

Everyone loves to publish

This is the season when young people, printer's ink in their blood, turn their fancies to thoughts of publishing.

The Informer, in the tradition of campus gadfly, has already tossed its cap (admittedly, only a size 4 but with potential to grow) into the ring, published by a group that prefers to remain anonymous, this mimeographed sheet has already been produced three times.

According to its creators, the original concept of the Informer involved changing the minds of those who were not yet radicalized. Now, however, the paper acts as a house organ — a means of communication among members of the "new culture."

For staffers of the Informer it's "publish and perish" rather than "publish or perish". Publishing is difficult enough (the Informer staff knows that — they were evicted after their first issue and consequently missed the next deadline) without the added problems of harassment from neighbors, the police and the landlord.

Another paper, still lurking somewhere in the wings, is scheduled to come out as soon as the publishers learn how to use the press (someone said that the would-be publishers accidentally poured ink into their offset press).

Produced by members of the Young Americans for Freedom, this paper will assume the role of adversary to The Nebraskan in order to provide students with an alternate source of information and opinions. YAF apparently doesn't have the financial problems that the Informer is struggling with. Claiming that, "A paper isn't that hard to get together." Terrill Cannon, president of the group, stated, "We have the funds and the press. We'll print as soon as we get organized."

The Nebraska welcomes both the Informer and the yet un-named and unproduced YAF papers into the business. There is plenty of room for the diversity of thought and expression. Whether or not the two papers will last the year is a matter that will rest on the finances and, more importantly, the dedication of the people involved.

THE NEBRASKAN

Telephone: Editor: 472-2588, Business: 472-2589, News: 472-2590. Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Subscription rates are \$5 per semester or \$8.50 per year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods. Member of the Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.
The Nebraskan is a student publication, independent of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government.
Address: The Nebraskan
34 Nebraska Union
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68504

Editorial Staff
Editor: Kenley Baker; Managing Editor: Connie Winkler; News Editor: Bill Smitherman; Sports Editors: Jim Johnston and Roger Rife; Nebraskan Staff Writers: Gary Seacrest, John Dvorak, Mick Moriarty, Dave Brink, Steve Strasser, Sue Schaffer, Steve Kadis, Pat McTea, Carol Guelchius; Photographers: Dan Ludey, Mike Hayman; Entertainment Editor: Fred Eisenhartz; Literary Editor: Alan Boye; News Assistant: Marsha Banhart; Copy Editors: Gure Puntuch, Jim Gray, Warren Obr, Blythe Erickson; Night News Editor: Ben Lamovitch; Night News Assistant: Lee Schweitzer.

Business Staff
Business Manager: Pat DiNatale; Coordinator: Sandra Carter; Subscription and Classified Ad Manager: Jan Boatman; Salesmen: Greg Scott, I. Jane Kucinski, J. J. Shields; Circulation Managers: Chuck Balduff, Barry Pilger, John Waggoner.



Letters . . . Letters . . . Letters

(Editors note: the following letter refers to a style change recently adopted by THE NEBRASKAN. Almost all newspapers use AP style which suggests that men be called by their first and last names for the first reference and thereafter be designated only by their last name.)

Likewise, women are first referred to by their first and last names but later references are supposed to consist of the last name with "Miss" or "Mrs." as a prefix. THE NEBRASKAN has eliminated the use of Miss or Mrs. when referring to women. However, Ms. will be used to designate a woman when clarity requires differentiation between the sexes — as between husband and wife, brother and sister, or two unrelated people with the same last name.)

Dear Editor:

With regard to the notice that THE NEBRASKAN will henceforth designate women by the prefix "Ms." rather than "Mrs." or "Miss" (small black box, bottom of front page, Oct. 8 issue) because the traditional usage "discriminates between married and unmarried women," let me express my outrage at the inadequacy of the decision.

As a male member of the human race, I submit that the designations you now propose to us ("Ms." vs. "Mr.") discriminate between men and women, an obvious and crude

affront to my personal dignity, to say nothing of an infringement of my civil rights.

In the interests of fairness, let us designate every human being at birth with a unique number which he will use for identification thereafter under all circumstances. This will insure complete fairness in all public communication and end the blatant discrimination implied by distinguishing between married vs. unmarried status, or between male vs. female.

I hope you will give both this suggestion and the one described in the Oct. 8 issue of THE NEBRASKAN the careful attention they both deserve. Identification Number 123456789 (Richard K. Boobar)

Kudos

Dear Editor:

On Friday, October 2, your paper published a review of the motion picture *Getting Straight*. The review was written by Cater Chamblee.

I enjoyed his review immensely, as it reconfirmed in my mind the idea that there is definitely a lack of communication between students, faculty, and administrators.

I would be the first to agree with those who suggest that the movie is a gross oversimplification of the problems that exist on our college campuses today. I would suggest that before one can proceed to solve any problem, an individual must be cognizant of

the fact that a conflict of sorts does exist. Also, one must have the ability to analyze the problem objectively, which is often quite hard to do. Each of us is either playing the role of student, faculty member or administrator. And sadly enough, none of us is willing to assume the responsibility or attitudes of the other.

Joseph J. Plant

To Mr. Cater Chamblee:
As I left the movie *Getting Straight*, I was inundated by surrounding comments such as "right on," "lays it on the line," "very heavy," et al. I almost slit my wrists. Many thanks for your trenchant testimonial elucidating the true worth of this abomination.

G. I. Anderson

Associate Professor
Architecture
P.S. I sent a copy of your review to Holly Spence of the Lincoln paper suggesting she should shape up.

Present Crisis

Dear Editor:
A non-functioning government for the people. Education that is totally irrelevant to the people. Economics that is totally irrelevant to the people. Religions and values that are totally irrelevant to the people. People are irrelevant to the people.

Exploitation of the environment, poisoning of the environment, exploitation of natural foods through processing; exploitation of people

through processing. Overpopulation without ration is out to kill our world and our nation.

This sounds apocalyptic, but it isn't. What is apocalyptic is the fact that most people don't know this entity of confused terror is in existence and they are responsible for it and they make it worse every tenth of a second of a day, by not acknowledging its existence.

The present crisis is to make people aware of the doom and demise of the human race by its own hands (in fifteen years approximately) without them panicking and bringing it closer.

My guess is that the only thing that can save us is us, but we can't save us if we don't know we need saving.

Our romantic notions of "life will go on as usual" has totally blinded us to the real reality of the present crisis.

It seems ludicrous to me to bring children into the world today to become presidents, lawyers, doctors, teachers, or even policemen, when you have to be way over fifteen years of age to hold these types of jobs and your kids won't make it past sixteen. Pre-teenage marriages are going to be the thing of the day for those who wish to see their grandchildren.

You might want to ask me where are my isolated examples of documented proof of what I'm saying. And I say

Outside the Tower

Universal service: dangerous

by TOM SIEDELL
If Sen. Birch Bayh's (D-Ind.) recent visit to our campus proved anything, it was that the art of nostrum-peddling is not dead. In less than an hour the good senator covered everything from God to Mother (she died when he was young, you see).

THE "SYSTEM," he said, must be made more representative, more responsive, more relevant, more viable. He quoted John Kennedy. In short, he used every cliché in the liberal's handbook. He even discarded his prepared text in order to give a more personal, "off the cuff" speech. No kidding. Of course most of the speech was given verbatim from his press conference earlier, but at least he tried.

MOST OF HIS speech was innocuous enough, of course, but in the question-and-answer period afterward he touched lightly on a proposal which seems to me to be one of the most dangerous ideas yet to appear on the American political scene, more dangerous even than involuntary military conscription.

The proposal is generally called by its proponents "national service." The idea is not that we abolish the draft by instituting a volunteer army, but rather that people be allowed to fulfill their obliga-

tion to the national government by serving in, for example, the Peace Corps or VISTA.

ON THE SURFACE, this seems like a wonderful idea. Just think, all our young people can serve their country by waging peace, a marvelous idea to be sure, rather than waging war. How glorious this sounds! Of course, some will still have to go into the military, to be shot at like clay pigeons at a trap shoot, but there will be an alternative for those who desire it.

The root question here is this: Does the government have the right to demand the services of its citizens without their consent, and, if so, under what circumstances?

THE FIRST DUTY of a government, any government, is to preserve itself. If it does not try to preserve itself, it falls those from whom that government derives its support, whether that be a small group in the society, or, as in the ideal democracy, the entire citizenry. This means that the government has two primary objectives. First, it must protect itself from internal subversion, and second, it must maintain its existence as a sovereign nation. In a republican form of government this does not mean that, for instance, the party in power tries to preserve itself in power, but rather that those of both

parties, all elected representatives of the people, must work to protect the "system."

Now, given this rule, I think a case can be made that a government can call upon its citizenry to aid in those twin objectives; in particular, it can draft people into the military. This, of course, causes certain problems in a nation that fancies itself to be free. Clearly any free society which desires to abridge to any extent an individual's freedom of action must do so on clearly defined grounds. This is the essence of constitutionalism. Indeed, it is only in a constitutional system that freedom can exist at all. Surely, then, a free society, specifically the government in that society, must limit itself in order to provide the greatest degree of freedom to individuals in that society. As this applies to the military draft, it can force conscription only when absolutely necessary "emergency" conditions, if you will; and it must never forget that this service is involuntary servitude. Slavery — no more, no less.

Sen. Bayh and those of his cohorts who favor "national service" are clearly violating this principle. What they are saying is something like this. No, we don't need to draft everyone (indeed, maybe by making certain changes we

could get enough volunteers to do the job), but, gee, wouldn't it be nice if we could get all these warm bodies to work on all the wonderful projects we'd like to see done. Think of all the VISTA workers! Marvelous!

What these men fail to realize is that they are asking people to become slaves, not on the grounds that it is absolutely essential in order to preserve what freedoms they have, but rather in order to make certain charitable contributions. Now, I have nothing against charity; I consider it to be one of the most noble activities a man can participate in. But the essence of charity is that it is voluntarily done, not forced. The proposal for "national service" asks the citizenry to give up their freedom not just in a limited, short-term, emergency situation, but rather in a lasting program which would conscript people, needed or not.

I THINK IT IS TIME that all of us, not just those of us who have sought for a longtime a volunteer military, but everyone who recognizes that a draft is involuntary servitude, necessary or not, to understand that a system which would demand such servitude for what are essentially political activities would be a grave blow indeed to a free society.

Our man hope

Will anybody buy Unruh?

by ARTHUR HOPPE

Here it is, less than four weeks to election day. As usual, the eyes of the Nation are focused on California.

If Governor Reagan can win big, the experts say, he will once again become the Conservatives' standard bearer. He'll be a force at the '72 GOP Convention. And he'll possibly be our next President.

So as the excitement mounts to fever pitch, the question on everyone's lips across this great land of ours is:

"Can Reagan whip Whatshisname?"

To get the answer, I instituted an all-out search for the Democratic campaign headquarters. I think I found it: a third-floor walk-up strategically located outside the high-rent district in the little community of East Gilroy.

A crayoned sign over the door says bravely: "Jess Unruh Victory Headquarters and Next-to-New-Shop (pants cuffed while U wait)."

I could tell I was in the right place. A churchmouse staggered out of a hole in the wall, toppled over, clutched its bony chest and expired before my eyes in the last agonies of starvation.

"Yes, we're confident our dynamic, hard-hitting, all-out

campaign will bring us victory", said one of the many (three) campaign aides, "and do you have a cheese sandwich on you? Or maybe a stale cracker?"

I asked where the candidate was.

"He's off on another triumphal Statewide tour to carry his message to the people," said the aide. "But you might still catch him at the 11th street entrance to the freeway, unless he's already caught a ride."

Hitchhiking? Was this any way for a candidate to carry his message to the people?

"Frankly, we can't afford a stamp," said the aide. "That's why Mr. Unruh's been going around standing on sidewalks. You know, he stood on Henry Salvatori's sidewalk to dramatize the tax break this big contributor got from the Reagan Administration. Then he stood on Reagan's sidewalk to dramatize the free housing Reagan got from Salvatori and his friends."

Very dramatic.

"It gets us free television time," said the aide. "Our goal is to have Mr. Unruh do something each day that'll make the 6 o'clock news. We had a dilly scheduled for tomorrow: Mr. Unruh was going to ride naked on a white palfrey down Sunset boulevard to dramatize high taxes."

Great idea! What went wrong?

"Do you know how much it costs to rent a white palfrey?"

Poor Mr. Unruh. I suppose if he loses, he'll kill himself.

"We advised against it," said the aide. "What god's free TV time after the polls have closed?"

Wait! The very fact that Mr. Unruh's poverty-stricken can be turned to his advantage. It shows that no fat cats have bought him off. Poor, but honest, that's Mr. Unruh.

"By George, you're right! This will turn the whole campaign around. I'll get on the phone to Associated Press!" cried the aide enthusiastically. "Excuse me, do you have a dime on you and how would you like to be Finance Director in our new Administration?"

I said I didn't have a dime.

"Well, we'll just have to think of something else," he said with a shrug. And as I left he was debating whether to spend the remaining campaign funds on three bumper strips or a ham sandwich.

But it's good to know that no one's bought my old friend, Mr. Unruh. Unfortunately for him, at this stage of the campaign, it doesn't look as though anyone will.