

Editorial

Council should back resolution

The Lincoln City Council tonight will consider a resolution calling for "a mutual and verifiable cessation in development, production and deployment of nuclear weapons."

Beginning at 6:30 p.m., the council will open the doors of its chamber in the County-City Building and begin a public hearing on the resolution. The council will then either pass or reject the measure.

It most likely will and most definitely should pass it.

Lincoln citizens, in about the past year, have shown their grave concern about the nuclear arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. They have been vocal and active in protesting the buildup. Most recently, 8,000 Lincolniters have shown concern by signing a petition for a nuclear freeze.

The resolution before the council doesn't, however, include the word freeze. According to council member Margrethe Ahlschwede, introducer of the resolution, the word was omitted intentionally. "Freeze" usually is believed to mean either unilateral disarmament (where this country stops building and deploying nuclear arms whether other countries do or not) or a bilateral freeze (where all nuclear arms producers cease building and deploying such weapons).

A freeze is frightening to very many people. It is

obvious that this country could become very vulnerable to attack if it were without nuclear power.

Thus, Ahlschwede played her cards right. Quoted in the Lincoln Journal, she said she wanted the resolution worded to express sentiment against nuclear weapons and to avoid controversy. It appears she achieved both goals.

The resolution urges President Reagan and Congress to "take such steps as may be necessary to join with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other nations possessing nuclear military capabilities in a mutual and verifiable cessation in the development of nuclear weapons and of missiles and aircraft designed primarily to deliver such nuclear weapons."

If the resolution is passed, Lincoln will be among about 200 other cities formally protesting nuclear arms buildup. Being on record as a buildup opponent would be a fine addition to the city's list of laurels.

UNL students, employees, faculty members and administrators can play a part in getting the resolution passed. They can attend tonight's council meeting, and testify against the arms race.

As leaders of Lincoln's intellectual community, a strong showing from UNL may carry weight with council members and ultimately with boys in Washington — the ones who control this country's nuclear weapons.



Letters policy

The Daily Nebraskan has been flooded with letters to the editor. Although we welcome the views of all readers, we remind letter writers that brevity is a virtue.

Please attempt to make your point concisely. Letters that are three and four pages long must be reduced substantially and your point may be lost somewhere in the reduction.

If you have submitted a letter that has not been printed, it may be because it is not clear, timely or is too long. If your letter has not appeared within one week after you submitted it, you may call the editor.

All letters from students should include the author's name, year in school and major. Letters from other readers should include the author's title.

For many, budget cuts mean poverty

For many American women, poverty is a way of life. According to the 12th annual report of the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity, "All other things being equal, if the proportion of the poor who are in female-headed families were to increase at the same rate as it did from 1967 to 1977, they would comprise 100 percent of the poverty population by about the year 2000."

With a little help from the Reagan administration, we might reach that point a lot sooner.

Although the motive behind the 1983 budget plan is to cut waste and return to the states some semblance of



Julia O'Gara

fiscal control, the method — massively reducing the budgets of human services programs — is highly questionable.

Granted, the costs of nearly all federal aid programs have skyrocketed over the past decade; but with spiraling inflation pushing the cost of living to unprecedented highs, now is hardly the time to pull the safety net out from under the most vulnerable sectors of our population.

Consider the programs, those that benefit women, children and the elderly most, that will be cuts in the proposed 1983 budget:

— Women, Infants and Children Food Programs. Two million women and children receive financial assistance from this program to buy food supplements such as milk and cheese. Reagan's proposal: cut \$300 million from the program, thus ending assistance to 700,000 individuals. Another alternative would be eliminating WIC altogether and including it in "block grants" to the states where it would have to compete for funds with other state programs.

— Food Stamps. This is Reagan's favorite welfare target, supposedly riddled with frauds and cheats; 85 percent of these 22 million "frauds" and "cheats" are women and children. Reagan's proposal: cut \$2.3 billion from the program. With this cut, some 70 percent will receive only partial benefits, while an additional 16 percent will get nothing at all.

— Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Of the 4 million participants in this program, 93 percent are women and children. Reagan's proposal: cut \$2 billion, apply restrictive eligibility standards and require applicants to participate in "workfare" programs. Up to 600,000 families will lose all or part of their AFDC benefits.

— Low Income Energy Assistance. The elderly and low income women who are heads of households make up 83 percent of those who receive energy assistance funds. Reagan's proposal: cut the budget by 31 percent, resulting in 2.3 million households losing financial aid to help pay for heat and energy-saving home improvements.

Other disturbing consequences could result from these particular budget cuts. Pregnant women would be especially hurt by having their food stamps and WIC assistance discontinued (just look up the latest findings on the occurrence of mental retardation and learning disabilities in children who were undernourished while in utero).

And how are "workfare" participants with small children going to work their way out of poverty when, because of AFDC cuts, many will become ineligible for federally assisted child care?

President Reagan has denied the accusation that he rode into the White House on the backs of the poor. But in light of these budget proposals, his message is clear: When it comes to throwing excess baggage overboard, it's going to be "women and children first!"



Letters

'Cram, punt,' don't cheat

Bob Glissmann, in his Sept. 22 column mentioned three options ("cram, cheat or punt") for taking a test. While these are certainly not all of the available options, I feel the "cheating" option is particularly unacceptable.

Cheating is an inappropriate classroom behavior. It erodes the academic integrity of every institution of higher education. Cheating also penalizes those students who are trying to obtain an honest and legitimate education and who may receive a B on an exam as opposed to one who cheats and receives an A, but has not learned the subject material.

Cheating is unethical and has a negative impact on our community and society as a whole. Abscam and Watergate are but two examples of dishonesty breeds dishonor. We do not need to condone such misbehavior.

Studying is the best option for succeeding on the first test and all tests. The benefit is an education, not just a grade.

Dolores Simpson-Kirkland
assistant to the dean of students

Springsteen fans loyal

In his review of Bruce Springsteen's new album, "Nebraska," (Daily Nebraskan, Sept. 23), Pat Higgins complains that the album is a diversion from Bruce's other hugely successful albums, but overlooks the fact that any true innovation must be divergent. To lead, you must break new ground, and to break new ground, you must definitely divert.

Higgins feels that "louder and faster is better," and that Springsteen fans may be disappointed by "Nebraska." What Higgins does not take into account is that Springsteen fans are not easily swayed and that mainstream rock is not their musical ideal.

The true Springsteen fan is not the one who simply jumps onto the dance floor to such cooks as "Cadillac Ranch" and "Ramrod", but rather, one who has been touched, inspired and driven by Bruce's phenomenal lyrics.

Granted, Springsteen's lyrics concern the "typical people," but it is those typical people who comprise his devoted following, one that is unmatched in loyalty.

Kif Ward
junior, psychology
Matt Edwards
sophomore, English

Review music, not artist

About Pat Higgins' review of Bruce Springsteen's "Nebraska" album (Daily Nebraskan, September 23): next time try reviewing the music on the album, not what you think of the man.

Lori Moran
sophomore, commercial art

Israelis couldn't lose

I can just see the glitter in Prime Minister Menachem Begin's eyes. The Israelis have done what they planned to do.

By making a very radical Phalangist leader, Bashir Gemayel, president, the Israelis either committed a huge blunder or played it extremely cleverly. I personally go with the latter explanation because I don't think Israelis are that dumb.

After taking care of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Syrians with the help of extremely sophisticated American-supplied killing machines, the Israelis concentrated on the large number of Anti-Israeli Lebanese (Lebanese National Movement).

Unable to do anything about them themselves, they sowed the seed of conflict and made the leader of a small Phalangist party president of Lebanon, knowing that in Lebanon elections must truly represent all religious and political factions.

But the daring Israelis had nothing to lose. If they would have succeeded in establishing Gemayel's government and wiping out the Lebanese National Movement, the Israelis would have found a permanent home in Lebanon.

On the other hands, now that Gemayel is dead, the Israelis can claim that a Lebanon without a president poses a threat to their security and thus claim that the Israeli presence in Lebanon is necessary.

The recent massacre of Palestinians by the Phalangists, right under the nose of the Israeli army, proves that the Israelis intend to propagate violence in Lebanon, so they can stay there indefinitely.

Ali Quraishi
junior, computer science
Letters continued on Page 5