

Editorial

Daily
Nebraskan
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

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

Penalties not harsh SMU deserved the worst

Southern Methodist University simply must be writhing — not in ecstasy but in agony, after the school's football program brought shame upon the school, the athletic department, even its community, when found guilty of violating several National Collegiate Athletic Association rules. Only, the penalties administered were not strict enough.

SMU football will be non-existent next year. The following year the team can play seven conference games, but none at home. The team is ineligible for bowl games and television privileges and was slapped with several more penalties.

The losers include the school's athletic teams. Many of these programs exist because of the revenue brought in by the football program. Sound familiar? Football is as popular in Texas as it is in Nebraska. SMU had a program that drew fans and money.

Also finding their way into the loss column are the teams SMU would have played, including the Big Eight's Oklahoma. The Sooners were scheduled to play SMU next year and the year after. The

NCAA move will force the Sooners into playing one less game or adding another at a moment's notice.

Finally, non-football weekends can't do much for the Dallas economy.

But the real loser is the university. School officials and administrators should not have let the violations occur. Most dealt with the school's booster program, including player payments. On paper, NCAA sanctions look severe. In fact, the NCAA's decision is too lenient.

Stricter enforcement is needed. Disbanding the SMU program for more than one year would have been a step in that direction. Too many times athletics are put too high on a pedestal.

Penalties more severe may have shown the rest of the country that the NCAA means business. Until then, the other athletic programs, not all, watch SMU lick its wounds and continue to play the "game."

One final note: It was interesting how the college recruiters flooded the SMU campus the day after the decision was handed down. Talk about being put on the market.



'Return of the Condom'

Prophylactics migrate from wallets to purses in AIDS '80s

One of the remarkable twists in the plot of "The Return of the Condom" is that it's making the biggest hit among women. A covering that can only be worn by men is being discussed by, marketed to and even bought by the opposite sex.

In the 1940s and '50s, this condom was part of the rite of passage of the sexually anxious male. In the 1980s, it's becoming part of the paraphernalia of the sexually anxious female. Thirty years ago, the condom made an impression in the wallets of insecure men. Today it's finding a place in the purses of nervous women. Then, it was used for birth control; now, for AIDS control.

I saw my first ad directed at women just a few months ago in Ms. magazine. The message began with a woman saying the obvious: "I never thought I'd buy a condom." She went on to describe sex these days as "a risky business" and to end with the pitch, "So why take your fears to bed?"

Since then, I have noted condoms in pastel containers bearing names that are less reminiscent of warriors and more of women's pages, e.g. Lifestyles. I have also seen the most dramatic pitch to women, saying bluntly: "I'll do a lot for love, but I'm not ready to die for it."

According to loose industry estimates, 40 percent of condoms currently are bought by women. Use some arm-chair calculations, factor in booming sales in the gay community, and it seems likely that, among heterosexuals, more women are buying condoms than men.

Does this matter to anyone but a market researcher? With the possibility of AIDS behind each new sexual encounter, we care less who buys con-

doms than that they get used. But I am still struck by the idea that, here again, women are being urged to be "responsible," women are the ones who are both self-protective and other-protective.

In the original version of "The Condom," men were more likely to be charged with birth control. If boys carried that promise of sexual adulthood in their wallet, at least adulthood was associated with responsibility. Fathers of teen-age boys, never long on intimate sexual talk, did offer one perennial and charming warning not to get some girl "knocked up."

asked women whether they were using birth control before they had sex were more caring and better prospects for the long run than those who didn't.

What then of this Ms.-directed pitch for condoms? Why has safety become more of an issue among women than men? Only women can get pregnant, but AIDS is an equal-opportunity disease. Perhaps men are greater gamblers or more afraid to appear afraid. Perhaps women simply talk more among themselves, expressing their fears and sharing advice.

Mostly, I suspect that this gap in the behavior of men and women facing the same sexual epidemic is the legacy of the past generation of change. Women have kept watch over the exigencies of their sex lives. They have been the caretakers, the calculators, of risks. They have continued this role. In this new day, so-called men's magazines still portray sex as a sport, while women's are full of messages about health.

In the final analysis, though, condoms are used by men. Even when women are persuaded or frightened into buying them, it's men who wear condoms. The man who is reluctant to protect himself and his partner is probably not — in an updated version of my sociological study — a good prospect.

At this moment, when AIDS has turned the sexual revolution upside down, one of the tricks of social policy is to get men to take the initiative again. The much-heralded "Return of the Condom" must also be a return to mutual responsibility.

© 1987, The Boston Globe Newspaper Company/Washington Post Writers Group
Goodman is a Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist for the Boston Globe.

NSSA money better spent elsewhere

UNL's membership in the Nebraska State Student Association has generated considerable debate this semester. To the uninformed, NSSA doesn't seem to be a bad thing. Perhaps it can even do us some good. Let's examine UNL's needs and how NSSA can meet them.

We can identify three interests UNL has at the unicameral this semester: student-regent vote, the recreation center and our budget. What has NSSA done, and what can NSSA do, to advance UNL's interests? After repeated badgering, NSSA's general assembly took a favorable position on the student-regent vote. But the legislation was killed in committee, 5-1-2, and it appears NSSA's help did us no good. Further, NSSA's constitution prohibits it from addressing campus issues such as the rec center or our budget. It is clear, then, that of our interests at the unicameral, NSSA does us little, if any, good.

How can UNL best represent itself? Another lobbyist — for NSSA or for

UNL wouldn't be effective. The university has several lobbyists, who do a good job of providing and explaining information. The university, however, has no grass-roots appeal. The more than \$20,000 that UNL spends on NSSA could be better spent on newsletters mailed to the parents of every student at UNL, explaining our situation and urging them to write their state senators. We also could use the funds to send ASUN officials around the state to talk to clubs and business leaders. Students speaking to citizens will be much more effective than one employee of NSSA in Lincoln.

As can be seen, the money UNL spends on NSSA can be better utilized elsewhere. With this in mind, the answer to the question of UNL's membership in NSSA becomes clear.

Doug Weems ASUN senator
Rob Mellion ASUN second-vice president
Committee for Fee Allocation chairman
Tim Geisert ASUN second-vice president

Math editorial just missed comic genius

Your editorial "Math hysteria" (DN, Feb. 23) was well-named — it was truly hysterical. Of the many jokes, I had two favorites. First, the line about "a plethora of technocrats hanging about the boardrooms of America" was most amusing. The phrase almost makes sense if you want to compare the number of technocrats to the number of journalists there. And comparing technocrats with the financial, managerial and legal types who actually overwhelm the boardrooms would have been totally without comedic value.

The second line I really loved was the one about the Chinese economy. You know, where you said that if mathematical education was really important to an economy, then the recent superiority of Chinese students

in that area already should have overcome the innate inefficiencies of their economic and political systems. I mean, if math education can't overcome a few periodic purges and rapidly industrialize the biggest agrarian economy in the world, what good is it?

You just missed making it a true classic. As you claimed that you weren't trying to prove that math isn't important, I was sure that you were about to use the line that some of your best friends know some mathematics. But keep working on it, and I'm sure that you'll find a promising career in editorial humor ahead of you.

Leo G. Chouinard II
associate professor
mathematics and statistics

Political epiphany and a dialectic in a downtown bar in the afternoon

Last week I noticed an unusual phenomenon. I saw a small, scruffy dog running down 11th Street. Cars were dodging the hairy shape, but it kept yelping and running. It wasn't after anything; it was heading straight down the street, an unlicensed dog in the left lane.

Of course, it only took a second for me to realize that this was the dying ideal. "Unlicensed dog in the left lane" is a rare breed lately. Whenever I realize these things, as a student, I make a toast to science, sociology and the new enlightenment. I went to a bar.

I walked in and the tables were

empty. The bar stools had a handful of sapiens gooped over them. There were two men, a gentleman and a sleepy-

Lee
Basham

looking woman. Two men were crushing unpoped popcorn with their fingernails — talking about their new

Detroit models, I believe. "Admit they're junk, Joe..." ". . . And if you buy one of those foreign cars, someone's gonna drop a hammer on you."

Keen analysis was needed. I stepped up and sat down. "Look, guys, if you say, 'I'll only buy your stuff, Sam,' Sam can sell you anything he wants. So Sam can either hand over a real machine or Sam can disguise junk. Which is cheaper, eh?"

The first man cut in, "So we say, 'Hey Herman, hey Chung, the real thing

See BASHAM on 5