OPINION

Thursday, June 29, 1995

Page 4

Nebraskan

Editorial Board University of Nebraska-Lincol

Joel StrauchEditor, 472-1766Gerry BeltzFeatures EditorJennifer MiratskyCopy Desk Chief

EDITORIAL

Understanding

Cartoon opinion, not truth

The Daily Nebraskan would like to clarify the intentions of last week's political cartoon. This cartoon was meant to make a statement about the arrest of Francisco Renteria, it was not a direct attack at Officer Luke Wilke.

This cartoon portrayed Wilke holding a nightstick. It was known to the artist of this cartoon and the editor of this paper that Wilke did not use a nightstick in his arrest of Renteria.

But it has also been reported by witnesses that Wilke's arrest tactics might have been a little harsh.

We did not mean to imply that Wilke beat Renteria with a nightstick. We did intend to imply that it is our opinion that excessive force was used during this arrest.

Political cartoons have been used almost as long as politics has been around. And they have always been given certain license in their expression.

During the '60s and '70s, cartoons about President Nixon showed him climbing out of the sewer. But most people knew that Nixon was from California, not a sewer.

If people inferred that Wilke beat Renteria with a nightstick, we want them to know that this was an exaggeration.

Some concern has also been expressed about the fact that Wilke's name was used in the cartoon.

When political cartoons are aimed at widely known figures like President Clinton or Kato, nametags are unnecessary.

But when the cartoon addresses less well-known figures like Jan Stoney or Luke Wilke, labels are often necessary to illuminate the background for the common reader.

This cartoon was not meant as a personal attack on Wilke, but a political statement about the arrest of Renteria.

We hope this editorial will clear up the misunderstandings that many readers had about the cartoon and help people comprehend what a political cartoon is and the function that it has as a vehicle of opinion.

Nebraskan

Features Editor
Copy Desk Editors

Photo Chie Art Directo General Manage Production Manage Advertising Manage Asst. Advertising Manage ublications Board Chairmar Joel Strauch, 472-1766 Gerry Beltz Jenniter Miratsky Courtney Mathleson Tanna Kinnaman James Mehaling Daniel Shattil Katherine Policky Amy Struthers Laura Wilson Tim Hedegaard, 472-2586

The Daily Nebraskan (USPS 144-080) is published by the UNL Publications Board, Nebraska Union 34, 1400 R St., P.O. Box 880448, Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448, weekdays during the academic year (except holidays); weekly during the summer session. Readers are encouraged to submit story ideas and comments to the Daily Nebraskan by phoning 472-1763 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. The public also has access to the Publications Board. For information, contact Tim Hedenand, 472-2588.

Subscription price is \$50 for one year.
Postmaster: Send address changes to the Daily Nebraskan, Nebraska Union 34, 1400
R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448. Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, NE.
ALL MATERIAL COPYRIGHT 1995 DAILY NEBRASKAN



Vebraskan readers say:

And God says...

In an opinion written by a student June 15, 1995, the large print portrays that abortion was the only answer, but I am thankful for the small print.

"I went back to the waiting room and realized that three women who were there in the beginning had disappeared."

I am thankful that three women may have chosen to give their children the opportunity to live and attend college, to experience a job and be able to do all the things they were created to do.

My confidence continues in that for those three women and their children, there is no hell, if they chose to receive the love of God in Jesus Christ as the answer.

Dennis Brink Professor Animal Sciences

I am responding to the anonymous letter printed on June 15, 1995. Incidentally, why can't this response remain anonymous?

It was interesting to read an actual account of what happens inside an abortion mill. "Clinic" is such a nice word, isn't it? It in no way obscures the harsh reality of what occurs within.

I am, however, thankful they discussed other life-giving options with you. But if we close ourselves to God's will and His guidance in all our "decisions," ours is a similar fate: separation from God because of sin.

"The wages of sin is death," in this case the physical death of your baby. You didn't save yourself on the table. You allowed the murdering of your

innocent child.

Because of sin, a part of you surely died along with your child. It wasn't your insides that were sucked out. It was various parts of your baby!

You traded job experience, one semester and your relationship with your boyfriend for a human life! Fair trade, I'd say.

The Bible is clear about the presence of a child in-utero. Psalms 147:13 states, "He has blessed your children within you." We're all made "in his image; male and female He created us."

Jesus encourages us to "take up our cross and follow Him." Jesus asked you to take up the cross of single motherhood, or to choose adoption, postponing your plans temporarily for the eternal life of your baby.

Why not ask what Jesus would have you do? What would Jesus say to the abortionist? To the Supreme Court? To those who think a personal "choice" is somehow more important than a person?

Not until we all repent, make reparation for our sins, and include God in every facet of our lives, will we be able to recognize evil and fully understand the gravity of our offenses against each other, but most of all against He who knit us in our mother's womb.

Richard O'Hearn, P.E. Project Manager Facilities Insensitivity

This letter is regarding the editorial and cartoon which appeared in your newspaper on June 22. It is my hope that you take this letter constructively.

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.

If the editor, the editorial staff and Mr. Mehsling do not become involved in some legal action by Mr. Wilke, it will be a surprise to me and a result of Mr. Wilke's extraordinary good nature.

This is irresponsible journalism at best and a demonstration of your profound insensitivity to the community you live in and your ignorance of the facts involved in the Renteria tragedy.

What I find amazing is that you have completely ignored facts gathered by one of your staff reporters, Catherine Blalock, who covered Mr. Wilke's trial in your newspaper. You stubbornly persist in framing Mr. Renteria's initial encounter with police as a mistake and racist. It is time you open your eyes and ears.

Mr. Renteria was approached by that UNL Police Officer for QUES-TIONING. He was not identified by "mistake." If you don't understand the difference then this letter has been a waste of time.

Pathologists who testified at Mr. Wilke's trial cannot agree on the cause of Mr. Renteria's death. Witnesses cannot agree on what they saw the police officers do. But yet, it is obvious, according to your editorial, who you believe should be blamed for his death

I know for sure that your ignorance of facts, your extensive use of innuendo and your insensitivity to what the police officers have gone through, are fanning the fires of racism and prejudice on both sides of this controversy.

Our community doesn't need this from you and your newspaper.

Les Veskrna