

Editorial

Koefoot receives DN endorsement

It's hard to find many measurable differences between the two candidates running for the 5th District seat on the NU Board of Regents.

Robert Koefoot, the incumbent from Grand Island, believes the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources is vital to the university. James Norton, the challenger from David City, says the "Ag College should be as number one as . . . (the) football team."

Koefoot said in a recent Daily Nebraskan interview that "faculty salaries are key to a quality university." Norton said about the same thing.

Norton, in an interview before the May primary election, said he favored requiring some sort of admissions standards, an issue raised last semester by the board. Koefoot said the same.

Both said the NU budget is inadequate but have indicated they are not willing to fight for more.

On what, then, do Koefoot, the doctor, and Norton, the lawyer, disagree? A few key issues. Among them:

— Pay for student presidents/regents. Norton said he agrees with the current policy of denying student presidents/regents a salary. He believes students should run for the dual-role office as a "service," not to collect a salary.

Koefoot has consistently said the student president/regent should collect a salary for his or her duties as president.

— Student regent vote: Koefoot is flatly against it. Because student regents serve on the board only one year (the length of their presidential term), they don't have time to learn enough to vote, he has said.

Earlier Norton had no opinion on the vote.

— Budget appropriations. Koefoot supports asking the Nebraska Legislature for a lump-sum budget. Norton opposes that idea, saying the "Legislature is entitled to know where the university intends to spend it (money)."

— Alcohol on campus: In their pre-primary interviews, the candidates were asked about the Residence Hall Association proposal to allow liquor in the halls. Norton said he would support such a policy. Koefoot opposed it, saying the policy is "too liberal the way it is."

Because Koefoot is in his second six-year term on the board, we know better where he stands than we do his opponent. Although he has not been an especially vocal regent, he has voted surprisingly pro-student in a few important instances.

He voted for a \$26.8 million budget in the fall of 1980, saying the "board has a responsibility to educate the young people of the state."

During the term of ASUN president Rick Mockler, he supported a Mockler resolution for helping students find financial aid.

He recently told the Daily Nebraskan that the biggest problem facing students is finding the money for college. And although his suggestion to find that money (get part-time jobs — "God helps those who help themselves") may not sound too appealing, he has shown empathy for student concerns.

Because of that empathy — and because the board needs members with his experience — the Daily Nebraskan endorses Robert Koefoot for the 5th District seat.

Liberal species endangered, but not yet extinct

Somewhere in the bowels of Hamilton Hall, a biologist has it isolated in a protective cell. Its artificial environment resembles Massachusetts — snowy, desegregated, and full of Kennedys and O'Neills.

It is the only known living Nebraska Liberal (or, as it is scientifically known, *Nebraskus Liberalus*). I'm proud to



Mike Frost

say that I played a part in finding it.

Up until last week, this rare strain of creature was thought to be extinct. Many, this writer included, had even begun to doubt that it ever really existed. This so-called Nebraska Liberal, it was theorized, was nothing more than a misunderstood Edward Zorinsky.

I wasn't even thinking about it that fateful day that I walked into a local downtown retail outlet that shall remain nameless (because the people at Penney's are too proud to accept such cheap publicity) to buy a new pair of tennis shoes. As I was coughing up my \$25 (why I keep



Editorial policy

Unsigned editorials represent the opinion of the fall 1982 Daily Nebraskan. They are written by this semester's editor in chief, Patti Gallagher.

Other staff editors write one editorial in her place each week. Those will carry the author's name and title after the final sentence.

Editorials do not necessarily reflect the views of the university, its employees or the NU Board of Regents.

The Daily Nebraskan's publishers are the regents, who established the UNL Publications Board to supervise the daily production of the newspaper.

Reagan's recovery theory failed

I Am The People, The Mob

... When I, the People, learn to remember, when I, the People, use the lessons of yesterday and no longer forget who robbed me last year, who played me for a fool — then there will be no speaker in the world say the name: "The People," with any fleck of a sneer in his voice or any far-off smile of derision.

The mob — the crowd — the mass — will arrive then.

— Carl Sandburg

"Stay the course."

— President Ronald Reagan



Jeff Allen

Two years ago when President Reagan came before Congress he presented a theory to the representatives of the "people." The theory would become reality he said, if you support it. They did. Born of this support was the Economic Recovery Tax Act (ERTA), the "Conceptual framework of supply-side economics."

It was through this act, Reagan stated, that consumers and businesses would receive a return of their tax dollars, resulting in increased investment, prosperity and employment.

Much to the disappointment of Congress, individual investors and corporations that received tax refunds were not reinvesting their returned capital. Most, in fact, had applied the windfall as partial or total payments to existing debts. What funds, if any, that remained were "held in balance" as investors anticipated an improved economy where such investment dollars would yield higher profits.

The result, therefore, was not greater productivity and increased employment, but rocketing unemployment and

a "hemorrhaging federal budget deficit."

Reagan's response to the first-phase failure of ERTA was not, however, to "stay the course." Less than six months after the ERTA package was in place, the Reagan administration instituted the largest tax increase in the history of the United States. Reagan stated that the record \$98.3 billion tax increase (House Resolution 4961) was not a tax increase at all, but a "plan" for the improved enforcement of existing tax law.

The Council on State Governments revealed, however, that only \$21 billion of Reagan's tax increase bill would be collected through "measures designed to gain compliance with existing tax law." The president failed to mention that HR4961 contained provisions for taxing individuals by an additional \$18 billion and businesses by an additional \$50 billion. Was this the same President Reagan who reported just four months prior to HR 4961 in his 1982 State of the Union address that: "Raising taxes will slow economic growth, reduce production and destroy future jobs?"

The Reagan administration has nominally recognized the high human cost of "staying the course." He has warned voters to beware, however, of those who would use the human cost of high unemployment as a stepping-stone to political office. But it is Reagan who has used the nation's 10.1 percent unemployed as a means of disguising even deeper economic trouble.

Reviewing the ramifications of the ERTA collapse, the Council of State Governments revealed that states will be even bigger losers in Reagan's New Federalism program than the already 11-plus million unemployed. Unfortunately, the CSG has concluded that Nebraska could be the biggest loser of all.

According to the CSG, states like Nebraska that "tie" state tax statutes to the federal tax code not only lost revenue when federal tax rates decreased through ERTA, but lost a considerable amount when Reagan shifted administrative responsibility of federal programs to states.

Continued on Page 5

my money in my esophagus, I'll never know), I said something witty and insightful along the lines of "Gosh, \$25 sure doesn't go as far as it used to."

"No, it doesn't," the clerk, a short, balding man in his mid 40s replied. "Sometimes I wonder why so many are so naive as to believe that these so-called Reaganomics are going to have any significant effect on curbing the nation's inflationary spiral."

My ears perked. This eerily resembled liberal rhetoric. I remembered an article I had once read in National Geographic that said the Nebraska Liberal is quite an elusive creature. I decided to make sure I wasn't mistaken.

"Boy, that senatorial race sure is something, isn't it," I ventured, studying the clerk out of the corner of my eye.

"You're telling me," he said, busying himself with my shoes. "Keck vs. Zorinsky. What's the difference between the two? It's against my conscience to vote for Zorinsky, a Republican in Democrat's clothing. Yet, I can't vote for Keck, a man who's so far right, he's barely pro-electricity, let alone pro-equal rights."

"There's always Virginia Walsh," I said, circling my prey.

"No, her talk of bilateral disarmament and the like is rather bland and generic. I can't see possibly helping Keck

by splintering what is potentially his opponent's coalition."

By now, I was sure he indeed was *Nebraskus Liberalus*. But I had to make sure. "Boy, things are sure going to be better once Bob Kerrey is elected governor."

"Certainly better than with Thone. But, still, I can't help but be a bit suspicious of a businessman who can't seem to commit himself to even a single issue."

I knew then that this was, as they say, the real McCoy. I quickly alerted the proper authorities at UNL's research center that I had located an actual *Nebraskus Liberalus*. They were skeptical at first. "Yeah, everybody thinks that they have seen one ever since Kerrey started leading in the polls."

I quickly related my conversation with the man. They were convinced. "We'll be there as soon as we can. Keep him talking. Mention the Kennedys or something."

I managed to keep *Nebraskus Liberalus* occupied until they got there. They dragged him off without much of a struggle. Seems he was a pacifist as well. As he was being taken away, he mumbled something about Keynesian economics.

I feel somewhat guilty about being the one responsible for caging him up. But at least now he won't have to choose between Keck, Zorinsky and Walsh.