EDITOR

Erin Gibson

OPINION Cliff Hicks

EDITORIAL BOARD

Nancy Christensen **Brad Davis** Sam McKewon Jeff Randall **Bret Schulte**

Social insecurity

Address debt dilemma before it's too late

It seems that Congress has learned from its Social Security crisis of the early 1980s.

Then, Social Security was a few months away from defaulting on its funds to the American people and being forced to borrow from Medicare's trust fund.

The problems that will be addressed at a two-day Social Security conference, which begins today, aren't nearly as pressing. Economists estimate that the fund will run out of money in the year 2032, when the Baby Boomer generation will be in its twilight

Still, it makes sense to address the problem now, when it will be less expensive and less of a responsibility for the American people to shoulder. The economy is strong now, and because President Clinton is not up for reelection, he can concentrate on actual reform rather than posturing for voters.

Exactly what the proper solution is for solving the Social Security dilemma is a more complicated question. Clinton himself has neither devised nor supported any particular plan, making it difficult for Democrats and Republicans to mobilize for or against a cause.

It is unlikely that most in Congress would risk supporting raising the age at which the elderly are eligible for Social Security benefits. Such a policy hurts minorities, whose average life expectancy is lower than that of whites. The policy has been considered politically damaging. The same could be said for taking more money from Americans than already is taken.

The plan that will be given the closest look is that of privatization of the Social Security system. One policy calls for the mandatory set-up of a Social Security fund for each individual family, which, in turn, would invest that fund into a choice of market stocks or government bonds.

Republicans favor the plan, saying it will pay dividends for both the recipients of Social Security and the economy, which would receive the extra investment from millions of households. Another plan is similar, but puts the investment responsibility in a government organization rather than the individual.

The plan has drawn criticism from the labor unions and liberal Democrats, who claim that privatizing the Social Security Act would only serve the Wall Street firms that controlled it. Furthermore, the results could be catastrophic for those who invest during a period of recession. Some say the plan leaves too much up to investment know-how, which, if those who needed Social Security had, they probably wouldn't need Social Security.

While the solution is sure to be a compromise and may include privatization of some sort, it's good that the government is addressing the problem now. Better that than waiting until our generation is looking at an empty cookie jar that we once helped to fill.

Editorial Policy

Unsigned editorials are the opinions of the Fall 1998 Daily Nebraskan. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, its employees, its student body or the University of Nebraska Board of Regents A column is solely the opinion of its author. The Board of Regents serves as publisher of the Daily Nebraskan; policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. The UNL Publications Board, established by the regents, supervises the 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 student employees.

Letter Policy

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor and guest columns, but does not guarantee their publication. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit or reject any material submitted. Submitted material becomes property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned. Anonymous submissions will not be published. Those who submit letters must identify themselves by name, year in school, major and/or group affiliation, if any.

Submit material to: Daily Nebraskan, 34
Nebraska Union, 1400 R St. Lincoln, NE 58599,0449 E mail:

NE. 68588-0448. E-mail:

letters@unlinfo.unl.edu.



Sex stinks

In response to Josh Wimmer's article, "Star city sex industry" (Friday) Let me ask you this, Josh. Let's say the powers that be legalize prostitution. How would you feel if your daughter wished to join this most "honorable" profession? Or your sister? Or your girlfriend? Brother? Best friend? I won't bother with the rest of your ridiculous points. Fortunately for Lincoln, people like you are a minority.

> Brian O'Grady Library Technician I

With or without honors

I have a confession to make. I am a non-honors student living in Neihardt, the honors dorm. Don't worry, I'm not the only one. In fact, there are a fair number of us non-honors people living here. However, it seems as if that will

be changing within the next year or so. You see, on Friday, I received in my mailbox a letter from Ana Campos, our residence director here, which stated all kinds of new guidelines for living in Neihardt. Apparently it came about from the honors program's promising all incoming freshmen honors students a room in Neihardt. When they were unable to live up to their promise, they saw the need to change something, and put out this letter.

Mostly it just said that there will be fewer single rooms next year, and if people want to move to other dorms, they will be given priority assignment to wherever they want. However, as I went on to read the back of the letter, it began to talk about non-honors resi-

It had three things to say about us: First, we would get priority assignment to rooms in other dorms for the 1999-2000 school year. Second, we could continue living in Neihardt for the 1999-2000 school year. After that, however, we will have to move out. Lastly, if any non-honors student is living with an honors student, and they want to continue living together, they both will have to move out. This seems like blatant discrimination to me.

After receiving countless university mailings with the little "UNL does not discriminate against gender, race, etc.," I would think this sort of thing would not go unnoticed. It almost seems as if they are trying their hardest to make the honors dorm as exclusive as possible by kicking out residents that aren't good enough for them. And

with the construction of another honors dorm beginning soon, I would think they would have plenty of housing in the near future.

It all just seems very wrong to me, and I can't believe the honors program would go so far as to kick people out of their homes just to make themselves more exclusive from the rest of cam-

> Cory Lueninghoener sophomore computer engineering

Rutgers 0000

In response to the Daily Nebraskan's Dec. 3 (Thursday) article concerning "Rutgers 1000," I would like to praise the University of Nebraska and at the same time express my concern of thoughtlessness of the Rutgers group.

In this diverse world, a critical part of a young person's education should include openmindedness. I find it rather sad that a group that is so supportive of a quality education can be so close-minded that it cannot recognize the opportunities and lessons in life that serious collegiate athletics have to offer young people who are pursuing their dreams.

I am a very serious student and track athlete at UNL, and if it were not for my hard work, the help and support of many highly respected individuals, and athletic programs, I may not be receiving the quality education that I am at UNL.

dents have their options of how they can pay the high expenses of education, and I have made the choice of doing this with the hardest work that I can imagine putting myself through. Sometimes I do think that there must be an easier way to pay for school than earning my scholarship, but then I think of my dreams as an athlete and the fact that I have this great opportunity to achieve them. Besides, the harder I work, the more determined I am to get my effort's worth in the class-

Rutgers English Professor William Dowling said, "Nebraska places no emphasis on academics. The whole attention of the state is on 40 steroidpumped non-students.'

From this Nebraska student-athlete's point of view, this statement, among others, seems very uninformed and is extremely insulting. I'm sure that other student athletes here would say the same.

It's extremely distasteful and even pathetic that the Rutgers group makes assumptions like this when it obviously has not done its research. I realize that from an outsider's point of view, like that of the Rutgers group, it would seem that athletics here do get more attention than academics. They do not realize that if this is true, the imbalance of attention only reaches as far as the public eye. Which is a more appropriate objective here, for public opinion or education? UNL has clearly made the right choice - education, of course.

If the Rutgers group feels the need to badmouth other schools because they think their athletics smother their academics, they had better do their research first. They sure have run their mouths with some very serious, but uniformed, accusations. Athletes at UNL work very hard at their sports and in the classroom, and this school makes it worth our efforts with the education it provides. I would know this, and "Rutgers 1000" has no clue what it is talking about.

In closing, I would like to say this: Thank you, UNL, for helping me pursue a great education, a successful career in my future and my athletic goals as well. I also thank you for not making it easy and for continuing your dedication to excellence despite obstacles like the sorry claims of Rutgers 1000. Go Big

> **Tony Smith** junior geography



MATT HANEY/DN