

# Editorial

Daily  
**Nebraskan**

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Mike Reilly, Editor, 472-1766  
Jeanne Bourne, Editorial Page Editor  
Jen Deselms, Managing Editor  
Mike Hooper, Associate News Editor  
Scott Harrah, Night News Editor  
Joan Rezac, Copy Desk Chief  
Linda Hartmann, Wire Editor

## Law holds little water *Liquor law is paradoxical for local bars*

**A** rule in Nebraska's liquor laws provides a loophole that seems to contradict the purpose of the law.

According to the present multiple drink act, a drink means "a container containing no more than 1 1/2 fluid ounces of the same spirits."

It does not regulate containers containing 1 1/2 fluid ounces of several different liquors.

The controversy started last week when Lincoln police ordered Duffy's Tavern to stop serving its fishbowl drinks. The fishbowls contain the equivalent of six regular-sized drinks. The tavern's policy was to serve fishbowls only to groups of two or more.

At a State Liquor Control

Commission meeting Thursday, Reynold McMeen, part-owner and manager of Duffy's Tavern, said the commission should clarify the rule. The rule doesn't make provisions for "group" drinks.

It doesn't make sense to allow large drinks that contain several types of alcohol but not allow those drinks that have only one kind.

The State Liquor Control Commission recommended eliminating the rule that prohibits the sale of large drinks. A final hearing is scheduled for Jan. 13.

Meanwhile, large drinks that contain more than one kind of alcohol are still available — and they're potentially more potent than those now prohibited.

## AMA decision only noble

**T**he American Medical Association released new guidelines Thursday dealing with the treatment of AIDS patients.

The Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs said it is unethical for doctors to refuse patients who are infected with the AIDS virus.

This is a very noble proclamation. Unfortunately, the AMA is acting like a dog with dentures — its statement has no "bite" to it. *The AMA has no legal authority to enforce these guidelines.*

It shows good intentions, but in a society where poor people are refused medical attention because

they aren't able to pay, it means very little.

The council also urged doctors who have the AIDS virus to refrain from activity "that creates a risk of transmission of the disease to others."

In a Washington Post article last week, Dr. Nancy Sicdey, a council member, said, "This makes it clear. If there is a chance you can pass on the virus, you have no place operating on a patient."

*This is an issue the AMA might have more power in enforcing.* It also reassures patients who may be hesitant to opt for non-emergency surgery.

## AIDS testing is still personal choice

### *Mandatory tests at work hurt employees by invading privacy*

**E**mployees at the Eastern Nebraska Community Office of Retardation have been told they must comply with a frightening precedent.

Mandatory AIDS testing. A report on Omaha's KMTV channel 3 said employees who directly work with the mentally retarded are required to take an AIDS antibody test. But office administrators aren't. That has incensed employees who believe everyone at the office should be tested — not just certain workers.

ual contact and sharing needles, not casual contact."

Mandatory AIDS testing, like drug testing, unjustly invades the privacy of an employee. Unless an employee is having sex at work and spreading the virus to co-workers, it's unnecessary. A person's AIDS antibody status is simply none of the employer's business.

In a medical environment, there's a slight possibility of proper transmission, but proper precautions and a little common sense can obliterate that risk. Syringes with a plastic guard on the needle are now used in hospitals to avoid transmission through a pricked finger.

Until recently, the infamous Northwest Airlines banned AIDS victims, including employees, from scheduled flights. Vociferous protests from AIDS education groups forced the Minneapolis-based carrier to change its policy.

The same thing must be said to employers. The work world is no place for an AIDS witch hunt. If an employee tests positive, word will surely get out in the office and the person will face either termination from paranoid supervisors or discrimination and scorn from colleagues.

Since the virus is often dormant for two to five years or more, an employee in perfect health who is carrying the virus shouldn't have to face the fear a positive test result can bring.

AIDS has most definitely hit the Midwest. There have been only a handful of deaths in Lincoln, so far, and the statistics are slightly higher in Omaha. More than 30 people have tested positive in Lancaster County

alone, according to reports from the AIDS counseling and testing site in Lincoln.

But those people volunteered to take the test.

Currently, a person can be tested for free and use an assumed name to assure anonymity. We must make sure that freedom continues.

It's probably only a matter of time before insurance companies require an AIDS test before a policy can be issued. AIDS might force many insurance companies to fold if they don't require tests.

But in the workplace, one's privacy and dignity must be preserved. An employee carrying the AIDS virus is tantamount to a pregnant woman. Like a pregnant woman, AIDS carriers have a certain amount of time in which they are able to perform their duties normally. Pregnancy tests just because they are female, so they shouldn't ask everybody to take AIDS tests just because they are susceptible humans.

AIDS is a personal matter. Employers have no right to force people to make a decision about their personal health. Many who believe they've been infected avoid the test simply because they don't want to know if they're going to die. An AIDS test is a metaphorical way of looking into a crystal ball at the future.

And we must remember that it is the individuals who must decide if they want to be gypsies gazing into that ball — not an employer, the government or anyone else.

**Harrah is a senior news-editorial and English major and a Daily Nebraskan night news editor.**



**Scott Harrah**

Jackie Stoysich, an employee at the office, wrote the Omaha World-Herald about the testing. Stoysich wrote: "Some employees may test positive for the disease, just as employees of restaurants, hospitals and department stores would be if they were required to be tested. If I am to be tested, the clients should also be tested. I have the right to know that they are AIDS-free. Why not test the high-school kids who make my hamburgers at Burger King? Let's also test everyone at my doctor's office, including the secretary and the cleaning man. And don't forget my hairdresser and paperboy."

Stoysich closed her letter with a cogent message about the futility of mandatory testing: "I thought AIDS was contracted through intimate sex-

## Readers denounce abortion, DN review, roach critics

### Letters

#### Reasons for abortion self-centered excuses

This letter is in response to the abortion issue that has raised so much attention lately in the Daily Nebraskan.

First off, let me to state clearly my position on abortion and why I have this conviction. I stand on the premise that conception is when life begins. One cannot effectively argue that life begins when a child is able to live and function away from any motherly support. The reason this is ineffective is threefold:

— Life then becomes a function of technology and medicine.

— The definition of life is not definable from one person to another or from one culture to another.

— Babies cannot function on their own.

Certainly, one who stands on the argument that life begins when a child is able to live on his or her own is merely reaching for a way to justify that which has no reasonable grounds for justification. Life isn't something that fluctuates like export demand for U.S. beef. It either is or it isn't. In addition, I believe this thinking sets the stage for further irrational justifications that would appear to be well steeped in our current materialistic self-centered culture: justification of the elimination of babies with defects and the elimination of elderly who are "no longer useful to society." The list would not necessarily stop there.

Equally, one cannot effectively argue that life begins before concep-

tion. If something exists, then it has gone beyond the potentiality of existing. If something could exist if certain events happen, then it doesn't exist before those events happen. Even though sperm and eggs are living tissue, they are still not unique life until they unite.

Go back with me to the day each of us was born and ask yourself honestly: Barring an abortion, wasn't that day written in stone nine months prior? Something that is now a certainty, barring interference, no longer has a potential of not occurring. What difference does the day you were born have from the day you grew of three feet in height? Both were inevitable barring physical harm, and both could not have occurred unless conception or life started the process.

The fact that women have to go through considerably large amounts of social, physical and emotional trauma is not a proper foundation by which to make the decision on legalized abortion. Nor should the decision be based on the expected quality of the life or of the cost/benefit to society. (One can effectively argue about the social-economic damage abortion is causing.)

The ground by which to make a stand on the legalization of abortion is: When does life start. Because if life starts at conception, then abortion is no different than first-degree murder. None of the other arguments seem to outweigh the incredible social atrocity of taking human life in mass quantities.

From the position of the followers of Jesus Christ, of which I am one, it is a known fact that Jesus did more and is doing more to break through barriers concerning women's rights as individuals than all the liberators of our modern day. He did it with a

loving, caring heart and it was walked out in his everyday affairs. I feel very much assured the biblical stand on abortion is not designed to lock women into cages with no escape. It is grounded in a clear, perfect understanding of who we are as humans and what is right for us and what is wrong for us.

Kyle Stiebert  
graduate  
agricultural economics

#### Roaches do not bug food service worker

As a student employee and patron of the Harper food service, I am extremely angered by the stories and letters recently published in the Daily Nebraskan concerning roaches.

In the year that I have worked in the kitchen, I admit that I have seen roaches — three on three occasions. To me, this is not alarming. In a kitchen of its size, or any size, it would not be feasible to think it would possibly remain roach-free. I ask Nancy Bauman, Michelle Ebadi and Jeffery R. Psota — the three people who have voiced their complaints against the food service — if their kitchens are so clean that they've never had any problems with bugs. I think it is highly unlikely.

As for the food, it would be more than impossible to prepare foods to everyone's liking because of the volume of students being served. Granted, the food is not just like Grandma's, but Granny never cooked for 1,100 people, either.

So if the food is so bad and the roach problem so great, why not "go elsewhere." You're forced to live in the residence halls and be subjected to the "abuse" that you're suffering.

Cancel your housing contract, get a few bucks from Seaton Hall, move off campus and cook yourself.

Ron W. Eis  
sophomore  
broadcasting

#### More support needed for alternative bands

In response to Steve Katelman's letter critical of my assessment of the band Sidekick, let me say this:

I was at all the shows he mentioned and enjoyed what I heard. I was a roadie for Suicidal Tendencies along with other employees from Chesterfield's.

Sidekick is one of the best bands I heard, but that doesn't mean that all the other bands stink. The Finnsters were very successful here and at The Drumstick. (Yes, the Finnsters did play the 'Stick). Many people came to see both of these bands.

Other shows — FIREHOSE, Leaving Trains — only had a few people show up. You can't afford a \$500 band when only 40 people at \$3 a head show up. Yet Chesterfield's has persisted in pursuing these bands.

The local music community obviously doesn't come to these shows despite our advertising, posters and help from local record stores and newspapers. Talk about terminal illness — where are the people interested in alternative music during these shows? If 40 people is it, then we can't afford to keep losing money.

Charlie Burton has a loyal and local following that doesn't wince at

paying a \$3 cover charge, but there aren't too many other bands that can say that.

If people want to dance to cover tunes, let them. If people want alternative music, let them have it. But don't knock them for their decisions.

Brady Wiebeck  
manager

Chesterfield, Bottomsley and Potts

#### R.E.M. for listening; not a 'spiritual' event

I don't know what Kevin Cowan expected when he went to see R.E.M. the other night, but I went to hear good music. I'm 5-foot-4 and sat 21 rows back from the stage. I couldn't see or care what Michael Stipe was wearing or the light show and could barely see the slide-show backdrop when I stood on my chair. But, oh God, could I hear. And what beautiful sounds I heard. We danced in a frenzy to "Pretty Persuasion" and rocked to "Crazy," definitely the highlight of the show. "Moral Kiosk" was a pleasant surprise early on in the show that swept me away. So what they didn't play "Radio Free Europe"? It was just an oversight to tick off people like Kevin. The only weight created by the commercial market comes from people who are jealous the whole world loves their favorite band.

So, what were you expecting, Kevin? A spiritual awakening, maybe? Not me, buddy. I was there to dance.

Carrie Rau  
sophomore  
language arts