

Editorial

Daily Nebraskan
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Vicki Rugh, *Editor*, 472-1766
Thom Gabrukiewicz, *Managing Editor*
Ad Hudler, *Editorial Page Editor*
James Rogers, *Editorial Page Editor*
Chris Welsch, *Copy Desk Chief*

Dear Bob: Vetoes will cripple state

An open letter to Gov. Bob Kerrey:
Once again you claim senators have not cut enough from the 1986-87 budget.

If you proceed with plans to veto up to \$46 million from the Legislature's proposals, you will do irreparable damage to the state. What will go next — \$1.3 million in mental-retardation services, \$800,000 for an Omaha Metro Area Transit system or \$11 million for an increase in state employees' salaries?

For the last four years, you have demanded cut after cut and vehemently opposed tax increases.

No one likes to pay higher taxes, but you continually ignore that state revenues have dropped because our system is based on the declining federal tax system. Nebraskans actually are paying less taxes than in the early '80s.

Supposedly the decline in federal taxes shifted responsibility for programs back to the

states. It seems you are unwilling to let Nebraska pick up the slack. While other states make provisions to provide lost federal services, Nebraskans will do without.

Compare Nebraska's plight with that of a restaurant owner. If income was dwindling, could the business owner save money by hiring fewer waitresses, buying lower-quality food and reducing the number of entrees offered?

In the short-term, such actions might save money. But soon angry customers would leave because of poor service, unappetizing food and inadequate choices.

Gov. Kerrey, your short-sighted budget cuts already have damaged the state and the university.

Since you choose not to run again, please let the Legislature and Nebraskans do what is best for the state.

Forget the line-item vetoes. Let us start rebuilding the programs you seem intent on destroying.

U.S. terrorism

No short-term solution to problem

Terrorism, the personification of the grim reaper, soon could reap its gruesome harvest in the United States, experts say.

Terrorism is considered a form of low-level warfare, except for the indiscriminate nature of its attacks.

Following the Gulf of Sidra attacks, Libyan radio reported: "Everything American, be it an interest, goods, a ship, a plane or a person, is a military target . . . As America permits itself to strike against the Arabs, it is the right, indeed the duty of the Arabs to strike at America."

Open societies are particularly inept at fighting these "cowards," who kill the weak and innocent. Terrorist bands are small and secretive. U.S. borders are relatively open and movement within the country is free.

The insidiousness of terrorism foists a dilemma on democratic countries: sacrificing openness for protection, or preserving openness only at the cost of sacrificing lives.

What can the United States do? Passive defensive measures, such as better security at airports, are of limited effective-

ness. But some protection is better than none. Active "counterterrorist" defense measures involve forces trained to react to terrorist incidents.

This alternative requires better cooperation between U.S. law enforcement agencies and local police departments.

Measures beyond these are surrounded with controversy. Dr. Robert H. Kupperman of Georgetown's Center for Strategic and International Studies argues for the selective assassination of "key figures" in the "operational aspects of terrorism." The option is frightening — and one currently prohibited by presidential order.

Proposals to strike against terrorist camps similarly are replete with uncertainty. U.S. forces would engage in the same violence we condemn.

International sanctions should be taken against states that continue to aid or harbor terrorists.

Additionally, strong support for democratic-centrist movements, as in the Philippines and South Korea, can prevent extension of terrorist groups. The solutions are long-term, but right now they are the only alternative.

Terrorism not funny Chi Omega party in bad taste

Any excuse for a party . . . The Chi Omega Sorority has announced plans for a "Terrorist Party" on Friday.

Party goers are asked to dress as terrorists, in accordance with the party's theme.

Terrorism is a new theme for a Greek party. But in view of recent terrorist attacks on innocent civilians, such a party would be in poor taste.

In 1985, at least 926 people

were killed in terrorist attacks. This year, more than 40 have died, including five U.S. civilians killed in recent bombings of a TWA jetliner and a West Berlin nightclub.

Terrorism is a serious global problem, claiming hundreds of innocent lives. It hardly seems appropriate for a party.

College student always will have parties, but they should not mock such a serious problem.

WHEN THERE IS TOO MUCH PETROLEUM AROUND WE SAY



OIL GLUT

WHEN OIL PRICES DROP DUE TO A GLUT THE TERM IS



FREE MARKET

WHEN PUMP PRICES FALL CUSTOMERS REFER TO IT AS



CHEAP GAS

WHEN THE VICE PRESIDENT FLIES TO THE MIDEAST TO PUT A STOP TO ALL THIS IT'S KNOWN AS



BUSHWHACKING

Liberals abandoned altruism

Cause and leaders lost to quest for individual gains

Ladies and gentlemen, you see before you a most pathetic man. Worse than the man without a country, I am a man without an ideal. At least, I am a man who feels robbed of his ideal and betrayed by those who fostered his belief in that ideal. You see before you the empty shell of a disillusioned liberal.

There was a time when I believed. My first political hero was Bobby Kennedy. The anti-war movement made sense to me. I even angered many of my friends and relatives by taking a stand against prayer in public schools, because I saw the tremendous danger of admitting the practices of one religion to the exclusion of others in a pluralistic society. But besides these specific ideas, there was an attractiveness about the whole mentality that just seemed right to me.

At the heart of liberal dogma was the centrality of human rights. Liberals consistently fought for those who could not fight for themselves. Oppression of human beings was to be opposed, no matter where it was found and no matter what purpose it served. The purpose of a just state was to insure that everyone would be granted equal opportunity to share in what political theorist John Rawls calls "the primary goods" — "liberty and opportunity, income and wealth and the bases of self-respect." The liberal was concerned with, in a word, fairness.

To this end, then, liberal dogmas encouraged people to selflessness and altruism. The important thing was that everyone be granted equal opportunity under the law. So Northern whites marched for Southern blacks, rich white Anglo-Saxon actors pleaded the cause of poor, unemployed Native Americans, men spoke out on women's rights and college professors protested the use of

young men to fight an unjust war. The movement stirred in us that intuition that most closely approximates true humanity — the willingness and eagerness to lose ourselves in pursuit of the well-being of others.

Liberalism was not concerned with matters of fiscal or economic impact. There was no good reason for failing to meet the needs of others. If liberalism was found to be impractical, then so much the worse for practicality. If we had built a world for ourselves that made it economically necessary or even feasible to oppress large numbers of people, then that world must be drastically and painfully altered.



James Sennett

But liberalism has come of age. And like the 1960s hippie who grew into the 1980s yuppie, the formalization of ideas has led to the surrender of integrity. Liberal thinking has deteriorated into special-interest concerns that have lost any sight of the big picture — once its sole motivating force. Concern for human rights has become concern for "my rights." We no longer see people marching and protesting for the causes and rights of others. Liberal dogma now encourages each person to get his (or hers), rather than seeing that others are able to get theirs.

So gays march for gays, women speak out for women, teachers strike for teachers, farmers worry about farmers and no one is standing up for the children, who cannot, alas, stand up for

themselves.

What is really sad about their deterioration is that liberalism is now indistinguishable from the conservatism so greatly despises. At least it is indistinguishable where it counts the most — in motivation for action. The caricatured conservative is driven by profit motive and the great American dream. He wants to get his, and doesn't particularly care what it might cost others in the process. The come-of-age liberal is driven by a paranoid obsession with the idea that someone is going to try to deprive him. He takes whatever measures needed to ensure that he gets his, and he doesn't particularly care what it might cost others in the process.

So you can understand my disillusion. I bought into the liberal ideal, and now the liberals have abandoned it. The problem is, I still believe in the ideal, but I am finding it harder and harder to link up with political leaders who share that ideal. Concern for the liberty of all does not reduce to special interest politics. Promotion of the general welfare cannot be interpreted myopically without total distortion. Once concern for others becomes encouragement of others to be exclusively concerned for themselves, the difference in ideal has eroded.

To resurrect the liberal ideal, we must rekindle our own concern for others — regardless of our own current situation. And in our action on behalf of others, we must preach "Go, thou, and do likewise." A nation in which everyone is equally fighting to get his own way presents no viable alternative to a nation in which only one class is permitted to so fight.

Sennett is a graduate student in philosophy and campus minister with College-Career Christian Fellowship.

Golfer may still have Hogan's swing, but unusual pro makes him lose grip

Because it was a sunny spring afternoon, I was amazed to see this friend sitting in the gloom of the barroom.

So I took the next stool and asked him why he was there.

"Why shouldn't I be here?" he answered in a listless voice.

You know why.

The truth is, he has always been a man obsessed. For most of his adult life, he has sought the perfect golf swing. He has read every golf book and magazine, gone to golf clinics, spent a fortune on private lessons and tried every miraculous putter, amazing driver and incredible ball as soon as they reached the market.

In the winter, he spends hours in his

living room, swinging a weighted club to strengthen his golf muscles. He once accidentally struck his wife in the brow with his follow-through. When she regained consciousness, he was studying the lump on her head for clues as to whether he had hooked or sliced.



Mike Royko

When the snow melts, he abandons the golf course or practice range only for his job or to sleep. While sleeping,

he wears earphones that play a hypnotic recorded message: "Left arm straight, head still, shoulder turn, weight shift. . ."

He once joined a midnight religious cult, hoping to cut a deal with the devil: his soul for one season as Jack Nicklaus.

So I repeated my question: Why was he there?

His voice shaking, he said: "Because it is all a lie."

What is a lie? He brought his hands together and said: "What is this?"

That is your perfect Vardon overlapping golf grip. Anybody can see that.

See ROYKO on 5