

OPINION

Wednesday, February 22, 1995

Page 4

Daily Nebraskan

Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeff Zeleny Editor, 472-1766
Jeff Robb Managing Editor
Matt Woody Opinion Page Editor
DeDra Janssen Associate News Editor
Rainbow Rowell Arts & Entertainment Editor
James Mehling Cartoonist
Chris Hain Senior Reporter

Faulty logic

Reducing income tax won't help Nebraska

Gov. Ben Nelson is at it again. Last week he testified before the Nebraska Legislature's Revenue Committee in support of LB663, his proposal to reduce the state's income tax by 4.5 percent.

Come on, Gov. Nelson. Sure, an income-tax cut sounds like a good idea, which is what most of Nelson's proposals sound like. But also characteristic of Nelson, is that a closer look reveals that it is not necessarily a good idea.

In this session, among other things, Nebraska's governor has suggested a 3 percent increase in the budget for the University of Nebraska, a get-tough crime package that would include stiffer sentences and more money for several law-enforcement agencies.

Decreasing the state's revenue intake is not going to help fund any new programs, no matter how desperately they are needed.

The Legislature's Appropriations Committee recommended a preliminary budget cut for the University of Nebraska. Student leaders from across the state already have lobbied against such cuts.

Reducing the state's income tax is not going to help the university. The Daily Nebraskan would very much like to see lower taxes for the people of Nebraska, as well as a smaller, less bureaucratic and more efficient government.

But with the newly Republican-controlled Congress working toward those same goals, an ever-increasing amount of American government will fall on the states, which can better deal with many social problems.

It may not be long before welfare and Medicaid will be managed without any influence from the federal government. Nebraska has been experiencing a crisis with its Medicaid program in the last few years.

The states are going to need more revenue in the future, not less. A tax cut certainly looks good to average Nebraska citizens. It looks even better to the state senators who represent average Nebraska citizens and often are looking at reelection or a loftier political position.

Perhaps aspirations for a seat in the U.S. Congress are behind the motives of the governor.

Everyone involved needs to look past the here and now and consider what is best for Nebraska's future.

In one breath

The Daily Nebraskan is a business, a real newspaper with real subscribers. But our subscribers don't stop at the newsstand in the morning, or send a check every six months.

You — as students of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln — are our subscribers. And your subscription rate now is 88 cents per semester.

Nationwide, the newspaper industry is facing a crisis as newsprint costs continue to skyrocket. The cost of paper on which the Daily Nebraskan is printed will increase at least 62 percent.

These unprecedented costs already have forced the price of the other two LINCOLN newspapers to increase from 35 to 50 cents.

Tonight, ASUN will vote on whether to increase your subscription price by 9 cents. So what can you get for 97 cents a semester?

Calvin and Hobbes. Crossword Puzzles. Personals. Greek Affairs. Rainbow Rowell. E. Hughes Shanks. Jamie Karl.

Not a bad buy.

Editorial policy

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Spring 1995. 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.



Daily Nebraskan readers say:

Send your brief letters to: Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588. Or fax to: (402) 472-1761. Letters must be signed and include a phone number for verification.

Gun ownership

While Doug Peters' column "Kill a criminal, earn \$5,000" (Feb. 14) contained entertaining sarcasm, I'd still like to bring up some serious points regarding self- and home-protection.

Gun ownership and use varies from state to state; for example, the storing of one's weapons with one's resident assistant vs. the campus police just isn't an issue in California. What seems to remain the same is the idea that home- or self-protection must be ensured.

Realistically, \$5,000 is not going to encourage anyone to "bait" a would-be burglar; this "baiting" certainly would be discouraged and the \$5,000 unpayable. Besides, 800 members only amounts to \$8,000 (allowing for only 1 3/5 kills). If two of these members are trigger-happy, then Darrell Frank is likely to be victim No. 3.

Having been a handgun owner in the past, I decided rather to play the percentage game with the adolescent premise that nothing would ever happen to me where I would need a gun. But who's to say? Criminals might.

I still have the right to purchase a weapon and use it in the protection of my life, health and my personal property.

Polly Ann Najarian
graduate student
agricultural meteorology

UNL bureaucracy

After "four years prostrate to the higher mind" at this institution and seemingly never once having a place of employment, I have just realized that all this while I have actually held a steady job throughout my time here at the university.

In fact, we are all employed. And if you already have a job, then actually you are holding two jobs. We are employed at dealing with all of the paperwork and signatures



James Mehling/DN

and appointments and the like that the university requires of us to get so many things accomplished.

So when someone asks you if you have a job, you may respond, "Yes, I'm currently employed, working out of my home and on campus 20 hours a week, trying to cut through yards of red tape and deal with all the unnecessary bureaucracy it takes to stay afloat at this school."

The university, it seems, takes countless measures to stifle any opportunity of transferring credits, either from abroad, a different university or even a different department. And think how many countless hours you've spent trying to go through drop and add or get an override, being sent to a thousand different buildings to get one signature.

Why is this so difficult? It's like each college here is a different warring Neanderthal tribe and each department is a warring faction with that Neanderthal tribe.

Who are these ancient white male regimes, and what are they trying to prove with all of their paperwork, except that they can justify having 37 secretaries per bureaucrat?

NRoll may have been a small step to ease some of the load of registration and drop and add, but the university should for once cater to its students and make it much simpler to transfer credits.

But of course, I forgot, the omni-important money would not flow as freely into the system if it were easy to transfer credits.

Kevin Grubb
senior
Russian and English

Human organisms

I would like to express my appreciation to Jo DiLallo and Dennis McGucken for their Feb. 15 letter "Fetus defined." It is the first of many I've seen to address a real issue in the abortion debate.

Bravo for their statement "It is perfectly obvious that a fetus is both a living and a human organism. ... What we are debating is whether fetuses are persons, morally and constitutionally, in the sense that they are bearers of rights, the most basic of which is the right to life."

I strongly support both of these statements, the truth of which is missed by so many actively involved in these issues.

I must, however, disagree with their assumption that there is a distinction between a human organism and a human person and that some human organisms, like fetuses, are not "full-blown metaphysical persons."

Is there such a thing as a half-blown physical person? Personhood is a direct consequence of human existence and not an arbitrary specification by one human concerning the ability, in any sphere, of another.

Humans are capable of judging the quality of existence of all living things ... except one another.

Matt Davis
graduate student
education