

# 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

## Beer sale needed

City can't afford to lose ESPN event

A bid for a national water-skiing competition to be at Holmes Lake Park this summer could be wiped out if the Lincoln City Council votes to ban alcohol at the event.

The City Park and Recreation Advisory Board voted Friday to support having the competition at the lake, but recommended opposing the sale of alcohol.

The event would be sponsored by Coors Beer, which wants a 10-year contract with the city. The competition would be televised by ESPN to an estimated 10 million viewers.

Chances are that Coors would not sponsor the event here if alcohol were prohibited.

About 15 people spoke at the advisory board meeting. Most were opposed to the selling of beer, according to a story in the Lincoln Journal.

Mary Jo Williams, executive director of the Lincoln Council on Alcoholism and Drugs, said, "To me it makes no sense to teach our students and children that alcohol is a drug and that they shouldn't drink, and then make an exception and allow it when it can be sold for a profit."

Yet the city already made an exception to sell alcohol at the Haymarket Festival during FarmAid III.

For special occasions like this, it is suicidal for the city not

to make an exception. Lincoln cannot afford to lose events like FarmAid and sporting events like this. The ESPN telecast would give the city some national exposure and could possibly attract even more sports events.

Michael Martin, a University of Nebraska-Lincoln senior, former NU football player and member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, said at the advisory board meeting that sports and alcohol don't mix and such messages should not be sent to young people.

The message sent to NFL football viewers is certainly confusing, as every other commercial promotes beer. Also, all the bars that advertise specials to watch games with should be stopped if this precedent is followed.

Everyone knows that NFL athletes don't drink beer right before kickoff, and the athletes participating in the ski tournament probably wouldn't either.

This event is something Lincoln can't afford to lose. The publicity and income potential are probably unmatched by any local events that are planned.

If the City Council votes against selling alcohol at this event, it should stop whining about economic development — for it would be discouraging the very economic boost it so very badly needs.

## Democrats lack future plans

Buckley says Democratic Party needs new leaders for 1988

The presidential exhibit last week (superbly handled by Tom Brokaw) reminds us of the spacelessness of the Democratic foreign policy. Consider:

The program began with Sen. Albert Gore announcing that he found it "appalling" that five men running for president on the Republican side were not supporting the proposed Intermediate Nuclear Forces treaty. Gore uses the language carefully, and one wonders how he has reasoned to the position that reservations about that treaty, reservations also held by Richard Nixon, Henry Kissinger, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Bernard Rogers, William Hyland — respectively, a

in strategic weapons: soap-bubble time. But those with kindergarten experience in foreign policy know that the only kind of cuts we are, or should be, seriously interested in — those that would deprive the Soviet Union of an effective first-strike threat either by nuclear or by conventional weapons — aren't going to happen.

At this Jesse Jackson weighs in with the astonishing intelligence that he is the most practiced man in town in the exercise of foreign policy. He said that in a circle that included the vice president, who also was the head of the CIA, ambassador to the United Nations and ambassador to China, and another who was commander of NATO, chief of staff of the White House and secretary of state. Jesse Jackson never fails to re-establish his credentials as the greatest con man in politics, whence his singular charm.

When Dukakis was asked if there were circumstances under which he would sanction a move against Nicaragua, he said yes, if Nicaragua were to be armed with offensive weapons. I think Dukakis intended us to understand him to say that if Nicaragua were apprehended, as Cuba once was, with nuclear missiles, then he would be in favor of an anti-Sandinista policy. What we are now doing, he declared, is among other things "flatly illegal."

Illegal? That's what the governor of Massachusetts said. But doesn't Article 52 of the United Nations Charter permit regional arrangements involving security, and isn't the evolution of a Warsaw Pact power in Central America something that warrants regional security arrangements? And what about the Rio Treaty signed in 1947, whose language is that "an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states?" If Nicaragua's \$2 billion of Soviet weapons is less than an aggressive arsenal, what is it correctly termed? A world's fair?

Sen. Paul Simon said that we were

preoccupied with Nicaragua, that we were paying no attention to Mexico, which is (he kindly supplied the figures) 30 times as big as Nicaragua. But to say that we are preoccupied with Nicaragua is a little like saying that the British and French in 1941 were preoccupied with Poland; or that in 1960, Nixon and Kennedy were preoccupied with Quemoy and Matsu. Nicaragua is the center of effort of the Soviet offensive in the Western Hemisphere. Why make a fuss over Gibraltar? Come to think of it, why make a fuss over Simon?

When the discussion turned to the Middle East, one discovered that the Democrats have no strategy in the Middle East, unless one calls an approval of anything Israel does a strategy, to be likened to a disapproval of anything South Africa does. But in this respect, the Democrats are not very different from the Republicans, and it is true that the Democrats can jaw for a while over the ineptness of Reagan's initiative toward Iran in 1986 — the Republicans would have done the same if it had been Carter, though ineptitude by Carter is less noticeable, for being more of the same, than ineptitude by Reagan, which is unusual.

The audience might safely conclude that the Democratic candidates live off the kind of clichés that go into the formation of things like One World, Union Now, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and the Democratic Party of 1988.

### William F. Buckley, Jr.



former president, a former secretary of state, a former United Nations ambassador, a former commander of NATO, and the editor in chief of Foreign Affairs — are reasonably dismissed as "appalling."

Now, Sen. Bob Dole is careful to say these days that he is not opposed to the INF treaty — indeed, he is "happy" that the president has agreed to sign it. And, for that matter, Gen. Alexander Haig has said that it is too late to "scuttle" the treaty. But this is not to say that either of them rejoices over its advent, or that we should do less than gravely to consider its implications.

Rep. Richard Gephardt also found it appalling that Republican candidates should have reservations about the proposed treaty, which Gov. Michael Dukakis thinks is terrific, but that we should think now quickly in terms of broader cuts — a fine idea, especially if such cuts could incorporate the renunciation of Marxism-Leninism. It is fine to talk about cuts

### Letter Policy

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor from all readers and interested others.

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.

## Readers discuss fights, farms, foreigners

### Letters

#### Police didn't do job during snowball fight

On Nov. 3, people on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus were bleeding from pellet gun wounds, windows were shattered while chunks of ice, bottles, rocks and illegal fireworks flew freely about, and cars were battered with lumber torn from wooden fences.

Two blocks away, Lincoln police sat by for hours while more than \$9,000 in property damage took place, content merely to direct traffic away from the riot. When asked why nothing was being done about the situation, one LPD officer said it was "the price they (rioters) pay for living there."

This, in my opinion, is completely and totally unacceptable. If it is not the duty of the police to preserve law and order, and to protect private property, then what is? Has our law enforcement become a force of meter maids and traffic cops, more concerned with harassing those who commit the victimless crimes of jaywalking and failure to buckle up, than in stopping mob violence in the streets?

People have said the university and Lincoln police were unable to stop the fight. Well, results are directly proportional to the effort expended, and if the paltry efforts to stop the fight that were employed by police were the

best they can do, then I think some policies and priorities are way out of line.

The efforts now being made to convince the students not to riot again are reasonable, but it is still after the fact. An inherent weakness with any police force is that help usually arrives after the fact. But the incident on Nov. 30 was not an instance of arriving after the fact, but one of standing by and, in effect, allowing violence to happen.

If destruction of private property and threat of bodily harm is the "price we have to pay" for attending this university, then I think that the tax money that we "have to pay" for non-existent police protection should be refunded and required no more.

David P. Blazek  
senior  
engineering

#### Common sense needed in planning snowball fights

It seems to me that the annual snowball fight at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln is criticized on two counts: property damage and bodily injury. I agree that these outcomes are sufficient to justify intervention, but has the arrival of our "men in blue" ever done any real good? No. If anything, they bring more people out onto the playing field. Perhaps, then, it is time for a new strategy — common sense. Have the inevitable occur off the beaten track — like in the area east of the Buck Beltzer Field. Since the only reason one would have for being there is to participate, they have im-

plicitly consented to whatever befalls them.

James F. Marquardt  
graduate student  
philosophy

#### Editorial column topic is foreign to Bourne

The recent article written by Jeanne Bourne (Daily Nebraskan, Dec. 1) about foreigners was very enlightening for me. First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Bourne for taking such pains to come up with a solution that would secure the financial future of foreigners. As a foreigner myself, I feel obligated to thank her in person for giving me such a useful tip. After all, where would a poor and ignorant foreigner be without such useful advice by someone so concerned.

Although I am deeply impressed by the flowery language and personal touches used by Bourne which give this article an authentic look, I am still unclear about the motives of the writer. Is it a warning for Americans against the possible hazards in getting involved with a foreigner? Or has it anything to do with the Foreign Awareness Week? (Not that I am aware of one.)

Bourne overlooked one major point before she sat down to write this article. She forgot that she was writing for a student newspaper and not for the New York Times. If she had spent some more time in her research she would have known that such problems do exist in big cities like New York and Chicago and are nearly non-exis-

tent in towns like Lincoln. She overlooked yet another fact that the so-called foreigners present in Lincoln are students, not people looking for work. The sole purpose of their stay here is to acquire knowledge and not a permanent visa. These students come here through legal processes, and every move they make is closely watched by International Educational Services and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

I agree with Bourne that some of these students (mostly males) do marry Americans, but not for the reasons she mentioned. To add a personal touch, two students from my country married American women, not to get a green card, but because they are in love. Both of them are happily married, and one of them is the proud father of a baby boy. I can cite many more examples like these, but that is beside the point.

The point is, unlike their counterparts in big cities foreign students have other options available to make their stay permanent besides marrying an American. At the completion of their studies they can get a training visa for a couple of years to work here. Most of the foreign students who get jobs this way are eventually sponsored by their employees to stay here permanently. So why take risks? Besides, most of the foreign students who come here eventually go back. It seems to me that Bourne has generalized the issue and has criticized the majority of foreign students, who have nothing to do with this business of acquiring permanent visas.

Another highlight of Bourne's

work of art was the constant use of the word "foreigner." It seemed to me as if she was referring to a "thing" and not people. I think a more humane presentation would have been better.

Last but not least, in this world of supply and demand, if there were no seller, there wouldn't be a buyer. So if some foreigners are willing to buy permanent visas, there are sellers who are willing to sell it. This trading is a big business in cities like New York. There are lawyers who make a living out of this, and there are women who can be justifiably classified as professional wives. But I haven't heard any such trading going on in Lincoln. So writing about this issue does not make sense, unless of course it is a part of "Foreign Awareness Week."

The people I have talked to believe that this article has pinpointed the small number of foreign students on this campus. The presence of such ideas will further widen the gap between American and foreign students. They further believe that these articles have damaged the image of foreign students at this university.

In the end, I would like to leave a bit of advice for Bourne. The next time she feels like doing something creative, try something that is not beyond her comprehension — something like writing about the fall collection of designer jeans or how to avoid date rape. I am sure readers will find such articles interesting, and there will be a tremendous increase in her fan mail.

Nadeem Khan  
senior  
management