

# Editorial

Daily  
**Nebraskan**

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeff Korbek, Editor, 472-1766  
James Rogers, Editorial Page Editor  
Lise Olsen, Managing Editor  
Mike Reilly, Associate News Editor  
Joan Rezac, Copy Desk Chief

## More fees unwise Should we pay that much?

The Board of Regents' approval of construction and financing plans for the \$16.6 million campus recreation and indoor practice center may have angered about 60 percent of the UNL population, especially after they found out they would be paying an extra \$35 a year in student fees for something some may never use.

James Griesen, vice chancellor for student affairs, said Saturday at the regents' meeting that about 40 percent of UNL students participated in intramural sports last year. He also said the project has been given new life because of the student's willingness to tax themselves. That's quite an assumption.

He may be right, though. ASUN ballot polls revealed that a majority of students would be willing to pay extra student fees to finance the facility. The Daily Nebraskan guesses that students didn't realize the cost would be as much as \$35. The DN recommends that students shouldn't

have to help finance the recreation center.

We have no qualms with funding the center through private donations of which the university is seeking \$3.5 million (\$1.5 million has already been raised). Nor does the DN have any problems with the selling of revenue bonds. The university plans to raise \$9.6 million by placing a \$5 surcharge per game on football tickets. But student fees are a no-no, especially when some students don't even use the facility.

Currently students pay \$211.90 a year in fees. Adding \$35 makes the total \$246.90. Griesen said Big Eight students pay an average of \$225. There's no question Nebraska will be above the average. The question is: Will students really want to pay that extra \$35?

Our bet is that they won't, and if they did they would rather see their money go toward academics than recreation.

## Surgical options

Tuition increase could solve woes

As noted in yesterday's Daily Nebraskan editorial, Regent Dr. Robert Koefoot's reaction is the type of overreaction that does not advance a reasoned approach to the financial woes affecting the NU system.

Chancellor Massengale has so far manifested a much more mature approach by looking at long-range goals and capabilities. He should be allowed to continue the process. So far, his proposals reflect a sober and delicate balancing of programs, finances and long-term interests of the university.

The first rule of propriety in decision making is that if a given result can be attained by an extreme measure or by a less extreme measure, the less extreme measure should be adopted over the extreme measure. While Koefoot's proposals may be well-intentioned, to the extent that his stated goal of saving money

for other programs can be attained without "amputation" the alternative to the radical surgery should be adopted.

At least one less extreme measure exists. The College of Law, College of Dentistry and the NU Medical Center all are post-undergraduate professional schools. That means that almost everyone involved is pursuing coursework that leads directly to a career. There's no reason to subsidize such students.

If these students were made to bear the real cost of their investment in themselves — and that's what it really is — then the schools could be saved and costs contained. Professional schools' tuition would be raised to reflect the true cost of providing the valuable training to students who will reap the benefits of their investment over and over again in the years to come.

## Woes for Wobegon

'A Prairie Home Companion' folds

Garrison Keillor, that well-known denizen of the Saturday night airwaves is leaving 'A Prairie Home Companion.' While it's sad — sort of like an old friend moving away — his leaving was ultimately inevitable.

'A Prairie Home Companion' will end with Keillor's resignation. The eclectic combination of folk music, silly advertisements for "Bertha's Kitty Boutique," and "Bob's Bank," and, of course, Keillor's wonderful monologues, will all be missed.

The show brews a powerful elixir of American innocence past.

Keillor's monologues are full of places and people that we think we know of . . . or at least some how feel we think we know of.

Nonetheless, it was inevitable that the show consume itself. The lure of true innocence is that it is unreflective and unspoiled. Keillor's sentiments rang true because they expressed his persona. Success can't do otherwise than consume such innocence.

Keillor is acting prudently in getting out while he's still fairly fresh. Nonetheless, it's a sad day.

## Jackson's words reveal vision

Speech inspires despite failure to follow the assigned topic

"Let us be more than a strong people. Let us be a good people."

With these words, which will likely be his slogan for a 1988 presidential campaign, the Rev. Jesse Jackson closed a stirring — if somewhat controversial — speech before the Model United Nations and the Lincoln public last Wednesday night. Both the speech and the man were such as have not been heard or seen in these parts for some time.

There were problems. Jackson spoke not at all to the occasion and even less to the assigned topic. The words were clearly those of a man on the presidential campaign trail, and his eyes were more on the 1988 Nebraska primary than on the 1987 Model United Nations. His immodest rehearsal of his accomplishments and constant reminder of his close association to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. wore quite thin over the hour-long speech. His unexpected appeal for volunteers and funds smacked of the cheapest opportunism and must have violated some rule of protocol. The public-address system was atrocious, but even the wonders of bad electronics were not enough to stifle the style and pure magic of one of our nation's true rhetoricians.

Perhaps the worst problem of all — and one regarding which I have seen nothing in print — was that the two major thrusts of Jackson's speech were completely inconsistent. By the time he was well into his verbal barrage against the Reagan administration and his transparently localized bemoaning of the plight of the American farmer, his opening words concerning a new realization of America as just one part of a global community were conveniently forgotten.

No one bothered to ask how a politi-

cal program designed to raise the standard of living for America's oppressed (and thereby the overall average of the American public) could possibly coincide with a goal of making America's consumption of the world's resources reflect more accurately its proportion of the world's population. But politics is a marvelously amnesic phenomenon.

James  
Sennett



But all we have said so far is that the man is a politician. We knew that before he came. Despite these problems, I found myself stirred by the speech, the man, and — most of all — the vision. In fact, Jackson himself has almost singlehandedly reintroduced the word "vision" into the American political arena. Like no American leader since King, this man truly has a dream. And it is a dream that I can buy into. It is a dream most aptly captured in the quotation opening this column.

A good people. What does that take? It takes at least a political and social platform that is built up from an ideological foundation based on the idea of personal, moral and social responsibility. It takes a notion of interpersonal dependency that is not pragmatically based — that says more than, "Well, here are all these problems. What's the quickest way to solve them?" It takes a commitment to the genuine needs of other people that will not allow fiscal convenience to outweigh physical concern. It takes a liberalism unencum-

bered by the heresies of special-interest politics. It takes an understanding of political structures as subservient to people, not vice versa.

I am a sucker for a politician bearing evidence of moral backbone. I voted for Jimmy Carter twice. I know — fool me once, shame on you and all that jazz. But in 1976 and 1980, America had a choice between a political scheme that was grounded in pragmatics and one that was grounded in a sense of decency. I determined to prefer a president who would attempt to be good and fail over one who would attempt to be strong and succeed.

In 1984, the choice had eroded. There was no choice of good. There was only the choice between a plan to be strong that was working and a plan to be strong that would fail miserably. So I gritted my teeth, clenched my fists, closed my eyes and voted for Reagan. If we can't be good, we might as well be strong.

But Jackson represents a return to morality in politics. He represents a spark of intelligent good will in the darkness of domestic and international paranoia that has engulfed our nation in the last third of this century. His call for mercy to temper justice (is justice without mercy justice?) struck a chord with me — one that will most likely continue to vibrate throughout the 1988 presidential campaign. Sure, there are points of his program with which I disagree. But I can be extremely tolerant of the specific views of a person when I believe that he is grounding them in the right motives. I want this to be a good nation, too. If this is where Jackson is headed, I will go with him.

Sennett is a graduate student in philosophy and campus minister with College-Career Christian Fellowship.

## Letters

### Senior gift should aid current exhibits

As a graduating senior, I am glad to finally have an opportunity to make a statement about this institution of higher education, through the senior gift.

This is the first chance I have had to offer input on the decision of the gift, and I feel responsible to offer my reasoning behind my choice and to offer yet another alternative for the gift's use.

First, I didn't choose the campus recreation center option printed in the pamphlet accompanying the ballot because of my stand in opposition to the university policy on construction. It appears as though the university cannot deal with people (professors and students), so it chooses to deal with objects (buildings and parking lots). The current state of affairs in the university is such that we can no longer acquire or keep the instructors of quality, due to poor salaries, yet the university and the state insist on spending money on new parking-lot land, new buildings or additions for existing colleges when other colleges face financial extinction (i.e. nursing and pharmacy), or new performing-arts centers that the university will use only minimally. The list goes on. I refuse to support such heinous mismanagement of funds.

I also did not choose the Sheldon Art Gallery exhibit donation. This is a worthwhile project, but I believe that it takes second place in importance to the recipient of my vote for the gift, the Morrill Hall fund.

Morrill Hall is a fine and well-loved state institution on our campus. It appears, however, in the pamphlet, that the gift would be used to create (or to help create) a new exhibit on the Plains Indians. I hereby propose that the gift instead be used to maintain the existing displays in the museum, in the form of an air-conditioning system, for

which the museum has been lobbying for some time. After the acquisition of the air-conditioning system, the remainder of the money (if any), could be used for new displays. I do feel, however, that until the temperature-control system is installed, adding any new displays to the museum would be like putting water into a leaky bucket; it will all deteriorate in time and all the displays will be lost. I will, however, support any donation to Morrill Hall wholeheartedly and above any other donation to the university.

I vote for the 1987 senior class gift to be donated to the Morrill Hall fund, but I only wish that its use were more wisely designated.

Eric Stehl  
senior  
theater arts and dance

### Students resentful of tuition increase

When we came to graduate school here, we thought we had come for an education. It seems, however, that our purpose is to help pay for a new indoor practice field for the football team. Sure, the students also get a new recreation center in the deal, but not every one of us has the time or the desire to use it.

Increasing the student fees \$30 to \$35 a year is rather exorbitant. We appear to be getting a real bargain in comparison to the \$120 a year the faculty and other university employees will have to pay to use the facility, but at least they have a choice.

If we have to pay \$30 to \$35 a year extra (as inevitably will happen) we would much prefer that our money goes toward the fund to install a climate-control system in Morrill Hall.

Stacia Spaulding  
graduate student  
and 28 others

### Contra controversy comes to UNL

For the past several months Americans have been enraged by the illegal arms deal between the United States and Iran. Investigations have been made and indeed wrong acts had been made by several federal officials. But little focus has been made on the real issue: To whom have the funds been diverted? The funds went to the Contras, of course. But who are the Contras and why is the present administration so intent on supporting their cause? Few of us can legitimately answer this.

Most of us are too concerned with which "M\*A\*S\*H" rerun is on instead of catching a glimpse of the news. In any case, the Contras and Latin America are serious issues and should be a concern for all people. War with the involvement of American soldiers is becoming increasingly possible. Let us not forget Vietnam.

But now we have a chance to learn about the Contras on our own campus. Friday at noon in the Nebraska Union, a film titled "Who Are The Contras?" will be presented by Glen Silber, followed by an open discussion. Let us not be ignorant of what our country is doing in Latin America.

Patrick Sullivan  
sophomore  
pre-dentistry

## Letter Policy

Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space available. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit all material submitted.

Anonymous submissions will not be considered for publication. Letters should include the author's name, year in school, major and group affiliation, if any. Requests to withhold names from publication will not be granted.