

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

Do or die

White House needs foreign policy success

Plans were announced Monday for Secretary of State Warren Christopher to travel to the Middle East to try to save the fragmenting peace between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

Christopher's trip represents a chance for much-needed foreign policy success for the Clinton administration. The president's early foreign policy errors have caused some critics to doubt his ability to lead the United States abroad.

If Christopher can help save the negotiations between the Israelis and the PLO over limited self-rule for Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and Jericho, the chance for peace in the region will be greatly increased.

The United States spends a great deal of resources to maintain stability in the Middle East. Securing peace in the region would mean the United States could concentrate those resources at home.

President Clinton has shown his early foreign policy inexperience in the first year of his presidency. If Christopher can help save the agreement between the Israelis and the PLO, it will show the Clinton administration has the ability to manage world affairs successfully.

The chance for peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians is not great. It would be unfair to judge Clinton's foreign policy on one agreement.

But Christopher's success or failure in the Middle East will either be a step forward for the Clinton administration or another step backward. And if the president suffers another defeat, he should seriously consider making major changes in his foreign policy team.

OTHERS' VIEW

Many of us can remember our parents struggling to answer our innocent questions about "the birds and the bees." Once upon a time, our questions had relatively easy answers.

Recent scientific breakthroughs reminiscent of some of this century's sci-fi novels and movies might just be making those simple questions much harder to answer. Researchers at George Washington University recently revealed they successfully cloned human embryos.

The prospect of "another you" should certainly make you stop and think for a moment — if it doesn't already scare you. The fact that doctors can take cells from "flawed human embryos" to construct new, healthy embryos raises all kinds of questions.

There are few, if any, restraints on such genetic engineering. The government hasn't touched it, and few lobbying groups have raised public awareness.

It is time for all of us to ask some simple questions. What will the limits be on such research? Should the government regulate genetic engineering? Who will make sure doctors use the research for the right reasons?

It is time to realize the horrific possibilities, as well as the wonderful potential of such startling research.

It is important for science to progress, and it is important for society to find ways to solve its worst medical problems. But it is even more important for us to face and understand genetic engineering before it is time to tell our children where they came from.

—The Daily Collegian
Penn State

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.

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.



THE DAIRY LOBBY

PAT HAMBRECHT

Evil feminist seed planted early

I hate feminism. I always have. Ever since I was forced to watch those creepy "anything boys can do, girls can do better" ABC after-school specials in the classroom, I've known mean-spirited feminists were gunning for my demise.

It's impossible to travel from kindergarten to sixth grade without realizing the hypocrisy of the feminist mind-set. Elementary school is a matriarchal ward ruled by minimally witty, humanist nuns who allow the witticism "girls are made of sugar and spice" mold their view of the sexes. In the sorority-like playpen of grade school, it didn't take long to learn the implied creed: Girls are social models, boys are discipline cases.

This unspoken creed was spelled out for me on the day my third-grade teacher, Mrs. Pierce, told me I wasn't cut out for the "gifted" program. I was smart enough, she said, but I talked too much. She sent Carrie instead, a behavioral prodigy who never talked out of turn.

I have a sneaking suspicion Carrie is attending Bryn Mawr University right now on a women's scholarship. She's probably writing her doctoral paper on the institutional tyranny of the American patriarchy.

Perhaps I would have a different attitude if I would have ever had a man for a teacher. But in grade school, there were no male role models. The only men I saw during my first seven years of public education were janitors, gym coaches and principals: physical grunters who mopped vomit, taught dodge ball and administered spankings exclusively to, of course, boys.

So it's a small wonder that I began to suspect our society was estrogenally dominated from the womb to the final suffocating embrace of Mother Earth. As a child, I thought I knew why men donned helmets and risked their lives fighting fires, crime and each other.



To be a capital-wielding millionaire, influential scholar or a powerful politician would be fun, and there's no reason a woman shouldn't be one. I'd like to be one too.

They did it to get away from their moms.

I did have male teachers at my junior high school, but by then it was too late. Puberty had hit me like a truck, and I found myself compelled to flirt with girls, perform for them and write awful love poetry through no choice of my own. I was addicted to something I'd never wanted, like being a crack baby.

Gladiatorial combat is a tender and compassionate sport compared to the masculine competition for female favor in junior high school. The desire for sex electrifies adolescent society into a free-for-all with the murderous Darwinistic frenzy of football, fist fights and 30-minute French kisses at the junior high dance. Notions of fairness and equality wilt before the power of primal bacchanalian romance; it is the single motivating force of the human race.

I have a hard time seeing the gendering of labor as an evil phenomenon. It translated sexual competition into a productive abstraction of labor. Instead of cracking antlers, men could channel their energies into trade, farming and conquest. Instead of beating each other with clubs to please women, men pioneered industry and civilization. Is this a bad thing?

In a modern context, I understand why women petitioned for their place in scholarship and labor during the

Industrial Revolution. To be a capital-wielding millionaire, influential scholar or a powerful politician would be fun, and there's no reason a woman shouldn't be one. I'd like to be one too.

It is unfair, though, for women to petition only for high-paying or intellectual jobs. Those jobs are easy. True, equality-minded feminists should demand unisex conditions for coal mines, prisons and construction crews, without deference to maternity leave or physical strength. But for some reason, Gloria Steinem and Kate Millett have neglected those trouble spots.

The real reason I hate feminism is because it's false. Feminists live on college campuses or other temples of the bogus, trading their bland, useless gender theories between one another. Or worse, they frolic through government offices and play around with sociological statistics.

Male chauvinists may be crude and cruel, but they also build bridges, automobiles and buildings. Feminists just talk. And women who do have the cunning to seize power and money don't do it for their sisters. They're egotistical, selfish fascists — just like the rest of us.

Hambrecht is a sophomore news-editorial major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Greeks

Could someone tell me what the purpose of the greek system is? I mean, besides placing middle-, upper-class white people in an artificial position of superiority, helping ensure their success and excluding those who don't drink in excess, have dangerous sex lives or have no greater desire than to maintain the status quo. What does it do for this university and its members besides create problems and give people a bad impression?

Shawn Carlson
freshman
general studies

Beating

Considering the current investigation about the beating of a

Malaysian student by several individuals, one of whom is a current football player and one of whom is an ex-player, the editors of the Daily Nebraskan may be a little more sensitive as to what kind of quotes they choose to print. It is unfortunate that you have chosen to quote Kevin Ramaekers (DN, Nov. 12) as saying "I'll be beating the hell out of somebody. I'll really be pissed. ..." I hope that it doesn't end up being another international student.

Biljana Obradovic
graduate student
English

Death penalty

Ironic it is that most Christians I have encountered support the death penalty.

At the risk of burning in hell, I

choose not to worship this Bible God with whom I have so many differing ideas. This is why I cannot be considered hypocritical when I say I think whoever is convicted of torturing and murdering Candice Harms should die.

Although I feel these men should die, I cannot support the death penalty. It angers me that those who want to see vengeance carried out oversimplify this issue and seem to have no concern about the fact that a minority or a poor person is much more likely to die; hate warps the judgment of many.

Until our system is fair and consistent, we must continue to reward these individuals with free room and board for life.

Paul Koester
senior
soil science