

'73 ERA repeal lacks logic

Editor's note: The editorial on page four of Thursday's Daily Nebraskan ("UNL indifference to student rights criticized") was the opinion of Joe Dreesen.

The 1973 Nebraska Unicameral couldn't decide between serving as a legislative body or a circus. On Feb. 22 of that year, it became a circus with Sen. Richard Proud of Omaha gladly playing master of ceremonies.

The legislative chambers were packed for the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee's hearings on a resolution to rescind ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. And Sen. Proud played to the crowd.

"Now who is the biggest backer of ERA?" Proud asked. "Probably the organization called NOW (National Organization of Women). They also back unrestricted abortion, marriage of homosexuals, all that type of thing."

Proud's fellow senators, somehow finding logic in that statement, nodded. The ERA was as good as gone. It had been ratified less than a year earlier by a vote of 38 ayes, 0 nays and 11 abstentions.

The 1973 Legislature has never explained the logic of repealing an amendment for equal rights in a nation supposedly based on the concept of

equality.

The cost of that body's action in wasted time is obvious. Many worthy bills were pushed out of consideration by the time-consuming anti-ERA resolution. The eventual cost of this insult to women is hard to measure.

Now it appears the state will be given one more chance to redeem itself. State Sen. John DeCamp of Neligh has introduced a resolution seeking approval once again for the ERA. He introduced the original resolution in 1972.

With the chance for redemption comes the likelihood of another session bogged down by endless arguments that the ERA is not necessary, that women's rights have already been legislated. The fact that women themselves support the amendment speaks to the contrary.

The unicameral should admit its mistake and speedily re-ratify the ERA. This year's 90-day session should not be gobbled up by senseless debate.

Perhaps the task would be easier if more than one woman had a seat in the Legislature. Perhaps, if that were the case, it would not be necessary.

Wes Albers



K. Kelley
The Christian Science Monitor

"O.K. Pop, you crank, I'll drive."



to the editor

Cartoons cussed

Dear editor:

We find the cartoon on the front page of the Daily Nebraskan (Thursday, Jan. 23) objectionable. The implication that mothers who are students neglect their children and are unable to handle the responsibilities of both school and child-rearing, maligns all student mothers. In fact, the only aspect of the cartoon that could be considered amusing are the grammatical error and the misspelling of "chemistry."

Patricia Petersen
J.K. Jensen

Not funny

Dear editor:

The purpose of this letter is to comment on your front page cartoon which appeared on Thursday, Jan. 23. The cartoon accompanied an excellent article on services for women going back to school.

The cartoon pictured a woman reading a Chemistry book and jamming a bottle into her baby's mouth. The baby, looking very dejected, is saying "I wish I were a chemistry book."

The message seems clear: If a woman chooses to go back to school she will be neglecting her children. This only serves to reinforce the guilt that our society

has placed on women who want to continue with their education or have a career.

The article accompanying the cartoon explained that women "hesitate to return to school because of the stereotyping of their roles."

This cartoon is reinforcing those very stereotypes. Was this the intent of the Daily Nebraskan? If not, a note of explanation and apology would be appropriate.

Mary Heppner

(Editor's note: The daily Nebraskan apologizes for poor judgment on Thursday's cartoon. It was not meant to offend.)

Driving to war

Dear editor:

Like most solutions proposed to the oil problem, that advocated by Mark Speece in the Jan. 22 Daily Nebraskan is both simplistic and indicative of ignorance of the magnitude of the problem.

Although it may surprise Mr. Speece, the additional billions in our deficit balance of trade going to the Arabs are indeed one of the causes of our economic troubles. Also, the current and preceding administrations are not solely responsible for the inflation/recession; Congressional do-gooders spreading year-round cheer with public funds (electoral pump-priming, if you will) have done their share in creating the problem.

Nationalization of the oil companies (does he propose to nationalize their foreign ventures, too? There's some legal resistance there) will not bring down prices. It would send the stock market plummeting, greatly increase the national debt (after

all, those companies belong to citizens who must be repaid) and saddle us with another huge bureaucratic establishment to support.

It is widely thought that the difference between a capitalist and a bureaucrat is that if you give a job to a capitalist, he'll try to do it more efficiently to increase his profit, while if you give it to a bureaucrat, he'll try to do it less efficiently to assure himself of continuing employment. Bureaucracy is to government what DDT is to the environment. Once you've got it, you're stuck with it.

The possibility of war over oil in the Middle East is very real. The Arabs are taking a very dangerous path, and Mr. Kissinger's recent statements, which caused the uproar, were only vocal expression of what everyone already knew. World cooperation is fine, if everyone wants to cooperate. But the Arabs are demanding dangerous and unrealistically high prices for their oil. Faced with economic ruin if they continue to pay ever-increasing prices, Western nations may well consider a militarily feasible invasion. Wars are seldom fought over ideals, often over money.

I don't advocate a war. Obviously, the best way to avoid one is to decrease our dependence on foreign sources of oil, through development of domestic sources and decreased consumption. Regulation by Congress has made domestic development fiscally ridiculous until recently. The oil companies have been warning for years about dependence on foreign oil, only to be called prophets of doom. Mr. Ford's tax on imported crude oil is designed to discourage waste. The decision we must make now is whether the convenience of driving our cars now is worth going to war over in the future.

John Chain

