

Peer pressure

UNL falling behind in faculty salaries

If the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's current peer group is something from an educator's dream, the comparison group forwarded last year by a legislative consultant is a nightmare.

Presently UNL ranks 10th in its 11-member comparison group for faculty salaries, trailing universities such as Purdue, Ohio State and Penn State.

As nice as it would be to compare UNL to these schools, it is simply unrealistic. Nebraska legislators, in particular, have complained that UNL doesn't compare to its current peer group in terms of money spent on research, student enrollment, the faculty size or state population.

Ranking low wasn't the problem with the comparison group presented to the Legislature last year by Boulder, Colo., consultant Denis Jones. UNL ranked third in Jones' group, trailing only Iowa State University and the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

But, if finishing in the cellar is bad, leading the pack is worse.

"Faculty, to a large extent, still believe the existing peer group is a realistic one because it recognizes the fact that institutions in the group are the ones we compete with for faculty," Academic Senate President George Tuck said in December.

So with two inadequate choices available, the search goes on for an adequate group in which to rank UNL.

For UNL, ranking in the cellar isn't necessarily bad. The faculty, and the university as a whole, stand to gain if UNL's peer group allows for salary increases. But the group must be realistic.

This week, the university will take its biggest step toward a happy medium when a consulting team composed of the retired presidents of Penn State University, the University of Florida and the University of Tennessee visit Nebraska.

Everyone involved must remember that statistics from other schools are not good enough to establish faculty salaries. If the Legislature is honestly committed to improving education at UNL, faculty salaries will continue to increase as well.

Censorship no cure for racism

A picture of a man being arrested for a crime is not sensationalism. However, trying to draw the readers' attention away from the severity of a crime by listing the accused individual's good points is. The fact of the matter is that a crime was committed and the DN was fortunate enough to be the only news agency to get a picture of the alleged perpetrator at the scene. The DN was not being "insensitive" or "inhuman" or any other "in." The DN simply was reporting the news. I find it hilariously ironic that at a college where freedom of speech is taken so seriously, and where we are all supposed to be fighting racism, some individuals would

immediately resort to censorship and racial bias at the very first negative connotation associated with a minority.

I suggest that all of those individuals who feel that Scott Baldwin was dehumanized by that photograph go tell him so. Stand by his side and support him. But please, quit trying to be armchair newspaper editors. I will interpret what I read and watch. And when a person gets arrested for whatever, I don't want to see a picture of a touchdown, a great reception, or even a 3.0 GPA report card.

Thomas K. Eads
sophomore
computer science

DN critics' assertions absurd

Wouldn't you know it, the Daily Nebraskan finally gets its hands on some indisputably front-page news, and the editors are lambasted for deciding to forsake tradition and actually print news. The same thing happened last year after the DN reported that during the Greek Fight Night fund-raiser, a fight broke out (go figure).

Strangely, the same argument was used in both cases. People closest to the really-big-allegedly-violent-guys implored the DN to print the good things that happened, as well as the bad — supposedly to balance the assortment of facts.

I equate absurdity with the assertion that the DN should have accompanied Monday's (Jan. 20) photograph with a shot of Baldwin majestically running for a touchdown. Baldwin's excellent football statistics and academic performance are not relevant.

The people most disturbed by the sight of a nude and bound Baldwin on the front page of the DN complain that the press doesn't care about the average day of Scott Baldwin. They claim that "stereotypes have been encouraged by this article and photograph."

The logical extent of their reasoning is that all public and quasi-public

actions should be screened for racial, gender or ethnic implications so that we can all overcome prejudice, racism, sexism, injustice, discouragement, low self-esteem, confusion, poverty and halitosis — through ignorance.

The premise that reporting this event will perpetuate racism is false. Unfortunately, among the readers of the DN are people who are racist and who will continue to be racist whether the DN reports this event. It is not as if the photograph pushed teetering photoracists over the brink.

Nevertheless, because Scott Baldwin is black we are expected to whitewash the news on Martin Luther King Day. Martin Luther King Jr. spoke eloquently against violence, racism and injustice. He was not noted for campaigning against an informed citizenry.

The DN reports newsworthy events. As citizens, it is our task to process the information we receive intelligently. Simply because some people are not up to this task is no reason for the DN to cease relating newsworthy events.

The truth shall set you free.

Pohl Longsine
senior
mathematics and computer science

HOLD 'ER THAR PARDNER,
YOU GOTTA BE A
GOOD ENGLISH
SPEAKIN'
HOMBRE TA
GIT IN 'ERE!



BRIAN ALLEN

Jobless need work, not charity

A reoccurring topic that emerges from time to time is welfare reform. Periodically, different state legislatures propose various reform packages that invariably fail to address the real problem with today's welfare system: If you give people money not to work, you can't expect them to try to find a job.

What we should provide to people in need is not welfare, and not a check in the mail on the first of every month. This type of system caters to the slugs of this world and is demeaning to decent people who want to work but simply cannot find jobs. It gives no sense of pride or accomplishment.

People on welfare need jobs, not handouts. Instead of simply mailing out billions of dollars every month and raking the taxpayers over the coals, the United States must use the welfare budget to create jobs for needy people.

If people are laid off or lose their jobs and need help for a while, such a system would give them welfare jobs. They wouldn't be glamorous jobs. The pay would be poor and the work hard to encourage people to find jobs not dependent on the government. But people who were in need and willing to work would get help.

The idea behind any welfare system is to help those in genuine need of assistance while keeping the number of moochers and freeloaders to an absolute minimum. Some people are simply down on their luck momentarily and need help for a short time, and we should help these people — especially if they have children.

Unfortunately, some people abuse the system — people who are perfectly capable of supporting themselves but who are simply too lazy or unmotivated to do so.

The problem is how to sort the two groups, how to provide help where and when it's needed while keeping the loafers out of the system.

Problem solved: All we must do is make welfare recipients work for their money. People who need help will still be able to get it and anyone too lazy to work will be cut from the system.

It wouldn't cost the taxpayers any more money. They're already giving money away; let's at least make welfare recipients earn it. This would give help to those who need it and are willing to work for it, and would keep the slackers out of the system and off the taxpayers' backs.

This is not by any means a new idea. From 1933 to 1942 hundreds of



The need for welfare reform and the need to do something about dwindling landfill space are two negatives from which we could make a positive — the reclamation of valuable recyclable resources.

thousands of people worked in a sort of government welfare program called the Civilian Conservation Corps. Those who needed help got work, and the country benefited from the planting of millions of trees and the completion of numerous drainage and soil conservation projects. The thing that puzzles me is why we ever let welfare programs change and become the system of handouts they are today.

Some may ask, "What about single mothers with small children? They can't afford to pay for day care for their kids while working for your new welfare system."

Look at that — we just found jobs for the 10 percent of our nation's welfare recipients who prove to be the most qualified to take care of children. These workers could care for the children of the other 90 percent of the recipients.

Now all that remains is to find jobs for that other 90 percent.

While the Civilian Conservation Corps was a great idea, planting trees is out. Not only would it jeopardize the jobs of many people already in the nursery/horticulture business (and the last thing we want to do is to put more people out of work), but let's face it, our state doesn't have that much land in need of reforestation. Much of the land not being tilled or grazed already either has trees on it or is valuable prairie or wetland wildlife habitat.

What we need is a job which meets several very specific requirements. It

must be performable by people with varying degrees of education or training. It must be performable by the majority of the working-age population, regardless of sex or physical build (i.e. no heavy lifting). It must be capable of absorbing millions of man(woman)-hours of labor. It must be at a permanent location, preferably near public transportation routes so people without cars can get to work. It must be a job that currently employs very few people, so as not to put anyone else out of work. It must be useful, and if not self-sustaining, at least capable of paying for a portion of the welfare system's budget.

Actually, it was my brother who came up with the perfect job: "Put them to work sorting garbage," he said. "The deadbeats won't do it, and we can cut them from the welfare budget. The rest would perform a useful function by sorting recyclables that are going to landfills. They would be helping the environment, and the work would be distasteful enough to encourage them to find other jobs. Plus, the recyclables could be sold and help pay for the program."

Here we have a unique opportunity to create a solution to two problems. The need for welfare reform and the need to do something about dwindling landfill space are two negatives from which we could make a positive — the reclamation of valuable recyclable resources. Sort of like killing two birds with one stone, we would solve two social problems with one program and deriving a benefit from the process.

According to the UNL Environmental Resource Center, our country produces an average of 160 million tons of garbage a year. While 80 percent of this waste is recyclable, only about 10 percent of that is being recycled and 1 percent is being composted.

The other 69 percent of recyclable materials is not being reclaimed because of the cost. It is not cost-effective to sort out any but the most valuable recyclable products.

If we put welfare recipients to work sorting garbage, it still won't be cost-effective. The program won't make any money, but it would certainly be better than throwing recyclables away and mailing out money for nothing. At least taxpayers would get some return on the welfare dollar, which is infinitely better than the return they are getting now.

Allen is a senior mechanical engineering major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.