

Daily  
Nebraskan  
University of Nebraska

Mike Reilley, Editor, 472-1766  
Diana Johnson, Editorial Page Editor  
Jen Deselms, Managing Editor  
Curt Wagner, Associate News Editor  
Scott Harrah, Night News Editor  
Joan Rezac, Copy Desk Chief  
Joel Carlson, Columnist

## Loan forgiveness

LB 1204 could remove loan pressure

Graduates who have to repay a student loan could have part of the loan forgiven under a bill introduced by state Sen. Ron Withem of Papillion.

But on the flip side of the coin, a Dec. 7 Daily Nebraskan story cited instances where students' cars, televisions and other items were repossessed because they failed to pay back their government loans.

LB1204 would create "higher education loan forgiveness," which would be administered by the Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education.

The fund would make money available for graduates who want to apply to reduce their loan. Reduction would be granted on a first-come, first-served basis. Payments would be sent directly to the lender and could not total more than half of the graduate's loan obligation.

But according to Assistant U.S. Attorney Douglas R. Semisch, 75 percent of the civil actions at his Omaha office concern student loan defaults.

The lawsuits are a result of the U.S. Justice Department's

emphasis on collecting loans, according to Christopher Hagen, U.S. Attorney and head of the U.S. Attorney's Office in Des Moines, Iowa.

The federal government sues for the amount of the promissory note signed by the student when the loan was taken out. With several repayment options available, a judgment by the government is rendered against the student. Hagen admits that most students work out some sort of payment plan with the U.S. Attorney's Office. But if the student doesn't respond, more drastic measures may be taken.

Perhaps Withem's proposal is an attempt to curtail the number of lawsuits and give some students a financial break.

Working on a first-come, first-served basis doesn't seem entirely fair, and the proposed bill also raises some questions about economic logic. But it might help some students who are unable to find substantially salaried work in their fields following graduation. It doesn't let students off the hook entirely, but it might help in extreme circumstances.

## First Amendment in jeopardy

U.S. Supreme Court's double standards may endanger learning

I shouldn't have been surprised. I should have known it's just a sign of the times. But I get frightened when the document on which life in the United States is based has been struck down and made to be nothing more than a lie.

And the U.S. Supreme Court is to blame. The Supreme Court ruled two weeks ago that high school newspapers can be censored by principals who deem certain stories unsuitable for teen-agers in their school. A Hazelwood, Mo., high school principal had refused to allow the student paper to run an article on teen pregnancies and the effects of divorce on children.

On the surface, the ruling is the opinion of the majority of the eight people on the high court right now. They call themselves justices, but what came out of this ruling wasn't necessarily justice.

Byron White, the justice chosen to write the majority opinion, wrote that high school newspapers are a "supervised learning experience for journalism students," and not a public forum like all newspapers usually are supposed to be. But what is it the students are supposed to learn? There are, of course, all the basics of journalism that can be learned in the classroom.

But are they also supposed to learn that in the United States there really is no freedom of the press as long as the Supreme Court creates double standards?

The court actually is creating a division between papers which are done for commercial profit and those which are done for the educational experience. When it comes to the news, though, there is no difference. They all report news.

The same is true with student reporters. Just because they are younger and less experienced than most journalists doesn't mean they can't report as well.

The decision even created a difference between public and private high schools, saying that private schools

would not come under the ruling. That means public schools are censored and private ones are free to print what they want.

It is bad enough when school principals have the power to kill stories they believe to be "inconsistent with its educational mission," as White said was the case in Hazelwood. What's just as bad is when the Supreme Court allows the labeling of certain publications and not of others, thus striking down freedom of the press as guaranteed in the First Amendment.

Kip  
Fry



The Court said the Hazelwood case was an issue of maintaining authority in the classroom and not one of press freedom. But when they are talking about using that authority on a newspaper, it quickly becomes one of the media.

But all this is nothing more than the veneer on the woodwork.

When you look a little deeper into the grain of the issue, you'll discover that the Supreme Court is just following President Ronald Reagan's agenda.

The Supreme Court includes two Reagan appointees — Sandra Day O'Connor and Antonin Scalia—who are more right-wing than the people they replaced. For example, Lewis Powell, former holder of the now-vacant seat on the court, was always considered a swing vote. None of Reagan's three nominees could be considered likewise. Reagan understandably wants the court to reflect himself. But he is definitely not a swing vote.

William Rehnquist, originally a

Nixon nominee, was promoted by Reagan to chief justice. Reagan could not have found a better person to fill the post to fulfill his agenda.

On top of this, if any of Reagan's three most recent infamous nominees — Robert Bork, Douglas Ginsburg and Anthony Kennedy — had been confirmed at the time of the vote, the 5-3 decision would have been even more lopsided.

It makes a little more sense now. We can expect nothing better when the court has been so influenced.

While Newsweek recently boldly declared that the 1980s and all its greed are now history, we are still under the direction of the man who led us through these times. But we must remember that these are the times in which we have seen Reagan also create divisions between rich and poor, black and white, man and woman. These are the times which have seen an explosion of the national deficit while the defense budget grows just as maniacally.

Only William Brennan, Thurgood Marshall and Harry Blackmun saw through the muck and dissented. Apparently Reagan hasn't finished his job yet.

Despite their noble intentions, these three are not enough to forestall Reagan.

Nonetheless, the Constitution doesn't really mean anything as long as the Supreme Court insists on overturning it. Reagan may not really intend to dismantle the Constitution with his selections to the court. He says he firmly believes in the freedom of the press, but he does little to uphold that pledge. He may not have actually cast one of the votes, but it was his court which voted. It was his court which denied.

And I'm not surprised.

Fry is a graduate news-editorial student and is the editor of The Sower, the Daily Nebraskan's depth supplement.

## Osborne credited; gay programs praised

### Reader says athletes 'get a free ride'

Generally, I don't write letters to the editor, but I've decided to make an exception. When I read the letter from Val Novak, a Nebraska volleyball player (Letters, Jan. 18), I felt compelled to reply.

### Letters

In her letter, Novak argued that the public is wrong for thinking that athletes get a free ride. The reason the public thinks this, though, is because it is true. To say that athletes get less than minimum wage, if one divides the total value of an athletic scholarship by the hours devoted to the given sport, is a feeble argument. If one divided the amount of tuition by the total amount of hours spent on school work, one would discover that most of us pay to go to school. What a novel concept.

If the only reason she can find for participating in volleyball is to entertain the public, and if Novak really believes that an athletic scholarship is not sufficient reimbursement for athletic participation, perhaps she should re-evaluate her commitment to that activity. Novak posed the rhetorical question, "What else would people do on Saturday afternoons than watch Nebraska football?" Not speaking for others, of course, but I have never had any difficulty finding something to do besides watch Nebraska football, especially in the middle of January.

Novak also suggested that scholarship athletes, such as herself, endure the hardships of practice and other things for paltry compensation and

simply for the entertainment of the public. I'm not convinced that her purpose is so selfless. Athletes play sports for what they get out of it — free education, glory and recognition. If the benefits to athletic participation were non-existent, so would the participation.

Greg Coffey  
senior  
speech communication

### UNL fortunate to have Osborne as head coach

I was appalled to read the Daily Nebraskan's tacky editorial regarding Tom Osborne's salary increase. Quite obviously, you have no idea of how important Osborne is to the state of Nebraska and to the university.

If it wasn't for Osborne and his assistant coaches' outstanding success, the state and the university would lose millions of dollars that the football program generates. And don't forget the football program supports other non-revenue-producing sports at the university.

Ninety-nine percent of the universities in the country would give their right eye teeth to have Osborne as their coach. We should be glad he has stayed here in Nebraska despite receiving lucrative offers to coach elsewhere.

If the editors of the DN can't give their wholehearted support to the second-winningest active coach in the country, I suggest they move to Dallas and support SMU football and learn just how good we have it here.

Rachelle Ackerman  
Milford

### Gay/lesbian committee 'cause for celebration'

The existence of a Gay/Lesbian Programming Committee as a component of Campus Activities and Programs is a cause for celebration of diversity and an exciting first step in human understanding. The travesty at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln is that this committee was purposely or inadvertently robbed of funds to provide adequate programming. The funds were to be used in co-sponsorship with two other committees were spent by these committees.

The lack of available funds for a Gay/Lesbian Programming Committee leaves it quasi-impotent. Without funding, the GLPC is hindered from expression of ideas and a creation of tolerance of dramatically stigmatized minority. So where's the beef? This is the question to ask the executive committee of the University Program Council and the Association of Students of the University of Nebraska.

It doesn't appear that student leaders who could remedy this situation have any guts.

The gay/lesbian community and GLSA have provided many, many quality programs at UNL in the past several years. Some excellent programs have included gay/lesbian concert performers, a play, Gay/Lesbian Student Month, UNL Condom Day and various educational programs.

Last year, several students, both gay and straight, fought for this committee. We were under the impression that this committee would be able to do quality programming. We were wrong. The obstacles to successful

programming are still there — lack of funds and cooperation of UPC committees in co-sponsorship.

The solution is funding of GLPC and the cooperation of ASUN and other UPC committees.

The university thinks this committee is controversial. What will they do when a Gay/Lesbian Alumni Association forms?

Rodney A. Bell II  
alumnus and former UNL GLSA  
president  
Grand Island

### Women's basketball boring, reader says

In reference to Chuck Green's column (Daily Nebraskan, Jan. 20) on women's basketball and the lack of attendance in women's sports, I have attended many Nebraska men's and women's games and found no comparison between the two.

In women's basketball, there are few really exciting moments, such as breakaway slam dunks, massive blocked shots, arms above the backboard, super quickness (Maurice Ivy is an exception), and thoroughbred speed. You are not going to see, from a fan's point of view, the same game with women as you will see with men in a comparative sport.

Simple knowledge and genetics prove women are not comparable to men in size and strength — something Tennis magazine did a story on recently.

Just ask the roughly 8,000 people who left after the Nebraska-Missouri men's game and didn't stay to watch the women's game afterward. My

guess is a majority would say the same thing: How can you compare the two games, and therefore, why stick around to watch it?

Bill Connors  
UNL alumnus

### Osborne earns credit for football recruits

After coming in from yet another frigid Nebraska day, the criticism by Daily Nebraskan sports columnist Chuck Green of Nebraska's coach Tom Osborne and his staff on every aspect of Nebraska's football program, seems especially ignorant and reveals his immaturity as a sports-writer.

Not recruiting Nebraska high school players (other than offensive linemen) is top priority on Green's agenda.

Great players such as Bret Clark, Jim Skow, Tom Rathman, Danny Noonan and all-Big Eight player Steve Forch and Keith Jones have all graced Nebraska high schools.

After 25 years in the football program, I think Osborne can evaluate a recruit better than Green can.

Overlooked by many, but not by Nebraska coaches, were Irving Fryar, Mike Rozier, Marc Munford and Neil Smith, who undoubtedly will make a fine pro player.

Give Osborne a break. Our state doesn't border Texas like Oklahoma. Nor does it have glorious beaches and warm ocean breezes like Miami. We have cornfields, Pioneers Park and a heck of a coach. Without Osborne, we'd be in serious trouble as the Kansas schools to the south of us are.

Mark Tvrdy  
Lincoln