daily nebraskan

page 5

letters

I am absolutely thrilled to find out that as a member of the Unification Church I represent a threat to students everywhere. I never imagined imposing this on so many people.

Kay Schneider, if you are sincerely serious about your accusations, then you would investigate or demand an official investigation into our movement for the safety of the students.

I suggest that the fallentry and valor expressed in your letter be used to prove those false, twisted lies, rumors and allegations. So far I only see you sowing phobias, alarms and apprehension.

Most of these accusations were published before in a pamphlet by Love Our Children, Inc., of Omaha. L.O.C. was founded by concerned parents in cooperation with Ted Patrick, as a part of the deprogramming movement in North America. (American Civil Liberties Union, Conference on Religious Deprogramming, New York, Feb. 5, 1977.)

Patrick also tried deprogramming Catholics, Greek Orthodox, Protestant and other "cult" members. I, along with the A.C.L.U. and other responsible people, regard the deprogramming movement, and the attitudes of fear, discrimination into intolerance which lead to hatred and bigotry as the real threat to people everywhere.

> John A. Raineri Sophomore, Arts and Sciences

Regents questioned

Well, the Board of Regents, has done it again. To those of us who appreciate the ironies of life in the Big Eight, the timing of the passage of the 10 percent increase in tuition was wonderfully apt. We are told that next year, we shall have to pay 10 percent more to get the education we're getting now (assuming the faculty doesn't get disgusted with its low salaries and leave) — and within 48 hours of said announcement, we get our tuition statement for this semester. A nice case of adding insult to injury.

We should be upset with this 10 percent hike in tuition. Even more, we should question the reasons given in justification of the increase. For example, I recall no specific explanations of what would be done with the money. If the increase were passed to allow for inflation, why wasn't it restricted to 7 percent or less? If the increase were passed to allow for inflation, why didn't the Regents say so in so many words? If the increase were passed to allow for inflation, can we trust that faculty salaries will get a similar boost? (They need to eat, too, you know.)

A story in last Sunday's Lincoln Journal quoted some of the reasons for increase, according to the regents themselves. Remarks attributed to Regent Schwartzkopf come to mind in particular, "Many students like (ASUN President and non-voting Student Regent Bud) Cuca can afford to drive their cars to class, but complain about the rising cost of education." To say that we cannot compalin about a 10 percent increase in tuition because we drive cars is to make a logical non-sequitur. I, for one, am disturbed that decisions of such importance to the whole university are made without direct and serious consideration of and consultation with those affected – especially when they are grounded in nonsense and not real logic. If one has x dollars and it takes x plus y dollars to live and to get an education, too many students will be forced into taking the short-term option. A diploma is better in the long run, but in the meantime, one cannot eat one's textbooks.

In a more fanciful moment, I assumed that this 10 percent increase in tuition is in truth a lot to lower enrollment. After all, it would serve to ease the overcrowding in the dorms. I don't believe seriously that the Regents would do such a thing, for if the Board had, it would be hurting its plans. (Lower enrollment means lower total income.) But then again, one can never tell for sure — and that is frightening.

Karen Montee First year, College of Law



The vast majority of students are on very limited budgets; we are being squeezed from all sides by rising costs. Very soon, we will be forced to make some choices.

