

editorial

Middle-income student will cash in on Carter plan

"Hey, buddy, can ya spare a dime?"

The Carter administration is heeding the pleas of college students across the nation for federal funding of their education.

President Carter Wednesday announced a \$1.2 billion national aid program for college students from middle-income families, an attempt to counteract a congressional push for tax credits for parents.

The aid would include grants of \$250 to students from families with incomes between \$15,000 and

\$25,000, and subsidized loans for students from families with gross income up to \$47,000.

Joseph Califano, secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, has said that families in lower- and middle-income levels need federal assistance to send their children to college.

But, Califano says tax credits would provide benefits for high-income taxpayers, as well as those who need the money.

"We cannot afford poverty programs for people who aren't poor," Califano said.

With this, we agree.

Tax credits would not specify just lower income groups. The people who need the money wouldn't get it; and the people who don't need it would get it.

The way our United States tax system is organized, the high-income levels can get more breaks—if their accountants are cunning enough—than the average middle-class taxpayer.

This has overflowed into the educational system, and the members of Congress have not realized it.

There has been much discussion of late about the great burgeon-

ing number of students defaulting on their educational loans. Students seem to be in the limelight.

But when students who do not need money are benefitting from pushes in Congress, it is the lower-income students that suffer from the quickly deflating pocketbook syndrome.

As much as Carter can be criticized in his policies, this is one area that should be commended. Califano and Carter seemed to be concerned about the plight of the less fortunate (when it comes to money) students.

Thankfully.

Canal treaty debate unlocks complexity on simple issue

The U.S. Senate is debating the Panama Canal treaties, a simple issue blown out of proportion by the opponents of the treaties.

The opponents, mainly conservative Republicans, have tried to portray the Canal treaties as more than an agreement between the United States and Panama.

They have attempted to make the treaties an issue symbolic of an American retreat from world leadership and an example of United States reluctance to exert its influence over a "tin horn" dictator in a small country.

The debate in the Senate will concentrate on questions of national security and economics. But, at the heart of the debate, the question will simply be imperialistic American pride.

The treaties will be approved by the Senate. Robert Byrd, the Senate majority leader, is too shrewd a politician to allow the treaties to be debated and voted upon without certainty of the outcome.

However, the three- to five-week debate which Byrd had promised will provide the public with an insight into the foreign policy making process and will undoubtedly stir emotions.

I. Kent
wolgamott

The opponents of the treaties have a valid point when they attack the treaties' ambiguities on the issues of defense and priority use of the canal.

Byrd and Minority Leader Howard Baker have expressed their concerns in these areas and will support a reservation



to the treaty which outlines the U.S. position in these matters.

The reservation should be enough to guarantee passage of the treaties, but the hard core opponents of the treaties will accept nothing more than complete rejection of the new agreements.

The opponents believe the treaties represent a post-Vietnam attitude on the part of the American people, an attitude characterized by a sheepish nonconfrontation policy with smaller countries.

They use a patriotic argument to persuade people that the canal give-away is the first step in undermining the United States position in the world, turning the country into a second-rate power.

What the opponents fail to consider is that the world is more complex than the

simple you-are-either-for-us-or-against-us policy.

The classic confrontational method of dealing with smaller nations is becoming a thing of the past. Smaller nations control many of the vital resources in the world and the United States must recognize this.

The Panama Canal treaties do not give anything away. They are the product of negotiations which have lasted through four administrations.

Any money given to Panama under the terms of the treaty must come from the revenues of the canal. The change will be phased in over 30 years, not overnight.

Most importantly, the treaties show U.S. recognition of the conditions in the real world of international relations.

If the United States is to continue

to lead the world, it must respect other nations' existence and sovereignty.

The Panama Canal treaties are a result of cooperation between the United States and a member of the third world. They can signal the entrance of the United States into a new foreign policy.

It is imperative that the people of this country realize that we live in an interdependent world. The debate on the canal treaties should graphically demonstrate that fact.

We must hope that their thorough coverage will be enough to offset the misconceptions spread by opponents of the treaties who are pursuing a policy intended to propel us back into the 1950s.

L. Kent Wolgamott was an aide in Nebraska Sen. Edward Zorinsky's Washington office last year. He is now a senior political science major at UNL.

letters to the editor

I would like to encourage the Daily Nebraskan and its readers to exercise more caution in making generalizations about the Nebraska Legislature.

Do not be so quick to assume that Scottsbluff Sen. William Nichol's behavior during Professor Andus Skuja's testimony is typical of the Legislature.

I was present for the Judiciary Committee hearing which has drawn so much scorn and agree with John Milnikel that Nichol's behavior was nothing short of ridiculous.

But I also have seen other state senators perform the duties of their office.

For every William Nichol in our Legislature, there are several people like Steve Fowler, Douglas Bereuter and John DeCamp.

Our Legislature is considered the most open and responsive in the nation, so take care in sensationalizing and extrapolating

instances when it appears otherwise.

Bob Gleason
ASUN Government Liaison Committee

Rape concern

There was a recent article in the Daily Nebraskan about an anti-rape pellet that deters attackers by emitting the smell of a skunk on the attacker, as well as the victim.

I hope this might be a solution to a problem that has concerned me for some time: How should my wife protect herself when she is out alone?

Would the device work? I suppose not, but I hoped that some organization or individual would examine the product.

The attitudes and statements of Gina Washburn, director of the Lincoln Rape Crisis Center, and Nancy Turhume of the Women's Resource Center, who both talked about the product in the article,

leave me confused.

"It's just recognition of the individual's incompetence towards the situation," Washburn said. But isn't this true? Aren't women somewhat helpless against attackers who are larger and much stronger?

Turhume said the idea wasn't too bright and that it was obvious "that a man invented it." As a human being, I resent this denigration of men just as much as I would if she had said woman.

Many men are sensitive to the problem of rape, not just those that have wives and children.

Washburn and Turhume are entitled to their opinions. But as representatives of influential organizations, I hope they choose their words more carefully in the future.

We know and expect these organizations to be pro-women, but sometimes it is hard to resist the feeling that they might also be anti-men.

I'll try to resist that conclusion.

Many men are less than sensitive about the problem of rape, and the statements of Washburn and Turhume do not help.

Name Withheld

Lecture hall scrapped

I would like to correct a glaring error in "Little Mo's" letter to the editor Thursday criticizing sports complex track policy.

The sports complex did not cost "many thousands of thousands of dollars." It cost \$13.1 million dollars, i. e., about 50 times what it would have cost to build a decent lecture hall in Manter Hall, the new life sciences building, for use by hundreds of students.

If I remember correctly, the sports complex was funded about the same year as Manter Hall, and the life sciences lecture hall was scrapped because we already had Henzlik.

John Janovy Jr.
Life science professor