

OPINION

Thursday, April 27, 1995

Page 4

Daily
Nebraskan
Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeff Zeleny Editor, 472-1766
Jeff Robb Managing Editor
Matt Woody Opinion Page Editor
DeDra Janssen Associate News Editor
Rainbow Rowell Arts & Entertainment Editor
James Mehlsing Cartoonist
Chris Hain Senior Reporter

Hold your fire

Storage a small sacrifice for safety

This weekend, the NU Board of Regents will give students a chance to voice their opinions about proposed changes to the Student Code of Conduct.

The most controversial change in the code would require students who live on campus to store their guns at the University Police Station.

Currently, student's guns are locked in a specific area in each residence hall or greek house.

The Association of Students of the University of Nebraska and the Residence Hall Association have opposed the change, claiming it would be inconvenient for students.

It's true that the administrators who suggested the policy were not worrying about students' convenience. They had a more serious worry — students' safety.

Not that the new policy is tremendously inconvenient, either. It should not be difficult, even for East Campus students, to stop by the police station at 1335 N. 17th St. before they go hunting or target shooting.

It's just inconvenient enough to make students think before reaching for a deadly weapon.

The policy does not deprive students of their right to bear arms. They are welcome to use their weapons. But placing a drive to the police between an upset student and his or her gun will discourage passionate, desperate acts.

Armed students could be dangerous to themselves and those around them. Administrators are thinking of the greater good, the safety of all students.

Responsible gun users should accept the inconvenience and realize that the new policy will protect them from danger, too.

Quick blame

Hatred heats up after Oklahoma flames

The young girl was dying, but her image screamed at us. The photo of one-year-old Baylee Almon being carried away said everything we didn't want to know about what happened in Oklahoma City.

Everyone is asking questions. Who did it, and why they did it. The only answers they're getting is what they gather from television and from newspaper headlines. Unfortunately, those sources aren't really answering all the questions. But maybe we should all be glad that they're not.

CBS, hours after the bombing, reported Muslim fundamentalists were probably responsible for what happened in Oklahoma. Until the John Doe sketches were released and Timothy McVeigh was in custody, hatred toward Middle-Eastern Americans was close to exploding.

Luckily, CBS's was about the only blunder in what could have been one disaster after another of inaccurate reporting. News outlets across the country are throwing out information around the clock, and doing it quite responsibly. In situations such as this, it is easy for rumors to become more concrete than facts, but what little facts are known about the bombing are solid enough.

The credibility of the media is often in question. With only a few exceptions, the coverage of the Oklahoma bombing has been reported with the utmost care, honesty and responsibility.

We should all be glad that the few things we do know are not things we shouldn't know.

Editorial policy

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Spring 1995. 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: Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.



Daily
Nebraskan
readers say:



Send your brief letters to:
Daily Nebraskan, 34
Nebraska Union, 1400 R St.,
Lincoln, Neb. 68588. Or fax
to: (402) 472-1761. Letters
must be signed and include a
phone number for
verification.

On-campus drinking

I am writing in response to Chad Pekron's letter (April 21). Pekron called for the enforcement of the law that makes it illegal to consume alcohol on campus. He related the alleged suicide of a UNL student to the alcohol problem on campus.

First off, it is extremely sad that a human life had to be lost, but Pekron's call for the enforcement of the no-alcohol-on-campus law is far from a solution to the problem.

It is ignorant to think that the police or anyone subordinate to the state can solve problems without costing taxpayers dearly. I cite the \$250 billion squandered on the war on drugs. Maybe it's time to stop criminalizing those who consume alcohol underage.



Bret Gottschall/DN

If the selective service were to resurrect the draft, I could be sent to die in a foxhole for my country, but I still cannot enjoy a beer after a long, hard day. The drinking age should be lowered to at least 18.

And UNL should become a wet campus, because it is a violation of personal liberties when students are not allowed to consume alcohol where they live. Granted, there does need to be some regulation on

where and when alcohol is consumed.

But one must remember the choice to drink or become intoxicated by such means is purely a choice of that individual. The government or anyone else need not take responsibility.

After all, is a government that racks up debt that responsible, anyway?

Christopher A. Nollett
freshman
journalism

Bad editorial

Aside from Jamie Karl's poor journalistic hate-mongering, the editorial "Dead right" (April 25) concerning the subject of doctor-assisted suicide was by far one of the worst pieces of journalism I have ever seen. The Daily Nebraskan provided few facts and then started moralizing on the decay of modern society.

First, you made the point that Dr. Kevorkian broke the laws of the state of Michigan (which I do not refute), but you distorted the position he takes by saying he is "thumbing his nose" at the law. Based on that rationale, Abraham Lincoln and Martin Luther King Jr. were also thumbing their noses at the law.

Why would someone blatantly thumb his or her nose at the law? Because the law is not always right. Kevorkian is practicing an American tradition called civil disobedience.

Second, although this was an editorial, you did not address the issue objectively. The role of a newspaper is not to propagandize, but to present two sides of an issue, evaluate evidence and in editorials, present an opinion based on that evidence. You didn't present a single position in support of doctor-assisted suicide.

There is actually very little controversy when people realize the actual position of Kevorkian supporters. Most do not support the

right of anyone to commit suicide in any circumstance; in fact, most agree that suicide is NOT an option in almost every single case of a person wanting suicide.

They support suicide only in those cases where a patient is terminally ill, meaning that they will die no matter what happens. If I'm strapped to a hospital with a week to live, racking up exorbitant hospital bills to leave to my family; have my affairs in order and rationally discuss the matter with my family and physician, then give me liberty by giving me death!

Then there is the matter of your evidence by relying solely on the U.S. Supreme Court decision. Must I remind you that newspapers should always be questioning things instead of taking them for granted? Must I remind you that a law is not always correct morally? Must I remind you that simply because a right is not explicitly stated in the Constitution does not mean that it is wrong?

Third, how did you ever make the leap from doctor-assisted suicide to the destruction of the world? This incredible ideological leap is so dramatic that I cannot even fathom where you came up with it.

Kevorkian has assisted in 21 suicides and now the world is coming to end? Ah, but pardon me, I am also making exaggerated claims with no basis; you really said "it will be the beginning of the end of our country, or our world, as a civilized one."

This is absolutely ridiculous! All that you are really doing is jumping on the bandwagon of ignorance and fear, which is why I would venture to say that Jamie Karl wrote this piece of trash.

As a final note, I find it ironic that this editorial (if it should even be called that anymore) was printed above a model example of an editorial by the University Daily Kansan. Perhaps you could learn something.

Zach Niemann
freshman
philosophy