

Daily Nebraskan

COVERING THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA SINCE 1901

VOL. 94 NO. 94

inside **W**ednesday



Huskers take on Oklahoma State tonight, page 7

Arts & Entertainment
Susan Sarandon navigates
"Safe Passage," page 6

February 1, 1995

"The end of the Cold War has complicated our foreign policy in ways we could not have imagined."



Travis Heying/DN

Donald F. McHenry, a former U.N. ambassador, spoke at the Lied Center Tuesday afternoon as part of the E.N. Thompson Forum on World Issues. His speech was titled "The United States in the Post-Cold War Era: Who Will Answer the International 911?"

U.S. designated as 911 operator

By John Fulwider
Staff Reporter

The United States must prepare itself to answer the 911 calls that will inevitably come from the international community, a former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations said Tuesday.

Donald McHenry spoke at the Lied Center as the third lecturer in the E.N. Thompson Forum on World Issues.

His lecture, titled "Who Will Answer the International 911? The United Nations in the Post-Cold War Era," focused on the lack of preparedness of both the United States and the United Nations to deal with world conflicts.

"If the United States wants to answer the international 911," he said, "it must see that the machinery is present so the call will be answered."

Donald F. McHenry

A former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, he graduated Illinois State University and earned a Master's Degree from Southern Illinois University. McHenry is a Georgetown professor and director of several major corporations, including Coca-Cola, SmithKline Beecham and AT&T.

He said U.S. readiness to answer that call had been limited by political rhetoric and the public's opinion that domestic issues were more important.

"The public ... strongly believes that the United States must devote its attention to long-neglected problems here at home," he said.

McHenry said the American public was prepared to support U.N. action where a clear threat to U.S. national security existed. But, he said, it has not agreed on how to handle international conflicts that do not directly affect the United States.

The lack of an obvious U.S. adversary following the end of the Cold War has exacerbated the problem, he said.

"The end of the Cold War has complicated our foreign policy in ways we could not have imagined," he said.

McHenry said a major problem in handling present-day conflicts was that since World War I, international agreements had dealt with conflicts between countries.

Now, he said, the world faces many civil wars, such as the ethnic conflicts in the former Yugoslavia.

See **McHENRY** on 3

Right to Life calls for boycott

By Kristin Armstrong
Senior Editor
and Paula Lavigne
Senior Reporter

Dean Blattert was surprised Tuesday when his construction company's name was publicly connected to the proposed Lincoln abortion clinic.

He had no idea he was about to be boycotted.

Blattert's name was on a list printed in St. Mary's Catholic Church's bulletin on Sunday; the list also was distributed by anti-abortion protestors at the Jan. 20 Walk for Life.

The list named businesses involved with the proposed clinic, including Earl Carter Lumber Co. Blattert co-owns Earl Carter, which has been supplying building materials to a company contracted to build the clinic. He declined to name the contractor.

The list also names Ken Whyrick, owner of Stone Wood Builders, and his contracted companies, including architect Melinda Pearson and Midwest Refuse.

Right to Life president Pam Tabor said Tuesday the list was published so people would call, write or boycott the contractors

working on the clinic.

However, Blattert said he did not know this was the intention of the list until Tuesday.

"To me, it was just a clinic to be built," he said. "I had no idea what type. It's none of my business what they build."

"Now there's a case against me for being prejudiced."

But when protestors turned up in front of Earl Carter on Tuesday, Blattert realized the consequences of the list. "I told the protestors that I was supplying to a company, and I had no knowl-

See **BOYCOTT** on 3

States may control fate of budget bill

By J. Christopher Hain
Senior Reporter

Last week in Washington, D.C., the U.S. House of Representatives passed the balanced budget bill, and



with expected passage in the Senate, the 50 states could soon control the future of the proposed 28th Amendment to the constitution.

LEGISLATURE Assuming approval by the Senate and president, ratification of the amendment would be required by at least 38 of the 50 states to make it part of the constitution.

In Nebraska, it looks like the support exists to do just that.

"Nebraskans are very clear that they want this amendment," said Sen. David Bernard-Stevens of North Platte.

So are state senators.

A survey of state senators by The Associated Press last week revealed that 44 senators said the Legislature would likely approve a balanced budget amendment.

But several senators, including Sen. Curt Bromm of Wahoo, said they were reserving judgment on the bill until they had a chance to see the

Amending the Constitution

A survey of state senators by The Associated Press last week revealed that 44 senators said the Legislature would likely approve a balanced budget amendment. Several state senators said they would hold off a decision until they saw the amendment's specifics.

The U.S. House of Representatives passed the balanced budget bill last Thursday. With expected passage in the Senate, which is considering it this week, and presidential approval, 38 of 50 states would be needed to ratify the amendment. The U.S. Constitution would then have been amended 28 times.

specifics of the amendment language.

Bromm said he was concerned that such an amendment might force Nebraska lawmakers to raise taxes and might affect federal programs,

See **TALLY** on 3

Proposal may be heavy load on Nebraska's back

By Brian Sharp
Senior Reporter

Economics professors at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln said rhetoric surrounding the proposed federal balanced budget amendment could be translated into two plans: eliminating the federal government or strapping states with more than they can carry.

Neither option is acceptable, or realistic, the professors said.

Craig MacPhee, chairman of the economics department, said the unbalanced 1990 federal budget of \$1.25 trillion brought with it a \$221 billion deficit.

He said that in balancing the budget, interest on the federal debt had to be paid, and if defense spending and social security were also taken off the chopping block, only \$275 billion of the budget would remain to face possible cuts.

To eliminate the deficit and balance the budget, the remaining federal programs would have to be scaled down by 80 percent, he said.

"You're basically eliminating the federal government ... to eliminate the deficit," he said.

That means other programs, such as agriculture, would be vulnerable to drastic cuts, he said. Serious cuts could have repercussions on the state,

he said, given UNL's and Nebraska's stake in agricultural research, extension services and price supports.

A tax hike would be the only solution, MacPhee said. But Democrats and Republicans are not taking that route, he said, not nationally and especially not locally. Spending cuts are thus being moved into another dimension.

Charles Lamphear, professor of economics and director of the Bureau of Business Research at UNL, said talk of pulling social programs off the bargaining table was unrealistic when talking about a trillion-dollar cut in federal finances.

"There is no way in God's green earth you can get a trillion-dollar cut without cutting into social programs," Lamphear said.

That's what has state leaders worried. Gov. Ben Nelson has said shifting the costs for welfare and Medicaid to the state may balance the federal budget but would bust the state.

The current debate over which level of government will carry which responsibilities marks a major change, economics professor John Anderson said. It also marks an inevitably larger burden for states to manage, he said.

When the federal government looks to cut program spending and

See **BUDGET** on 3