

opinion/editorial

Students' voice calls for approval of SSA funds

The next round of the proposed State Student Association fight moves to the floor of the ASUN Senate Wednesday night. There the senate will vote on the final 1981-1982 student fee recommendations from the Committee for Fees Allocation.

Among the items to be voted on will be the \$20,750 that CFA has tentatively allocated for the SSA.

In last Wednesday's balloting, the SSA question received approval by a 1,281 to 935 vote. While not an overwhelming majority, the vote, along with some 3,139 signatures on petitions collected by the Government Liaison Committee, signals student support.

The SSA question on the ballot was in the form of a survey, not a referendum, and thus is not binding on the senate.

It is doubtful that the senate—acting as representatives of the students—could find a way not to vote approval of the SSA. Indeed, failure to forward the senate's approval of SSA could signal

the end of ASUN's credibility.

Gaining a stronger voice in the Legislature and in Congress has been a goal of past ASUN administrations and that goal gets closer with every advancement of the SSA.

Arguments against the SSA have been muted. Some senators doubt that the SSA is the best way to let students' opinions be heard. Students want the SSA, and think it is the proper megaphone to get their messages heard.

Some senators don't want to commit so much of student fee money to an organization still in its forming stages. But CFA guidelines stipulate that money may not be allocated unless one other state campus votes its funding and support also.

Raising student fees by 50 cents per semester bothered some, but that fee would be refundable, similar to Fund A allocations for such functions as the Daily Nebraskan, University Program Council speakers program and student government officers' salaries.

So the principle of majority rules and minority

rights would prevail. Students who didn't want their money spent on the SSA could get it back.

The GLC Core Committee opposes a bill that would restrict the SSA from affiliating with the United States Student Association unless approved by a student referendum. To preclude the SSA's option of joining the USSA or any other national organization would be a restricting harness.

Also, the proposed bylaws call for a three-fourths vote of the General Assembly before membership with the USSA can be approved.

The NU Board of Regents has left the SSA decision to Interim Chancellor Robert Rutford. Rutford said this election would probably affect his decision.

We strongly reiterate our support of the SSA and urge the senate to vote approval. The students—those who cared to vote—have spoken. Once again, we must wait and see if they are heard.

Tom Prentiss

NOW SHOWING !!!

Slash and Burn

STARRING JAMES WATT

The true story of one man's attempt to DEFILE a CONTINENT

A REAGAN FILMS (R) PRODUCTION

★SEE: Brutal Disregard for the Environment! Rated PG

★SEE: 550 Million Acres Pillaged!

★SEE: Mountains made to Molehills! Opens in DENVER

DAVE LUEBKE 1981

Bewildered liberals regroup again for another long haul

For a moment, the woman across the table looked drained of energy. If she were the sighing sort, she would have breathed out the closing line of our short conversation.

Instead she spoke in a careful voice. "All I know is that I'm in the same movement for the second time in my life and I'm not even 40."

goodman

The sentiment was a stark and simple one. The woman who had claimed some victories for the causes of her twenties and early thirties was now watching the territory erode. She felt no momentum, for her "side" had lost any illusions about a swift "win." The second pause of this struggle would be, she suspected, to hold the old ground, trench by trench.

Her words over lunch resonated in my mind. Though she spoke them in Denver, the same feelings were repeated all along the way from Colorado to California last week. I met people realizing that they would have to fight again for the turf they thought they'd already won. And wondering if they could.

The woman in Denver was talking about women's rights, but she might just as easily have been talking about the environment, peace, civil rights, human rights.

In Phoenix, a woman active in the anti-Vietnam War movement talked with dis-

belief about our increasing involvement in El Salvador. "Didn't we learn anything?"

Moving backwards

In Los Angeles, an environmentalist who drives home through smog as dense as the fog of Cape Cod, talked about the undermining of the clean air deadlines. "It's going backwards."

In San Francisco, a civil-rights activist shook his head at the critical words in Reagan's budget speech. "The taxing power of the government must be used to provide revenues for legitimate government purposes. It must not be used . . . to bring about social change."

What is a legitimate government's purpose if it isn't social change for justice? he asked ardently and then reflected on his own heat. "I've said it all before. I've heard it all before. It makes me so damn tired."

Tired. It was the word I heard most often—even more than "angry"—when I talked with people called liberals, who had done time in a movement to help the poor or end the war or clean the air. People who thought they had built something solid now feel the ground crumbling, as if it had been staked on sand and not hard rock.

As Sen. Paul Tsongas says again and again, "The last election changed things. Not only did we lose Democrats and liberals, but those who are left are so weary."

Weariness is not just an occupational hazard of politicians. It also infects the legions of those who care and cared . . . and now often call their own belief in swift victory "naive."

Continued on Page 5

Reagan's 'get-tough' policy may cause risky Cold War

McCarthyism lives. History has repeated itself and the United States once again is involved in what seems to be a communist scare. The word "communism" means only one thing to many people: Soviet Communism.

If Joe McCarthy were alive today, he probably would thank President Ronald Reagan and the good general for putting the nation on the right track again.

richardson

Reagan and Secretary of State Alexander Haig have set out to teach Americans new lessons about the Soviets. Memorize them. They may be helpful to you if you're called on to appear before a grand jury out of the McCarthy days.

1. The Soviets are afraid of guns.
2. The U.S. should give "truly needy" countries guns.
3. A buildup of arms throughout the world will not cause a cold war.
4. The United States and the Soviet Union will review the SALT agreement. Note: The United States definitely will have the upper hand in any new SALT agreement.

With this kind of logic, the United States and the Soviet Union will be in a Cold War in no time. The Soviets will not sit tight while the United States builds up its arms as well as the arms of other countries. It's archaic to think that the Soviets will be stopped by more guns. After all, they have guns, too.

It's ludicrous to think all communism and rightist movements are supported by the Soviets. Even more ludicrous is the idea that Soviet Communism is practiced in all the countries that practice some kind of communism.

And yet Reagan's foreign policy toward the Soviet Union—as promised in his campaign—is one of "get tough." Get tough means increasing arms.

It's through this policy that Saudi Arabia has been promised F-15s. Israel will receive \$600 million in credit toward the purchase of U.S. weapons. Morocco will get U.S. tanks costing \$182 million. Mexico has bought fighter planes costing \$15 million. And the United States has no business in El Salvador.

If support continues to El Salvador and other countries, and Reagan continues to point his finger at the Soviets for all evils, there will not be any U.S.-Soviet talks. Instead, the Soviets will only intensify their arms buildup. We will find ourselves in another Cold War. And a cold war today is much more frightening in light of the new nuclear technology.

Reagan and Haig should re-evaluate their actions in terms of the future, not in terms of world power.

been granted rights to improve African ports.

The most controversial move is the support of El Salvador. Reagan has increased the amount of arms support from \$5 million to 30 million. And the number of U.S. military advisers in El Salvador has doubled to 54.

El Salvador could very well escalate to another Vietnam. Reagan answers the Vietnam idea by saying that he's only carrying out the promise of a previous administration. But that excuse didn't work for Lyndon Johnson and it's not going to work today.

Reagan and Haig claim they are fighting the spread of Soviet Communism by helping the El Salvador government. Making communism the ultimate bad word, the administration has decided to support the good guys. Incidentally, the Shah used to be one of the good guys.

The administration must give a better justification for intervening in El Salvador. It's not enough to say without concrete proof that the U.S. is fighting Soviet domination. World domination by the Soviets was used as a reason for Vietnam. And there is no reason to believe that El Salvador will not turn into another Vietnam.

Groups across the nation, Mexico and Canada are warning the administration against getting involved in El Salvador. Indeed, a civil war, similar to that in Vietnam, may be the root of El Salvador's problems. In that case, the United States

nebraskan

UPSP 144-080

Editor: Kathy Chenault, Managing Editor: Tom McNeil, News editor: Val Swinton, Associate news editors: Diane Andersen, Steve Miller, Assistant news editor: Bob Lannin, Night news editor: Kathy Stokebrand, Magazine editor: Mary Kempkes, Entertainment editor: Casey McCabe, Sports editor: Larry Sparks, Art director: Dave Luebke, Photography chief: Mark Billingsley, Assistant photography chief: Mitch Hrdlicka, Editorial page assistant: Tom Prentiss.

Copy editors: Mike Bartels, Sue Brown, Pat Clark, Nancy Ellis, Dan Epp, Beth Headrick, Maureen Huffless, Alice Hrnicek, Jeanne Mohatt, Janice Pigaga, Tricia Waters.

Business manager: Anne Shank, Production manager: Kitty Policky, Advertising manager: Art K. Small, Assistant advertising manager: Jeff Pike.

Publications Board chairman: Mark Bowen, 473-0212, Professional adviser: Don Walton, 473-7301.

The Daily Nebraskan is published by the UNL Publications Board Monday through Friday during the fall and spring semesters, except during vacations.

Address: Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 14th and R streets, Lincoln, Neb., 68588. Telephone 472-2588.

Material may be reprinted without permission if attributed to the Daily Nebraskan, except material covered by a copyright.

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb., 68510.