

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

Up in smoke?

EPA members' ties may bias results

A new Environmental Protection Agency panel is about to begin studying the health risks of secondhand smoke, but the group's composition leads to questions about its ability to study the issue objectively.

Seven of the 16 panel members have ties to the tobacco industry.

Maybe "protection" should be taken out of the EPA's name. The panel isn't doing an honest job protecting the environment if almost one-half its members are potentially biased.

Six members of the panel have connections with the Center for Indoor Air Research, which is financed by some of the world's biggest tobacco companies: Philip Morris, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. and Lorillard Corp.

A seventh member was appointed with the recommendation of the Philip Morris company.

That leaves nine members who are actually impartial enough to review the scientific accuracy and objectivity of two upcoming EPA reports on the health effects of passive smoke.

The other seven panel members may not have unethical intentions, but their ties to the tobacco industry leave doubts about their objectivity.

This way, the panel's discussions could sound a lot like a criminal standing trial with a jury full of family members. When it hits so close to home, it's difficult to be fair.

What's ironic is that just a month ago, the author of a report on secondhand smoke was dismissed from the panel because the tobacco industry lobbied to get rid of him. Industry leaders thought Dr. David Burns might be biased because he was the author of a U.S. Surgeon General's report on passive smoking.

But there are no cries of injustice from the tobacco industry now.

The EPA should start from scratch and form a new panel. The controversy surrounding the current group of panelists will only hurt the credibility of secondhand smoke research.

While it is good to appoint qualified panelists with knowledge of their subject, the EPA could find researchers and scientists who have no ties to the tobacco industry or even those with no connections to anti-smoking efforts.

If the EPA truly wants to learn about secondhand smoke, it should ask the experts who have studied the effects of passive smoke, not officials with ties to those who create the smoke.

— Lisa Donovan
for the Daily Nebraskan

10,000 RUBLES. IT'S FROM MOSCOW... IN EXCHANGE FOR AN AMOUNT OF GRAIN OF EQUAL VALUE ... SO I'M GIVING IT TO THEM.



SHELTON 01/13/90
Daily
Nebraskan

Arizona voters should apologize

Entire state will suffer because holiday referendum lacked support

Although Martin Luther King Jr. was killed by an assassin's bullet 22 1/2 years ago, some people are still taking shots at him.

But these shots dig deeper than bullets, and for many, they hurt even more.

Arizona has been the target of national criticism since Tuesday, when the state's voters rejected by a 51-49 margin a referendum that would have created a paid state holiday honoring the late civil rights leader.

The referendum, Proposal 302, would have allowed for a paid state holiday known as Civil Rights Day, and would not have affected any other paid holidays.

Terry Trost, vice president and chief economist of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, said the input he received from state voters was that the proposal was leading in the polls — until the National Football League issued a warning two days before election day.

Paul Tagliabue, commissioner of the NFL, had said that if the legislation was not passed this year — it had failed several times before — he would recommend that the league's team owners consider moving the 1993 Super Bowl, which is scheduled to be played at Sun Devil Stadium in Tempe, Ariz.

The proposal was defeated, and Tagliabue's recommendation came the next day.

If 21 of the 28 owners vote affirmative on such action, the Grand Canyon State can say bye-bye to Super Bowl XXVII.

Trost said the reason the proposal failed was that voters took offense at the warning.

"Nobody likes to be threatened," Trost said. "Especially when the threats come from the outside."

That's true. But if Arizona voters are swayed in their political thinking that much by a second-grade threat, their hearts weren't in it anyway.

If the Super Bowl is moved out of Arizona, a lot of revenue will be lost. The state might as well bid farewell to much of the respect the rest of the country has given them in the past, too — it's gone already.

This past weekend, the criticism took a new turn.

On Sunday, the NCAA Postseason Football Committee authorized Fiesta Bowl officials to move the game to a site outside Arizona, where it has been played since its conception in 1971.

The likely site would have been San Diego, but Fiesta Bowl president Larry Gunning announced Monday that the game would be played in

Tempe, Ariz.

Arizona dodged a financial bullet.

Earlier last week, the Fiesta Bowl committee made it known that Virginia, the former top-ranked team in the nation, would be the top candidate for the Fiesta Bowl, with an opponent to be named later. Although formal bowl invitations cannot be extended or accepted until Nov. 24, the deal was all but set.

But after the King referendum was voted down, Virginia athletic direc-



Chuck
Green

tor Jim Copeland told The Associated Press he wasn't sure if the Cavaliers would accept an invitation.

"It (the Fiesta Bowl) has been an option we've considered all along, but it's a real difficulty working through that (the vote), and I'm not sure we've resolved it yet," Copeland said.

That statement carries a lot of weight, especially considering that Virginia's team roster is loaded with the sons of some of the nation's best-known people, including Ron Pete, son of pro golfer Calvin Pete, Scott Griese, whose father was former Miami all-pro quarterback Bob Griese, and Derek Dooley, son of University of Georgia athletic director Vince Dooley.

Another is Yusuf Jackson, the son of civil rights leader and perennial presidential candidate Jesse Jackson.

He and another player, defensive back Tony Covington, said they would rather stay home from the bowl trip than play in a state that dishonored King.

It's now become clear that the Cavaliers are not at all interested in spending their winter break in Tempe. Virginia is now rumored to be headed for the Sugar Bowl to face the Southeastern Conference champion, which probably will be Tennessee.

Don Meyers, a Fiesta Bowl official, said he thought the problem was damaging to college football.

"It is time for someone in Arizona to step forward and say, 'We're going to resolve this issue, and we're going to resolve it now,'" he told AP.

Amen.

What's beyond a lot of people, though, is why there's a problem at all.

Someone would be hard-pressed to explain why residents of Arizona wouldn't want to honor the greatest civil rights activist this country has

ever known. It would be even harder to unravel the mystery behind not wanting another paid holiday.

But the whole state of Arizona can't be chastised for the ignorance of some of its voters. After all, 49 percent of registered voters supported the holiday.

Unfortunately, the entire state will suffer socially, economically and governmentally.

Although the state will keep its Fiesta Bowl this year, the '93 Super Bowl still is up in the air, and probably will be for a long time.

But the choice should be clear: Move the Super Bowl to another site.

There obviously are people in Arizona who don't respect King, for whatever reason. That's their choice. But in 1990, it's a poor choice. And the reasoning is unfathomable.

While most of the world's population — not the least of which, many Americans — clamor for sanctions and other actions against South Africa for its apartheid policy, the same behavior is taking place right in our backyard.

What's good for South Africa is good for Arizona. Stupidity and unfamiliarity has to be dealt with everywhere.

Although I've never been a big fan of mixing politics with sports, this is one case in which it should. Human dignity is at stake.

There is already debate about where to play the '93 Super Bowl if it is moved from Sun Devil Stadium. I have a suggestion: Play the game at Legion Field in Birmingham, Ala. — the city in which King became famous.

Playing the game there would send a message across the world, and the black players who make up the majority of the NFL rosters probably wouldn't hesitate to vote to move the game there.

Arizona voters owe black America an apology. They also owe their fellow state citizens an apology for lost revenue. They owe the whole world an apology for their ignorance.

Most of all, they owe Dr. King the honor he deserves.

The world continues to be trapped in a chokehold of bigotry, whether it is realized or not. If the problems can't be solved in Arizona, they sure can't be solved in South Africa, or anywhere else.

Only when such problems are recognized and solved will the world be free — at last.

Green is a news-editorial major and is a DN night news editor, sportswriter and columnist.

opinion READER

Reader embarrassed by fans' rude behavior

My family has season tickets to the women's volleyball games. My three young children really enjoy the games. However, at the Colorado vs. Nebraska game a group of inconsiderate male students entered the NU Coliseum about halfway through the match. Rather than taking seats, they took standing positions (of course) on the floor, blocking the east exit. Unfortunately for us, our seats were on the front row immediately adjacent to them.

Besides creating a fire hazard by blocking the exit, these students proceeded to ruin the game for those around them. They yelled insults at the members of the Colorado team, who were standing right in front of them. They booed every call by the officials, even though all the calls were correct. They did not cheer for the Nebraska team, they only cheered for themselves. Every time one of them did something immature, the rest would all laugh and applaud. The more outrageously stupid the act, the more the person was rewarded by his companions. It was downright em-

barrassing. They even jeered at the pep band, who were cheering for the team. My children were exposed to words they have never heard before, but worse than that, they were exposed to disrespectful and disgraceful behavior by persons who should have known better.

That evening, I gained an appreciation for the fans who sit near those who have been ejected from recent games. No one has an inalienable "right" to ruin a game for someone else. It is not a question of school spirit, it is a question of respect for the rights of others to enjoy the game. Those who attempt to justify such behavior in the name of "school spirit" apparently have not sat near them at a game. Such individuals have less school spirit than anyone else in the stands. They don't care about the game or the team, only about their own diseased egos.

Irv Nelson
graduate student
accounting