

### The right stuff

#### Apollo 009 capsule swap made in heaven

Even in a time of budget cutting, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln has managed to gain a valuable collection of space artifacts.

UNL doesn't have to pay a cent for the roughly \$1.5 million worth of objects, including some that accompanied Apollo astronauts to the moon. Instead, the university will give up its ownership of one of the craft that carried such items — the Apollo 009 space capsule, which has been disintegrating outside Morrill Hall for years.

The capsule will be taken off the UNL campus, restored at a cost of about \$400,000 and displayed at the Kansas Cosmospere space center.

The swap was finalized last month, UNL officials said Wednesday at a press conference. It is still subject to approval from the NU Board of Regents.

No money will change hands in the agreement. But both UNL and the Cosmosphere, as well as Apollo 009, should benefit from the trade.

UNL gets a strong addition to its museum, the Cosmosphere gains a piece of U.S. history and the capsule will be subject to the care of experts rather than the cruelty of the elements.

—E.F.P.

### Parts is parts

#### Laws shouldn't cover women's breasts

For those who consider separate public restrooms a sexist institution, a dismissal of charges against 10 women who exposed their breasts in a New York park came as good news.

In overturning the convictions of the 10 women, Monroe County Judge Patricia Marks said women's breasts legally should not be distinguished from men's breasts. Such a distinction violates the New York state and U.S. constitutions, Marks ruled.

In 1989, the women, who call themselves the Topfree 10, were convicted of violating New York's public nudity law after removing their shirts for a picnic in a public park. The women gather yearly to bare their breasts in protest of the law.

Assistant District Attorney Elizabeth Clifford said New York law defines female breasts as private body parts because of community beliefs, public morals and common decency. But, in the decision, Marks noted the testimony of defense experts who said society doesn't consider women's breasts as private or intimate body parts.

In European countries, the distinction between men's and women's breasts has long since blurred. Perhaps the New York decision is an indication that lopsided laws based on biological assumption will no longer be tolerated on this side of the ocean.

—J.P.

### Artificial turf in stadiums causing football injuries

I am writing in response to two events that happened this weekend at the Nebraska at Kansas football game. First, Kenny Wilhite's non-contact, but nevertheless severe, knee injury. Second, the fact that the Nebraska athletic department is trying to replace the turf at Memorial Stadium with another artificial surface. Wilhite's injury would not have occurred on a grass field. We have lost other great players, such as Terry Rodgers, due to injuries attributed to artificial surfaces. I hope Wilhite will be fine, but the likelihood of this type of injury can be reduced by playing on grass.

The problem is that the athletic department is just looking at the bottom-line costs. A natural surface is more expensive. However, it would pay off by reducing practice- and playing-related injuries. A grass field would also help prepare us for bowl games. A majority of the New Year's Day bowls are played on grass. The trend in football is to switch back to grass fields. The University of Michigan and the Chicago Bears switched

back. Furthermore, if I was a "blue-chip" recruit, I would not consider schools that had artificial surfaces. I would want to protect myself from an injury that might end my career prematurely.

Playing on an artificial surface is like playing football on your basement floor with a carpet. When asked, NFL players preferred playing on grass. If the university was a private company, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration would probably force it to protect its workers and install grass. It is unfortunate that the Athletic Department is not concerned enough with the safety and the well-being of its athletes to consider a grass field. If you share my view on this matter, I suggest that donations made to the turf fund be contingent on installation of a grass field. I will not support the athletic department by purchasing any more season tickets until there is grass at Memorial Stadium.

Sanjay Batra  
graduate student  
industrial engineering

#### LETTER POLICY

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor from all readers.

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.

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.



### PAUL DOMEIER Bush disqualifies himself

Events on Nov. 9, 1989; Jan. 17, 1991; and Aug. 21, 1991, may have cost George Bush the 1992 presidential election.

Doubtfully, but possibly.

On Nov. 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall came down. In the next few months, Communist regimes across Eastern Europe were dismantled and four decades of Cold War came to an end.

On Jan. 17, 1991, U.S. air forces began bombing Iraq. In the next few weeks, one of the largest armed forces in the world was routed by the best military in the world. Vietnam demons were exorcised and Bush showed that rules on armed aggression have changed in the post-Cold War world.

On Aug. 21, 1991, a last-gasp hardliner coup failed in the Soviet Union. In the next few days, the U.S.S.R. was dismantled. The United States won a 70-year waiting game.

Bush's time as CIA director, ambassador to China and vice president has paid off with unprecedented success in foreign affairs.

And, in a way, he's eliminated the need for his position. His success has changed the presidency's requirements, and he may no longer be qualified.

America is clamoring for Bush to stay at home and push through domestic policy to get us out of the recession, save our cities, reform the courts, and so on.

As if he could. What he wants, Congress won't pass. What Congress wants, Bush won't sign. It's called having a Republican president and a Democratic-controlled Congress, especially when the Republican president's strong suit is foreign affairs.

Yet Bush bears the brunt of blame for this system that we love so much. That epitomizes the silly expectations we have for our executive leader — I repeat, executive, not legislative, leader.

Bush has done his job as president. Now we want him to be prime minister.

Well, he can't be prime minister, because our government doesn't work that way.

Ronald Reagan's first term defined what will happen with the presidency and Congress in different hands. Reagan was able to do what he wanted



**Bush has done his job as president. Now we want him to be prime minister. Well, he can't be prime minister, because our government doesn't work that way.**

to do. He got his tax cuts and increased military spending.

But he couldn't undo what he wanted to undo. Congress kept the portions of the welfare state Reagan wanted to remove increasing the crippling deficit.

Reagan led, and Congress followed halfway.

If we really want one leader responsible for pushing domestic policy through Congress, we need to tinker with the Constitution and give someone that responsibility and power. The vice president could be elevated to that role, because he already is president of the Senate. Presidential tickets could pair up as foreign consul/domestic consul instead of president/stiff.

Congressional policy based on coalition would allow the creation of more political parties, which in turn would represent the American people better than the current "big-tent" parties.

In that system, Bush could be president forever.

But that change is unlikely ever to happen, certainly not before Novem-

ber 1992. Next year's campaign will be waged in the shadow of the unrealistic expectations we have for Bush.

Of course, if we are at the end of the recession, the election will be a lock for the Republicans. Even if the economy stays sluggish, Bush's chances will rise considerably as soon as the Democrats nominate a candidate.

Despite recent shakiness, I expect Bush to be president another four years.

I'm not sure that's good. Bush may be better as the do-nothing choice than some Democrat as the do-the-wrong-thing choice, but still, nothing gets done.

It's not unfair to Bush. He has served his purpose, done what he's good at, and it's time for him to return to civilian life. That's part of the whole term-limitation movement anyway, moving people in and out of politics.

We need a different type of Republican to come with new ideas and an internal focus. That type of leader would have a better chance doing and undoing the right things, even with a Democratic Congress. Foreign affairs are secondary.

What could Bush do on foreign affairs in another term? With the Soviet collapse, the only threat from Communist/socialist ideological imperialism comes from universities, unions and certain Democratic presidential hopefuls.

With or without Bush, the United States will be the unquestioned world leader in furthering peace, prosperity and the relaxing of tensions.

These tensions aren't the realm of a superpower president. Middle East trauma won't ease until the participants want it to ease. Ethnic-based civil war looms all across the globe, and American troops have no business in those battles. Having Bush in charge might be an advantage, but not enough to risk the country's health.

But we're stuck with Bush. Sad to say, Jack Kemp won't be president until 1997.

Domeier is a senior news-editorial major, the Daily Nebraskan copy desk chief and a columnist.

#### EDITORIAL POLICY

Signed staff editorials represent the official policy of the Fall 1991 Daily Nebraskan. Policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. Its members are: Jana Pedersen, editor; Eric Pfanner, editorial page editor; Diane Brayton, managing editor; Walter Gholson, columnist; Paul Domeier, copy desk chief; Brian

Shellito, cartoonist; Jeremy Fitzpatrick, senior reporter. Editorials do not necessarily reflect the views of the university, its employees, the students or the NU Board of Regents.

Editorial columns represent the opinion of the author.

The Daily Nebraskan's publishers are the regents, who established the UNL Publications Board to supervise the daily production of the paper.

According to policy set by the regents, responsibility for the editorial content of the newspaper lies solely in the hands of its students.