

Editorial

Daily
Nebraskan

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeff Korbelik, Editor, 472-1766
James Rogers, Editorial Page Editor
Lise Olsen, Associate News Editor
Mike Reilly, Night News Editor
Joan Rezac, Copy Desk Chief

Moving closer Cigarette tax will help museum

Morrill Hall renovation made it out of Legislative committee and Hugh Genoways, museum director, moved another step closer to a goal he has wanted to accomplish since he became director last summer. Finally Morrill Hall is getting the attention it deserves.

The Legislature's Appropriations Committee approved a plan introduced by Sen. Jerome Warner of Waverly, that would earmark one-half cent of a state cigarette tax for a decade to pay for the renovation project. The tax would raise \$3.9 million.

In January, Genoways told the DN that the money would be used for a revitalization of its permanent displays and for a new air-conditioning system. Genoways said the museum needs air conditioning because excessive heat makes the fossil ex-

hibits expand and contract at such a rate that they slump.

In light of the 1987 senior gift to the museum, the renovation becomes increasingly more important. As of April 10, the Daily Nebraskan reported that seniors pledged more than \$51,000 for an exhibit in the new North American Indian Gallery. The gallery will include exhibits representing tribes from the Northwest, the Southwest and the Lakes region as well as the Eskimo people.

Under Warner's plan, bonds would be marketed and work on the project could begin as early as next fiscal year. The bonds would be repaid from the cigarette tax.

Until then, Morrill Hall rests on the shoulders of the Legislature. Surely the Legislature will deem Morrill Hall, a state museum, important enough.



Democrats go debt route Liberals have converted welfare programs into 'entitlements'

I have just been reading a frightened review of a gloomy new book about the economy. The book's author apparently warns that the United States has long been living beyond its means; that this has been possible only because the economy's expansion encouraged huge domestic and foreign loans; and that doomsday will arrive when the slowing economy can no longer service its debts and our creditors decide to close the bar.

At that point (the author contends) we will adopt, willy-nilly, one of three courses, all extremely painful; either a savage inflation (which would enable debtors to pay off their debts in worthless currency) or an equally savage deflation (which would have the same effect by driving many of them into bankruptcy) or a near-total nationalization of the economy, under cover of which the government would default on its own bonds.

Is there any truth to this grim prognosis? I am afraid there is. The actual scenario probably will be less drastic than any of those above; but I just don't believe that the basic laws of arithmetic have been repealed for our sake.

How did we get into this mess? Not having read the book, I am not sure just how squarely the author points the finger, but there is no serious doubt about the answer. Democracies traditionally have trouble resisting the temptation to vote themselves more

"benefits" than they are willing or able to pay for. Left-liberal politicians are always egging the voters on to greater and greater profligacies, on the theory that the necessary money is out there somewhere — most probably in the hands of "the rich." But of course in fact there is no such convenient pile of loot (at least, of any significant size), so the politicians go the debt route — with the long-range consequences described above.

William A. Rusher



If you think I am pointing the finger at the liberal Democrats, go to the head of the class. They would dearly love to blame the consequences of their demagoguery on Ronald Reagan, and have laid a considerable foundation for doing just that by weeping crocodile tears over the federal deficit in recent years. But poll after poll shows that, more than six years into the Reagan administration, the American people still regard the Republican Party as far abler than the Democrats to cope with the deficit.

And it's not hard to see why. The two biggest expenditures of the federal government are for social welfare and

defense, in that order. Cutting defense is a fool's game. That leaves welfare; but the Democrats decades ago craftily converted the major social welfare programs into "entitlements" — commitments that don't even require annual re-passage by Congress, and which are indexed to the inflation rate. So any president would have found himself strapped to a rocket pre-set to take off for the stratosphere under the economic and demographic pressures of the early 1980s.

To his credit, President Reagan has battled stoutly for major reductions in the domestic budget, even offering to take the heat all by himself if Congress would just give him the necessary line-item veto. But the response of the Democrats was only a dry chuckle. There will be no meaningful cuts in the domestic budget while they control Congress, and if that pushes the nation ever nearer to the economic brink — well, with luck Reagan may still be around to take the blame when it goes over the edge.

Is there any way disaster can be avoided? In the long run, probably not. Not even Ronald Reagan can persuade the American people to take the budget-slashing steps that would be necessary to put our fiscal house in order. So fasten your seat belt, and observe the "No Smoking" sign when it appears.

© 1987 Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
Rusher is the publisher of the National Review.

Letters

Reader clarifies; women denied tenure

In reply to Frederick M. Link's letter, "Doctorate not grounds for promotion," (Daily Nebraskan, April 21), I will clarify my statements made in "Men still dominate university positions" (DN, April 15). In that article, an unfortunate misquotation appeared. My statement should have read that "another possibly discriminatory case was against a woman in the English department who was denied a tenure-track position even though she held a doctorate." This situation may be evident in many other departments and is not particular to a specific discipline.

In reference to departmental hiring procedures, Link states, "We don't hire anyone at the beginning level without the Ph.D. or equivalent." However, I know of many instructors throughout the university who hold only the master's degree. This includes the English department.

Finally, it should be noted that, while "the permanent staff in English includes 11 women," Link failed to mention the total number of men in the department. According to the 1986-1988 *Graduate Studies Bulletin*, the ratio of male faculty to female faculty in the English department is nearly 4-to-1.

In essence, then, the situation mirrors that of the whole university, as well as that of other universities throughout the country. While there may be several different reasons or causes, the underlying fact is that "men still dominate university positions," and by quite a large margin, at that.

Connie Neal
graduate student
Women's Resource Center staff
volunteer

Reverse discrimination can't be ignored

A letter war in the Daily Nebraskan is not the best facilitator of good communication. However, I cannot let Jayne Stratton's (DN, April 22) blatant display of reverse discrimination (sexism) go without a short comment.

Stratton suggests that the fraternity that sponsors the escort service to "protect" the otherwise helpless women on campus perpetuates male domination. That is false. The service was set up solely to help eliminate sexual assaults on campus.

It is unfortunate that a sincere effort

to reduce tragic events (e.g. rape) has been marred by a sexist label. It is also unfortunate that a person like Stratton who feels discriminated against would blame all males for sexism which does plague our society. There are many men as well as women, regardless of race, who want equality for all people. The problem is that they (we) are often "shut out" because of prejudice and stereotypes.

John Ward
senior
engineering



Rivera's heart bleeds for homeless as roving reporter scans streets

There are journalists and there are celebrity journalists. The difference? Journalists are hard-core newsmen, devoted to finding out the facts and presenting them objectively. Celebrity journalists, however, earn enough fame and status to deviate from the norms of journalism and eventually get to say whatever they want. Linda Ellerbee, Barbara Walters and their kind have become household names, as famous as film and music stars.

And then there's Geraldo Rivera, the latest addition to the Andy Warhol School of Journalistic Fame.

Rivera is perhaps best known for his position on ABC's "20/20," which he quit to pursue his now infamous, ridiculously self-indulgent series of syndicated "Geraldo Rivera Specials."

Rivera, with his bleeding heart and perfectly styled hair and moustache, has injected a litany of unintentional humor into the vein of "investigative journalism" he practices on his shows. First there was last year's ballyhooed hypefest about the opening of Al Capone's secret vault on live, national television. Rivera promised viewers that

they would see "the remnants of a legendary gangster." When the vaults were opened, Rivera discovered that absolutely nothing was in them.

Next came his special about the problem of drug dealing and drug abuse in America. Rivera preached and lashed out vitriol as he showed police arresting alleged dope dealers in a suburban home — on live national television once again.



Scott Harrah

Later it was revealed that the supposed drug kingpins were actually innocent. But good old Geraldo Rivera, in his never-ending quest to expose corruption to the tube, decided to move on to another project.

On Monday night, Rivera's third special, "Innocence Lost," was aired

live from California's runaway-and-teenage-hooker-infested Hollywood Boulevard. The focus of the show was to expose the problems of runaways, who Rivera said are all part of a "new epidemic." The show was supposed to be an eye-opening documentary, but Rivera's melodramatic tongue and his sensational tactics made it come off like a bad soap opera.

In the beginning of "Innocence Lost," Rivera interviewed a 12-year-old black girl in a New York bus station.

"I ran away when I was 10 and had a baby when I was 11," the doe-eyed girl tearfully told Rivera. "I live here in the bus station."

And where do you sleep? benevolent, caring Rivera asked.

"In the stalls of the ladies' room," the girl said solemnly.

Rivera started to ramble on about "this pathetic little girl, a baby who had a baby — forced to sleep in the ladies' restroom."

Clink . . . the camera switched to Hollywood, where a group of runaways

See HARRAH on 5