

Editorial

New policies on parking are needed

Parking is one of those things you never worry about until you can't find a parking place. But when there are fewer parking stalls or meters than the number of drivers looking for them, parking becomes a monumental problem.

On the UNL City Campus, parking takes on such a dimension each football Saturday. When the Big Red plays at home — and 76,000 fans come to watch — parking spots are at a premium. The problem is complicated by a UNL parking policy.

Each football Saturday, the athletic department leases about 25,000 stalls from the university (at \$1 each) for various athletic booster clubs. So while members of The Husker Award Fund, The Directors' Club, The Touchdown Club and The Wheel Club zip into the lots nearest Memorial Stadium, the students and faculty members who purchased spaces in those lots get to look for parking elsewhere.

According to Capt. Kenneth Markle of the UNL police department, parking on football Saturdays has been handled as explained above for years (at least all 27 years that Markle has been at UNL). And those purchasing parking permits have been duly informed that they can't use spots they paid \$20 or \$35 for (the first price for a semester permit, the second for a year) when the Huskers play in Lincoln.

The warning is right there on Page 15 of the 1982 UNL Parking & Traffic Regulations bulletin. It reads:

"Most parking facilities are closed to regular permit holders on football Saturdays. Area 16 (just north of the Nebraska Union) is reserved for faculty and staff permit holders with Saturday morning business or class on a space available basis."

But unless you read your entire parking bulletin, including the paragraph on Page 15, you were probably surprised the first time you tried to use your lot on a Big Red Saturday.

The fact that the policy has existed for years and years doesn't make it a good one. First students and faculty members are issued parking permits for what are probably the most inconvenient lots on City Campus and then the only possible benefit of those spots — a convenient place for the games — is denied them.

Of course the \$20 or \$35 that parkers pay doesn't come near what members of the various booster clubs pay in donations. But boosters, supposedly, part with their money expecting nothing in return. Parking customers part with their money expecting a service in return — namely, use of their parking lot when they want it.

Parking problems are not, though, exclusive to football Saturday. Space is insufficient for commuting students on class days. Those who arrive early on campus for 8:30 a.m. classes, or late for afternoon classes easily can find space in the "green" lots on the perimeters of campus. But the battle for stalls between about 9:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. is fierce.

And as commuting students vie for green spaces, literally hundreds of stalls in the red (faculty/staff) parking sections are left empty.

The remedy for this problem is simple: shuffle lot assignments to provide more green spaces and less red ones.

A third campus parking problem is on R Street, between 12th and 16th streets. The street, easily the most traveled on campus, is lined with one-hour, city-monitored meters. One hour is too little meter time; it is not long enough for a student to attend more than one class or to attend meetings in the union without having to dash out to "feed the meter."

The policy on football Saturdays and the ratio of red to green lots create problems that should be considered by the UNL Parking Advisory Committee.

Parking is not a pressing problem of our day. But the unavailability of a stall you paid for — or a ticket for an expired meter — can sure ruin an otherwise good day.



NOW delegates avoid taking strong position on lesbianism

During its annual convention in Indianapolis last Sunday, the National Organization for Women elected a new president and set goals for the coming year. The main focus of future activities



Julia O'Gara

will be on corporate sex discrimination, particularly in the areas of retail trade, insurance and the textile industry.

For many, NOW has been the vanguard of the women's movement, an organization dedicated to helping all women become fully enfranchised citizens.

Well, maybe not all women — not lesbians, anyway.

Over the years, NOW has become one of the biggest political action committees in the country, and as such has amassed a considerable campaign fund somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2 million. The money will go to those candidates NOW believes best represent the interests of women.

Because the group knows it is unrealistic to expect prospective fund recipients to be in total agreement with NOW on all issues, NOW has decided it would be a mistake to require candidates to support lesbian issues as a condition of receiving NOW PAC-money.

"We have to draw the line somewhere," said Jean Starr, newly elected president of the Lincoln chapter of NOW. "We can't afford to be identified as a single-issue group; we have to be politically smart."

The refusal of the national convention delegates to take a hard-line stand on lesbian concerns is hardly surprising; lesbianism always has been a touchy

issue within the women's movement, especially for NOW.

When NOW was formed in October of 1966, its purpose was to combat sexual discrimination and bring all women into full participation in the mainstream of American society. But despite its praiseworthy statement of purpose, NOW has an unmistakable upper middle-class bias. This is probably because of the nature of the group that founded NOW, and is one of the reasons it has been often criticized as not being truly representative of the majority of American women.

The organization still suffers from the elitist image problem that started back in the early 1960s with Betty Friedan's infamous remark about the lesbian issue as a "lavender herring." Friedan, along with other well-meaning but easily excitable heterosexuals, thought lesbianism would hurt the women's movement. Indeed, the threat of being called a man-hating "women's libber" was enough to keep many "straights" from joining NOW in the early years.

But by September of 1971, during the fifth annual NOW conference in Los Angeles, the delegation came out with a resolution that was miles from its original position on the threat of the Lavender Menace. It read:

"Afraid of alienating public support, we have often treated lesbians as the step-sisters of the movement, allowed to work with us, but then expected to hide in the upstairs closet when company comes. Lesbians are now telling us that this attitude is no longer acceptable. Asking women to disguise their identities so they will not 'embarrass' the group is an intolerable form of oppression, like asking black women to join us in white face."

Continued on Page 5

Why believe the worst about Israel?

Let us return to the horrors of Sabra and Shatila, the two Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon where innocents were murdered. And regarding those horrors, for which the Israelis astoundingly are being blamed, let us raise two forbidden topics.

The first has to do with the perpetrators of these enormities. According



Ross Mackenzie

to most accounts, Israeli troops allowed members of the Christian Phalange to enter the camps for the purpose of rounding up lingering Palestinian terrorists. Survivors say the camp pogroms were carried out by individuals who wore uniforms of several Christian sects. Perhaps they were.

Perhaps they were not. Perhaps, rather, the massacres were carried out by individuals masquerading as members of the Christian Phalange, yet who in reality were not Phalangists at all. Or perhaps they were indeed Phalangists yet working in the service of someone else. Neither is an impossibility.

Those who had the most to gain politically by machine-gunning women and children in Sabra and Shatila were those who sought to discredit Israel. Surely it is not inconceivable that agents of the Palestine Liberation Organization or the Kremlin would undertake such killings if they thought they could get away with them.

The second forbidden topic is anti-Semitism.

One hears frequent admonitions these days against racism as it relates to blacks, but rarely as it relates to Jews. Yet the virulence of the hostility to Israel in Lebanon, particularly in the aftermath of Sabra and Shatila, suggests that historic venality toward Jewishness persists unabated in this supposedly enlightened time — notably in the most sophisticated quarters.

As The New Republic has noted about the parceling of guilt for the Lebanese killings, "There is a double standard here, to be sure: When Israel was not involved, comparable events in Lebanon were not even reported."

As Norman Podhoretz has noted, "A good deal of anti-Semitism, embodied in the application of a double standard to the behavior of Jews (has) surfaced in the attacks on Israel's conduct in Lebanon. The same double standard is at work (regarding blame for Sabra and Shatila) as well . . . When Christians murdered Moslems for having murdered Christians, the world immediately began denouncing the Jews who were, at the very worst, indirectly involved."

How eager we are to believe the worst about Israel. The Soviets are gassing Afghans and using slave labor on the Siberian pipeline to Europe, but the world needs "more proof." Yet for merely venturing into Lebanon against the PLO, The New York Times and The Washington Post have likened Israel to the Nazis. For a sin he did not commit,

Sabra and Shatila have made it respectable to say outrageous things about Israel — to parade a latent animus toward Jews no less morally debilitating than a hatred of blacks. In his September Commentary magazine piece, Podhoretz put it strongly but accurately when he concluded:

"I charge here that the anti-Semitic attacks on Israel which have erupted . . . are a cover for a loss of American nerve. They are a cover for acquiescence in terrorism. They are a cover for the appeasement of totalitarianism. And I accuse all those who have joined in these attacks not merely of anti-Semitism but of the broader sin of faithlessness to the interests of the United States and indeed to the values of Western civilization as a whole."

1982, Tribune Co. Syndicate, Inc.



Article objectionable

We, the interns and volunteers at the Victim/Witness Unit, object to the article in the Oct. 8 issue of the Daily Nebraskan written by Eric Peterson titled "Victim, Witnesses get support."

First, Shirley Kuhle was not interviewed. She sent two articles about the Victim/Witness Unit and its goals to the newspaper. Secondly, things were taken out of context. At no time has Kuhle stated that the "unit intervenes in the self-destructive behavior pattern of victims." Also, neither she nor the article said that "the victim may become suspicious and mistakenly recognize innocent people as the criminal."

These statements also blame the victims, something Kuhle and all of us at the Victim/Witness Unit do not knowingly do. Most people we deal with are concerned citizens who have to be able to work through their confusion, anger

and resentment. The next time Peterson writes an article, we sincerely hope he really interviews the people involved, not just makes up an interview out of articles that he reads.

Peggy Croghan and 10 others

Concert memorable

Having attended the magnificent Diana Ross concert Friday, I would like to give a word of thanks to the University Program Council. UPC deserves a standing ovation for bringing one of the foremost artists in the world of pop music to our campus.

Ross' spirited performance was a definite example of all the categories of pop music.

I am grateful for having had the opportunity to spend "an evening with Diana Ross." It was an experience I will never forget.

Eddie Burton
sophomore, marketing

Letters