

Daily Nebraskan
Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeremy Fitzpatrick Editor, 472-1766
Kathy Steinauer Opinion Page Editor
Wendy Mott Managing Editor
Todd Cooper Sports Editor
Chris Hopfensperger Copy Desk Chief
Kim Spurlock Sower Editor
Kiley Timperley Senior Photographer

EDITORIAL

Bold changes

Clinton honest about health care reform

President Clinton addressed some of the toughest issues of his health-care reform plan directly and honestly Wednesday night in his speech to a joint session of Congress and the country.

The speech may have been viewed initially as a pep talk to push Clinton's plan, but it did contain hard facts and solid details about the changes planned and ways to finance them.

Clinton outlined six principles to the proposed health-care reform: security, simplicity, savings, choice, quality and responsibility. Establishing a health-care plan for everyone and saving money currently wasted through bureaucracy were especially stressed.

Clinton spoke candidly and openly about the costs of his proposal for a new system. He said directly that new taxes on tobacco would be imposed and that some may pay more at first in the new plan than they would under the current system. For instance, college students may pay more to help pay for health care for older, higher-risk members of society.

A change is definitely needed in the current system. The president urged legislators to keep in mind the citizens who need a change in health care to stay alive rather than some special-interest groups who benefit from the current system that wastes money.

The Clintons received more than 700,000 letters telling nightmare stories about the current system that testified that change is needed to keep Americans healthy. Clinton took the first step to change boldly Wednesday night.

Sticky situation

U.S. needs to support Russian president

As the United States struggles to address domestic challenges like health care, events half a world away threaten to prevent America from focusing on reform at home.

In Russia, President Boris Yeltsin suspended parliament and hard-line lawmakers Tuesday. He called for new elections in December.

Yeltsin warned that anyone who opposed him would be "punished by law."

Russia is now in a state of uncertainty. Yeltsin is battling with Vice President Alexander Rutskoi for control of the country. The Associated Press reported Wednesday that military and police commanders have remained loyal to Yeltsin.

Armed conflict is quite possible as the situation unfolds. The destabilized political climate and a faltering economy could produce a spark that would light Russia on fire.

Yeltsin said Wednesday violence would not be necessary. "We would not like and do not intend to use any force," he said. "We want everything peacefully, without blood."

But the collapse of Russia is a real possibility. Fighting there could trigger instability all over the world.

The United States can help prevent that by firmly standing behind Yeltsin and his democratic government. President Clinton voiced early support for Yeltsin. He should take any possible action to back Yeltsin's government.

If civil war breaks out in Russia, the United States would no longer be able to concentrate on its domestic affairs. Health care and other domestic programs would have to be delayed in favor of an international focus.

EDITORIAL POLICY

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Fall 1993 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.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

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.

AKRON BEACON JOURNAL © 93



BOYS OF LATE SUMMER

MATT ZIMMERMAN

Three cheers for Hooters girls

In Friday's Omaha World-Herald, one Elmer Pinkerton from Elmwood writes: "When I see women complaining that women are being exploited, I see complainers who will not and never would fit into a Hooters girl's uniform. By their analogy, any woman who works for wages is being exploited."



For as long as I can remember, all women have truly enjoyed dressing up in sophomoric, restrictive, revealing outfits. What's the big deal now?

For once in my life, I am left speechless by the eloquence of an editorial statement. Humbled by this proud declaration, I am only able to respond with these two simple words: damn right. In our never-ending battle against the evil scourge of liberalism that is invading every aspect of our lives—as well as our campus—destroying the traditional family, making us feel responsible, and all around ruining everybody's day, it's about time that someone stood up against this fiction called the exploitation of women. Way to go, Elmer!

For the life of me, I just can't figure out how anyone in their right mind could interpret waitresses in tight, cut-off T-shirts and short shorts as somehow demeaning to women. For as long as I can remember, all women have truly enjoyed dressing up in sophomoric, restrictive, revealing outfits. What's the big deal now? The feminazis just want all of us upstanding, God-fearing, red-blooded Americans to feel guilty about partaking in a little harmless, wholesome fun. I, for one, am not buying into it.

And hey, not only is it fun for us, it's a hoot for all of those Hooters girls, too. According to a recent World-Herald column, DeShawne Bird, bartender and assistant manager of Omaha's Hooters restaurant, thinks that "It's the funnest place I've ever worked." Lisa Vleck, a 21-year-old Hooters girl, says that "The main thing is that we have a good time."

And having a good time is what's most important, isn't it? Far be it from

me to argue with success. It's not up to me to pass judgment on these gals who are just trying to make an honest living. If they like their jobs and we like watching them do their jobs, who minds if it degrades women? No one's making them do it, right?

Critics contend that just because these girls go about their jobs scantily dressed, this somehow lowers women's self-esteem. Far from the truth, according to the girls that work there. Twenty-two-year-old Lisa Schneider said, "The first thing I thought about was wearing the uniform. I really didn't know what they were. But after I got here and went through the training, there was nothing wrong about it."

See? It may be true that girls might have reservations about donning the costumes initially, but after they do it for a while and get used to it, they really forget what they are wearing. It doesn't bother them anymore.

And just think of the important function the gals serve as role models. How inspiring it must be for younger girls in the community to be able to look up to the Hooters girls for guidance. Let's face it, it's a rough-and-tumble man's world out there, and it isn't easy for anyone to make it, let alone a woman. It must be heartwarming to know that there is a place in society waiting for them when they grow up. Or when they look mature enough.

Where do these people who file

lawsuits against Hooters get off making all of the trashy comments that they do? How in the world can these leftists say that the Hooters girl image encourages sexual harassment? Unbelievable.

First of all, this is, in part, just another case of male bashing. Why don't we have the right to ask these women out if we want to? They are beautiful, sexy girls. I'm sure that they really appreciate customers constantly coming up to them and telling them so.

Second, the girls have no responsibility to contribute anything to the overall attitudes between men and women. Even if wearing skin-tight outfits did contribute to backward, sexist, stereotypical images of women as being playthings for men ... which, of course, is inconceivable ... it isn't the girls' fault.

People see what they want to in the outfits. The girls aren't there to convince you one way or the other. They are there to make a living.

So for all of you who are sick and tired of listening to the old, tired rhetoric of victimization, I'm buying the next time we go to Hooters for dinner. In all actuality, the meals are excellent. And, of course, the true reason we all go down there is for the food.

Right?

Zimmerman is a junior English major and Daily Nebraskan columnist.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Gun control

Much like Al Gore, the DN has no clue what is going on in the real world. Take crime for instance. The DN seems to believe gun control would have prevented the Waco fiasco and the recent killings in Florida. Brilliant, guys! Adolf Hitler would agree with you. So would the Chinese Communists who murdered the unarmed students of Tiananmen Square. Why them? Because they were the originators of gun control—not so much in fear of crime but to perpetuate crime by the state against its own.

Crime in America has no parallels with gun use. If it had, why would gun control have not been so necessary in 1778 when citizens could possess cannons? Would David Koresh have been a criminal in 1778 for owning guns and cannons? No, for the Achilles

provision of the 1986 Firearms Act had not been enacted yet.

Twenty-two states are under court order to release prisoners prematurely. A welfare check has caused children to be born for money, not love. And violent crime has increased due to all these problems and more because liberals like the DN don't want to tackle the real issues, so they choose to blame inanimate objects like guns. Liberalism is truly the most gutless choice you can make. So is gun control.

Dustin Ruge senior finance

"Entertainment"

Just what does Patrick Hambrecht find "entertaining" about Joseph Stalin (DN, Sept. 21)? It must be the 1929-30 rural collectivization in which 1-3

million families died of starvation or in slave labor camps. Or perhaps he refers to the purges of the '30s. Stalin's "exploits" resulted in a much more impressive sum of 8 million.

Hambrecht must conclude that the "Man of Steel" had a dull start in the '40s. Stalin's invasion of the Baltic States resulted in only half a million deportations and deaths. And the Katyn Forest massacre is numerically dwarfed by Stalin's earlier adventures. Yet the sum of Stalin's "exploits" are unparalleled, and this must be why Hambrecht finds Stalin more "enjoyable" than Adolf Hitler. Hambrecht, research your impotent attempts at wit. Those who lost relatives to totalitarianism find your ignorance repugnant.

Karl E. Serbousek senior mechanical engineering