# **opinion**

# Readers fight political apathy with letters

## Reader opposes proposed increase

I'm a working wife of a University of Nebraska-Lincoln graduate student who does not participate in many of the functions that are supported by the fees allocations.

I think the Committee for Fees

Allocation should not support funding for the Gay/Lesbian Programming Committee. I am vehemently opposed to their beliefs and think they are morally, socially and above all spiritually wrong and I am opposed to increasing fees for this

I commend Libby York, Association of Students of the University of Nebraska senator and CFA member, for representing the student body.

> Mary Gillespie Princeton, Neb.

# Student wants say in appropriations

I found the lead story in the Daily Nebraskan (Dec. 2) to be somewhat disturbing. Its headline read: "CFA urged to fund gay/lesbian programming," and concerned a Committee for Fees Allocation forum last Thursday that I was ignorant of and unable to attend. There was one quote in particular by GLPC's Chris Carroll that I took exception to.

"Students had rejected (GLPC funding) last year because of their rejection of the homosexual lifestyle, not rejection of the GLPC," Carroll said. "They're denying funding because of the morality of the issue."

The DN also paraphrased her as saying student disapproval is not

relevant to the funding decision.

This letter is not intended to lambaste the homosexual sector of the university community, although homosexuality is contrary to my Christian background and morals. I'm not going to tell them where to live and what to do. But when it comes down to where my money goes, I would like to have a voice, and I'm sure anyone else would, too.

You see, the 6.06 cents that GLPC seeks from me and every full-time UNL student through the University Programs Council fees means very little to me monetarily. I'm certain that I lose that much change every couple of days. But, morally, that money means a lot.

Those six cents would add up to \$1,600, which the GLPC would use to tell me, through programs and posters, that "being gay is OK," something with which I and quite a few other students disagree. Why should we pay to hear it? I realize that GLPC could do some good by dispelling "homophobia," but the odds are that the most violent antigays wouldn't listen to the programs anyway.

So, Carroll, I'm afraid I'll have to agree with CFA member Libby York in that "overwhelming" student disapproval for GLPC is relevant.

David Schwartz freshman civil engineering

# Reader: Educating bigots is wasteful

The Gay/Lesbian Programming Committee would like \$1,600 in student fees to educate students on the "subject of homosexuality" (Daily Nebraskan, Dec. 2). Apparently this education would be meant to rid the campus of homophobia (fear of homosexuals). But even if homophobia is "rampant," this does not justify funding.

Let's assume that every heterosexual student suffers from homophobia. Does this mean that GLPC should automatically receive student-fee money? No.

We don't allocate student fees to end students' fears of closed spaces or heights. It's unfortunate that a person has a phobia, but it is not our responsibility to rid them of it. Perhaps one could say that ridding people of the fear of closed spaces or heights has nothing to do with ridding people of homophobia because phobias such as the former affect only the fearful person while the latter affects others, too.

Homophobia does not imply that homophobic people are dangerous in any way toward homosexuals. The people who tend toward violence are called bigots. If GLPC desires to educate bigots in order to eliminate their tendency for violent behavior, then GLPC should say so. However, trying to change a bigot's behavior by educating them would be a goal that no amount of money could help accomplish. Education relies on the use of reason, which is the very thing a bigot refuses to listen to. It seems very unlikely that a bigot of college age will listen to reason now when all the previous years of school have not had an effect.

If there are other reasons why GLPC thinks it should have studentfee money, then it should state them. Asking for money for the sole purpose of educating people on homosexuality is not a justifiable reason for GLPC funding.

> Bill Bergfeld sophomore engineering

## U.S. has its reasons

**SENNETT** from Page 4

I am sure that the official story would be that the difference is one of overture. The Soviet Union has made great strides toward international cooperation under Gorbachev and fiscal policies have begun to recognize the rights and desires of Soviet citizens in unprecedented ways.

Soviet satellites feel a freedom

Soviet satellites feel a freedom to protest and suggest that they have never known before. "Glasnost" and "Peristroika" have become household words, and are the only Russian that many of us know. To refuse to play footsie with Gorby would be to discourage a trend that we should rather do all we can to encourage.

Eut why does this reasoning not apply to Arafat? From Gorbachev, we demand only movement in the right direction. From Arafat we demand total concession. One U.S. official was quoted as saying, "We will be glad to welcome Arafat to this country -- as long as he brings all the U.S. hostages with him."

Yet no one is demanding that Gorbachev's ticket be paid for by the release of all political dissidents or the legalization of solidarity in Poland or the dismantling of the Berlin Wall.

the Berlin Wall.

No. The difference is quite clear. It is one of power and imminent danger. Arafat poses no real threat to us. We can shove him around, feel self-righteous about it, and not lie awake worrying about the consequences.

Arafat has no nuclear warheads aimed at Western Europe or major

U.S. metropolitan areas. Arafat has no contracts to buy American grain. Arafat does not have the capability to wreck the U.S. economy by engaging us in a no-holds-barred arms race.

All Arafat has is a cause and a grievance -- and a right to speak. And that carried little weight in the major league game of power brokerage.

Is it not irrevocably ironic that we welcome Gorbachev during the very week that we deploy a top-secret, state-of-the-art, all-weather spy satellite over his nation? An American proverb says, "Good fences make good neighbors." An even older Arab proverb says, "Trust Allah, but tie up your camel."

The United States is making nice with Gorbachev because it must. It would be fiscal, political and international insanity to do otherwise. Sure, he is the first Soviet leader in memory to pack a plea for rationality in Superpower negotiations. But he is also the fourth Soviet head of state in the Reagan years -- and Reagan met with them all.

I do not wish to downplay either Soviet advances or Palestinian crimes. I simply wish to point out that, on the level of official rationalization, the moves of last week and this week are unquestionably inconsistent. And this was the deciding factor in my effort to form an opinion about the Arafat embargo.

Sennett is a graduate student in philosophy and is a Daily Nebraskan editorial columnist.

# Looking for a place to live? Consider the UNL Residence Halls

#### Costs:

· As little as \$9.72/day
· That's \$292 per month, including food
(and no dishes to do!!)

### Includes:

· Local telephone service · Cable TV hookups · All utilities · Weekly linen service

## Benefits:

· Flexible payment terms to accommodate special situations

· Close to classes, the library, computer centers · Some halls have on-site computer labs

· Part-time jobs available where you live

Depending on your choice of halls, single rooms may be available

For more information, visit 1006 Seaton Hall or call 472-3561

