

Daily
Nebraskan
Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeremy Fitzpatrick Editor, 472-1766
Rainbow Rowell Opinion Page Editor
Adeana Leftin Managing Editor
Todd Cooper Sports Editor
Jeff Zeleny Associate News Editor
Sarah Duey Arts & Entertainment Editor
William Lauer Senior Photographer

EDITORIAL

NATO delivers

Airstrikes against Serbs showed resolve

During the past 23 months of war in the former Yugoslavia, NATO has frequently threatened to intervene to support U.N. resolutions.

Beginning last week, the United States and its allies told Bosnian Serbs — who have military control over 70 percent of the area — that NATO would use airstrikes to stop fighting in designated areas.

When six Serb planes were found bombing in a no-fly zone and refused to respond to three warnings, U.S. F-16 fighter jets brought four Serb planes down.

Although any act of violence is horrible, NATO forces acted wisely. To show strength and resolve, it was important that NATO stood behind its threats.

The fighting groups will take NATO seriously only if the alliance stands firm. Airstrikes should continue to be used to enforce U.N. resolutions.

Because NATO has said it will stop fighting from any side, the strikes do not show support for any group. And the strikes can be used to show NATO's commitment to a cease-fire without greatly risking U.S. troops.

If handled with care, the strikes can be carried out without dragging the United States into further military involvement.

By earning the respect of the Bosnian Serbs, Croats and Bosnian Muslims, perhaps NATO may be able to help bring much-needed peace to the area.

OTHERS' VIEW

Watch your head. The United States and Japan once again are throwing rotten eggs at each other over the latest trade dispute. Unfortunately the citizens on both sides are in the cross fire.

The latest disagreement came after trade talks between the world's two largest trading nations ended abruptly. Both countries are right, but both countries are also wrong.

The United States claims that Japan unfairly restricts trade into their island nation. This is largely true. Subsidies and trade restrictions put rice prices seven times higher in Japan than in the United States. Similar restrictions hold true for a variety of goods ranging from vegetables to electronics.

However, the United States is wrong to demand that Japan buy certain numbers of cars, parts and other goods. Forced trade is really not trade at all. The best example involves car sales to Japan. When President Bush went to Japan with the Big Three automotive presidents, they demanded Japan buy more U.S. cars. Too bad the U.S. companies were not building any with the steering wheel on the right side. Otherwise the Japanese might want them.

For a nation based on trade, Japan should not have such extreme trade barriers. However, they should not be expected to abide by the forced trade guidelines that the United States is demanding.

Both sides need to adjust their position and move closer to "true" free trade. This means a reduction or elimination of trade barriers by both sides, as well as elimination of the so-called "numerical indicators" that the United States demands.

— University Daily Kansan
— University of Kansas

EDITORIAL POLICY

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Spring 1994 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.



FIRST SUSPICION OF A MOLE

SAM KEPFIELD

Chilly? Just the facts, ma'am

According to a report by the UNL chapter of the American Association of University Professors, the climate for women in the University of Nebraska-Lincoln College of Business Administration is "chilly." Evaluation procedures are unfair, pay is unequal, women are treated rudely and harassed, and a general atmosphere of sexism prevails. It sounds like a Tailhook convention in the making.

On Feb. 19, the regents heard the report, drawn up by a committee chaired by UNL sociology professor Dr. Helen Moore. Amazingly, UNL officials, including Chancellor Graham Spanier, did not immediately begin groveling on the floor, begging forgiveness and promising a task force to look into the matter.

They don't need to study the accuracy of the charges. What UNL ought to do is look at the people bringing the charges and their ulterior motives in doing so.

The AAUP's Committee W report is an unsolicited effort, which Moore claimed was derived from forums at UNL during the past several years. The "sources" in the report alleging the misconduct were anonymous, but Moore said they were not made by only one or two people. Women in CBA had complained before but were ignored. Hardly a slam-dunk case.

The intellectual vacuum at the heart of the report, and the argument in general, is not so surprising when one considers just what the AAUP really is. Dr. John Silber, former president of Boston University and candidate for governor of Massachusetts in 1990, called the AAUP nothing more than a white-collar trade union. In his 1989 book "Shooting Straight," Silber chronicled the antics of the AAUP, particularly its bastardization of the tenure process to create a closed, union-shop mentality in faculty departments. The AAUP adopted an adversarial



No, being truly enlightened, they prepare reports in a cliquish atmosphere on how they perceive white men are oppressing them.

stance against university administrators analogous to the militant unionism of the AFL-CIO's war with management in the private sector. As such, Silber claims, the AAUP lost any sort of moral authority to speak for its members. It isn't even on record as prohibiting the falsification of evidence, out of a naive belief that such things simply aren't done. It is an open invitation to academic fraud.

Moral, not to mention factual, emptiness is all over the Committee W report. Moore and her four colleagues who prepared the report were all women. If UNL took her allegations seriously and appointed an all-male committee to respond to the charges, would Committee W accept it? No! It would be a classic case of "the old boys' network" pulling together to cover its collective butt.

Moore and Committee W are part of an "old girls' network," a subgroup of the myriad prejudice pests who imagine sexism, racism and all other -isms to be lurking in every single nook and cranny of our society. They don't oppress others in a cliquish atmosphere like white men do. No, being truly enlightened, they prepare reports in a cliquish atmosphere on how they perceive white men are oppressing them.

Factually, the report is at odds with reality. Two professors from CBA contradicted the report at the regents' meeting. Professor Roberta Schini called the atmosphere at CBA "the most collegial and supportive" that

she had ever been in. Nancy Stara, assistant dean, also disagreed with the general tenor of the report calling CBA men sexist. Joan Leitzel, vice chancellor for academic affairs, told the regents that women were angered by the distorted view of CBA.

This has always been the problem with organizations that claim to speak for everybody in a particular group—the National Organization for Women, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People or the Mexican-American Student Association. They begin with perhaps laudable goals, but as these goals are accomplished, they need to justify their continued existence.

So, with real discrimination on the wane, they have to invent it. Only this discrimination is so subtle and ubiquitous that most people don't recognize it—such as, say, a "chilly" climate. Is it any coincidence that this report was presented at the end of Rape/Sexual Harassment Awareness Week?

Sometimes university administrators can be cowed into submission by this tactic; this time they weren't.

Until CBA women themselves prove real discrimination, which seems unlikely, Moore and her colleagues should go back to what they're supposed to be doing at this university—teaching — and not write dubious reports at the behest of outside militants.

Kepfield is a graduate student in history and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Students for Dave

It's true, I, Gary Doyle, have too much time on my hands. Why else would I do something as trivial as running David Letterman, a nonstudent, for an Association of Students of the University of Nebraska election? The reason is simple: It's a joke. Comedy.

I'm graduating, so it really doesn't matter to me who gets elected. It's all the same year after year anyway. Sure, the names and faces change, but the ideas and the talking have been heard over and over again. Not once have we seen any long-term plans for parking, safety or creating a multicultural atmosphere on campus. Where are the solutions? I don't expect short-term answers. These are long-term problems that require long-term planning.

If ASUN is truly a well-running

student government machine, then why is it that they only have the power to recommend? When are they going to stop talking and start doing?

I'm amazed anyone cares I'm running Dave for president. Yet, already I've done interviews with radio stations across the country.

It's truly a sad day when staunch ASUN supporters are so scared and insecure that when the status quo is attacked, they must lash out with personal attacks, rather than deal with the situation in a constructive and positive manner. Obviously there are problems with student government, or else there wouldn't be only one party with a complete ticket and another party that can't even participate in debates.

My intent is not and has never been to make a mockery of the ASUN elections, but instead to increase participation and awareness on campus. Isn't

that what every student leader wants? A 14 percent voter turnout at an institute of higher learning is horrendous.

If it takes something like running Dave for president to increase student participation in these elections, then so be it.

Unfortunately, the other student leaders on campus don't use their ability to look at all sides of the issue before they jump to conclusions. I guarantee there will be a much stronger selection of candidates next year because of what has transpired so far during this election.

I urge every student who reads this to go to the polls and vote on March 9. Whether you're for VISION, RESUME, LETTUCE or Dave doesn't matter. Let your voice be heard.

Gary Doyle
senior
management