

Editorial

Daily
Nebraskan

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Mike Reilly, Editor, 472-1766
Jeanne Bourne, Editorial Page Editor
Jen Deselms, Managing Editor
Mike Hooper, Associate News Editor
Scott Harrah, Night News Editor
Joan Rezac, Copy Desk Chief
Linda Hartmann, Wire Editor

A union alternative

Student center to be a welcome addition

A little entrepreneurship will go a long way this spring on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus.

David Hunter, a Lincoln developer, announced plans Monday to open a new student center in the old OMC Warehouse on 16th and W streets on campus. It will open in March, he said.

The student center will be a bright alternative for students living in the Harper/Schramm/Smith and Abel/Sandoz residence halls and Triangle fraternity. Hunter said the new student center will offer a dry-cleaning service, banking services, sundries, a copy center and casual clothing store. It also will include a food court with six restaurants.

Although officials say the new center won't be competitive with the Nebraska Union, it will still give students located several

blocks from the union a place to shop and eat.

The new center also will be a boost to the student job market. Hunter said the businesses plan to hire student employees.

Hunter said he wanted to do something "for the students." He's even having a contest to name the building. A survey of the DN staff produced several interesting names, including:

- Our hUse
- The Hall of Justice
- The New Student Union
- McUnion
- The Bill Allen Memorial Union
- The Yuppie Center
- The Tom Osborne Student Center

But no matter what you call it, the new student center will be a welcome addition to the UNL campus.

Annual snowball fights irresponsible, dangerous

For the last three years, University of Nebraska-Lincoln students could count on three things in late November and early December:

- Thanksgiving vacation;
- A loss to Oklahoma in football;
- and a snowball fight between residents in Greek houses and students in residence halls.

For children, snowball fights can be a harmless, playful pastime. For UNL students, it has evolved into a vicious, dangerous annual event.

Sunday night, about 150 UNL students caught motorists in a crossfire near 16th and Vine streets. The result: \$1,000 in damage to windows of Greek houses, residence halls and cars.

According to newspaper accounts, snowball damage has totaled \$3,500 during the last three years. Damages totaled \$500 last year and \$2,000 in 1985.

This damage comes at a time when letters pour into the Daily Nebraskan from students complaining about tuition increases, engineering surcharges and access to the new indoor practice field.

But at the same time that students ask for more and better equipment, they don't show respect for the property and equipment they already have.

There's no way to stop this immature behavior. Lincoln and UNL police have already tried to stop the fights. But it's time for UNL students to stop and think about the consequences of their actions.

Wedlock no short cut to a visa

Marriage to a foreigner for money, pity not worth the trouble

Marrying for money or sympathy can be big business, and it can break hearts as well as pocketbooks.

In an article in Monday's Daily Nebraskan, James Cole, district director for the Immigration and Naturalization Service for Nebraska and Iowa, said he thinks only a minority of resident aliens marry to get permanent resident alien cards, also known as green cards.

But I know of many cases. And there must be multitudes more the INS doesn't know about.

Motives vary, and sometimes they are honorable.

For example, I know several women who were dating Iranian men when the hostages were taken during the Iranian revolution in 1979. They probably would have married eventually, but imminent deportations sped things up considerably. They felt they were saving their husbands' lives by sparing them from having to return to a war-torn country.

In Monday's article, one woman who married a foreigner made an important point. She said, "The law isn't always right. When I made that decision, a human life was at stake. The future of that life was more important than that law." Her husband faced deportation to Lebanon while its civil war was at its peak.

Other times the reasons seem less pressing. Some foreigners feel they have better chances for success and more job opportunities here. Marrying an American seems to be the easiest way to take advantage of these opportunities.

Sometimes foreigners make citizens believe they are serious about the marriage and then, after they get their permanent visa, they file for divorce. Some aliens believe this is the fastest, easiest way to get green cards.

But it's really not so easy.

In November 1986 Congress passed the Marriage Fraud Amendments. This makes it much more difficult to get a permanent visa.

I know couples who married and were harassed by INS before these laws were passed. First they were interrogated separately. They were

for divorce. If the foreigner paid her to marry him, he has no legal recourse to retrieve his money.

If an American man marries a foreign woman, he could be held liable for her economic support. The same goes for the foreign husband. Many states still have laws that say men are responsible for economic support and women are responsible for child care and domestic duties.

A man once offered my brother \$10,000 to marry one of his relatives from Korea. They just wanted her to become an American citizen.

I have even heard of scams where American men marry Oriental women for pay and they never meet them. The women are sent to large cities to be prostitutes.

One of the women quoted in Monday's story was asked for advice by a friend who was offered \$1,500 to marry a foreigner. She said, "Don't do it."

This is sound advice. For foreigners who are considering this alternative: You are bound to lose. You can easily lose your money and never get residency. The price you may have to pay is too high to gamble on the consequences. If things are so dangerous in your home country you could probably apply for political asylum.

For Americans: Don't sell your friendship so cheaply. At the time you may think it is noble and good, but you probably will regret it later.

Bourne is a senior news-editorial major and Daily Nebraskan editorial page editor.

Jeanne Bourne



asked questions like: What kind of underwear does their spouse wear? And what color is the kitchen phone? If the responses didn't match, they were in big trouble. They were occasionally awakened at 3 a.m. by INS officials checking to see if they lived together "as husband and wife."

These new laws force couples to go through two interviews two years apart. After the first, the alien is given a temporary visa. Then, if the couple is still together after two years, the foreigner will get a permanent visa.

It is a risky business, and the foreigner is usually the most vulnerable.

Say a couple gets married and later the woman decides not to wait for two years. She can simply leave and file

Assumptions need questioning

The recent exchanges in the Daily Nebraskan about vegetarianism and animal rights demonstrate that confronting complex questions without attempting to separate value issues from factual issues leads one into difficulty. Brent Boettcher's letter (DN, Nov. 23) is a good example of what happens when we fail to question the basic assumptions we have all grown up with. Honestly questioning our assumptions is not easy, partly because it often leads one to make decisions that require substantial changes in the activities we take for granted.

I have been a vegetarian of one sort or another for about 16 years. My reasons have varied over time, but right now I do eat meat on very rare occasions, either out of a feeling of togetherness and friendship for friends who cook it, or out of a sense of curiosity and adventure when eat-

The difficult question, of course, is determining what is "necessary." This is where values and facts get blended into mush. Boettcher, for example, argued that animals are an important source of nutrition, and that "people who eat a balanced diet that includes meat . . . are generally healthier than those who don't." What he failed to note, however, is that a "balanced diet" does not require meat. The official "four food groups" we hear so much about don't include a "meat" group; there is a "meat or meat substitute" group. Some other countries don't even have a meat group, calling it instead a "protein" group that lists meat and dairy products at the bottom of a long list of protein-rich food. More-than-adequate protein can come from a bean-nut-grain-based diet, as thousands of years of experience in the soy-based Asian countries make clear. People who also eat dairy products are in no danger of suffering from lack of protein. To argue that we need a meat-based diet for health reasons is simply inaccurate.

Also false is the notion that humans are "natural" meat-eaters, at the "top" of the food chain. Many anthropologists have demonstrated that our so-called hunter-gatherer ancestors most likely were in fact gatherer-hunters for whom meat was only an occasional treat. And although our digestive system handles meat well enough, it certainly doesn't require it. A reasonable argument can be made that our digestive system has more in common with the digestive systems of vegetarian animals than with carnivorous ones; our closest relatives, the apes, are primarily vegetarian. There is, of course, nothing natural about over-crowded, force-fed conditions typical of American meat production.

In a world where massive numbers of people are hungry, our own protein-wasteful ways are hard to justify. More than half the harvested acreage in this country is used to feed animals. The amount of grain that goes into a cow to produce one hamburger could instead directly feed more than a dozen people. There is more than enough protein in the world to feed

everyone right now, except for two factors: political and profit-motivated distribution problems, and the use of protein to feed animals rather than people. Boettcher's argument that meat is necessary to prevent mass starvation is exactly the opposite of the truth, as books like "Food First" by Frances Moore Lappe and Joseph Collins make clear in abundant detail. The United States actually imports more protein than it exports, mostly to feed animals. Our meat-eating directly robs the Third World of its own scarce resources. Although Boettcher has a point about the disruptive short-term economic effects of a switch to a meatless society, he overstates his case.

In looking at the somewhat different issue of the use of animals for research, greater effort to separate values and facts again would be useful. I respect those who argue that humans have no right to maim and kill animals for any purpose at all, but I am selfish enough to allow for some life-saving research when no alternative is possible. I think the point to focus on, however, is that much research that kills or mistreats animals can be done in other ways. These other ways may be more expensive or less convenient, but expense and convenience do not justify routine killing. Neither do many "educational" dissections by bored biology students, nor many repetitive animal-killing research projects by tenure-seeking professors. Among the most unjustifiable reasons for mass animal blinding and killing is the safety testing of cosmetics. I can accept the death of animals to save human life, but I find it hard to accept those deaths simply in order to test another brand of eye shadow.

Although it is in our routine, everyday activities that we actually have the most impact on the rest of the world, I do realize that our eating habits generally seem somewhat removed from notions of an animal's rights or the plight of the hungry.

Dennis Fox
research associate
law/psychology

Letters

Senators aren't elected to find other jobs

At an annual salary of \$76,000 plus expense accounts, adequate compensation and benefits should not be a factor in attracting the finest and most qualified candidates for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's position as head lobbyist, contrary to the issue of faculty salaries facing UNL.

University of Nebraska President Ronald Roskens is scheduled today to announce the appointment of a vice president of university relations as UNL's chief liaison with the state government and the Legislature. Although declining to comment on the five candidates and their credentials for the post, state Sens. Pat Morehead and Lee Rupp have announced they

are two of the five finalists in contention for the position.

Prior to its amendment in 1968, the Nebraska Constitution prohibited a state senator from accepting such a position prior to a one-year absence from the Legislature due to a presumed conflict of interest. State senators should not be encouraged or allowed to pursue a tax-supported influential position under the pretense of serving their constituency. We do not elect our senators to assist them in "job hunting" at the taxpayer's expense, only to have them resign one year into office and leave their districts without elected representation for the balance of their terms.

Moreover, the serious issues facing the university on appropriations may well be overshadowed by allowing a senator to resign to assume the vice president's position. President Roskens would be ill-advised to appoint Rupp or Morehead in the face of a presumptive conflict of interest controversy that will compromise the focus from the real issues facing the university in the next legislative session.

John R. Linn
Lincoln

Guest Opinion

ing in restaurants serving exotic foods I have never tasted. I suppose this makes me suspect in the eyes of those who never make exceptions, but given my reasons for not eating meat, I don't look at it as an all-or-nothing decision. I do think that drastically cutting down on society's use of animals would have a number of positive effects, for us as well as for the animals.

People become vegetarians for many reasons, ranging from an emotional reaction from visiting a slaughterhouse to a doctor's orders or a search for less-expensive food. Perhaps the most fundamental reason is a belief that killing animals is as wrong as killing people. For some, this comes out of deep religious roots. For others, it's a result of a non-religious moral view holding that animals, too, have a right to life. This view is clearly in contrast to Boettcher's notion that animals can be killed because they can't think. My own original decision to stop eating meat came during the Vietnam War, when killing of all kinds seemed pointless. I'm no longer a pacifist, however.

Letter Policy

Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space available. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit all material submitted.

Readers also are welcome to submit material as guest opinions.