

opinion/editorial

Canada gets American thanks for friendship

Last week there was a bright moment in the now-three-month-long ordeal in Tehran, when the United States found out that its neighbor to the north is a first-

class friend. Canada, which hardly has been a major international actor, received the thanks of Americans for the return of six diplomats from

Iran. The effort by the Canadians show guts. Forging passports, closing an embassy and protecting U.S. citizens in a country so anti-West is a clear indication of that intestinal fortitude.

The move came at a time when the international picture is moving back toward bi-polarity, as nations analyze what move is best for them in the face of a possible conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Clearly, Canada has decided it is behind the United States.

It would be easy for the Canadians, like many of our other so-called allies, to pay lip service to U.S. concerns. Action is another matter, and the leaders of this country must recognize and reward that decision.

They also must take advantage of the attitude that led to the decision.

Admittedly, Canada is not an international military force. But that country's heroic action in

freeing our people from the turmoil in Iran affords us an opportunity to send a message to the world.

The Canadians deserve whatever American aid they need or want. Other allies, such as the French, who have failed to actively support U.S. moves against Iran, should be penalized.

This country definitely owes Canada. If foreign aid priorities must be adjusted to pay that debt of gratitude, it should be at the expense of allies who have not been so helpful.

Perhaps rewarding Canada would make other allies rethink their attitude toward supporting the United States with something more than rhetoric.

Rewarding Canada for its bravery and friendship would do something else: It would show the world that the United States rewards those who treat it well, and would cement an already strong alliance in this hemisphere.

Randy Essex



letters to the editor

I must call to question Skip Volkman's Feb. 5 article on Abraham Naharin and its title, "Physicist hopes to calm illogical radiation fears." First, I ask how Prof. Naharin plans to do this and second, I would like to know what is illogical about fearing my white blood cells may begin to multiply at a cancerous rate.

The article said nothing to answer either of these questions but instead centered on Prof. Naharin's research on the damage the radiation does to living things and the genetic alteration of the DNA molecule. Other findings mentioned were that mammals are most susceptible to radiation, germs and viruses are least affected, and that children are more susceptible than adults.

I must thank Mr. Volkman for putting these illogical fears into the public eye.

Glenn Simonsen
Sophomore, English

Cartoonist praised

You probably receive more than your share of vehement screeds from advocates of the left or right. Perhaps this note will break the monotony, it is a letter of congratulations for the "Rag", not denunciation. Specifically, I wish to commend the art work of Dave Luebke, so consider this a fan letter.

I've been a regular reader of the Daily Nebraskan since August of 1971, and during that time, there have been two talented cartoonists who have been regular contributors: Greg Scott, and now Dave Luebke. Sure, they differ, but they both draw cartoons with a style that shows their humor and attention to detail. Don't tell Luebke, but I think that he is the better caricaturist. (You see, if you do tell Luebke, he will have to draw a larger head on his self-portrait.)

So much for my opinion. I also have a question about Luebke. His technique reminds me of someone. The way that Luebke uses hatching in his caricatures reminds me of a Briton (?) by the name (I think) of Gerald Scarfe. If you print this letter, or if someone decides to answer it, I would like to know if anyone notices a resemblance between Luebke's work and that of other political caricaturists. It's an academic question that I pose, but then, that is what I'm here for.

John Wiltse
Junior Law Student
Minor Bureaucrat

Conservation or war?

In respect to U.S. foreign policy, the Mid-East crisis, and the issue of military draft, a recent letter published in the New York Times put the matter something like this

"The referendum must be put clearly before the American people. Are we willing to go to war in order to keep our large, fast automobiles, to continue to use more and more energy in our homes, plants and bus-

inesses, and to continue the yearly style changes in our clothing, largely made of synthetic fabrics?

"If the answer to that question is yes, then the youth of this country will simply have to submit to the draft, just as the young maidens in ancient Mayan culture submitted to be sacrificed to their gods."

I find it hard to beat the directness and clarity of that.

Larry Doerr
Campus Minister
UNL

Hypocrisy alleged

Has Vice President Hubert Brown compromised the self-righteous allegiance he gave to "academic freedom" at the regents' meeting in November? It seems that speakers who have on occasion advocated totalitarianism are merely contributing to the "ideological debate."

But the South African coins to him are clear symbols of oppression. I will not lecture Mr. Brown on his specious analogies comparing the South African government to the Nazis. But I would hope to give attention to Mr. Brown's

Even 'little things' concern Warner

By Julie Bird

If there ever was a hot seat, Sen. Jerome Warner of Waverly sits on it.

Warner chairs the Legislature's powerful appropriations committee, which decides how much money goes where and to whom. The dollar amounts soar into the millions.

What concerns the man in the hot seat? Is he bothered with the university's contention that they need far more than the amount allocated them in Gov. Charles Thone's budget?

legislature

Does he worry that schools may have to cut programs to live within a 7 percent spending lid? Is he afraid some important program in the state will have to be dropped because there isn't enough money available?

Yes, he is. But something else captures Warner's attention as well. It's styrofoam cups.

Warner, who is known by legislative pages for his large coffee mug, looked around the chambers one day at all the styrofoam coffee cups lying unused on tables and

hypocrisy on the issue, if he has not noted it already himself.

Stanford Sipple
Junior, Economics

Law not the answer

Friday's article on the fledgling "Students for Life" organization prompts me to add my opinion to the dozens which have appeared in the Daily Nebraskan on the subject of abortion. It is a subject which has become so very polarized that reason and intelligence often fall by the wayside.

I would simply like to suggest to all who are contributing their honest efforts and time to pro-life organizations such as Students for Life that legality of abortion is ultimately beside the point. I don't like abortion, I feel it is immoral, but making it illegal simply will not stop it from happening. It is estimated that there were as many as a third of a million abortions annually in the years before the Supreme Court decision on abortions. If abortion is proscribed by law now, its incidence might decrease somewhat, but it would not stop.

Continued on Page 5

desks. "If people had to haggle over the budget every day like I do, they'd bring their own coffee cups," he sighed.

Nitpicking? Maybe, but those cups cost more than a penny apiece. Already this session the state has spent nearly \$300 on coffee supplies and that's just since January. And, as Warner said, the little things add up.

For example, this week the Legislature addressed a proposal to increase mileage reimbursement five cents a mile for some state employees.

"That didn't sound too bad until I found out it would cost the state another \$100,000 for every cent increase," Warner said. "I was surprised when I sat down and figured it out."

He was reminded of Lyndon Johnson's term when the president used to make an issue of turning out the lights in the White House for energy conservation. At the time, people laughed because it seemed insignificant, he said.

"Now the emphasis is on the little things, because the little things eat up the budget, just like energy," he said.

Warner said his four years chairing the appropriations committee have made him more cost conscious in most cases, but said his wife jokes that the best time to get him to agree to personal expenditures is when the Legislature is in session.

"I guess that when you're used to dealing in thousands of dollars, \$300 or \$400 doesn't seem like much," he said.