

War followers argue issues; reader attacks DN policy

Voicing opinion anonymously student right

A recent edition of the Daily Nebraskan contained an article that, when I read it, aggravated, annoyed and angered me to no end. I regarded the opinions expressed in this article as inappropriate, incorrect, racist and totally off base. I rarely feel moved to respond to anything printed in the Daily Nebraskan, but this was the exception. In fact, I even went so far as to hike across campus to visit with the editorial staff. However, that visit proved as disturbing as the article itself — if not more so.

The editor of our college tabloid agreed that my opinions about the article were worthy of print and said he'd like to print what I had to say. However, he could not, or would not, protect my anonymity even though I felt that recriminations could result if my name was published. Apparently, the editor of the Daily Nebraskan feels that "accountability" is more important than accuracy and the right of students on this campus to express their opinions without fear of academic or social harassment.

Doesn't seem right to me . . .

Sue Kelly
senior
English

Editor's note: The Daily Nebraskan would not, could not, publish anonymous letters. It says so on page 4. In rare circumstances, the Daily Nebraskan uses anonymous sources for news articles, but editorial pieces always are signed. The Daily Nebraskan believes accuracy and accountability go hand in hand on the opinion pages. Without accountability, there is no desire for accuracy.

War necessary to stop inhumanity to Kuwaitis

When referring to people who supported our country's war efforts in the Middle East, Martha Barrett

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Metroka made the mistake of labeling us as "pro-war individuals" (DN, March 1). We are not people who like war, nor do we advocate war like the term "pro-war" suggests. We are people who have the ability to see farther into the future than the nose on our face and realize that war is sometimes necessary to stop escalated atrocities of aggression, destruction and murder of innocent people in the future. One of the main reasons for the war was to stop the spread of disease that causes such atrocities and, in this case, the name of that disease was Saddam Hussein. It is easier to chop down a diseased seedling now than it is to wait until it has developed into a full-grown tree.

Martha, you say that you "grieve the human carnage, destruction of property and rape of the environment" and that you "cannot visualize this atrocity as a moral action." Not once in your letter did you contribute even a small portion of the blame onto Saddam Hussein's shoulders. To you, apparently, the United States is at fault. Here we are dealing with your vision problem again. It wasn't the United States that marched into Kuwait and purposely tortured and murdered many of the people, destroyed Kuwait City as well as much of the country, and raped the environment with the dumping of oil and torching of oil wells. These atrocities were the acts of Saddam Hussein, not us. If the "government information telling us how bad the enemy was" is not good enough for you, then maybe you should have opened your eyes and paid more attention to the reports that came directly from the people of Kuwait and others who have seen this murder and destruction up close for themselves. The United States' actions were justified and moral.

Martha, hundreds, if not thousands, of the people of Kuwait were tortured. Babies were tossed out of their incubators onto the floor to die so the incubators could be taken back to Baghdad. Young men had cigarettes

smashed out on their chests, their eyes plucked out, parts of their bodies burned with acid and the bottoms of their feet slashed. Women didn't get treated much differently than the men except that some were raped and some had their breasts cut off. These are just a few of the many reports that have come directly from Kuwait, not just information from our government. You say that "we call ourselves civilized, but in my view we behaved like high-tech barbarians." You have a lot of gall to make such a statement in light of the facts that you either didn't see or just chose to ignore.

And yes, Martha, as you said, people who oppose the war are criticized but not "for exercising their freedom." They are criticized for their blindness, ignorance of the facts, and for always blaming the United States first for everything bad that happens in the world. This is my opinion and you have every right to criticize me for it. You see, it's not a matter of criticizing someone for exercising his or her freedoms, it's a matter of being able to openly and freely criticize someone else's opinions that may differ from our own. Although you may or may not agree with me when I say that these freedoms are among many things that make this country great, I still would like to compliment you for taking a stand and speaking up for what you believe in; too few people do. I just can't help it if your opinions of the war effort and the way you are so quick to accuse the United States are way off track, but hey, that's my opinion.

Martha, you are right about one thing when you say that, "Man's inhumanity to man is not right or good, and never will be." But remember that this war was not a case of being inhumane to our fellow man, it was the means necessary for stopping, "Man's inhumanity to man."

William Peterson
junior
business management/economics

United States depends on wars; supporters naive

I have never felt such shame and anger for America and its leadership as I have felt in the last 30 some days. How sad that patriotism abounds so fiercely when we assume a role similar to hired assassins rather than being the first nation to combat the AIDS virus or the first to suppress poverty or drugs or even for assuming the leading role in education. Instead, the flags unfurl in support of a war initiated by a president who once broke a tie in the Senate voting 'for' the use of nerve gas. The same president who once stated that a nuclear war could be won.

For those of you who say "war for peace," despite the obvious contradiction in terms, stop and think about all those years of peace that the United States supposedly has had. The United States has been at war in some form or another for over 50 years with an average of 10 years peacetime between wars. Our true victory is that the majority of these wars have been abroad, leaving our land, although not our lives, untouched. Even in our rare moments of peace, the covert actions of the CIA have been at work. Either CIA involvement or U.S. financial backing has supported conflicts in Nicaragua, Chile, El Salvador, Angola, Libya, Chad, Kampuchea, Afghanistan, Guatemala, Brazil, Congo, Iran, Iraq, Peru, Bolivia,

Ecuador, Uruguay, Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia and the Dominican Republic and these are only in the last 20-plus years.

The U.S. military has shot down a civilian Iranian airliner, killing more than 200 civilians, bombed Libya to destroy the 'maniacal' Khadafi, battled its way into Grenada, maimed and killed hundreds in Panama in our pursuit of the 'evil' Noriega. Our CIA has mined the harbors of Nicaragua. Yes, our unblemished past filled with 2,000 invasions of other countries is an excellent credential for our police role in condemning that nation of Iraq for invading Kuwait. Our wise decisions on governmental rule have helped lift such men as Pinoche of Chile and Marcos of the Philippines to power. Our belief in the one and true democratic way has had us stuffing ballots in Chile. After all, as Kissinger noted, the issues were too important for the voters to decide for themselves.

How interesting that a nation so economically dependent upon its military should enter a war at a time when the military budget was facing cuts that would ultimately result in higher unemployment for former servicemen and women during our current recession. Instead, as the war progressed, defense manufacturers were humming, military personnel retained their positions and the military budget expanded.

The effects of brainwashing last a long time. Remember, the enemy without is never as fearsome as the enemy within.

B.K. Cheshire
graduate student
psychology/Russian

For information about
FREE FOOD
for pregnant women, infants, and children under the age of 5, call:
1-800-WIIC-1171

Women at risk

Forum focuses on AIDS prevention

By Jean Lass
Staff Reporter

The increase in the numbers of women infected by AIDS is an alarming concern that must be addressed, said a counseling director Tuesday at a Women's Issues Week discussion in the Nebraska Union.

Donna Polk, director of counseling at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Office of Multi-Cultural Affairs, said that in Lancaster County there are 183 AIDS cases, including adults, adolescents and children.

Women are at risk for the disease because it is very difficult for them to request that the man wear a condom and ask him about his sexual history, she said.

To help women feel more comfortable putting a condom on a man and asking him to wear a condom, Polk paired up the women and gave them bananas as a substitute.

Any sexually active female who has "high-risk" sex is a possible victim of AIDS, she said.

Polk defined high-risk sex as having sexual intercourse with multiple partners and intravenous drug users or by experimenting with anal, oral and rough vaginal sex.

"AIDS is a part of our lives, and we need to talk about prevention of the disease."
Polk, counseling director, multi-cultural affairs office

She said women have to be aware that sex is "risky business," and avoid being with "strange people in strange places."

Polk also recommended women be tested for the HIV virus which causes AIDS.

However, she said women should not go to their family doctor to be tested because the results will become a permanent part of their medical records.

Instead, women can go to the Indian Center Health Department for tests, she said. The Indian Center offers pre- and post-counseling for women tested for the virus.

To educate more women on AIDS, there will be a "Women and AIDS" workshop April 13 at the Culture Center. A \$13 registration fee is required, or arrangements can be made for women who can't afford the fee to attend.

Week's activities address women's concerns, issues

From Staff Reports

A number of activities are planned for Women's Issues Week, Tuesday through March 16, part of the National Women's History Month.

The featured event is the Dance Brigade, which will be Saturday at 8 p.m. in the Centennial Room of the Nebraska Union.

The Dance Brigade is a group of five dancers whose work is based on the myths of women's sexuality, reproductive rights and women's rights to control their own bodies.

Featured speakers for the week include Susan Welch, chairwoman of the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. She will speak about women in higher education, March 14 at 7 p.m.

in the Georgian Suite of the Nebraska Union.

Beth Mullaney, who sued the Indian Hills Community Church in Lincoln, will discuss the violation of confidentiality in counseling, March 15 at 8 p.m. in the Culture Center.

Hattie Gossett, a jazz performer and writer from New York, N.Y., will give a poetry reading March 16 at 8 p.m. in the Regency Suite of the Nebraska Union.

All events are free for UNL students except the Dance Brigade, which is \$5 for students and \$10 for non-students.

Activities are sponsored by University of Nebraska-Lincoln groups and local organizations, including the Women's Resource Center, University Program Council and the Feminist Action Alliance.

Sponsored by: **PI BETA PHI**

Fashion NEWS

APPAREL DESIGNER ZONE

B.U.M EQUIPMENT* *BILL BLASS
LIMITED* *TWEEDS* *EXPRESS
***ESPIRIT* & MORE**

OUTLET SALE

UNL CITY CAMPUS UNION
14TH & R
MAIN BALLROOM

MARCH 4-7 **50%-90%**
HRS: 9am-5pm ***** off retail *****

brought to you by: **APPAREL DESIGN ZONE** of California