

Editorial

'Market place of ideas' threatened by biased group

Accuracy in Academia, a fledgling group trying to expose "inaccuracy" and "liberal bias" in higher education, threatens intellectual freedom in U.S. colleges and universities.

The watchdog group, based in Washington, D.C., asks students to monitor their professor's lectures and report any inaccurate or "highly questionable" statements, according to the Nov. 27 Chronicle of Higher Education.

The group's actions are reminiscent of the "Red scare," started by the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy during his 1950s hunt for Communists.

The classroom is supposed to be a learning place, where professors present different sides of issues and new opinions, controversial and traditional.

Most students attend classes to hear lectures, which are based on years of accumulated knowledge. The AIA could cause professors to abandon their experiences and simply read from a textbook.

Faculty members should introduce students to new ideas and theories, not discouraged from testing new ideas because of conservative spies.

If a course deals with controversial subjects, professors should make their opinions known before the lecture begins so students can distinguish between facts and opinion. Professors also must not forget their duty to represent both sides of issues in their lectures.

Professors should be free to express all opinions without fear of being persecuted. But by its nature, AIA could limit the introduction and discussion of controversial ideas.

The group already has targeted an Arizona State University professor for his anti-nuclear views, according to an article in the Sunday Journal-Star. The 52-year-old associate professor says he has received telephone threats and verbal harassment.

The AIA lacks complete backing — it has only a \$50,000 budget and one full-time staff member. But if the group prospers, it could become a threat to higher education.

Faculty members deserve to be judged by their peers — not by a one-man judge and jury looking for liberals.

Another problem with the group is that it seeks predominantly liberal bias. The group perhaps could be commended if it was monitoring the quality of education and looking for bias and inaccuracy in all areas.

Currently, UNL professors have not been bothered by the AIA. But students and faculty should realize that the group appears to be advocating "Conformity in Academia," not Accuracy in Academia.



People pawns in state lottery

Bill Watson gets a lot of attention these days.

Not long ago he was an Omaha fireman, pulling down workaday wages. Then he won the Iowa Lottery's \$4 million jackpot. He quit his job, and now everyone wants to know what he's going to do with the money.



Chris Welsch

Lottery winners always get a lot of press. It makes sense; you win the lottery and you win the American Dream the easy way, like a Horatio Alger story without the work. Almost everyone fantasizes about what it would be like to have a cool million, or in Watson's case, a cool \$4 million.

The idea of a state lottery has been bounced around the Legislature recently. Sen. John DeCamp of Neligh is certain to play an instrumental part in pushing for a lottery in January's regular session. The state needs money, and lotteries bring in money. It is, however, a rotten idea.

Watson's story is the happy one, and the one we hear about, but thousands of wishers paid for his dream.

For every Watson, there are thousands of Mary Smiths and John Henrys who spend part of their meager salaries or welfare benefits for lottery tickets in hopes of tagging on to a chunk of the American Dream, which is pretty hard to come by these days.

Gov. Bob Kerrey spoke out against a lottery because he said it encourages people not to work. The idea is destructive to the work ethic, but it's worse because it plays on the hopes of the poor and bleeds the very segment of the economy that needs its income the most.

The number of rich people who play lotteries is incidental. The poor play, and the poor pay.

The same is true of the horse tracks in Nebraska. They also turn a pretty penny by exploiting one of humankind's eternal qualities and curses: hope.

The people at the tracks willingly throw away their money on the odd chance that they'll pick up a few more bucks than they came in with. By and large, the people I've seen at Nebraska's race tracks are not the Stuarts or

the Theisens, unless they are in the box seats. The bulk of the gamblers are average, poor to middle-class people.

You can say, "But they throw away their money willingly — no one is making them bet." You're right in part, but there are compulsive gamblers, and there are a lot of stupid people waiting for someone to fleece them.

I can take or leave the tracks. Horse races are entertaining, and they are private enterprise.

But when the government wants to set up a gambling operation, it's plain wrong. The state is here to protect and serve the people, not to make money off its constituents' weaknesses.

If the state needs money, there are better, more legitimate ways to get it. One is to raise the income tax again. Another would be a luxury tax that would hit the state's rich, who can better afford to pay.

I hope the legislators resist the lottery temptation. State-run gambling is not in the best interest of Nebraskans.

Bill Watson, who got back from a Hawaiian vacation last week, might beg to differ.

Welsch is a UNL senior English and journalism major and a Daily Nebraskan copy desk chief.

'Policy' instead of thought can kill

If you want to know what policy is, try asking a waiter why you can't substitute rice for mashed potatoes. The answer is policy. If you still don't know what policy is, ask the parking attendant why you can't make a claim for damages after you have left the lot. The answer once again is policy. It's another term for not thinking.

Policy in one of its many guises is responsible for the death of more than 50 passengers aboard Egyptair 648. The policy in question is the one that holds that you never negotiate and positively never acquiesce to the demands of terrorists. They are, in the words of Secretary of State George Shultz, not "worth the time of day. They're not even people, doing what they're doing."



Richard Cohen

Shultz made those remarks before Egyptian commandos attempted a rescue that, it now appears clear, was doomed from the very start. But even after the results were in, the United States, adhering to policy, commended Egypt for taking action. Never mind that more than 50 passengers were killed. Never mind that it could be argued that the policy of withholding fuel from the plane and keeping it in Malta had totally backfired. Everyone was congratulated. They had stuck to policy.

The hijacking of the Egyptian air-

liner was a particularly nasty terrorist incident. It seems to have been led by a madman who, according to witnesses, danced in the aisles and cracked jokes after executing passengers. Neither he nor his colleagues ever enunciated their demands, aside from demanding that the plane be refueled, and they were eclectically and somewhat contradictorily armed — small caliber pistols and hand grenades. The former were sometimes inadequate for up-close executions; the latter were more than adequate to kill many people.

It goes without saying that it is always easier to second-guess than to guess — to analyze with all the facts at your disposal instead of making a decision in the midst of terrible confusion. The latter, of course, is what Egyptian, Maltese and, maybe, U.S. officials had to do. None of them wanted things to turn out the way they did. Egypt can hardly take pride in an operation in which its soldiers reportedly killed some of the very people they were supposed to rescue.

But having said all that, it nevertheless is clear that a kind of mindless policy is being substituted for some hard thinking. The policy holds that you never negotiate with terrorists and, if possible, you kill them instead. The idea, besides having a beguiling simplicity, is to discourage other terrorist acts. The trouble with that is that terrorists are sometimes suicidal and could not care less that they have no chance of success. "Success" is martyrdom.

Even aside from that, though, is the suggestion that what fuels the policy is something besides logic — machismo and resentment. Administration spokes-

men talk of terrorism as if it were an insult to U.S. resolve, as if — in street talk — terrorists get into our face, back us down, humble an administration that once thought the problem so simple and talked about it in those terms. Only Jimmy Carter was incapable of dealing with terrorism. A new administration would banish it from the earth.

In a statement issued after the botched rescue attempt, the State Department said, "Terrorism, by its very nature, rejects the values civilized peoples hold dear." Of course, that's true. But terrorism succeeds beyond the incident in question if, in the fight against it, governments also reject "the values civilized peoples hold dear." The foremost value is the sanctity of human life, especially the life of non-combatants. If so-called rescue operations are attempted out of a sense of national pride or because everyone is simply fed up with terrorism, then like the terrorists themselves, governments have substituted other values for the one they are supposed to hold most dear.

In the last month, two different governments have moved forcibly and with great violence against terrorism. In Columbia, 52 innocent people, along with 18 M-19 guerrillas, were killed in a government attack on the Palace of Justice where hostages were being held. In Malta, more than 50 died when Egyptian commandos also answered violence with violence. In both instances, governments adhered to policy. Next time, they ought to try thinking.

©1985, Washington Post Writers Group
Cohen is an editorial columnist for the Washington Post.

The Daily Nebraskan

34 Nebraska Union
1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448

EDITOR	Vicki Ruhga, 472-1766
NEWS EDITOR	Ad Hudler
CAMPUS EDITOR	Suzanne Teten
ASSOCIATE NEWS EDITOR	Kathleen Green
EDITORIAL PAGE EDITOR	Jonathan Taylor
WIRE EDITOR	Michiela Thuman
COPY DESK CHIEFS	Lauri Hopple
	Chris Welsch
	Bob Asmussen
SPORTS EDITOR	Bill Allen
ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR	Barb Branda
WEATHER EDITOR	David Creamer
PHOTO CHIEF	Mark Davis
ASSISTANT PHOTO CHIEF	Gene Gentrup
NIGHT NEWS EDITOR	Richard Wright
ASSOCIATE NIGHT NEWS EDITORS	Michelle Kubik
	Kurt Eberhardt
	Phil Tsai
	Daniel Shattil
	Katherine Policky
ART DIRECTOR	Barb Branda
ASSISTANT ART DIRECTOR	Sandi Stuewe
GENERAL MANAGER	Mary Hupf
PRODUCTION MANAGER	Brian Heglund
ASSISTANT	Joe Thomsen
PRODUCTION MANAGER	Don Walton, 473-7301
ADVERTISING MANAGER	
ASSISTANT	
CIRCULATION MANAGER	
PUBLICATIONS BOARD CHAIRPERSON	
PROFESSIONAL ADVISER	

The Daily Nebraskan (USPS 144-080) is published by the UNL Publications Board Monday through Friday in the fall and spring semesters and Tuesdays and Fridays in the summer sessions, except during vacations. Readers are encouraged to submit story ideas and comments to the Daily Nebraskan by phoning 472-1763 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. The public also has access to the Publications Board. For information, contact Joe Thomsen.

Subscription price is \$35 for one year. Postmaster: Send address changes to the Daily Nebraskan, Nebraska Union 34, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448. Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, NE.

ALL MATERIAL COPYRIGHT 1985 DAILY NEBRASKAN