

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

Lethal study

Research doesn't justify whale killings

By March, more than 1,000 whales will have died at the hands of the Japanese in the name of research. Defying environmentalists' protests, Japan commenced the fourth season of its research whaling program Saturday.

In the last three seasons, about 280 minke whales have died each year, and officials estimate that 300 will die by the end of this season.

The Associated Press reported that Japanese officials say whales must be killed during the research to determine accurately their age, sex, childbearing state, diet and health.

It seems ridiculous to evaluate an animal's life when it's dead, especially when protesters say non-lethal research methods, such as skin samplings and sighting studies, are just as effective.

What's more unsettling is that environmentalists have charged that this research initiative is just a cover for commercial whaling.

That charge makes sense. Commercial whaling was halted at the end of the 1986-87 season, when the International Whaling Commission placed a moratorium on commercial whaling, excluding the minke. Whales had been hunted close to extinction by that season, the same year the research program began.

Because there are 760,000 minke whales in the Antarctic and 83,000 in the North Atlantic, the whale is not on the list of endangered species.

But when 300 whales are claimed every season, those who are studying in the name of making the minke's life better may actually be putting the species closer to extinction.

—Lisa Donovan
for the Daily Nebraskan

Votes vs. outrage

Anger fades as U.S. seeks U.N. help

How quickly moral outrages fade. In June 1989, China was an outlaw in the international community after its massacre of students in Beijing's Tiananmen Square.

A year and a half later, a Chinese vice minister of trade is being invited to the United States. When he arrives next month, he will be the highest-ranking Chinese official to make an official visit since the massacre.

Meanwhile, China's foreign minister will arrive at U.N. headquarters in New York to place that country's vote on a Security Council resolution that would authorize the use of force against Iraq.

Coincidence? Think again.

The United States needs China's support, or at least its abstinence, on the Security Council vote. As one of the five permanent members of the council — along with the United States, France, England and the Soviet Union — China has the power to block any resolution the other members endorse.

Until recently, China had been the only member of the Security Council opposed to a measure that would allow military action to drive Iraq out of Kuwait.

But in the last few days, news reports have indicated that China might abstain from the vote or even support the United States.

In his attempt to legitimize his actions in the Persian Gulf, President Bush has sought step-by-step approval from the United Nations. Later this week, the Security Council is expected to consider granting Bush the use of force, if Iraq hasn't pulled out of Kuwait by Jan. 1.

Throughout the Middle East crisis, Bush has maintained that the U.S. quarrel with Iraq is moral, not economic. At times he even has compared Iraqi President Saddam Hussein to Adolf Hitler.

In 1989, world leaders used similar language to denounce the Chinese for the Tiananmen massacre.

Apparently Bush hopes that those memories have faded. In this new international confrontation, he needs all the help he can get — even if it means dealing with a nation that not long ago found itself in Iraq's shoes.

—Eric Pfanner
for the Daily Nebraskan



Sorry, T.O., but it's time to go

NU is doomed to 9 wins a season unless changes are made

As sure as the sun rises in the east and tuition costs climb in the fall, the Cornhusker football team will lose to at least a couple ranked teams every season.

With the 45-10 butt-kicking at the hands of Oklahoma Friday, one thing has become clear to anyone who has the logic to recognize a problem: It's time for a change in the Nebraska Athletic Department.

Tom Osborne has got to go. It's that simple.

Usually, such a statement brings one major defense from diehard Cornhusker fans: "Tom Osborne is the winningest college football coach around. A lot of teams would love to have him..."

Osborne is the winningest Division I college football coach in the world, with an .813 career winning percentage. He has never fielded a team that won fewer than eight games, and he is respected throughout the land as a coach who runs a "clean program," whatever that is.

But consider this: Osborne's 18-year record against teams in The Associated Press Top 20 is 39-31 — a very mediocre .557 winning percentage.

Against Top-10 teams, Osborne is a miserable 16-26, for a .380 winning percentage. More often than not, when the Huskers pick on someone their own size, they are beaten.

The Huskers haven't beaten a ranked team since 1988, and haven't won a bowl game since 1986.

Against the good opponents, there's something missing. Obviously, Osborne's success has come against patsies.

One needs to look no further than this season to see that. Nebraska played one ranked team — Colorado — and lost. Oklahoma, which three teams have beaten this season, was ranked earlier this season.

Next season, Nebraska's schedule was to include Texas, Arkansas, Washington and Arizona State. Texas and Arkansas were replaced a few years ago with Colorado State and Utah State.

Atta boy, Tom. Keep that winning percentage up there, buddy.

If next year's schedule had stood,

fans would be writing letters next year extolling the virtues of seven-win seasons. The country would laugh, but Osborne would still get his statewide praise.

Osborne is a great man whose accomplishments should be admired. He's always spoken out for what he believes to be right. But like the wing-



Chuck Green

T offense, T.O.'s day as a coach has come and gone.

He'll make a great athletic director.

Naturally, this column, like most criticism of the program, will fall on deaf ears and blind eyes. It will bring nasty letters, chuckles and curses from fans who think they know better.

But it won't bring anything else. Osborne will get his annual raise for doing nothing more than duplicating last year's record, and fans will anxiously await 1991's nine-win campaign and inevitable disappointment at the hands of better teams.

All that will change around here is the calendar.

The players aren't to blame. Teams change every year. But there's one constant: the coaching staff.

Last spring, I wrote a column predicting that Nebraska would finish third in the Big Eight with two losses. Osborne criticized me after practice that day. You're right, Tom... I just don't know what I'm talking about.

Well, here's something else I don't know about: The football program needs a good house cleaning.

Not long ago, Nebraska was at the pinnacle of the college football world. Now, Nebraska is just another nine-win team. There are 12 of them in the latest Associated Press poll, and a few more that aren't even ranked.

There are high school coaches in the state who could take over Nebraska's facilities, roster and resources and churn out eight or nine wins a season against undermanned, over-matched opponents like Utah State,

Oregon State, Minnesota, Colorado State and most of the Big Eight.

When Devaney stepped down as Nebraska's coach in 1972, people wondered how he'd ever be replaced. The same would hold true with Osborne.

But like Devaney, he can be replaced. After a season or two, the concern would evaporate like a national championship dream.

I don't claim to be a better coach than Osborne. But there are a lot of coaches who are. A nationwide search would turn up some big names who would give anything to coach at Nebraska.

A search also would turn up some young, vibrant coaches with dreams as vast as the Sandhills, who would adapt a progressive strategy. Imagine, passes on first down, or on short-yardage situations. The run-and-shoot, maybe?

Coaches like Wisconsin's Barry Alvarez, North Carolina State's Dick Sheridan and Fresno State's Jim Sweeney come to mind.

On Friday, Oklahoma linebacker Reggie Barnes said Nebraska was not too difficult to stop, because all the Huskers could do was run.

"After we shut that down, they didn't have anything to fall back on," he said.

Against quality teams, Nebraska's outdated and predictable offense sputters like an antique car after the fall's first frost.

Nebraska will lose to Georgia Tech in the Citrus Bowl on New Year's Day. When that happens, the Huskers may finish unranked for the first time since 1968.

If Nebraska football fans are content with nine wins a year, then T.O. is your man. If, however, undefeated national championship seasons and national respect are at the top of the ol' holiday wish list, then let the search begin.

But if Osborne sticks around, which he undoubtedly will, Husker fans will again have to wait 'til next year... and the next... and the next...

Green is a news-editorial major and a Daily Nebraskan night news editor, sports reporter and columnist.

editorial policy

Signed staff editorials represent the official policy of the Fall 1990 Daily Nebraskan. Policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. Its members are: Eric Pfanner, editor; Lisa Donovan, editorial page editor;

Victoria Ayotte, managing editor; Diane Brayton, associate news editor; Darcie Wiegert, associate news editor; Emily Rosenbaum, copy desk chief; Jana Pedersen, wire editor.

Editorials do not necessarily re-

flect the views of the university, its employees, the students or the NU Board of Regents.

According to policy set by the regents, responsibility for the editorial