

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

## No hazing allowed

Greeks must show maturity, stop practice

If Gov. Ben Nelson signs a bill unanimously approved Wednesday in the Legislature, hazing will be considered a crime in Nebraska — a violation of state law.

With this signature, life on this campus should change. When Jeffrey Knoll fell from the third floor of Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity, the entire state was forced to re-examine hazing in the greek system.

Most people agreed that changes should be made. Administrators, lawmakers and leaders in the greek system came forward to say that hazing could no longer be accepted on this campus as an unavoidable part of greek life.

These concerns culminated in LB1129, proposed by Sen. Gerald Matzke of Sidney.

This bill, which will probably become law, cannot be ignored. With its passing, fraternities and sororities must take special care, not just to prevent an incident like Knoll's injury but also to avoid criminal prosecution.

Fraternity and sorority leaders should continue to take the lead. They must let their chapters know that hazing will not be tolerated.

Another serious offense will again draw the entire state's attention and could jeopardize the existence of the greek system on campus. Members must show they are mature enough to reject long-standing, dangerous attitudes about hazing and alcohol abuse.

Their cooperation with this bill will make the greek system and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln stronger.

## Call Bill

Students should fight higher ticket prices

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln's athletic department has gotten into the habit of making decisions that show disregard for students.

Last year, students were moved out of the stadium's best seats so boosters and others could have them.

This year, the athletic department has decided to charge \$73 — or a little more than \$12 a game — for student season tickets. That's a 50 percent increase per game over last season.

UNL Athletic Director Bill Byrne needs to get his priorities straight. Memorial Stadium was not created for the athletic department's boosters. It was created first for the students who play football and for the students who enjoy watching them play.

It's unfortunate that the number of student season-ticket holders has declined since 1983. But after an exciting season last year and the possibility of a national championship this year, that trend probably would have reversed.

Not anymore. Raising ticket prices isn't going to send students to the ticket office.

Maybe that's what the athletic department wants. They might be hoping students will purchase fewer tickets so they can be sold at full price. That is unlikely, but Byrne seems to be intent on taking students out of football games. Moving students out of the stadium's best seats and then charging them more money will accomplish just that.

Apparently, the athletic department isn't expecting students to respond. Cindy Bell, athletic ticket office manager, said she only expected about 10 calls.

Bell shouldn't get any calls. But Bill Byrne — who is ultimately responsible for this decision — should.

If you enjoy paying more for worse seats, we encourage you to call Byrne at 472-3644 and thank him for putting students first.

## 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.



## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

**Editor's note:** The following letter contained an error when it was originally printed in the March 28 Daily Nebraskan.

### Prairie dogs

I have read with great interest the recent responses to Paul Koester's column on prairie dogs (DN, Feb. 28, 1994) by Jeff Lutkehus (DN, March 9, 1994) and William Williams (DN, March 15, 1994). Their knowledge of the prairie dog ecosystem is obviously impoverished.

Lutkehus is right; prairie dogs have always existed in higher numbers than black-footed ferrets. However, ferrets cannot exist without prairie dogs. They live in prairie dog towns and feed almost exclusively on live prairie dogs. (They are predators, not scavengers.)

Arguing that ferrets are not adversely affected by reduced prairie dog populations is ludicrous. Research throughout the state of Nebraska, which has included aerial surveys, aerial photography and ground truthing to estimate prairie dog densities, indicates that this state does not currently have a complex of prairie dog towns capable of supporting a black-footed ferret population. Yet, Williams wants us to believe this state is overrun with wildlife.

I've spent five years working in prairie dog towns in Nebraska studying burrowing owls, a species highly associated with prairie dog communities.

Burrowing owl populations have declined by almost 50 percent, and this decline is associated with dramatic declines in prairie dog populations due to prairie dog control. The prairie dog ecosystem hosts a diversity of wildlife species, several of which, including the black-footed ferret, swift fox, mountain plover, ferruginous hawk and golden eagle, are endangered, threatened or species of special concern.

Being a student of agricultural economics, I was surprised that Williams did not discuss the economics of prairie dog control or the potential benefits of prairie dog towns to livestock. Research on prairie dog control has shown that it is not economically viable. In other words, the cost of controlling prairie dogs is higher than any "damage" they do. In addition, studies have shown that, although prairie dogs reduce the quantity of vegetation, their constant clipping of the vegetation increases nutrient quality, and livestock preferentially feed in these areas.

Williams' argument that cattle grazing has dramatically benefited the Sandhills ecosystem by keeping the vegetation short, and thus preventing wildfires that would "ravage" the land, represents a tremendous ignorance of the basic ecology of the prairie ecosystem. Prairies evolved under fire and benefit from fire. It is the suppression of fire that has damaged this system.

I do believe that most farmers and

ranchers care about the environment. However, we need to make farming and ranching practices profitable within the context of the native grassland ecosystem.

Martha Desmond  
graduate student  
forestry, fisheries and wildlife



James Mehsling/DN

### 'Propaganda'

In the March 28 issue of the Daily Nebraskan, an advertisement appeared on page 11 in the classified section, encouraging us to turn on our radios and "Listen to Freedom." This "Voice of Freedom" is a man named Earnst Zundel. For those of you who missed the recent "60 Minutes" profile of Zundel, he claims, among other things, that the Holocaust never happened. When asked if he considers himself a Neo-Nazi, he replied "no" because Neo-Nazi implies "new" Nazi. I interpret this to mean that he is an "old" Nazi. What a pleasant thought.

During the "60 Minutes" story, a college newspaper is faced with the decision of whether or not to print a piece of Zundel's hate-filled propaganda. In the end, the paper does print the ad along with an editorial conveying the dangers of Zundel's ideas. Their decision was based in part on the very noble principles of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The paper also felt that people were going to be subjected to Zundel's claims anyway, so why not print it under circumstances that they could control.

The difference between the advertisement in the DN and the one in the other paper was that the latter was much more overtly racist. To me, the one appearing in the DN was much more dangerous because its hate was cleverly hidden behind the word "freedom." Any "freedom"-loving person, such as myself, who may have missed the "60 Minutes" story may tune in out of curiosity alone, only to be exposed to Zundel's treacherous lies.

My question is: What were the

people in charge of advertising at the DN thinking when they decided to print this ad without a simple disclaimer? Perhaps they just did not know what Zundel stands for. I hope this is the case. After all, he is not a well-known man, and not everyone watched "60 Minutes."

Perhaps the DN knows who Zundel is and decided it was not necessary to print a disclaimer because there was

nothing in his ad suggesting he was a racist. The only other alternative is that the DN knows who he is, and they just don't care that they are helping to spread carefully hidden racism under the guise of freedom of speech. Frankly, this option scares me and because I am an optimist, I will give the benefit of the doubt and immediately dismiss it.

While I strongly believe in Zundel's right to speak, he becomes even more dangerous when he is allowed to speak to those who are uninformed beforehand of his views. If the DN knew who Zundel was, I feel that a simple editor's note in the absence of a full editorial would have been sufficient in informing its readers. If the editors and the advertising personnel did not know who Zundel was, it is certainly not my intention to question your journalistic integrity.

My only hope is to call attention to this hateful propaganda and to apprise those who intend to listen to Zundel's broadcast of his true intentions.

Joe Thompson  
junior  
geology

### VISION

Andrew Loudon has said the attitudes you have seen from the VISION party will continue during their reign in office. I am sad to say that he is correct. He will sit in office, lie, cheat, steal and basically be a good Republican. He has not even been sworn in and has shown the university community that he is one that cannot be trusted.

He also asks us to unite with him, to make the campus a better place. I must state that while this is a nice idea, I cannot ally myself with a crook, liar or a cheat. Loudon has shown the people he is not an open or an honest person. He has shown the people that he will cheat if it means winning and then be so pompous and arrogant to say "There will be a fine levied and we'll (VISION) pay it (DN, March 14, 1994)." I am sorry that this attitude persists from the VISION party, that one can willfully break the rules and only have to pay a fine. I hope everyone on campus realizes just what happened to this election, and votes next year.

J.B. Howell  
RESUME party presidential  
candidate