

Spirited advice

Beating around the Busch sheds light on some good liquor



JOSH WIMMER is a senior news-editorial major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

Folks, I've said before I'm not going to tell you how to live your lives. But there's a sickness on this campus, and watching it devour all y'all — well, it's making me sick. I've touched on it before, but now I'm taking a real stand against it.

I think you know what I'm talking about.

Busch Light.

Warning: It is against the law for persons under 21 years of age to consume alcoholic beverages! This newspaper does not condone such behavior.

My friends, I'm not going to tell you to stop drinking Busch Light. I think it's hard-wired into your systems, like that football thing, whatever that's about.

I just want to make you aware that there are other things to drink out there. Things with actual alcohol contents. Things that make you wince. Things that make 75-year-old lumberjacks slap you on the back and say, "Whoeee! Burns, don't it?"

Things that you should consume in moderation, or not at all if you are under 21.

Like any journalist worth his boxer shorts, I did some extensive research for this week. I spoke with one of my friends back home in hard-drinking North Dakota, the one who insists that Alcoholics Anonymous is a "club." We managed to agree on five hard liquors everyone of legal age should learn to appreciate.

Naturally, this involved a comprehensive taste-testing session and a bunch of peanuts, to cleanse my palate. The taste-testing, I must inform you, was so successful, I had to get the Artist Formerly Known As My Girlfriend to help with the next part of the research: driving me around to compare prices at local spirit retailers.

Never get behind the wheel if you are intoxicated. If you do, you are a danger to yourself and others. Call a friend or a parent for a ride home. Call the editor of this section or a vice chancellor of the university. They will be happy to see you home safely.

(Editor's Note: Says you!)

Anyway, this is what we found. Consume these beverages in moderation, buy them at the places listed, and you will be happy, happy Huskers. And I won't make fun of you.

■ Jack

Daniel's Tennessee Whiskey. Now, Jack is more than just a friend of mine — I like to think of him as a bodyguard.

For one thing, there's the psychological factor. Intimidation. It doesn't matter who you are — if people

see you drinking J.D., all of a sudden you're, like, angry Charles Bronson. And, should someone still decide to start something, Jack can act as a genuine weapon, too.

It's simple: Spit a mouthful of the highly flammable stuff at your attacker's face. Then flick a cigarette at him.

I guarantee you'll be the talk of the party for days; and he'll never bug you again, although his attorney might.

Super Saver charges only \$12.98 for a 750 ml bottle.

■ **Tanqueray Distilled English Gin.** Tanqueray is a personal favorite, probably because I'm an international secret agent. You too can pretend you're eliminating Her Majesty's enemies if you make the T & T (Tanqueray & Tonic) a part of your refreshment repertoire. Martinis, of course, are always good too, so long as they're not pansy-ass chocolate or blueberry martinis. Shaken, not stirred, naturally.

Once again, Super Saver's got the deal: \$13.98 for a 750 ml bottle.

■ Jose

Cuervo Especial Gold Tequila. It is almost an essential facet of college life that everyone has one very bad tequila experience. I'm not sure why this is. It might have to do with spring break, or it might be because the stuff is so fun to shoot, especially with salt and lime.



Warning! More than five or six drinks per hour is considered "binge drinking." This includes tequila shots! Studies say thousands of college students binge drink each year. Do you want to become a statistic?

The important thing to keep in mind with Jose is: You're not in charge. He's a slippery dude, and he'll make you think you are.

Never believe it. My roommate was once known to have proclaimed "Jose, he eees my beetch!" in a bad Mexican accent. My roommate was also known to have thrown up for six hours shortly thereafter.

As for bargain-hunting, you guessed it: Super Saver, 750 ml for \$11.98.

■ **Absolut Vodka.** Now, back when I was a kid, if you drank this stuff, people called you a commie. Not so today. Y'all got it easy.

My favorite part about vodka is it's made from potatoes, so it goes with just about anything.

Want a cheeseburger, but worried about those fatty French fries? No problem — substitute Absolut. Thanksgiving dinner kinda droning on and on? Don't pass the mashed potatoes, Mom — just the bottle with the blue writing, please.

Granted, it's a more expensive habit than super-sized Extra Value Meals, but you can quench it at Super Saver where 750 ml is \$15.98.

■ **Ron Bacardi Superior (Light and Dry).** If Tanqueray turns you into a super spy, rum transforms even a typical farmgirl into a bloodthirsty pirate.

Snarl and slash and swab the decks till your arms fall off, but just remember — beverage alliance or no beverage alliance, it's rum and Coke. Not rum and Pepsi.

If you hurry, you can catch the special at N Street Liquor, at 19th and N streets — \$7.99 for a 750 ml bottle.

Remember, all of the beverages mentioned in this column are for persons 21 years of age or older. Please do not drink and drive, and please be responsible drinkers.

Privacy, please

Government intrusions betray Constitution, violate citizens' rights



TIM SULLIVAN is a third-year law student and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

Do you value your right to privacy? Do you get angered about reports of intrusions of the privacy of your fellow citizens?

I do. In fact, I get very angry.

I recently read a book on the subject. Ellen Alderman and Caroline Kennedy, two practicing attorneys, published a book entitled "The Right to Privacy."

Government intrusions of the privacy of private citizens make me especially irate.

I suppose a good place to begin talking about the subject is to explain a little about our so-called right to privacy and its basis in the law.

As Alderman and Kennedy noted, over 100 years ago, Justice Louis D. Brandeis defined the right to privacy as "the right to be let alone."

As Americans, this would seem to conform with contemporary notions of privacy.

We tend to view our privacy as a freedom from intrusions; not just

intrusions by the government, but by other private individuals as well.

But legally, as Alderman and Kennedy point out, whether you have a recognized right to privacy, and whether a violation of that right is actionable, depends on what area of privacy you're talking about.

Legal sources of our right to privacy are found in the U.S. Constitution, state constitutions, federal and state statutes and judicial decisions.

Alderman and Kennedy recognized the necessity of determining the source of the right to privacy in various contexts and decided to group their discussion into six broad areas.

Those areas are Privacy vs. Law Enforcement; Privacy and Your Self; Privacy vs. The Press; Privacy vs. The Voyeur; Privacy in the Workplace; and Privacy and Information.

Length restrictions on this column prevent me from being able to summarize all six of these areas, so I decided to limit my ranting and raving today to the specific story Alderman and Kennedy told that got me angry enough to read the rest of the book.

Despite my 13 years of experience working in the correctional system, I was appalled at the stories of Carol D. and Diane H.

It all began in 1952 with the Chicago Police Department's policy of conducting strip searches of all people arrested and taken to their lockup while they ran background checks and held them until they post-

ed bond, even those arrested for minor traffic violations.

Unbelievable, right? Wrong. Or at least the Chicago Police Department didn't think so.

Carol and Diane were next door neighbors in Chicago. One evening they were at a friend's apartment for a dinner party. Unbeknownst to them, the police had been there earlier, responding to a noise complaint about loud music.

Shortly after midnight, the police returned and arrested all of the six or seven people there for disorderly conduct.

Carol and Diane were taken to the police station where they were approached by a woman in uniform who escorted them separately into another room and strip searched them.

Then they were loaded into a paddy wagon and taken across town to the women's lockup. They were escorted to a cell there, and strip searched again.

To add insult to injury, there were police officers moving about in the area during the second strip searches, and a video monitor was pointed at the cell.

The men who were arrested with Carol and Diane had only been "patted down" once.

Carol filed a complaint that the city ignored.

But fortunately for her, an attorney named Ted Stein and the ACLU had gotten wind of the "secret" policy.

After a tip to a local television

station that triggered an investigative report, the city agreed to change the strip search policy, but refused to concede that anyone's rights had been violated, arguing that the searches were "reasonable" under the Fourth Amendment.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized." — The Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Although the word "privacy" does not appear in the Fourth Amendment (or for that matter, anywhere else in the U.S. Constitution), the Supreme Court has interpreted the Fourth Amendment as protecting your "reasonable expectation of privacy."

It is well-settled law that the split-second demands of law enforcement often make obtaining a warrant impractical, and in many situations, no warrant is required.

But under the Fourth Amendment, all searches, with or without a warrant, must be "reasonable."

The reasonableness of the search is determined by balancing the need to search against the invasion the search entails.

I certainly don't think the need to search traffic violators outweighs the invasiveness of a strip search.

Carol didn't think so either. But the City of Chicago refused to budge.

Carol attempted to vindicate her right to privacy in court.

A federal district court agreed that the Chicago Police Department's strip search policy was unconstitutional under the Fourth Amendment, but did say that a strip search might be justified if there were reasonable grounds to believe that a woman were hiding contraband in a body cavity, as may be the case in arrests on drug charges.

The city appealed the U.S. District Court's decision to the 7th U.S. Circuit of Appeals, arguing that the searches were justified because the women posed a dangerous threat. The 7th Circuit disagreed.

The court considered that nature of the search, saying that a strip search is "one of the more humiliating invasions of privacy imaginable ... dehumanizing, terrifying, repulsive ... signifying degradation and submission."

The Court of Appeals also upheld Mary's \$45,000 damage award.

Alderman and Kennedy tell a lot of other stories that will get your blood boiling. I suggest you read it if you value your right to privacy.

It angers me beyond comprehension when the government behaves in such an ignorant, pig-headed way.

Why they couldn't just change their policy and admit they were wrong baffles me.

Look out, you government lawyers.

Here I come.