

editorial/ opinion

ASUN elections: 'Much ado about nothing'

Apr. 9, 1976
By Steve Moeller

"Much ado about nothing," (quoting Shakespeare), I believe could aptly describe the ASUN elections this year.

The Greeks brought something into the election that was absent from previous elections: machine politics.

I often have wondered how Mayor Richard Daley ran his Chicago machine. Thanks to the Greeks, I have found out. It is a simple formula: give your list of candidates to the voters and make sure the voters get to the polls. Efficient. Practical. Legal. Unethical.

Both the losing Greeks (who weren't endorsed) and Residence Hall student candidates have shown a certain amount of childishness since the election. Kids who play baseball near my home would call them "poor losers," but I think it goes deeper. These same people are now behind "the Coalition" (sounds like "the faction," doesn't it?) and threatened the whole constitutional position of the UNL student government.

This action of stripping ASUN Senate of its power and transferring it to another organization would set a dangerous precedent.

Will the losing side in an election now start seeking to strip the governing

body of its power? If there wasn't a question of whether the elected officials represented the entire campus, certainly there now will be one. Regents must think that student politics is a game engaged by "children."

In the four years that I have been here, the most important issue has been to get students to vote, so that the student government could make the unrealistic claim that it represented "all the students."

The Greeks have shown us the way: machine politics. Choose the candidates, provide lists, and force the people to the polls. I'm positive that at least 60 percent of the UNL students would vote in such an election.

The people now in office should be given the chance to govern and "the Coalition" should not set this dangerous precedent in motion, which, in theory, could turn the student government into a "Banana Republic," threatening overturned governments and elections every other week.

But, in conclusion, what does it matter? In my opinion, they are fighting over nothing. The stupid people got elected and the stupid people are still trying to get elected.

Steve Moeller is a senior anthropology major from Lincoln.

Letters to the Editor

Inmates request letters Ban on spray cans

Apr. 30, 1975

Dear Editor:

After just finishing an article on the depletion of the ozone by Paul Brodeur ("Annals of Chemistry," The New Yorker, April 7) and after having read similar sobering articles in national newspapers this spring, I am becoming increasingly worried about the dangers of using aerosol spray cans. The fluorocarbons used in aerosol cans are exceedingly dangerous to our world environment: these fluorocarbons are already present in the stratosphere and as they decompose they release atoms of chlorine which react with molecules of ozone to destroy the ozone. Ozone is, of course, essential to screening out the lethal ultraviolet rays from the sun.

In 1973, there were 2,902,340,000 aerosols produced and sold in this country.

Of course, Big Business is bucking the scientific evidence, and Congress, presented with the horrifying evidence, is dragging its political heels. A Du Pont spokesman was cited in a recent issue of The National Observer as saying that if aerosols were banned, the consumer wouldn't have a "free choice" -- where I might choose to live assured in the knowledge that I would not be one of those 40,000 who will get skin cancer because of ozone depletion from chlorofluorocarbons. He would not be able to provide you with that "free choice."

Write you newspapers, write your Congressmen. Convince your parents, your grandparents, your aunts, uncles, cousins, brothers, sisters and friends to work to ban aerosols. Do it today.

Below you will find a short profile on each of us. Thank you for your time and effort.

Tony Lauricella, No. 136-671, age 29, height 5'7", weight 170 lb., black hair, blue eyes.

Jim McManus, No. 139-935, age 35, 5'7", 200 lb., black hair, hazel eyes.

P.O. Box 69

London, Ohio

43140

Abortion contradicts human rights

Jan. 23, 1976

Dear Editor,

Jan. 22 was a tragic American anniversary. In 1973 the Supreme Court legalized abortion on demand. In this Bicentennial year, we Americans are constantly reminded of our American heritage. Certain sanctity for human life is the basis of this heritage. What good does it do to speak of human right when the right to life is not recognized as an inalienable and fundamental? Read the Declaration of Independence. Abortion on demand reduces the value of life to someone's whim. All reliable medical testimony says that human life begins at conception. It is ironical that some who protested against the Vietnam War because of its destruction of life would today support abortion. As a former student, I saw the student unrest here accompanying the war and participated in some of the protests myself. If we stand up for life, we should do so everywhere.

David D. Voegler

Strangers in the night

May 4, 1978

Earlier this semester, I was mad as hell about hearing there were maggots and bugs in my dorm food. Douglas Zatechka, housing director, wrote me, assuring me it was "bean sprouts" and not maggots and bugs.

OK, I'll buy that, but when I entered my darkened room the other night, I'm pretty sure it was a "bean sprout" I found scampering across the floor when I turned on the light. I think it was what you'd call cockroaches (I caught the little buggers, too, in case your friends at the FDA want to make a full scale investigation).

Before you and your cronies over at Regent's Hall decided to up dorm rates, Mr. Zatechka, I wish you had spent a week over here at Cather Hall to see what it's really like.

Jeff Barnes

Sophomore, journalism

McDonald's obnoxious

Mar. 1, 1976

To the employees of McDonald's: Your loyalty to your employer and the betterment of mankind warms many a heart, but the fact remains that the thought of the golden arches on campus, granting their neon benediction to the Eternal Hamburger is obnoxious.

Perhaps you truly believe that employees of McDonald's are kinder and happier, and like to pick up candy wrappers off the street, but strangely enough, I believe the common man on the street is capable of such extravagances, with a smile as well. And I would no sooner fall for the "You, you're the one" slogan than I would believe that Mr. Whipple is stalking me behind the grocery shelf to see if I'll assault the Charmin.

By no means do I intend to attack the sincerity and friendliness of McDonald's waitresses and waiters, but nut instead of all that McDonald's has come to epitomize -- the neon-signed, fast food joint that spits tasteless food all over the counter like a computer. Do I rightfully suspect the author of the McDonald's editorial to be a member of the management and not a clerk?

A McDonald's on campus may provide fast, inexpensive food service for students and faculty members, but it is too bad that such franchises have to overrun the small, independent businesses (remember Dave's?) that provided the same services just as conveniently and inexpensively, with more personality and warmth. Somehow, Ronald McDonald isn't the personality I'm referring to.

C. Callahan
J. Penrose

