

Editorial

Stinky habit has serious drawbacks

It stinks. It makes you stink, it makes your breath stink, it makes your teeth yellow, it clogs your lungs, makes you irritating and you'll probably die prematurely because of it.

If you smoke, you probably know all that by now. If you don't, you probably have at least thought about it. Groups like the American Cancer Society make sure we all know the hazards of inhaling.

Soon, smokers will be bombarded with a stronger reminder of the folly of their ways. Both houses of Congress passed a bill that would replace the current warning on cigarette packages with four more graphic and specific warnings.

The new warnings, which have yet to be approved by President Reagan, are:

- Smoking causes lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema and may complicate pregnancy.
- Quitting smoking now greatly reduces serious risks to your health.
- Smoking by pregnant women may result in fetal injury, premature birth and low birth weight.

• Cigarette smoke contains carbon monoxide.

Those warnings don't leave any doubt about what kind of risks smokers take. There's no need to candy-coat the facts.

The bill was slightly toned down, however. Under one amendment, certain findings of the Surgeon General were omitted, like this gem: "Cigarette smoking is the largest preventable cause of illness in the United States and is associated with the unnecessary deaths of over 300,000 Americans annually."

Smokers face more than just health risks. More and more communities and states are passing laws to protect non-smokers from the noxious fumes of tobacco by segregating smokers in restaurants and other public places.

Smokers face the risk of verbal assaults as well. Non-smokers are becoming increasingly verbal about irritating smoke in buses and planes and just about everywhere.

If you smoke and think it doesn't stink, there'll be no way to avoid knowing that others do.



"I'VE GOT AN OPENING IN THE BUSINESS OFFICE BUT THEY WANT SOMEBODY EXPERIENCED IN NON-SMOKING!"

Statistics show 11 percent receive aid for 'non-needy'

The U.S. Census Bureau recently released the findings of a study showing that nearly one in three Americans (30 percent) received income or other direct aid from the government.



Elizabeth Burden

The results may surprise some Americans. In the wake of social services cuts—with the prospect of future cuts—and increasing complaints from taxpayers about the welfare rolls, it behooves us to look at what these findings might mean.

The survey may surprise some people who have a predetermined image of who

gets government money. Those who think people receiving aid are either poor or minority or both need to take a hard look at the findings. One-third of the country is not below the poverty level, nor is one-third minority.

The survey showed that, while 30 percent of all Americans received aid, 19 percent got benefits for the needy. That is the common definition of welfare and public assistance—financial assistance for hardship and need. However, 11 percent of Americans received assistance for the "non-needy."

This points to a number of interesting possible conclusions:

- (1) If aid recipients are to be seen as shiftless, lazy people who are taking the

government for a ride, then one-third of the country has jumped on the wagon;

(2) Even with the narrow definition of direct aid employed by the Census Bureau—it doesn't include tax loopholes and probably should be fair—the number of people on the public rolls is sizable. There must be some people who scream about taxes, yet have their hands in the coffers;

(3) The common definition of welfare is such that 11 percent of the country's people can receive the money from the government without public criticism for being on welfare;

(4) If most of the people receiving assistance meet the government standards, then many people might be considered welfare recipients who are not now

considered such;

(5) There is little basis for the myths that abound about most people receiving "public assistance."

We need not look farther than Nebraska to see that the statistics hold true, though few people are thought to be the primary recipients. Census figures from 1980 show that almost 26 percent of Nebraska families received direct aid from the government. Only eight percent were below the poverty level.

The point is that quite a few people get "welfare," although it is not publicly defined as such. Before you throw stones at the system and deem it a crutch that undermines the work ethic, look into the mirror, lest you throw stones at yourself.

Daily Nebraskan

EDITOR Chris Welsch, 472-1766
GENERAL MANAGER Daniel Shatili
PRODUCTION MANAGER Kitty Policky
ADVERTISING MANAGER Tom Byrne
ASSISTANT
ADVERTISING MANAGER Kelly Mangan
CIRCULATION MANAGER Steve Meyer
NEWS EDITOR Michela Thuman
ASSOCIATE NEWS EDITORS Kevin Warneke, Kama Soderberg, Stacie Thomas, Vicki Ruhge, Ward W. Triplett III

COPY DESK SUPERVISOR Christopher Burbach
SPORTS EDITOR Lauri Hoppie
ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR Julie Jordan
NIGHT NEWS EDITORS Judi Nygren, Lauri Hoppie, Teri Sperry, Billy Shaffer, Joel Sartore, David Creamer

WIRE EDITORS
ART DIRECTOR Nick Foley, 475-0275
PHOTO CHIEF Angela Niefeld, 475-4981
ASSISTANT PHOTO CHIEF Don Walton, 473-7301
PUBLICATIONS BOARD CHAIRPERSONS

PROFESSIONAL ADVISER
 The Daily Nebraskan (USPS 144-080) is published by the UNL Publications Board Monday through Friday in the fall and spring semesters and Tuesdays and Fridays in the summer sessions, except during vacations.
 Readers are encouraged to submit story ideas and comments to the Daily Nebraskan by phoning 472-2588 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. The public also has access to the Publications Board. For information, call Nick Foley, 476-0275 or Angela Niefeld, 475-4981.
 Postmaster: Send address changes to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.
ALL MATERIAL COPYRIGHT 1984 DAILY NEBRASKAN

USA 20c

Letters

Student questions condemnation of cohabitation

I hope everyone will have ignored the Sept. 24 letter by Nels Forde concerning cohabitation out of marriage. His position is so far away from mainstream Evangelicalism and historical Orthodox Christianity that it belongs with the heretical group of deviations from Scripture that have plagued the Church since its beginnings.

What do I mean? It is his position that Christians lose their eternal lives by sinning in this way. I quote, "It hinders entry into heaven," and "Cohabitation of the sort described by Koppelman is condemnation to hell for Christians." Since Forde attempts to validate his position by using Scripture, I offer these passages as evidence to the error of his thinking.

Rom. 8:30: "... and whom He called, these He also justified, and whom He justified, these He also glorified." Notice that God does not lose anyone between justification and the future state of glorification.

Ephesians 1:13: "In Him, you also, after listening to the message of truth, the gospel of your salvation, having also believed, you were sealed in Him with the Holy Spirit of promise." Is man strong enough to break out of the Holy Spirit's seal?

Colossians 2:13, 14: "And when you were dead in your transgressions, and the uncircumcision of your flesh,

He made you alive together with Him, having forgiven us all our transgressions, having cancelled out the certificate of debt, consisting of decrees against us, which was hostile to us; and He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross." Note that all transgressions are forgiven because they were nailed to the cross. 2nd Corinthians says, "He made Him who knew no sin (Jesus Christ) to be sin on our behalf..."

I Peter 1:23: "For you have been born again not of seed which is perishable but imperishable, through the living and abiding word of God." This is so clear it needs no comment.

John 10:28: (Jesus speaking) "and I give eternal life to them, and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand." Did Jesus forget to mention that you could snatch yourself out of his hand? No.

With a typical 20th century mentality, Forde has equated the kingdom of heaven with eternal life, and added the words "in hell" to the passage which speaks of the unmarried as burning, which in its true context refers to a sexual desire in connection with a lack of self control.

Kurt Sandquist
junior
history