undergraduate library (*Daily Nebraskan*, April 24). I agree that it would be unfortunate to turn it into an engineering library. But there are good reasons for doing so.

The undergraduate library currently has three librarians and five other staff persons. Its collection consists of 55,000 volumes. The university library authorities think that to provide adequate service they would have to double the staff and greatly increase the number of volumes. This simply is not feasible. It would be better to pull the undergraduates back into Love Library and create a good engineering library than to maintain a poor undergraduate library.

As the undergraduate representative to the faculty senate Library Committee, I am the undergraduate students' spokesman to the university library administration. I need student input on this issue. Anyone interested can write to me directly or to ASUN.

Robert Zeilinger
2255 Vine St.

Giving blood

Dear editor:

Last week you ran an article about the recent bloodmobile visit conducted by the Red Cross. The indication was that the drive had been well publicized. A Red Cross spokesman was quoted as saying they never have trouble finding enough donors, and gave a figure of 200 as evidence of

that.

Two hundred donors represents roughly one per cent of the student body. The bad thing is that those are the students who heard about the drive. I know residence hall residents whose health aides never announced it. And what of the students who live off campus? If there was any publicity of the blood drive, it was not very evident. There are plenty of people who would gladly have given blood, had they but known the bloodmobile was coming.

Sally Hill

Our very lives

Dear editor:

Your *Midweek* special on agriculture in Nebraska was really surprising. Maybe an article like this will wake some people up as to how much agriculture does mean to our state and nation. The only knock on the article is that even though farmers do "take in" \$61,374 on the average in cash receipts, only \$14,819 of that is average profit. This point wasn't stated very clearly in the article.

Another point you completely omitted: most businesses like to have somewhere between 10 per cent and 12 per cent of their investment back in profit. The average investment in a farming operation today is over a half million dollars. This would dictate a \$50,000 per year profit for the farmer. He is far from it.

No other business has to invest so much, and yet get relatively so little back in return for it.

With cattle prices at pre-1950 levels and even grain prices not all that attractive anymore, and costs of production raging upward, maybe the farmer won't even make \$14,000 this year. It's an industry that means this very state, this university, our very lives. Maybe it's time we started paying more attention to it and started caring for it.

Mark Schoenrock



But man, proud man, makes the cynics weep

Last columns are usually treated as license for all kinds of reflective nonsense, and mine will be no different.

My first tidbit concerns the writing of columns. Every columnist's goal is to write a thought-provoking essay which will make people stop and reflect for a moment or two. I believe it's impossible.

If I write a concise serious essay, the majority either won't read it or will forget what's written before the paper leaves their hands.

But if I pad that column with sarcastic, biting comments which say in effect that anyone who disagrees with me is an ignorant baboon, then everyone reads it and the letters start pouring.

Prefer entertainment

The first approach reveals only apathy and the second only polarizes people. Rarely, as most of the letters show, is there evidence of thought. They're as much a joke as my column. People don't want to think, they want to be entertained.

Also, if the letters are a measure of response, this campus cares more about science fiction and Josh McDowell than Vietnam, India, freedom of speech and nuclear war—all of which I wrote columns about.

I began writing with a feeling that most people were stupid. And by stupid I mean speaking out about and having opinions on subjects with which they were completely unfamiliar.

This feeling has developed into a creed.

Admit ignorance

If someone asks you to discuss the Russian novel

and you haven't read a one in your life, then I would hope that you would admit ignorance.

But then, why do I meet people who haven't read a single book on evolution, telling me it isn't true; who haven't read a single book on Vietnam, telling me what's wrong there—why do people do this?

They will gladly expound on the Middle East crisis when they cannot even name the leaders of six of the Arab nations.

My point is that if a person is so unfamiliar with a subject that he doesn't know the barest of facts, his

bruce nelson cynic's corner

opinions are not worth anything.

Motivation

Then why do I write? Part of my motivation is a concern over things like exploitation, hunger, injustice, etc.

I don't think people really care about those things as much as they would like to believe they do.

If it is true that the United States as 6 per cent of the world's population uses one third of the world's resources then, if we simply triple those figures, 18 per cent of the world at our standard of living would

be using 100 per cent of the resources.

Obviously and fortunately it doesn't quite work like this, but, regardless, the statistic doesn't seem to bother us on our way to the movies or Valentino's.

Human ego

This brings us to the human ego, which is the major reason why I write. I simply like to see my name in print.

Indeed, I suspect that this is the motivation not only for writers and journalists but for most human action.

We humans are an evil and selfish lot. We're basically animals capable of rationality only when not thwarted or threatened. When we are, we lose all sense of value and will do almost anything to protect our fantasies.

It should have been evident long ago. Take a look at the sciences. We see mathematics, physics and chemistry the near perfect sciences. And then we see psychology, sociology and economics pathetically struggling to understand the human phenomena.

Cynicism no surprise

The reason neither Marxism nor capitalism works is because they are rational systems imposed upon irrational beings. Is it so surprising then to be a cynic?

Indeed, life is nothing but this. We are all selfish intellectual barbarians frothing at the mouth with our latest disease, running aimlessly hither and thither until ravaging death ends our mindless, meaningless but pitiful journey. And we can't stop.

"Vanity of vanities, says the Preacher, vanity of vanities! All is vanity."—Ecclesiastes 1:2