

Daily
Nebraskan

Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Amy Edwards, Editor, 472-1766
Bob Nelson, Editorial Page Editor
Ryan Steeves, Managing Editor
Eric Pfanner, Associate News Editor
Lisa Donovan, Associate News Editor
Brandon Loomis, Wire Editor
Jana Pedersen, Night News Editor

Review not enough

Required multi-cultural course needed

Two blatantly racial incidents at the University of Texas this month galvanized more than 1,000 students and Austin residents to march on the Texas Supreme Court and a fraternity, according to the Daily Texan.

Both incidents took place during the same weekend. One involved a car in front of UT's Delta Tau Delta house being painted with racial epithets and demolished.

The other involved members of UT's Phi Gamma Delta fraternity selling T-shirts on campus featuring a caricature of "Sambo" on the body of professional basketball player Michael Jordan.

The "Sambo" caricature was banned from the fraternity's shirts in 1987.

Luckily the march and rally were peaceful. The Texan reported that violence almost erupted once but was prevented by march organizers.

The incidents and ensuing rally and march caused UT President William Cunningham to suspend both fraternities pending a "thorough review," according to the Texan.

The Texan reported that Cunningham issued a prepared statement saying that "acts of racial harassment will not be tolerated at the University of Texas at Austin."

They weren't tolerated, but they weren't prevented either.

The University of Texas' problems are a mirror of hundreds of others at universities across the country. Most of them are not as blatant, but they do exist, as was evident at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln earlier this semester.

University officials everywhere are racking their brains for solutions and mumbling that something will be done, pending "thorough review."

It should be obvious that nothing is being done fast enough to ward off future problems.

Touting cultural plurality, putting together a fighting words policy and sending selected students to retreats is not enough.

What this university -- and others -- needs is a required freshman level course that will broaden students' perspectives on different lifestyles and cultures.

It also needs a deeper base of minority and women professors, and programs that are serious about attracting and keeping minority students.

Officials can talk all they want about heightening awareness and respect, and students can be proud of the few who stand up to combat racism.

But unless that talk turns into workable education programs, it won't make any difference to the people who are too ignorant to listen.

-- Amy Edwards
for the Daily Nebraskan

Writer's intent not alienation

Obviously, from the amount of controversy concerning my essay, it requires an explanation. It was not my intent to alienate women or, for that matter, men. I was merely pointing out some of the possible scenarios that might be detrimental to the armed forces if women were allowed in combat roles. There are certain benefits that would be present if women were allowed in combat, but that is for another essay.

In paragraph one, I point out that "our country has always viewed and treated women as something less than men." This is still true, although women are being treated as equals more and more. This is still a male dominated society, so perhaps, the fault lays on the men of this nation for raising women to be soft and pretty. Also in paragraph one, I state that "there are exceptions;" there are many women out there who could do much better in combat than some men could. It is my opinion that women are capable of becoming combat qualified, look at Israel for example, but first they must convince the cadre in the military that they both want and can do it.

In the second paragraph, I state that women "must be able to perform equally to men in unmodified physical activities;" I think that this is essential not only for a feeling of equality between male and female soldiers, but also to show the "higher ups" that women can perform at male standards. It won't be easy to convince the older brass, but if the women

really want it they can do it.

Paragraph three states that "troops can always go into town and get a whore." This was not implying that all women who associate themselves with servicemen are whores or that all the soldiers become involved with that type of women. It is merely an example of a possibility, showing that there are more opportunities around than just the women in their company. For the most part, the men in the military have very high morals and hold women in high regard. The scenario I depicted in paragraph three was a "worst case" scenario that could happen. For all practical applications it probably wouldn't.

As for paragraph four and the comment I made about women being "combat ready three out of four weeks every month," I was mistaken. The fact that women can perform just as well if not better during their "week" was made quite clear to me by a pair of female Army medics. My mistake. I apologize to anyone that may have taken offense.

In conclusion, I would say that if women want to be in combat they should be given the opportunity to prove their capability by one, a standard physical fitness test for both men and women, and two, a desegregated basic training. If a woman can make it she has every right to be in combat that the man next to her does.

Joe M. Davis
sophomore
criminal justice



"(Polhill's release) has to have a reciprocity. It is not feasible that all releases be made as good will gestures..."

--Leading Shiite Moslem cleric

Dialogue--not force--must continue

Hostage release, Lithuanian crisis show need for compromise

This has been the week of the brushoff.

The Lithuanian independence movement has reached the crisis stage with the Soviet Union's blockade of supplies to the rebellious republic. The Soviet government says it won't restore the supplies until Lithuania rescinds or freezes its March 11 declaration of independence and admits it is subject to the Soviet Constitution.

Instead of succumbing to the Soviet government's demands, Lithuanian leaders responded by implementing rationing policies within the republic and halting all exports to other Soviet republics.

Lithuanian leaders defended their actions by claiming the Soviets have put them under a complete embargo, but a Soviet official denied that allegation Sunday.

So, the Soviet so-called embargo is straining Lithuanian supplies, and the Lithuanian ban on exports is damaging other Soviet republics.

The Soviet economic sanctions are meant in part to deter two other Baltic republics from proceeding with their efforts for independence. But Latvia and Estonia don't seem too intimidated. Both are going forward with their plans for secession.

With the economic sanctions not dissuading independence efforts, some Soviet leaders are talking tough. In an interview on the British Broadcasting Corporation's "Panorama" program, Mikhail Gorbachev's senior military adviser said the Soviet army won't hesitate to use force in Lithuania if Lithuanians break the law.

Well, I guess that statement just about condones any use of force in the republic since Lithuania's declaration of independence, the basis for the whole controversy, is illegal under the Soviet Constitution.

According to The Associated Press, Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis responded to the military adviser's comments by saying, "... Force is always a real threat as long as there is no willingness to use politics. If they use force in Lithu-

ania, it means they would be prepared to use force in the world."

Although I doubt that any military activity in Lithuania would foreshadow a Soviet takeover of the world, I do agree with part of Landsbergis' statement. Without politics, force is a very real threat.

The biggest part of the problem in the Soviet Union is the lack of much-needed dialogue, the lack of politics.



Jana
Pedersen

Neither Lithuania nor Moscow is willing to back down, even a little.

Lithuanian leaders have tried to open communication lines, traveling to Moscow to ask for dialogue with Gorbachev, but the Soviet leadership is unwilling to open its collective mouth unless Lithuania delays secession for at least two years.

Some compromise. Meanwhile, the United States has done its own share of brushing off, which almost extended the 39-month imprisonment of hostage Robert Polhill by pro-Iranian kidnappers in Beirut, Lebanon.

U.S. officials refused to speak to Polhill's kidnappers, saying U.S. policy forbids negotiations with hostage-takers.

Thanks to intervention by Iranian and Syrian negotiators, Polhill was freed, and it looks like the negotiators may have arranged for the release of more than one hostage. Iran clearly showed it wants improved relations with the United States.

And the United States responded by saying it wouldn't pursue any change in U.S.-Iran relations until all hostages are freed.

I agree that there should be no U.S. negotiations with hostage-takers or more hostages are bound to be taken.

But I don't agree with the decision to wait until all hostages are freed before improving U.S.-Iran relations.

With all that's happening in the Middle East, it wouldn't hurt to improve relations with any country in the area. I don't mean opening embassies or selling arms to Iran. And I don't mean compromising other Middle East relations either. But a small gesture -- even if the United States "isn't into gestures" -- couldn't hurt.

Where politics fail, force follows, as has been demonstrated by the rounding up of army deserters and the occupation of a printing plant by Soviet troops in Lithuania.

It's time U.S. officials took a lesson from the Lithuanian crisis and realized that brushing off Iran's attempts to improve relations isn't helping the hostages.

I suppose the theory is that since Iran was able to secure Polhill's freedom without U.S. support, their negotiators should be able to secure freedom for the other hostages too.

But there has been speculation that Polhill was freed because Iran offered weapons to the kidnappers. It would be foolish of the United States to expect or want Iran to hand out arms to the organizations holding the seven remaining hostages. If there is any hope for peace in the region, under-the-table arms trades must be controlled, especially to organizations that are known hostage-takers.

If the hostage-takers see that U.S.-Iran relations are improving, their excuse for taking hostages is lost. The kidnappers would have no basis for claiming to be pro-Iranian if the United States and Iran have some sort of dialogue and that dialogue is threatened by the holding of hostages.

Without such dialogue, situations in both the Baltic states and the Middle East have little chance of improvement, and Landsbergis' label of force as a real threat may be all too real.

Pedersen is a sophomore advertising major and a Daily Nebraskan night news editor and columnist.

letter

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 sub-

mit material as guest opinions. Whether material should run as a letter or guest opinion, or not to run, is left to the editor's discretion.

Letters and guest opinions sent to the newspaper become the property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned. Letters should be typewritten.

Anonymous submissions will not be considered for publication. Letters should include the author's name, year in school, major and group affiliation, if any. Requests to withhold names will not be granted.

Submit material to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.