

opinion/editorial

Poor shouldn't pay price for American energy follies

Recent events in the United States have been traumatic for a country as utterly dependent on energy as this one.

OPEC decided in late March to raise crude oil prices another 9 percent, foreshadowing ever-increasing prices at the pumps. The Three Mile Island nuclear accident has raised many questions about the ability of American technology to solve our energy problem.

And President Carter's decision to gradually deregulate the price of domestically-produced oil is an obvious attempt to ration oil consumption by making it less feasible for the average person to buy.

All of this is a little frightening for people who are used to lifestyles of ease and luxury. Americans, in general, no longer will be able to afford large gas-guzzling cars. Large houses, which would cost a fortune to heat and air condition, will be out

of the question. And with more and more money budgeted to meet energy needs, less and less will be available for luxuries and the little pleasures of life.

While the middle class, simply because of its numbers, will bear the greatest burden, it is the poor who will suffer most unless Congress agrees to Carter's proposal to tax the windfall profits of oil companies and rebate the money to lower-income

families.

The poor already are suffering from high prices caused when the rest of us, fearful of losing our high lifestyles, refused to conserve, increased the demand for oil and made deregulation necessary.

The poor who have contributed least to the energy crisis should not have to contribute most to its solution.

Amy Lenzen

Column calls for 'Independent' voting

It was a dark and stormy night, for when roommate got snoopy about my column, nothing would stop his verbal lightning from striking.

michael gibson

I said I was writing about Wednesday's ASUN presidential election. I told him some Greeks were working against Joe Nigro because he was an Independent, and some Independents were working for him for precisely that same reason.

Confronted with that detailed analysis of student voting patterns, roommate grimaced, and I knew I would not escape this debate Scot-free.

"I have long believed," observed roommate, "that it is possible to base a society on anything, even love, as long as there is an external society—to hate."

"I suspect those students working for or against a candidate solely because of where he lives are working only to strengthen themselves, not student government."

"If they are concerned about who is the best candidate, the answer is fairly clear: Joe Nigro."

My confusion swiftly turned to gloating, for here was residence hall roomie endorsing a fellow independent.

"Balderdash!" rejoined roommate. "We noble Scots are slightly more objective than your average politically inept

TNE member.

"Nigro is the only ASUN Senator with a perfect attendance record at ASUN. He is also highly articulate, experienced in student government and the type of person who will stand up to the regents to protect student rights."

I questioned that analysis, especially since Bud Cuca had told the *Daily Nebraskan*, "Joe has ASUN experience, fine, but I have experience with people."

Roommate was not amused.

"Forgiving Mr. Cuca for his insinuation that ASUN is not comprised of people, his point still is moot. Nigro does have experience with people—in ASUN, the administration and the regents. Those contacts will be valuable in furthering student concerns."

"Nigro also will not have to waste time fighting with the ASUN Senate. If Mr. Cuca is elected, he will have to deal with a hostile senate, as Nigro's SOAR party swept 24 or the 35 senate seats."

Then, like a tiger stalking a deer, roommate sprang. "Unfortunately, some students are bound to ignore such factors and instead blindly follow a Greek Slate or someone yelling 'Dorm Power!'"

"One can only hope that they will take the time to attend the debate between the candidates today in the union, then sit down with a copy of the *Daily Nebraskan* and study the two candidates, their positions, and their qualifications."

"I hope they vote for Nigro, but, for the sake of all UNL students, I just hope they vote."



Students refute regent's letter on stadium expansion

UNL students are concerned about their education. Unfortunately, N.U. Regent Robert Prokop seems more concerned with expanding the football stadium than with expanding students' minds.

In his recent letter, Prokop, while claiming the regents are not overconcerned with football, deals not with the Residence Hall Association's often-expressed concerns about UNL's educational problems, but rather with RHA's opposition of the 9,000 seat, \$6 million addition to Memorial Stadium.

Not surprisingly, Prokop and RHA agree that the expansion, at \$575 a seat, is "foolhardy." Prokop, however, wants to build a new, even more expensive, 105,000 seat stadium.

Prokop also contends that since students pay only 14 percent of the revenue the Athletic Department receives from football ticket sales, we should not complain about helping to pay for the addition.

In other words, Prokop, who last year argued that political speakers should be paid for only by their users, now cannot swallow his own medicine. Instead he wants the stadium expansion to be subsidized by students who will not use it.

Actually, the per student contribution to the Athletic Department is \$3.92 per student ticket, virtually the same as the \$4.12 that comes from each general admission ticket. Is Prokop implying that financial contributions should determine who has input and votes on football stadium questions? Strange, students provide 14 percent of the revenue and have exactly zero percent of the vote on the N.U. Board of Regents.

Prokop also condemns RHA for saying that state tax dollars were paying for the expansion. Nowhere in the RHA letter, however, did RHA ever say that the expansion was being subsidized by the state at the expense of education.

But it is. Although football revenue usually pays for women's sports at UNL, next year \$357,000 for women's sports

will have to come from the state general cash fund because football revenue will be paying for the stadium expansion instead.

But even more misleading are Prokop's arguments about students and the regents.

guest opinion

Denying RHA's contention that regents devote too much time to football, Prokop, who told the *Daily Nebraskan* in December that he had spent 150 to 200 hours on the expansion issue, says the regents have spent no more than 10 hours in their meetings discussing the expansion.

According to Prokop, their meetings last 7 to 10 hours each month, an average of about 8.5 hours. At their April meeting, the regents covered 78 items, so with eleven meetings a year and about 78 items of business to discuss at each meeting, they have about 93 total hours to consider 860 items. Yet just one item—football stadium expansion—consumed a full one-tenth of the regents' time, at the expense of 859 educational problems.

Discussed stadium

Indeed, Lincoln Regent Ed Schwartzkopf summarized his term as board chairman by saying, "We discussed stadium expansion at our January, February, March, April, May, June, July, and October meetings."

Equally misleading is Prokop's claim that students only appear at regents' meetings to talk about alcohol and visitation in the residence halls.

Yet in the past three years, students have presented only one limited, experimental visitation proposal, and no proposals at all dealing with alcohol.

Rather, UNL's student government has lobbied in the Nebraska Legislature on bills dealing with UNL teaching salaries, tuition, the university budget, and renovation of classroom buildings (some of which the

State Fire Marshall may condemn as fire hazards).

And at the last regents meeting, held during Spring Break when students were at home, not in Lincoln, a standing room only crowd of students attended to show their concern about tightening UNL's admissions policies.

In short, if Prokop claims he never sees student input on educational issues, it may be because none is so blind as he who will not see.

Indeed, Prokop has rejected student input on numerous issues. At the last regents meeting, he voted to kill a plan that would allow the non-voting student regents to cast not a vote, but a 'formal opinion' on each item.

And it was just last year that Prokop helped kill the UNL political speakers program, despite the opposition of the UNL Administration, the Faculty Senate, the UNL student government, a petition signed by 5,000 students, and the virtually unanimous opposition of every major student organization on campus, including RHA.

Petition drive

The student opposition has been just as strong against the stadium expansion. Last year, a petition drive against the expansion yielded 2,000 student signatures in only eight hours. Student regents have consistently opposed the expansion.

The regents reacted to this opposition by holding their December meeting during finals week, when students were busy studying for examinations, and then by approving the expansion over Christmas break, when nearly all students were visiting their families at home.

But Prokop's most disappointing argument is that RHA is "obviously misguided if they feel that the regents are the members of the academic community that improve the quality of education."

Yet if the regents, whose own bylaws assign them "constitutional and statutory

power for general supervision over all elements of the university", are not responsible for improving education at UNL, then who is?

Lowest salaries

Who, except the regents, are responsible for that fact that UNL has:

—The second highest tuition of all Big Eight schools,

—the second lowest teachers' salaries in the entire Big Eight, low salaries that discourage high caliber instructors from coming here, and:

—A College of Business Administration and a College of Engineering which last year turned away over 2,000 students because they did not have the money to hire enough professors?

Yes, we as students and as student government leaders, are concerned about education at UNL, and make every attempt to voice our concerns to help improve education at this university.

We can only hope, however, that Regent Prokop will help us in our goal by devoting any future public letters to UNL's problems with education, not football. Together, perhaps we can make this a university that the football team can be proud of.

Jay Curtis
President RHA, 1979-80

Bill Skoneki
President, RHA, 1978-79

Michael Gibson
President RHA, 1977-78

Judith Siminow
President, RHA, 1976-77

Robert A. Gleason
Chairman, Government Liaison Committee
1978-79

Kenneth H. Mariensu
President, ASUN, 1978-79