

opinion/editorial

Rights of U.S. and world people should not be ignored

Monday marked the 30th anniversary of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and it seems fitting that this week has been declared Human Rights Week.

More than 50 nations have ratified the United Nations Human Rights Covenants, and President Carter has asked the Senate to approve them.

The Covenants include: freedom of thought, right to peaceful assembly, freedom of association, including the right to form labor unions, and fair, public and speedy trial for criminal charges.

They also include the right to work under just and favorable conditions, the right to an adequate standard of living, including food, clothing, housing and social security, the right to education and to health care, the right to participate in cultural life and to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress.

The covenants also prohibit governments from engaging in torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment.

The countries that sign the United Nations Covenants must report to the United Nations the progress they are making in finding jobs, health services and other basic rights for people in their country.

Congress should take Carter's suggestion and ratify the covenants.

The American people must look carefully at the covenants and demand that people of all nations enjoy the same rights we have guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

America has been a leader of human rights throughout the world and we must continue to fight and strive for everyone's rights.

We must demand that the United Nations care-

fully investigate countries which have already signed the covenants and continue to ignore them. Such countries include: Chile, Peru, Venezuela, Iran, and USSR.

Signing of the declaration would obligate the United States to look into American working conditions and raise them to a safe and adequate level.

It would reaffirm the rights of women and ethnic minorities and would encourage better education for all people in light of the increasing functionally illiteracy rate.

The United States must not ignore the rights of its own people or the rights of anyone in the world.

Our failure to sign the United Nations Human Rights Covenants will reflect upon our leadership throughout the world and it will show our prejudices in the development of international human rights.

Zorinsky stirring speculation, controversy over political plans

Amid speculation that Sen. Edward Kennedy might challenge President Jimmy Carter for his party's presidential nomination, Nebraska Sen. Edward Zorinsky has managed to stir some speculation and controversy over his future political plans.

The *Lincoln Journal*, Monday, reported that Don Waggoner, Zorinsky's 1976 campaign manager, was in Memphis at the Democratic midterm convention to push Zorinsky as a vice-presidential candidate in 1984, possibly as a running mate for Kennedy.

"This effort takes a lot of maneuvering. I did not go there and immediately announce that I was pushing Ed Zorinsky for vice president. I did go to get to know administration officials and key delegates," Waggoner told the *Journal*.

Laying groundwork

The Associated Press, in an article printed in the *Lincoln Star*, reported that Zorinsky had confirmed Monday that Waggoner was in Memphis "laying the groundwork" for a possible Zorinsky vice presidential bid.

But, the *Omaha World Herald* reported Tuesday that Zorinsky said he is not running for vice president, but is more interested in making sure Nebraska is best represented on the Senate Agriculture committee.

"If I were interested in being vice president, I would have talked to Sen. Edward Kennedy, who has offices across the hall," Zorinsky told the *World Herald*.

I. kent wolgamott

Reached in Omaha Tuesday afternoon, Waggoner said he went to Memphis on his own, primarily to be with his long time friend, Evan Dobelle, former chief of protocol now employed by the Democratic National Committee.

No challenge

Waggoner said he did meet with some delegates and members of the administration but the meetings dealt with future involvement by Waggoner in political campaigns.

"I never once said anything about Ed Zorinsky for vice president at any time to anyone."

Since Zorinsky was also in Memphis serving on an agricultural panel at the convention, Waggoner said he and

Zorinsky were together at several times but did not talk to anyone about a possible vice presidential candidacy for Zorinsky.

However, Don Pieper, assistant managing editor of the *Lincoln Journal* said the *Journal's* story "hasn't been challenged yet."

He said the quotes printed in the *Journal* were direct and accurate and those quoted were changing their stories after they thought about what they had told the *Journal*.

Pieper said that Waggoner did not have to directly mention Zorinsky while laying the ground work through meeting people and making contact.

"He was spreading the fertilizer," Pieper said.

This is my last column of the semester and probably my last regularly scheduled column to appear in the *Daily Nebraskan*, although I may write occasionally in the future.

Those of you who have read this far are probably the regular readers of my column, and to you I say I hope I presented some interesting, informative and controversial information and opinion in the last year. I enjoyed writing, thanks for reading.

letters

The comments made by Bruce Nelson in the "Guest Opinion" of Dec. 11, 1978 have incited me to write this letter. He made some rather childish remarks in his letter regarding the errors made by the Organization of Arab Students in their guest opinion on Dec. 4, 1978. It is unfortunate that those Arab students did not carefully proofread their letter and correct those errors before submitting it, but what is more unfortunate is Mr. Nelson's petty, linguistically prejudiced criticism of the misspelled words and "mind-boggling" syntax of the Arab students' letter.

Mr. Nelson's comment "I suppose writing well is difficult to master for revolutionaries who are busy being 'committed'" was as ludicrous as it was stupid. As a tutor of English as a second language for foreign students at the University, I can attest to the fact that writing well is indeed difficult for foreign students, whether they are "revolutionaries" or not. It is no easy task learning to write well in another language but foreign students devote great effort and time in improving their writing skills in English.

Perhaps the Arab students' opinions concerning the Middle East situation might be deserving of "all the ridicule others can muster," but their attempts at expressing these opinions in a foreign language are certainly not deserving of such ridicule.

Mr. Nelson found the errors "entertaining, but not nearly as amusing as the knowledge that the piece was written collectively." Mr. Nelson seems to be a person easily delighted by the trifling language errors made by foreign students. The misspelled words and the syntax of the Arab students' letter are not so mind-boggling,

but the asinine comments made by Mr. Nelson certainly are!

Nancy Marie Wood
Graduate Student

Racist sarcasm

In response to Mr. Nelson's article (which attacked the article written by the Arab Students in Nebraska), I must point out that his is an example of intellectualism that centers on "bad grammar" (of which Nelson accused the Arab students). Nelson's article seems to be flavored with racist sarcasm and intellectual arrogance. For example: "An example of the awesomeness of Arabs working together" perhaps?) Let it be known to Mr. Nelson that this type of racist attitude is the foundation of "facism."

Apparently, it is easier for Mr. Nelson's intellectual capabilities to attack something rather than to provide a meaningful and positive solution. The Arab students propose a "democratic-secular state" as an attempt to solve the Middle East situation. What does Mr. Nelson propose? Mr. Nelson's article appears to be void of any meaningful content or constructive criticism. That's too bad, because it is such a long article. As far as the bad grammar is concerned, let Mr. Nelson write his article in Arabic once, then we will see who is pompous.

Steven Sallie

Partial criticism

Monday, Dec. 11. I read the graduate history student's criticism of the OASN's

guest opinion. I must say I was shocked to read such a partial criticism especially from a history student. It seems to me that this writer had a misconstrued understanding of what the Arabs were trying to say and it was poorly written as the criticized opinion, with one important difference: "the guest opinion was written by a foreign student and one should not forget that English is not their native language. Writing well is difficult for us! Maybe instead of arguing a poor choice of words the writer (Dec. 11) should have defined facism. (Maybe he did not know either!) Facism is (after Webster) a political philosophy, movement or regime that exalts nation and race and stands for a centralized autocratic government by a dictatorial leader, severe economical and social regimentation and forcible suppression and opposition.

As a foreign student from a democratic country, I observe how the majority of the young people in America take for granted the many freedoms they have and cannot fully understand how it is living in a non-democratic country. It is time that people open their eyes and their minds to other countries, and races and not hold the belief that the "American way of life is the only way of life!"

OASN did not rebuke the Jews. They only pointed out the fact that the Jews made a bigger issue than other persecuted people of World War II. If one examines the situation the Jews were in at that period of time one would feel justified to complain, too!

By the way, the Palestinian question cannot be simplified, it can only be clarified! The passage "kind of dummy" shows

me how little understanding this student has of history. The quote "the appropriate noises are coming out of his larynx, but his brain is not involved as it would be if he were choosing his words for himself" refers to how masses of people may follow a cause or idea with enthusiasm but without seeing the negative points which might result.

In the circumstance of Hitler and Germany, this is true, but the situation of the Palestinians is definitely a different matter.

Palestinians were watching their lands taken from them by force by the British mandate (prior to 1948) and given to Israeli settlers who have homelands outside Palestine but chose to take others. The British were helping the Israelis but were crucifying the Arabs. In 1948, the British left Palestine when they were quite positive that the Israelis are armed enough to establish their own country. The Israelis did not only establish their own country but kicked 80 percent of the Palestinians outside the "new state". The Palestinians want to go back to their homeland, what will they do if Israel did not give them this right since 1948?

However, I agree a mass of people may use words or expressions (like facism) they may not know the meaning of, because they are told or believed it will bring about the "change" or "improvement" they want in their own way of life.

I believe the Palestinians have the right to "get

Continued on Page 5