

Daily Nebraskan
Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Chris Hopfensperger... Editor, 472-1766
Dionne Searcey... Opinion Page Editor
Kris Karnopp... Managing Editor
Alan Phelps... Wire Editor
Wendy Navratil... Writing Coach
Stacey McKenzie... Senior Reporter
Jeremy Fitzpatrick... Columnist

EDITORIAL

Careless

University officials abuse Apollo capsule

It was bad that the University of Nebraska-Lincoln allowed the Apollo 009 capsule to rot in the elements for 20 years. It is criminal that the capsule has been abandoned in a storage shed on East Campus for 11 months. The lack of care for the capsule is nothing new. For 20 years it sat in front of Morrill Hall on display disintegrating in the hot summers and the freezing winters. At some point, the burn marks — from the capsule's re-entry into the earth's atmosphere — were painted over. Two years ago, Hugh Genoways, director of the Nebraska State Museum, said that "from the museum's point of view, the (restoration of the) craft is a long ways down our priority list. "It would not be the first thing I'd put my money into." The mistakes began when the university neglected the capsule. The mistakes continue because university officials are too blind to realize they can't take proper care of it. In January, the regents decided against trading the artifact to the Kansas Cosmosphere and Space Center in Hutchinson, Kan. Apparently, it will remain in storage until UNL can afford to restore and properly display it. "We are doing the socially responsible thing in accordance with what we can fiscally handle right now," said Regent Rosemary Skrupa of Omaha. Responsible would be realizing what the university can handle realistically with tight budgets. Responsible would have been exchanging it for equally valuable space artifacts and giving the capsule to a group that has the capabilities to take care of the national treasure.

Wise choice

Regents must approve family leave policy

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln Board of Regents has a chance to do the right thing at its monthly meeting Saturday. Board members will be asked to approve a universitywide family leave policy for faculty and staff. The policy would provide employees with up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave to deal with the birth or adoption of a child, a death in the immediate family or the injury or serious illness of a parent, child or spouse. During a leave, an employee would continue to receive university benefits but would draw no salary. The family leave could be taken in conjunction with already-accrued sick leave, vacation leave or funeral leave, which would not be affected by the new policy. UNL has absolutely nothing to lose by installing this policy. Employees who take advantage of the policy could not be accused of slacking off at the university's expense because they won't be getting a paycheck during the leave. The policy would cost the university nothing. And the benefits would be worth millions. The policy encourages women to have careers. That aspect is especially important to a campus that's dominated by men. Nearly every other industrial country in the world has a family leave policy. It's about time the university caught up. The regents must approve the family leave policy. It just makes sense.

EDITORIAL POLICY

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Fall 1992 Daily Nebraskan. Policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. 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 regents publish the Daily Nebraskan. They establish 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.

LETTER POLICY

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor from all readers and interested others. Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space available. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit or reject all material submitted. Readers also are welcome to submit material as guest opinions. The editor decides whether material should run as a guest opinion. Letters and guest opinions sent to the newspaper become the property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned. Anonymous submissions will not be published. 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.



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Feminism

I am taking precious time out of my obsessive-compulsive overachieving search for the laws of property to respond to Sam Kepfield's insightful column ("Liberals infiltrate bar association," DN, Nov. 2). Yes, I believe I gained insight into many facets of Kepfield's mind. Is it all women that you are opposed to or just women lawyers? Maybe it's just feminist lawyers? Possibly it's feminists in particular who have left you so bitter. I think the phrase "an orgy of standard liberal feminist cliches" pretty much sums up the height of idiocy displayed in your column. Your attacks on lawyers and the legal profession may be well-grounded. I'm merely a first-year law student and certainly not equipped to take on a seasoned lawyer — with a good five, six years of experience — like yourself. I have, however, been a woman for 23 years, and I can spot an attack on my gender a mile away. First of all, there is no such thing as a standard feminist. Unlike many of our conservative counterpart groups, feminism is all-inclusive and welcomes anyone concerned with the advancement of the female gender — not all at the expense of the male gender, I might add — and can encompass many viewpoints. I'm sure that you've never been involved in such a strange, tolerant phenomenon, Kepfield, so be patient with me. This is my definition of feminism. Maybe Betty Friedan feels differently. One thing I'm sure we would agree on though, is that your belittlement of Anita Hill and the issue of sexual harassment is one of the reasons we have kept the word "feminist" alive. I'm sure the legislators in the late 1800s thought those annoying suffragettes were also spouting liberal clichés about wanting to vote. The nerve of those women! Secondly, I hardly think Anita Hill, a Yale-educated professor of contract law at the University of Oklahoma, is a likely target of your scorn. The recent election returns don't support your conclusion of "her perjured testimony" either. Arlin Spector, a ranking Republican senator who led the assault against Hill during the hearings, won his race by the skin of his teeth. He was aptly challenged by Lynn Yeakel, basically a one-issue candidate, that being to oust Spector for his conduct during the hearings. Finally, referring to Hillary Clinton as "the wife of a Democratic nominee" makes no sense either. Clinton is also a Yale-educated lawyer who happens to be rated one of the nation's 100 most influential lawyers by the National Law Journal. Are you suggesting that this fact does not qualify her to make a keynote address of the American Bar Association? I can see

why you are so disgusted with the backsliding organization. How dare they host a luncheon by the Committee on Women in the Profession!

If you truly wanted to make your own little corner of the world a better place, Kepfield, you would still be doing it rather than writing scathing, offensive columns in the Daily Nebraskan. By the way, did your little corner accommodate anyone with views differing from your own? Did it include standard liberal feminists?

I too would like to help or make better my little corner of the world someday. That is why your column disturbed me so greatly. Your hurried abandonment of idealism is certainly not encouraging to the few of us who aren't yet consumed with cynicism. I certainly hope I last longer than six years in working to keep "Oppressed Womanhood" out of oppression.

Kris Brenneis
first-year law student



Brian Shellito/DN

Change

The American people have spoken up for change. Responsibility of our national government is now firmly upon Democratic shoulders for the power that they will soon wield. I hope the Clinton administration and the Democratic Congress — who we, the people, must now rely on for the security of our future — will do the country well. But my convictions are that they will not. I am not a fortuneteller. I cannot foresee the future, but I do see the present, and I think Bill Clinton is a mistake. I want my scotch straight up... and keep 'em coming. Jack Kemp in '96.

Michael Johnson
freshman
history

Racial issues

Often I think I should write a letter in response to some issue, but who has the time. After reading Kirby Moss's column, I find I must take the time. Thank you Moss and Kimberly

Spurlock for "spinning everything into a racial issue." When a person is black, everything is. It's about time the rest of Nebraska hears it.

Denial is a part of change, but we need to get past denial and on to acceptance — acceptance of our differences. Acceptance that because of the perceived importance of that difference, we are treated unequally every day of our lives. And that is wrong. It's hurting all of us, literally killing us, both black and white.

Regarding Sen. Ernie Chambers: Give them hell, Ernie! But please don't let the Daily Nebraskan or anyone else speak for you. So often these issues don't include all the needed information to make an informed decision on the public's part. I, for one, would appreciate your perspective more fully.

J.L. Meier
senior
Teachers College

Choice

Thank you Jennifer Ernisse. Your column ("Choice key to sustaining rights," DN, Nov. 4) was one of the most thoughtful, accurate and eloquently stated articles about the abortion debate.

In your column, you very astutely point out that the real issue is not abortion; rather it is the issue of personal freedom and the Constitution of the United States. Under the Constitution, it says you cannot control my thoughts, my opinions, my property. And yes, our bodies are our properties and our business. Just as you stated, if we choose to eat a Big Mac, run a mile or not reproduce, it is the individual's business and no one else's.

This is not a pro-abortion statement. In fact, as your column points out, education is the key in order to circumvent unwanted pregnancy, be it through abstinence or contraceptives. But somehow some members of our society ignorantly believe that talking about sex promotes having sex. Oh yes, the lecture I had last week about possible outcomes of drinking and driving caused me to run right out and cruise down O Street after slamming five shots, just to see if what I learned was really true.

Clearly keeping our society ignorant because we are scared what they might do is not only counterproductive, but also destructive. It is about time we look at the real issue. And that issue is choice. No one is for abortion. We all should be vigilant in embracing and protecting our constitutional rights. If we lose those, what else do we really have?

Wendy Gordy
senior
special education