

Editorial

Contraceptive squeal rule ineffective policy, bad law

The "squeal rule" has been temporarily squashed.

The rule, nicknamed by its opponents, would have tattled on teens who seek contraceptives from federally funded health clinics. Parents of girls 17 and under would have been notified by the clinics within 10 days after their daughter received a prescription for birth control pills or other contraceptive devices.

Fortunately, someone with both common sense and authority spoke out against the regulation. This week, U.S. District Court Judge Henry Werker stopped the government from enforcing the rule.

If Werker had not acted, the rule, initiated by the Department of Health and Human Services, would have taken effect Feb. 25. Health and Human Services Secretary Richard Schweiker had promoted the regulation on the grounds that "family participation" in such decisions was advisable.

Schweiker was quoted in Newsweek as saying, "The government should not construct a Berlin wall between parents and children."

His replacement, Margaret Heckler, opposed the regulation, or at least said she did before her nomination to the position, as did others in the Congressional Women's Caucus.

If parents and children have not established a strong, trustful means of communication, it is unlikely that the regulation would have encouraged such a relationship to develop. If anything, it would cause more fear, more unwanted pregnancies,

more abortions and more resentment. It would only discourage teenagers from using birth control when the figures show that they are sexually active. It would penalize girls who try to seek medical help, while their boyfriends would be free from worry about their parents' reaction.

The regulation could still go into effect. The final decision will not be made until a trial is held, and there is always the chance for an appeal.

If it does take effect, about 5,000 family planning clinics would be required to issue information to parents of their clients. More than 400,000 girls are said to be affected.

The American Public Health Association opposed the regulation because of health hazards to both teens and their children. It argues that for those under 15, the maternal death rate is twice that for women 20 to 24, and that using birth control pills is far less risky for teens than pregnancy and childbirth. It also agrees that the rule would lead to increased abortion and infant-mortality rates.

All of these factors should be weighed before the rule comes up for further consideration. The government, if it is really concerned with the welfare of its constituents, should see that the dangers of the "squeal rule" far outweigh the benefits.

As Rep. Henry Waxman, chairman of the subcommittee on family planning programs said, "The proposed rule is bad law and bad policy."



Guest Opinion

Non-whites struggle for rights

What does it mean to be black, brown or yellow in this world? If you live in the Third World, it means to be ruled by a repressive, often genocidal, dictatorship supported by the white countries. It means, sometimes, having to seek refuge in those white countries themselves and then having to listen to the white man proclaim how humane his society is. If you are a Chicano, Afro or Native American, it means being, in a real if not legal sense, a second-class citizen in the country you helped create.

That is the basic reality of what it means to be not white in this world. It wasn't Third World people who created this reality, but the white man who did. It would be foolish and dangerous for us to ignore the existence of this ever-present reality.

The essence, therefore, of being yellow, brown or black is not a celebration of the harmless aspects of one's individual culture, although these are important. The essence of not being white is to stand up for the rights of non-white peoples throughout the world. Unless oppressed people stand together, they will never be

able to shake off oppression.

There are many black, brown and yellow people who cooperate with the white man in oppressing their own people. These Uncle Toms have black skins and white minds. As such, they must be opposed.

Conversely, many white people are also oppressed by the white man's system to the extent that they recognize this and enter into alliances with non-white people, they must be welcomed as friends. Third World people should even take the initiative and independently stand up for the rights of oppressed white people, even if the latter do not reciprocate.

However, the black, brown or yellow person cannot afford to be "nice" or "tolerant" and cannot afford to idly fraternize with those non-white or white people who explicitly or implicitly support continued oppression and refuse to examine their convictions or lack thereof. That's part of the hard reality of struggling for one's rights in the white man's world.

Krishna Madan
graduate student, teachers college

Daily Nebraskan

EDITOR Margie Honz
GENERAL MANAGER Daniel M. Shattil
ADVERTISING MANAGER Jerry Scott
PRODUCTION MANAGER Kitty Policky
MANAGING EDITOR Michela Thuman
NEWS EDITOR Sue Jepsen
ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR Patty Pryor
SPORTS EDITOR Bob Asmussen
ART DIRECTOR David Luebke
PHOTO CHIEF Dave Bentz
ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR Patty Pryor
SPORTS EDITOR Bob Asmussen
ART DIRECTOR David Luebke
PHOTO CHIEF Dave Bentz
GRAPHICS EDITOR John G. Goecke
NIGHT NEWS EDITOR David Wood

THE DAILY NEBRASKAN (USPS 144-080) IS PUBLISHED BY THE UNL PUBLICATIONS BOARD MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY DURING THE FALL AND SPRING SEMESTERS, EXCEPT DURING VACATIONS. POSTMASTER: SEND ADDRESS CHANGES TO THE DAILY NEBRASKAN, RM 34 NEBRASKA UNION, 68588. SUBSCRIPTIONS: \$13/SEMESTER, \$25/YEAR. SECOND CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT LINCOLN, NEBRASKA. ALL MATERIAL COPYRIGHT 1983 DAILY NEBRASKAN

Letter Policy

Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space available in the newspaper.

Letters sent to the newspaper for publication become the property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned.

Anonymous submissions will not be considered for publication, and requests to withhold names will be granted only in exceptional circumstances.

Submit all material to the Daily Nebraskan, Room 34, Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588.

Change in day-care law could spark spanking trend

Column potpourri II. It's February 1983, and today I will look at two issues that are surprising to see, even in the newspapers. They are issues of immediate interest, but somehow they seem out of place.



Brian Stonecipher

The first topic deals with some interesting discussions taking place before our state government. Monday night, child spankers and non-spankers squared off before the state Welfare Department. The public hearing was called to discuss possible changes in the day-care center laws which prohibit spanking (I told you that this issue seemed out of place).

I really hadn't thought much about spanking rules before. Then the future consequences came to me: it could start a new trend — spanking everyone for disciplinary reasons. I mean, why stop at day-care centers? Why not permit spanking through high school and even colleges?

There's nothing like a good child spanking to get the point across. I can see it now — when the six-week progress reports come out, there is a small note on the side: "Your progress is less than satisfactory — please report to the Administration Building tomorrow morning for your spanking." That would certainly give a new meaning to the phrase "Go Big Red."

One important campus issue right now is move of the Culture Center. Much has already been said for and against the move, so I'll try not to be redundant.

The Culture Center currently is housed in a terrible facility away from the heart of campus, and an alternate (Terrace Hall) became available. The proposed site does need some work, but generally seems to fit all the requirements of the group wanting to move there. The story should end right here, but it doesn't. Some very irrational and unfair arguments enter in.

Opposition throughout the decision process came from Greek residents living near Terrace Hall and from other students involved in approving the move and the budget. The arguments used are blatantly racist, only with the name-calling left out. (Stereotypes are the basis for argument: increased problems with burglaries, loud music, wild parties, rapes and a need for extra security.

Come on, this is 1983! A society should not have to put up with any group that prejudices on irrelevant heresay. What makes it unfortunate is that this group happens to be Greek and happens to have the political pull and resources to prevent such a move.

I'm hoping that those neighboring residences can come to their senses and put an end to this senseless racism. And I'm hoping that the people who are in charge of the move at this point will discount these biased arguments from their decision. Some specific things to watch for:

1. The proposal is now being considered by Administration. Let's see if Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Richard Armstrong and UNL Chancellor Martin Massengale can hold up under the Greek/alumni pressure.
2. The move is included in CFA's budget. Watch for Massengale to "pull" this single line from the budget to consider it at a later time (like after school is out and all the students are at home). It's happened before with the student president's salary, it could happen again.
3. Watch for comments from NU Board of Regents who have the final say in this matter.