

Editorial

Daily Nebraskan
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeff Korbellek, Editor, 472,1766
James Rogers, Editorial Page Editor
Gene Gentrup, Managing Editor
Tammy Kaup, Associate News Editor
Todd von Kampen, Editorial Page Assistant

Organ transplants More 'gifts of life' needed

News stories, books and TV shows talking about human organ transplants often sum up the experience with phrases like "The Gift of Life" or "A Second Chance at Life." The phrases may be trite by now, but they're still accurate and appropriate. Those receiving new organs quite literally get a new chance at life.

However, it takes two people — a donor as well as a recipient — to make organ transplants possible. And Nebraska, like other parts of the country, doesn't have enough people in the first category. Bob Duckworth, director of organ procurement for the Nebraska Organ Retrieval System, says Lincoln and Omaha surgeons could do many more transplant operations if only enough donor organs were available.

Some who need transplants make it in time, as did a North Dakota woman who received a new heart last weekend after 16-year-old Adrian Jordeth of Nehawka died in a car-pedestrian accident. Many more — 7,000 to 10,000 nationwide, Duckworth says — have no race against time until a suitable donor organ is found. You can help lessen the need to wait by signing an organ-donor card to be used in case you should die suddenly.

For a newly dead person to be a successful organ donor, Duckworth says, the organs to be donated must be undamaged and the person declared "brain-dead." That means the person's

brain functions have ceased irrevocably, although it's still possible to maintain other life functions with drugs and life-support systems. And that's where some people have reservations about organ donation — because some wonder if brain-dead people might somehow be revived.

Persons declared brain-dead can't come back to life even in theory, Duckworth says. Such declarations are made only after electrical activity of the brain has ceased and bodily responses that indicate brain activity aren't possible.

The late Karen Ann Quinlan, the subject of a famous "right-to-die" case whose example is often cited by opponents of organ donation, never woke up but wasn't brain-dead, Duckworth says. She breathed on her own after she was taken off the respirator, which wouldn't be possible if she was brain-dead, he says.

In other words, once they're gone, they're gone. But donors can live on in some sense through the organs they can give. A family's grief of a donor's death will still be there, Duckworth says, but families sometimes can take solace in the gift of life their lived one made possible in death.

Organ donation is a very personal decision, but those who do it can help others live. A signed organ donor card gives your permission to transplant usable organs once you're declared brain-dead. The Daily Nebraskan encourages any who feel so inclined to give this gift of life.

Forget the oranges

Team needs support, not bombardment

The Nebraska and Oklahoma football teams are again vying for a Big Eight Championship and a berth to the Orange Bowl. And every year fans from both schools use the field for target practice with oranges or anything else handy that serves as a projectile.

Not Nebraska fans, you say. Yes, even Nebraska people, the same ones that have been touted by the media as the best fans in the entire world. These same people have caused property damage and personal injury.

Several years ago a man working stadium security was struck by a frozen orange and left seriously injured. In 1982 after Nebraska beat Oklahoma, the fans tore down the goal posts and paraded through the city, making driving and even walking hazardous.

This unacceptable behavior doesn't only happen here. Last week at the Oklahoma-

Colorado football game, Buffalo fans with Orange-Bowl hopes pelted the field with oranges and other debris. A Colorado cheerleader was injured after she was struck by a bottle.

In Manhattan, Kan., National On Campus Reports noted that fans caused \$30,000 in damages to area businesses after Kansas State defeated rival Kansas. About 6,000 fans from both universities swarmed the business district, and threw full bottles and cans of beer through windows and looted stores.

For this Saturday's game, be loud in showing the Huskers your support, but please:

- Leave the oranges at home.
- Leave the alcohol at home.
- Act responsibly.

The actions of a few can really deter what really could be a very exciting game. Let's show a national TV audience as well as ourselves that Nebraska fans are a class act.

Editorial Policy

The Daily Nebraskan's publishers are the regents, who established the UNL Publications Board to supervise the daily production of the paper.

According to policy set by the regents, responsibility for the editorial content of the newspaper lies solely in the hands of its student editors.

State has place in takeovers, intervention into market place

With the apparent hostile takeover attempt of Goodyear, corporate mergers suddenly have become a salient issue in Lincoln. The rhetoric surrounding the event almost immediately entered the realm of blithering condemnation (e.g., portions of a teleconference meeting between mayors with Goodyear plants in their cities at times bordered on emotional and incoherent denunciation. Corporate takeovers have become a rapidly increasing American economic phenomenon, especially since 1980.

The question is what, if anything, government (local or otherwise) should do about the phenomenon. Preceding this question is the issue of whether government can legitimately intervene in the area of economic decision-making. I think that the answer is a fairly clear yes and that such an answer neither entails the demise of American capitalism nor a reduced commitment to non-statist property rights.

The location of units of economic decision-making — in decentralized, "private" decision-makers or government "centralized" decision-makers — has economic and moral (political) aspects.

Most of the best economic evidence points out that conglomerate mergers are unhelpful at best. In a comprehensive literature review in 1977 Maryland University economics professor Dennis Mueller impressively concluded that the empirical literature "draws a surprisingly consistent picture. Whatever the stated or unstated goals of managers are, the mergers they have consummated have on average not generated extra profits for the acquiring firms and have not resulted in increased economic efficiency."

Muller's 1985 update study indicates probable economic losses to merged corporations.

As interesting as the economic data is, the more important question is whether there is a warrant for political "intervention" into the wilds of the marketplace. Drawing carefully on the moral basis for American political and

precisely because it makes no sense to draw the line elsewhere. Similarly, in modern society, I think we can speak of certain property rights as justly arising from certain expectations of a community given the involvement and benefit of an industrial institution in that community.

Writing in the conservative journal "The Public Interest," business professor Peter Druker gives at least an amorphous vent to this idea: The term "free enterprise" was coined 40 or 50 years ago to assert that the shareholder interest, while important, is only one interest and that the enterprise has functions well beyond that of producing returns for the shareholder — functions as an employer, as a citizen of the community, as a customer and as a supplier."

In sum, the modern corporate structure is enmeshed in a whole host of "power" questions that are completely uninvolved in the central-case instance of "free" market activity. And all questions of power are political questions.

The very moral foundation of American political and economic society requires that analysis proceed down this avenue. It is the only avenue that avoids the foolish and injurious consequences of socialism and libertarianism. The Anglo-American property tradition does have the requisite analytical framework with which to grapple with this problem. This tradition is a realistic and fact-based perspective which has too long been ignored by policy makers and public alike.

Rogers is an economics graduate, a law student and Daily Nebraskan editorial page editor.

Jim Rogers



economic constitutions, I think the answer is a fairly compelling yes.

A helpful perspective on the question revolves about how just property claims can arise in a modern economy. This question is not obviously answered by a traditional appeal to laissez-faire economic decision-making. You see, in the central case of the free-market paradigm, there is assumed a large number of buyers and sellers each individually unable to affect market supply and demand. This central-case instance is so palpably different from the case of "modern" monopoly capitalism that additional moral and political questions are raised in the latter case that are not applicable to the former.

In John Locke's "Second Treatise of Civil Government," property rights arise "naturally" out of the necessities of human existence and its organization. For example, the apple becomes a person's property when it is picked off the ground (being previously unowned)

Homosexuals deserve consideration by UPC, says GLSA member

I must take issue with some of the points voiced in Tim Teebken's guest opinion (DN, Nov. 18).

The formation and financing of a Lesbian/Gay Programming Committee within the University Program Counsel is well within the scope and purpose of UPC. UPC describes itself as purposely reflecting the diversity of the student population it serves in its programming. One aspect of the student population at UNL is that 10 percent of its students are gay or lesbian. If the nationwide figures that qualified experts everywhere agree on apply to our university, and there is no reason to believe that they do not.

Is the creation of this committee a political question? In the view of one political science professor at UNL, politics is the art, science and study of who gets what and when. Since the members of the Gay/Lesbian Students Association, on behalf of the gay and lesbian student population at UNL as well as others interested in this type of programming, have asked for both a committee to handle such programming and the money to fund it; in this sense it is indeed a political question. It becomes obvious that the formation of any programming committee is a question of politics, as it involves a given population getting a committee to represent its needs.

Beyond this satisfaction of a cursory definition of political question, I think I understand why Teebken and many others view this as a "political group pushing ideological propaganda." Anything involving gays and lesbians is labeled "political" because it is controversial; because we are living in a world, and enrolled at a university, that is homophobic, discriminates against people based on whom they can fall in love with, and presumes to think that people care whether or not others approve of or "condone" their sexual orientation. I don't think heterosexuals tend to care what others think about the fact that they are attracted to people with genitalia different from

their own; and I also don't think gays and lesbians care much how others feel about them being attracted to people with their own kind of genitalia.

This is an environment in which the ability for two people to walk hand-in-hand in public comfortably is based on the sex of those people. Two men or two women who would attempt such a

Guest Opinion

warm display of affection would be seen by many as "flaunting" their orientation while heterosexual couples walk by unaccused. Verbal abuse, gay bashings and firing from jobs are just a few symptoms of a disease known as prejudice. I'm not surprised; we've seen it before.

Gays and lesbians have no more control over their belonging to a minority group than do Blacks, Hispanics, or physically challenged students (a.k.a. "the handicapped"). To illustrate this, it is patently and manifestly ridiculous to think that a heterosexual can simply, by force of will, stop being attracted to members of the other sex and start being attracted to people of his or her own sex. The converse is equally ludicrous, although Teebken writes of "former gays." Perhaps he knows of previously sexually active gays and lesbians who are now celibate, but nonetheless gay or lesbian. Or perhaps he knows people who thought they were lesbian or gay, but upon introspection realized they were heterosexual. This is a possibility; the opposite has certainly happened.

Nobody knows what causes a person to be homosexual, and nobody knows what causes a person to be heterosexual. Sexual orientation simply exists in each of us. Teebken's statement that homosexuality is a learned behavior should be accompanied with the statement that to the extent with which this is true with regard to homosexual acts, it is also true with heterosexual

acts. Remember the birds-and-the-bees talk, everyone? That's called *learning*. Sexual orientation itself, however, is not learned. We are not taught to be gay or straight; it just happens as a result of who we are, our environment and perhaps genetic predispositions.

By the way, "biblical facts" have no place in UPC's decision, as we do still have a thing called separation between church and state, even in the "semblance of justice and democracy on the campus" as exists.

The bottom line is that gay and lesbian students pay student fees like everyone else and deserve programming that serves their educational and entertainment needs and desires in return. UPC has agreed and approved the funded formation of the Lesbian/Gay Programming Committee and deserves applause and support for their well thought-out, understanding and logical stand. Hopefully the union Board will follow suit, as well as anyone else who needs to approve it. To do otherwise would be a step backwards with regard to treating people as people, with dignity.

Marc D. Seger
coordinator of internal affairs
UNL Gay/Lesbian
Student Association

Letter Policy

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor from all readers and interested others.

Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space available. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit all material submitted.

Letters and guest opinions sent to the newspaper become property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned.

Submit material to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union