

Editorial

Daily
Nebraskan

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeff Korbelik, Editor, 472-1766
James Rogers, Editorial Page Editor
Lise Olsen, Managing Editor
Mike Reilly, Associate News Editor
Joan Rezac, Copy Desk Chief

Risky mission

Honduras training unjustified

Sending the Nebraska Air National Guard civil-engineering unit into Honduras is unsettling, not to mention risky, dangerous and expensive.

In mid-April the Air Guard will send more than 50 men and women, age 19 to 58, whose professional skills range from farming to computer programming to a two-week training session at Palmerol Air Base in south-central Honduras.

The base is 75 miles from Nicaragua and 40 miles from El Salvador, both of which are embroiled in civil wars.

The Associated Press reported that U.S.-backed Contra rebels have staging areas along the Honduran southern border and

make frequent forays against government strongholds in Nicaragua. Although most of the security on the base is provided by the Honduran army, the U.S. Army has about 1,000 troops stationed there. That's comforting.

Guardsmen have said that training in Honduras does not worry them. They said they are training, not fighting. But of course there aren't any guarantees. There never are. No one can predict what will or could happen, only what should happen.

The Air Guard could just as easily train in the United States. Training would be cheaper, especially if they trained near Nebraska. Most of all there would be fewer risks.

Bring back Bob

Kerrey's knowledge needed at UNL

Dear Bob,
We are pleased to see the generally good response you have received from instructing a course on the Vietnam War at the University of California at Berkeley. We hear that the six-week course is very popular and you've been able to provide some valuable insight to a subject that is relatively new to university students.

We only wish that you, a former governor, would have stayed in

the state and provided UNL students with your expertise. Not only on Vietnam, but on state government or even success in the business community. We hope you consider this proposition for the future. We are also urging the administration to look at the possibility. They should have talked to you first.

Thanks for listening and keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
The Daily Nebraskan

Letters

Orr not working for family farm act

Gov. Kay Orr is in Washington, and God only knows why she is on this junket. One thing is for sure, however; Orr is not working for agriculture.

Thursday's press conference for the introduction of the Harkin-Gephardt Save the Family Farm Act had many congressmen and senators in attendance, as well as vocal farm-state governors and officials. According to a New York Times article this week, 180 farms are being lost daily, many in Nebraska.

Yes, Orr tells us that she is concerned about our agriculture and family farmers, yet she has ignored endorsing this bipartisan farm bill aimed at providing a higher farm income and a higher value of farm exports through

implementation of a popular-with-farmers supply-management program.

We all know that Orr is a fiscal conservative; so someone should tell her that government price tag would greatly decrease under the Harkin-Gephardt bill. The studies have been done, and both Republicans and Democrats see that this supply management program is workable.

The Save the Family Farm Act is a fiscally smart program desperately needed in Nebraska — so Kay, where was your voice for Nebraska?

Jerry Roemer
senior
ag honors

Harrah wrong about '60s society

I grew up in the '60s. I was six when John F. Kennedy was elected president and 16 when the "love generation" convened at Woodstock. I thought I knew what happened during that decade; that was, of course, before Scott Harrah told me what *really* happened (DN, Feb. 6). Gee whiz, did I miss something.

While I acknowledge the ongoing revivals of '60s clothing and music (I really must get my Nehru jacket out of mothballs), I don't recall that "traditionalism and post-war patriotism" were "eradicated in the '60s." (Curiously, Harrah claims that such notions are "slowly coming back." How something can be eradicated and then come back is baffling to me or to any educated reader.

All I remember is Robert Frost reading "The Gift Outright" at Kennedy's inauguration and American soldiers

dying, the Bay of Pigs and American soldiers dying, Oswald killing Kennedy and American soldiers dying, Ruby killing Oswald and American soldiers dying, James Earl Ray killing Martin Luther King, Jr., and American soldiers dying, Ohio National Guard troops killing Kent State college students and American soldiers dying, whites killing blacks and American soldiers dying.

Harrah's editorial is a jumble of disjointed, overgeneralized, predigested pap intended for an audience who he identifies as a "lost generation" (now there's an original thought). He ought to turn off his MTV and unplug his Walkman. Then he should set about to repair his most obvious deficiency: a lack of acquaintanceship with the materials. Try reading.

David M. Cicotello
teaching assistant
English



'Killing an Arab'

Anti-artistic pressure aggravates 'stupidification' of America

Part one: The gloom-and-doom British rock band The Cure writes a rather pompous little song based on the first chapter of Albert Camus' philosophic novel "The Stranger." The title of the song is taken from the central event in that chapter. It's called "Killing an Arab."

Part two: The song is discovered and aired by certain individuals who feel that killing Arabs is kind of a neat thing to do. As Robert Smith, a member of The Cure, puts it, "(Killing An Arab)" is being used increasingly by certain reactionary factions of the media, most notably by some particularly brainless and irresponsible DJs, as a part of a wave of anti-Arab feeling currently existing in some parts of America."

Part three: After complaints from Arab groups, The Cure and Elektra Records, the band's American record company, send out an open letter to AOR and college radio stations requesting that the song "Killing An Arab" be given no further airplay.

And so it goes. This little drama is a reflection in miniature of the ongoing process of the stupidification of America. We are rapidly becoming a race of educated idiots.

Our national idiocy is perhaps best demonstrated in our rapidly developing antagonism to the arts. America has always loved low art — slapstick, cartoons, trivial love songs — and that's a very positive aspect of our national character. If the American people hadn't been open to the "lower" art forms, if we hadn't been able to judge our entertainment on criteria other than technical excellence, the world would have never heard about jazz or the blues, and rock'n'roll would never have happened at all.

But now our national love of simplicity is becoming a national fanaticism for simple-mindedness. Look at tele-

vision. Look at hit movies. Look at the recording industry. Ninety-five percent of today's records are meaningless, formulated cliches. Ninety percent of the rest were recorded at least 10 years ago.

And, most tragic, the fractional percentage of the playlist that is new and meaningful is inevitably interpreted by the masses on the most superficial level.

The classic recent example of this is the adoption of Bruce Springsteen's Vietnam lament "Born in the USA" by millions as a jingoistic anthem in the tradition of Charlie Daniels' "In Amer-

ica," and Reagan's subsequent attempt to adopt Springsteen as an icon of the new right.

This principle is true even of The Cure's song, which was played predominantly by the supposedly more intellectual college and alternative stations. I don't like what The Cure and Elektra are doing about this controversy. I can't argue with it; The Cure is a British band, so they understandably don't give a rat how stupid the United States becomes, so long as their name doesn't get dragged through the dirt. And Elektra, of course, is only concerned with eliminating bad publicity and protecting the corporate coffers.

But with all due respect to The Cure, Elektra and the Arab community (which seems to have been decent about the whole thing), I hope that there are a few literate, rational DJs out there who know a little bit about The Cure and a

little bit about Camus and will still play the song, and who will then try to explain to their listeners (slowly, and in words of not more than three syllables) why killing Arabs, or killing anybody, is not such a great thing to do. I'm worried that the current solution to the controversy sets a bad precedent about giving in to pressure groups. Not, specifically, the Arab groups who protested "Killing An Arab." They had some legitimate cause for complaint, and they were quite reasonable about the solution. But there are other pressure groups in this country — book burners and fanatics whose attempts to suppress art on "moral" grounds are in reality only attempts to gain control over the minds of the population.

Perhaps even more dangerous than would-be little dictators are basically well-meaning but uneducated people like Vicki Frost, who has recently protested in U.S. courts teaching American schoolchildren about some of the world's great works of art with arguments like, "A central idea of the Renaissance was a belief in the dignity and worth of human beings. The painters of this time glorified or elevated the human form. God is to be glorified, not man."

I don't know what steps can be taken to educate a society so enamored of its own ignorance, but I am sure that it is necessary to attempt to educate the people and not to crumple hopelessly under uniformed criticism. Challenges to, and misinterpretation of, art like "Killing An Arab," which aims at significance, should be met aggressively, with conviction and solid facts. Otherwise America cannot help but become the illiterate, totalitarian "paradise" that the forces of suppression yearn for.



Chris
McCubbin

McCubbin is a senior English and philosophy major and Daily Nebraskan Diversions editor.

Government-subsidized bastardy: welfare destroys American family

Of all the harm that ill-considered liberal nostrums have done to this country, the damage caused by the federal welfare system may well be the worst. The fact that it was inflicted unintentionally, from the highest of motives, is irrelevant save as a spectacular example of how wrong-headed the pure of heart can sometimes be.

The keystone of the welfare arch is Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Like most liberal inspirations, this one began with the perception of a "need," which the expenditure of tax revenues could supposedly meet. In this case it was that of impoverished

widows, left by the premature death of their husbands to bring up minor children alone. The Tip O'Neills of the

William
A.
Rusher



world dashed to the rescue and quickly succeeded in making a bad situation infinitely worse.

As Rep. Jack Kemp has pointed out,

if you subsidize something, you get more of it. As soon as the news got around that there was cash to be had for being a single mother with minor children, the number of such mothers began to increase dramatically. I know of one girl in San Francisco who had a perfectly good job in a hotel but decided it would be more fun to raise a baby instead. So she quit her job, got herself pregnant, gave birth to the baby and settled down to raising it. Uncle Sam, through AFDC, is picking up the bills.

Far worse, however, was the impact of AFDC on many young couples strug-

See RUSHER on 5