

Daily Nebraskan  
Editorial Board  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Chris Hopfensperger..... Editor, 472-1766  
Jeremy Fitzpatrick..... Opinion Page Editor  
Alan Phelps..... Managing Editor  
Brian Shellito..... Cartoonist  
Susie Arth..... Senior Reporter  
Kim Spurlock..... Diversions Editor  
Sam Kepfield..... Columnist

EDITORIAL

## Wasting time

Board should focus on quality of choice

Two months ago, University of Nebraska President Martin Massengale announced that he would not seek a contract extension when his deal runs out at the end of the year. It looked as though the university would have plenty of time to find his replacement before the December deadline.

Unfortunately, the regents once again had to make a mockery of the university system with their petty bickering and closed-door politics.

Now it seems as though the process to find Massengale's replacement has taken a back seat to how long the current president will stay at the university. Regents Chairman John Payne proposed that Massengale be given a contract extension until June 1994. That would have eased the transition by not bringing in a new president in the middle of the school year, and it would have given the board additional time to get the search process right this time.

But the regents couldn't agree on the plan, and they are still looking for a solution. Now Payne has proposed a plan that would allow Massengale to retain his post until his replacement is found. That compromise is sufficiently vague to allow the regents to continue screwing around while they decide how to fill the president's seat.

Payne is correct when he says that it would be better for the university to have someone in office throughout the process, but that will not fill Massengale's chair.

The regents should be more worried about finding a qualified replacement for Massengale than how long they should keep him around.

Massengale announced his plan in January. That gave the regents nearly a full year to find his replacement. Now it's March, and the regents don't look like they are any closer to even looking for a new president.

## Partisan politics

Republicans should pass motor-voter bill

Tuesday marked another defeat for the motor-voter bill and another notch in the belt of the Republicans who have consistently opposed it.

The motor-voter bill would allow people to register to vote by mail and at motor vehicle offices, welfare agencies and many other places where Americans apply for the benefits and services of state and local governments.

Tuesday, Republicans in the Senate filibustered the bill. Democratic attempts to stop the Republicans' stalling by limiting debate on the bill fell one vote short.

Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell of Maine accused the Republicans of perpetuating gridlock by stalling and delaying the bill.

"The problem is those who don't want the Senate to vote on this legislation," Mitchell said. "No one should be fooled or misled about who is causing delay."

Sen. John Chafee, R-R.I., answered that the bill was petty. "I think it is bad legislation, and I hope it goes deservedly down the drain," he said.

Chafee and the Republicans are wrong. Voting is not petty. In a time when only half of the people in the United States vote in presidential elections, any measure that could improve that percentage should be welcomed.

The Republicans should get past partisan politics and do what is right for the United States — pass the motor-voter bill.

EDITORIAL POLICY

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Spring 1993 Daily Nebraskan. Policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. Editorials do not necessarily reflect the views of the university, its employees, the students or the NU Board of Regents. Editorial columns represent the opinion of the author. The regents publish the Daily Nebraskan. They establish 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 students.

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 or reject all material submitted. Readers also are welcome to submit material as guest opinions. The editor decides whether material should run as a guest opinion. Letters and guest opinions sent to the newspaper become the property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned. Anonymous submissions will not be published. Letters should include the author's name, year in school, major and group affiliation, if any. Requests to withhold names will not be granted. Submit material to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Conservatism

Conservatism inconsistent? Decide for yourself. After 12 years of conservative "pro-life," pro-"family values" presidents, 20 percent of American children live in poverty, and only 70 percent of our children are fully immunized against measles, mumps and rubella. This gives us the third-worst record in the Western hemisphere. In 1990 alone, 26,000 cases of measles were reported, mostly in inner cities.

Still there's more: Since 1980, no progress has been made in the United States in reducing the number of low-birth weight babies, which are the result of mothers receiving poor or inadequate nutrition.

Even more sad is the fact that the United States has an infant mortality rate higher than that of 21 other industrialized nations. Black children are twice as likely to die as white babies. The 12 years of pro-life presidents left the inner cities to their own demise despite high infant mortality rates, low birth weights and immunization rates as low as 50 percent.

Pro-life administration? Actions speak louder than words.

Paul Koester  
senior  
agronomy

Bible study. I am not necessarily against gun control in America, but saying the NRA is responsible for the situation in Waco is like saying that the Food and Drug Administration is responsible for suicides by drug overdose.

Todd Nelson  
senior  
Russian and sociology



David Badders/DN

### Example

I would like to address Jeremy Fitzpatrick's article "Waco proves gun control needed" (DN, March 19, 1993), because there are several important points that Fitzpatrick skated over in order to make his own.

The first is that Koresh and his followers are allegedly armed with such exotic weaponry as .50-caliber machine guns and even more powerful weapons that, Koresh has boasted, have the capability of stopping armored personnel carriers. Regardless of what you choose to believe, the NRA is not at all in favor of America's citizenry owning such weapons.

Secondly, the outrageous armory of the Branch Davidians is what caused this brouhaha in the first place, not Koresh's less-than-emotionally stable assertion that he is Christ. What do you think the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms was trying to serve him a warrant for — spitting on the sidewalk?

I think what happened here is that Fitzpatrick picked a lousy example to demonstrate the need for gun control. He should have picked some lone psycho who walked into a store, bought a gun and used it the same day on a local 7-Eleven, not a fanatical religious group for whom paramilitary training and aggressive arms acquisition are as much a part of life as

### 'Fighting back'

I'm writing this letter to let everyone who owns a gun or likes hunting or shooting for competition know that we are under attack. The mass media — NBC, ABC, CBS and the newspapers — has declared war on the gun owners of America. They have some pretty powerful allies, also. The president has said he would sign the Brady Bill if it passes through Congress. The president's appointee for attorney general is also an anti-gunner. Sarah Brady and Handgun Inc. have a lot of clout in Congress.

All who value their Second Amendment rights know that gun control is not crime control. We have to let people know that there are other ways to combat crime. Stiffer penalties for people who use guns in violent crimes is just one of the many ways. Most guns used by criminals are stolen and not bought legally, anyway. If guns are taken from honest citizens, then only the criminals will have guns and can terrorize anyone, without having to be worried about someone fighting back.

Washington D.C. and New York have the toughest gun-control policies in the country, yet more murders

are committed there with guns than any other method. Proof that taking away rights of people to carry guns only allows criminals to do what they want. Why not allow more people to apply for permits to carry concealed weapons? The police can't be everywhere. More people with concealed weapons make someone think before going into a public building and shooting people.

The anti-gunners argue that honest gun owners shouldn't be upset if we have to wait to buy a gun. Bull! I shouldn't be punished for wanting to buy something. Would people like a seven-day waiting period to buy a car? Cars kill more people every year than guns do. How about a seven-day waiting period on alcohol? Alcohol contributes to many damaging actions. Although the government tried that with alcohol — Prohibition — all it did was make criminals rich.

One last thought: Without the people who owned guns during the last time we were fighting for our independence, we would be part of the British empire and be singing "God Save The Queen." God bless America!

Kelvin K. Kreitman  
senior  
political science

### 'Real newspaper'

In regards to the shooting range story, "Shooting range cold, hostile place to be" (DN, March 12, 1993):

Once again the DN has shown us why it is not a real newspaper. This painfully typical DN article's author seemed filled with hostility and paranoia toward guns and was unable to produce an unbiased story. This was a cheap attempt to scare people away from recreational shooting while making some slanderous remarks about a businessman.

If the DN editors are unable or unwilling to separate news and propaganda, they should be replaced.

Jon Eggen  
senior  
biology

### Limbaugh

Rush Limbaugh serves the purpose in our society of "lightening up" the masses, making them feel OK with their lack of concern over the real issues facing our society; plus he gives them a common enemy that they have historically had a need for.

Rush assures us that this is all in good humor, but not once have I heard him speak out for the environment, women or the poor. I find his jokes about as funny as racist and sexist jokes.

Paul Koester  
senior  
agronomy