

# Editorial

## No political platitudes will eliminate deficit

An anonymous reader of Daily Nebraskan editorials noted, in a letter to the editorial writer, that "politics aren't logical."

Right now two political issues exemplify of that platitude are defense spending, and the federal deficit.

The two are related — increasing defense spending creates a money vacuum, sucking away any possibility of a surplus of funds to ease the deficit. Both of these political animals are growing by leaps and bounds. However, the Reagan administration dotes on defense and chooses to leave the deficit problem to Congress.

A copyrighted *New York Times* article Sunday said the increase in interest payments on the federal debt exceeds all the savings achieved by cutting funds from health, education, welfare and social services.

Federal officials said the increase in interest payments was because of the growth of the budget deficit, the article stated. If federal revenue is less than federal spending in a year, it creates a budget deficit. The federal government then must borrow from the public. The total amount borrowed is the federal debt.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated the total of all savings in social welfare programs at \$110 billion from 1982 through 1985. That is \$14 billion less than the estimated \$125 billion increase in spending on interest payments required during the same four-year period, the article said.

The social welfare cuts — so sacred to Reagan's economic recovery plan — have been swallowed by the increase in interest payments.

The growth of interest payments has even eclipsed the rate of growth of Reagan's other sacred cow — defense.

From 1981 to 1984 defense costs increased 49 percent, to \$237.5 billion, while interest payments increased 57 percent, to \$108 billion, the article stated.

Reagan's new budget plan would increase defense spending for fiscal 1985 by 9.8 percent, bringing it to

\$264.4 billion, according to *The Reuter News Report*. The deficit is projected, in the budget, to be \$180.4 billion.

The record deficit will increase the amount of interest the federal government is paying to the public. The record defense outlay will prevent any reduction in the deficit, and, as is par for the course, social welfare programs take it

in the shorts.

It's a vicious cycle. Government spends more in case we need to blow up the world, lets the deficit grow because it is the easiest thing to ignore, and lets the poor starve because there is no hunger, that the administration can see, anyway.

All is not lost, however. I have a plan.

It has become an accepted fact that by blowing up a limited amount of our nuclear arsenal, say 10 percent, we would create a nuclear winter that would probably kill everything but cockroaches on the face of the earth. If anything besides cockroaches did survive, the absence of an ozone layer would leave them exposed to unfiltered solar rays, a nasty prospect for any mammal, or marsupial, for that matter.

If we just set aside 10 percent of our nuclear bombs in a remote area of Alaska, we need never fear the Russians, because we would have enough power to destroy the whole world. Heck, let's keep the other bombs, too, just in case.

The Russians know about this nuclear winter business, too. We really don't need any more bombs. Even if the Russians found a way of shooting them down, they still would blow up, having the same icy effect on the atmosphere. They aren't going to attack if we don't make any new bombs this year. Then all the government has to do is cut military aid to oppressive regimes.

By not spending on new weapons, there would be money to pay that nasty deficit that threatens to nuke the economy.

There it is. The plan to save the economy and the world. It's all so simple that it just can't be done.

—Chris Welsch



## Reader urges Krishna to become Christian

In reply to Krishna Madan's column "Humanist Counterattack . . ." (Daily Nebraskan, Feb. 3), there is a need for some clarification dealing with problems in his argument. Let us start with

### Guest Opinion

Cain and Abel whose lives are mentioned in Genesis 4. Abel was killed before any mention of having children and Cain was driven from the land where Eve and Adam lived and then had a child by "his wife" (Gen. 4:17).

Mr. Madan, you said that Noah got "boozed up (and) went into his tent and raped his daughters". Indeed Noah did get drunk sometime after the ark had stopped (Gen. 9:20-23) but it was his sons who found him drunk and they covered up Noah's nakedness (a shameful state in that day) with a "garment" — no mention of Noah's daughters is recorded after the flood.

The Old Testament does have many examples of immoral lives (e.g. Gen. 19:4-13, Gen. 19:30-38, . . .) — murderers, fornicators, adulterers, liars, thieves, blasphemers, sodomites, etc. . . . and all of these problems are still here today (yes, even at UNL) and were also a part of our ancestors' lives. But none of these actions are approved of in the Bible but are intended to show the diminished state of people and how far from God people have run, even in the first generation of mankind.

It was said that Jesus was a "...hippie...bum...pinko-subversive (who went around) talking about peace and justice for the poor." Christ was indeed an outcast—rejected by His own people while He ministered to the needy, healed the sick and dying and told the pseudo-religious leaders to realize their sinful state and turn back to God.

Christ was an example to all people. He "who committed no sin, nor was any deceit found in His mouth, and while being reviled, He did not revile in return; while suffering, He uttered no threats, but kept entrusting Himself to Him (God) Who judges righteously; and He Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you were healed." (1 Peter 2:22-24).

You called God an "adulterous, deflower (er) of helpless virgins." But even Mary didn't understand how she could have a child as a virgin (Luke 1:34-35). God worked a miracle through Mary, he did not sleep with her, and through this miracle He brought into the world His only Son who would be killed by the rest of God's own creation, yet God loved us so much that He was willing to sacrifice His Son before sinful people so that we might have the chance to live with Him forever. (John 3:16)

I'm all for the advancement of the truth in an unbiased manner. Darwin was a historical figure of great importance and he had a theory. But the evidence supporting his theory and the evidence against his theory must be presented equally and so must the evidence for and against creationism. You can't deny the truth. Present all the information and their basis in fact (ugly or pleasant as it may be) and allow our children to know the whole truth, not just the pro-Darwinian case.

Whether I am hurt or bitter or immoral, I know that God's love is unchanging and his heart longs for me to return to Him. Christ has healed me spiritually, I have repented and have turned to God. It's a wonderful life and I hope, Mr. Madan, that you will join me. (Matt. 4:17, 1 John 5:11-12)

Robert Jay Bass  
senior  
physics



## Letters

### Article inequitable

I was surprised at the incongruity of the Jan. 31 issue of the Daily Nebraskan. On the front page, an article appeared about Elizabeth Koontz, Chairwoman of the National Commission of Working Women. In that article the writer discusses the inequities of pay between men and women. The impression that one is left with is that women are treated differently simply because they are women and that perhaps this is unfair.

On page three, the lead article begins "The petite, curly-haired blonde's eyes grow wider as she talks about UNL freshmen . . ." This article introduces the reader to a new university employee and her responsibilities in a newly-created position. My question is: would you have started the article with "The petite, curly-haired blonde's eyes grow wider . . ." if the blonde was a male?

The subtle, inequitable language used in the beginning of the article was read by many readers. This unconscious and probably well-meaning error nevertheless adds to the problem.

Julie Johnson  
instructor

education and family resources

### Instructors insulted

We are writing this letter in response to a statement made by Dr. Ralph Ewert which appeared in a story entitled "Student ailments can be relieved," (Daily Nebraskan, Feb. 1).

The statement that we are referring to quoted Dr. Ewert as saying "Most muscle pain complaints result from students in P.E. classes who are required to do extensive exercises in a short time. Many students want to run two miles in two weeks with no previous conditioning." As instructors in the physical education department we

are insulted by this statement. Dr. Ewert must think that we are trying to push our students beyond what they are physically capable of doing. This is not true. Dr. Ewert must surely know, you must overload the muscle beyond its normal capacity to get any degree of benefit and this may be at a low intensity for an individual who has led a sedentary lifestyle for a period of time. No matter what the intensity, initial muscular soreness is virtually unavoidable.

Dr. Ewert should evaluate the courses offered in the physical education department before making general statements which undermine the knowledge and responsibilities of the instructors in that department.

Alex Antoniou  
Graduate Student  
William Oliver  
Graduate Assistant  
Health, Physical Education  
and Recreation

### Madan called 'fool'

As I read Krishna Madan's column "Humanist counterattack begins with Bible" (Daily Nebraskan, Feb. 3), I became increasingly agitated, angry and, finally, disgusted. But to quote Proverbs, the famous book of wisdom, I decided to "answer not a fool according to his folly lest you be like him."

To dignify Madan's writing with an in-depth rebuttal would only lower me to his level—that of a fool.

I think Madan has perhaps overstepped the boundaries of journalistic license and is now "stepping where even angels fear to tread."

I find it very tragic that Madan, a professed secular humanist, does not accord Jesus Christ and God the same dignity he would a fellow human being.

Ellen Stackable  
senior  
Teachers College