

Daily
Nebraskan
Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeremy Fitzpatrick Editor, 472-1766
Rainbow Rowell Opinion Page Editor
Adeana Leftin Managing Editor
Todd Cooper Sports Editor
Jeff Zeleny Associate News Editor
Sarah Duey Arts & Entertainment Editor
William Lauer Senior Photographer

EDITORIAL

Flimsy solution

Balanced budget amendment waste of time

Some U.S. senators would like to bring a balanced national budget out of the realm of fantasy and into reality.

This is admirable, and even a little surprising, but their plan for balancing the budget is unsound.

They've proposed an amendment to the Constitution that would require a balanced budget. Spending could not legally exceed revenue unless three-fifths of the House and the Senate voted to make it so.

The amendment, which would go into effect in 2001, does not say how the budget would be balanced. Thus the amendment shows no commitment to changing taxing and spending policies. It offers no new ideas.

Most Americans try to keep balanced budgets in their households and expect as much from their government. Balancing the federal budget is important.

But by making it a law, legislators show they have no faith in their own self-control. If they want a balanced budget, then they should pass a balanced budget.

There is no reason to waste time and tax dollars debating a constitutional amendment at length.

Why not, instead, begin working toward a balanced budget? Why not just do it?

Laws similar to the proposed amendment in the past have been ineffective. How would this be any different?

Balancing the budget is like going on a national diet. Hiding the Twinkies won't do any good if you're still determined to eat.

OTHERS' VIEW

The Clinton administration is formulating a plan that would finance the president's welfare proposal by taxing recipients of welfare benefits. The ability that politicians have to try to make the world sound like a better place while creating more and more bureaucracy is bewildering.

The only reason the administration is proposing a tax on welfare benefits is because cutting them outright would sound too harsh and draw too much fire.

What the U.S. welfare system really needs is a plan that would encourage more people to get back into the job market and work toward supporting themselves. What the system doesn't need is a government that continues to create more bureaucracy, which will stand in the way of giving welfare recipients the help they really need.

Although most welfare recipients need money to sustain themselves, they also need a system that helps them get back on their feet. And if the money to establish a job-training program can't be found anywhere else, it should be taken from the welfare budget itself, but not through a tax on welfare benefits.

A plan stipulating that welfare benefits would be cut and that money from those cuts would go directly to a job-training program would save the government a lot of time and energy, which could be used in the creation of a system that works.

Most taxpayers and welfare recipients would rather see welfare money helping recipients than paying more government employees to figure taxes on the tax money.

— University Daily Kansan
— University of Kansas

EDITORIAL POLICY

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Spring 1994 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

Doyle's joke

We would just like to ask Gary Doyle his intentions. Sure, Dave Letterman is a good friend of ours, but is making a mockery of the Association of Students of the University of Nebraska actually going to improve the status quo of student government? Is this going to be detrimental to the process as a whole?

If Gary Doyle has been "toying" with this idea since January, why hasn't he tried to organize a write-in campaign for himself? Or is this, in turn, the biggest joke?

Students should either vote for a legitimate candidate or make a true mockery of the election and write in Gary Doyle.

Ted Wright
senior
political science

Bob Ronshaugen
sophomore
business

slightly ridiculous that he/she should have another problem before even stepping out of the car. Where am I going to park?

A commuter must decide which lot to park in, whether it be Lot 20 by the Reunion or Lot 20 by the Stadium, or whether to try for a metered stall. After roaming around side streets and full, overloaded lots, the student probably ends up in Lot 20, across from Harper-Schramm-Smith residence halls. This situation would've been fine last year when this lot was almost twice as large.

Students literally have to wait for classes to get out to find a space. Parking in a remote lot means walking a mile to class and maybe having to wait for a train. How many students have been late or missed a class because of these dilemmas?

Privileged parking is taking over lots. Why do professors receive stalls in the middle of campus? Are they not able to walk as far as students? Did they pay more for a permit? The system is unfair and needs correction.

Majority rules

In response to C. Douglas-Ybarra's letter to the editor (DN, Feb. 17, 1994), voicing a minority position on Regent Robert Allen of Hastings' supposedly "outdated, dishonorable and above all, out of touch" perspective:

Ten percent of the student population may be gay, lesbian or bisexual, but 90 percent obviously believes this choice is not for them, if not disgusting and animalistic.

Your needs probably are ignored, as there is only one of you and yours for every nine of us. Your needs for basic human life are the same as ours, and they are met in equal fashion. But if the needs incurred by your sexual preference are not being met, well, that's too bad. In this country, majority rules, and you have no so-called minority rights.

Concerning prayer at commencement, I realize there are many foreign students with us. This is a wonderful opportunity for us to learn about their various cultures so that we may improve our own.

If we were studying in their countries, we wouldn't think twice about a prayer to their god in a ceremonial exercise like a graduation. I doubt that many of them mind when we pray to a Judeo-Christian God, the predominant god figure in our country, at a graduation here. Once again, you are in the minority.

I believe it is you who is "out of touch," for you are the one clinging to the ideas of the few and not the accepted beliefs of the many.

Matthew Wegener
freshman
engineering



James Mehsling/DN

Everyone knows by now that the lot behind the Nebraska Union will become green space soon. I have no qualms about that. Go ahead; students don't use that lot, but they will. They'll use it to make nice, muddy bike trails and to throw attractive trash on. My, how green space will make the campus more inviting.

Parking on campus is a major concern for students. What is an appropriate solution? I suggest making parking a free-for-all. It's fair to everyone, and maybe then I'd get a stall.

Jenny Johansen
sophomore
psychology

Kepfield's problem

"What is the problem, specifically, with Sam Kepfield's column (Feb. 16, 1994)?" This is how Robert Tobin (DN, Feb. 22, 1994) chose to open his response to Kepfield's biased and insulting column. To me, as an active member of the Mexican American Student Association and a proud

Chicano, all this does is amplify the ignorance and disrespect which is found at a predominately white university.

Let me answer Tobin's question. What was wrong with the column was not the point made or Kepfield's opinion. I believe all opinions should be respected, bigoted or not. However, it was the manner in which Kepfield made his point, by insulting my compadres at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and my people by making assumptions about our backgrounds in print. That makes it personal.

Tobin states he sees "no overt racism" in Kepfield's column, but why would he? Neither man has ever been a minority and will not ever be a minority, so how could I expect Tobin to see anything wrong?

Well, here is what I read in Kepfield's column through a pair of brown eyes and a proud Chicano spirit.

I read that the cause that we believe in and are fighting for was a "brouhaha" and "whining." I also found out that I have nothing better to do than join my fellow "misfits" in making a mess, without having to worry about grades and studying. I was also informed that life was full of discomfort. Believe me, I was glad to find that out.

But my brown eyes turned red when I read that the white man in the picture above the article, in his suit and tie and thinning hair, knew more about my background, real life and discrimination than I do.

"MASA's troublemakers probably come from comfortable, sheltered, middle-class existences, with no idea what real discrimination is like," Kepfield wrote.

I would like to invite Kepfield to my "comfortable, sheltered and middle-class existence" that he says I grew up in to see just how much he knows about me, my people and which of us knows about "real discrimination." He may be just a bit surprised.

Telling me fighting for a cause I believe in is only whining, and mocking my actions, is stating an opinion. It won't leave a good taste in my mouth, but as another human being's opinion, I respect it.

To assume things about me in a campus newspaper—such as where I came from, who I am and what I know about discrimination—is insulting.

If Kepfield doesn't like what we're doing, fine, but there is no room to assume these actions are motivated by our ignorance of real life and especially our ignorance of real discrimination.

The members of MASA are my family here, and when the administration and its advocates, such as Tobin and Kepfield, slap them in the face, I stand beside them, ready to slap back.

I believe Emiliano Zapata said it best: "It is better to die standing than to live on your knees."

Jason Don Salazar
sophomore
general studies