

Daily  
**Nebraskan**  
Editorial Board  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Eric Pfanner, Editor, 472-1766  
Victoria Ayotte, Managing Editor  
Darcie Wiegert, Associate News Editor  
Diane Brayton, Associate News Editor  
Jana Pedersen, Wire Editor  
Emily Rosenbaum, Copy Desk Chief  
Lisa Donovan, Editorial Page Editor

## Quibbles and bits

### Private donation could be better used

Maybe Tom Osborne could reline his pockets. Nebraska's football coach will receive 5-percent interest from a \$250,000 endowment fund. The 5-percent stipend -- about \$12,500 a year -- will be tacked on to Osborne's \$114,000 annual salary. Future coaches also will be eligible for the interest.

We can all rest better now, knowing that Osborne and future football coaches will live well above the poverty level.

Granted, the Gail and Dan W. Cook III Chair for Football fund is a private donation, but surely there could be better uses for the money within the athletic department -- especially because Osborne already wanted to turn down the 8-percent raise he received this summer.

### Student athletes deserve congratulations

Student athletes deserve a hearty high-five as they DARE area youngsters to stop using drugs.

More than 100 University of Nebraska-Lincoln athletes have volunteered their free time to work the Drug Abuse Resistance Education booth at the Nebraska State Fair.

It's good to see athletes take time out from their already busy schedules to help out the state's youngsters.

### Condom companies have responsibility

Sexually active college students aren't the only ones who need to be responsible. The manufacturers can be equally liable -- or so some University of Arkansas students may find out.

Apparently some of the thousands of condoms distributed in the UA student newspaper before spring break 1990 were defective.

Safetex Corp., which provided the condoms, is recalling the Saxon Ultra-Thin latex condoms it distributed between June 1989 and July 1990.

If only the company could recall all the problems the condoms caused . . .

### Fraternity charity drive makes change

The men of Sigma Chi Fraternity deserve a pat on the back. This year, the annual Sigma Chi Derby Daze charity drive has made some great advances.

While passers-by who drop change in the various jars, which have the names of UNL sororities on the front, may not notice, there's a world of difference.

Last year a sorority representative's snapshot accompanied the name of each house. No more.

So while you're walking by the north end of the Nebraska Union, drop some change in your favorite sorority's jar.

--Lisa Donovan  
for the Daily Nebraskan



## Peace deserves chance in Gulf

America's desert shield in place to protect crude oil, not sand

Saddam Hussein is not the savior of the Arab nation. He is a tyrant. He is a bully. His invasion of Kuwait was unjustified. It was wrong. But his transgressions do not justify a U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf.

Is the United States there to save democracy and protect the rights of free nations? What about stopping "unjustified aggression?"

Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have terrible human-rights records and neither is a democracy. They couldn't care less about the United States standing up for the ideals of democracy and freedom.

If unjustified aggression is the problem, why didn't the United States occupy the Gulf when Iran attacked Iraq 10 years ago? Why not invade southern Africa to handle the aggression of South Africa? Why didn't the United States take action when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan? Why not invade China? Why not invade all corners of the world experiencing "unjustified aggression?" Why not send the military into New York City?

Oil makes this latest crisis different from the examples above. The United States gets most of its oil from Saudi Arabia. Japan, a country not normally supportive of our military involvements and one of the United States' largest creditors, gets most of its oil from Kuwait.

President Bush claims that we also are keeping Saddam from invading Saudi Arabia. It never has been sufficiently proven that Saddam was planning to invade. Why didn't he take advantage of Saudi Arabia's vulnerability just before the United States moved in? He had his chance.

Consider that Saddam's primary motivation was his dispute with Kuwait over oil. Secondly, Saddam claims that Kuwait is a part of Iraq, not an independent state. It is reasonable to assume that he was not headed for Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia was not involved until the United States came into the picture.

If you are still worried about Saudi Arabia, consider this: Why not make Saudi Arabia economically worthless to Saddam? Impose sanctions on the

country. It's a small sacrifice to make for freedom.

And what about sanctions against Iraq? Bush seemed very gung-ho about sanctions. Unfortunately, we will never know if sanctions imposed without military presence would have worked. Bush never gave them a chance.

It's frightening to see how things



Eric  
Aspengren

have escalated. At first it seemed that Bush was not necessarily going to involve the U.S. military. But once we realized our foreign oil sources were threatened, his rhetoric became considerably more heated. It is easy to imagine John Wayne pounding the table, saying, "This will not stand!"

The rhetoric has gotten worse. Saddam has been compared to Hitler. Yes, his actions do vaguely resemble Hitler's actions at the beginning of World War II. But he is not Hitler. Hitler is dead. This is just propaganda used in an attempt to dehumanize him. It seems much easier to kill a modern incarnation of a Nazi than it does to kill just another soldier being used as a pawn in a game played for money and oil.

This dangerous idea of a "last resort" consistently has forced the United States into using the military. It's a self-fulfilling prophecy. From the beginning, the United States assumes military force will be needed. In the end, it has been needed.

When will our world leaders stop underestimating themselves as leaders? They are not giving themselves a chance to prove themselves by actually handling a crisis without sending in the Marines. I wonder if any of our leadership knows or cares to learn how to solve a problem diplomatically. That is a true test of leadership.

It can be a dangerous and frightening decision to make. We have gotten used to using the military. Non-vio-

lence is new, partially unexplored territory. But it has been done. Don't forget the Judeo-Christian ethic of "Thou shalt not kill." These are not vague terms. Ghandi led India to liberation from imperialist Great Britain with non-violent action. Martin Luther King Jr. helped found a movement on non-violent action. And in the end our wars have been settled with non-violent action at the treaty table.

Remember, the important words here are non-violent and action. Nobody suggests we sit down and wait for people like Saddam to take over. It is absurd to think that non-violence implies inaction.

Non-violence is the only humane course of action to take. And anyone who tells me that we cannot engage in what is considered humane activity does not understand the meaning of the word humane. They also underestimate the human race.

It has never been proved that we must solve our problems with violence. It has, however, been proved possible that we can solve them without it.

Tough decisions have to be made. We have gone too long taking the easy way out. And yes, it is the easy way out. I am not saying that our leaders don't agonize over ordering men and women into combat. But we are used to it and it seems easier than the alternative.

Men and women throughout history have been trained to kill and die. Others have been trained to order these men and women to kill and die. The use of the military has become a way of life for most of the world.

It is scary to think that there are in excess of a million Arab and U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iraq. They are ready to use tanks, machine guns, helicopters, bombs and missiles to kill each other. They are even ready to use chemical or nuclear weapons "as a last resort." This behavior has been going on since the beginning of history. It must stop sometime. If not now, when?

Eric Aspengren is a freshman philosophy and aesthetics major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

## opinion READER

### U.S. military mocked in pitiful demonstration

This letter is in response to a pitiful anti-war demonstration that I witnessed in front of the Military and Naval Sciences Building on Sept. 5.

I could not believe the lack of preparedness on the part of the demonstrators. It is shameful that people trying to get across the message, "don't kill for oil," circumvented the issue by mocking the military (they fell into a ragged formation and barked out bogus commands) and they did so in such an unorganized manner: There was only one small sign explaining the purpose of the demonstration, demonstrators stood around looking like they did not know what was going on and there were no verbal outcries supporting actions of the protestors.

In addition to this, the attempted demonstration took place in front of the Military and Naval Sciences Building -- a building filled with people least likely to hope for war because they would be the ones who who

would be fighting and dying.

Why not demonstrate to the people with the power to decide to go to war or not? The Capitol, the governor's mansion or any other government agency would be appropriate. Why anger those who may fight? Start by motivating our elected leaders.

The last disgrace that I will mention is the group attempting to sing anti-U.S. involvement chants. Some demonstrators laughed when they incorrectly recited the words. How sincere these people are about being anti-war activists -- laughing while participating in their own demonstration. If something is done, it should be done right. When our generation is blamed for being blasé about political issues, I think I'd rather be labeled as such before being labeled "a rebel without a clue."

Sandy Burnham  
sophomore  
chemistry

## letter

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.