

OPINION

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Page 4

Daily Nebraskan

Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

J. Christopher Hain Editor, 472-1766
Rainbow Rowell Managing Editor
Mark Baldrige Opinion Page Editor
DeDra Janssen Associate News Editor
Doug Kouma Arts & Entertainment Editor
Jeff Zeleny Senior Reporter
Matt Woody Senior Reporter
James Mehsling Cartoonist

Lock out

Osborne oversteps authority with ban

When head football coach Tom Osborne leads the Huskers to victory on the gridiron, he is doing his job.

When he pronounces from on high what the student newspaper of the university can and cannot say about his players, he is not.

That job belongs to no one but the courts.

Osborne met Monday with the editor of the Daily Nebraskan to complain about editorial cartoons that he felt reflected a bias against his players.

That is his opinion and he is welcome to it.

As a private citizen he is encouraged to take all legal actions available to him to express that sentiment.

Even as a public figure he does not have to go silently. He may use press conferences or picket lines to make his point.

What he cannot do is what he has done. Banning the Daily Nebraskan from football practices is not an option.

As coach, he has exceeded



Bret Gottschall/DN

his authority.

As a representative of the university, he has exceeded the law.

He is not doing his job.

The job of the Daily Nebraskan, on the other hand, is to report the news.

And the football team is news.

The Daily Nebraskan also offers a forum for a variety of opinions — representative of the student body and the larger community.

Sports and the actions of sports figures offer an open field for opinion.

The Daily Nebraskan is more than a blank mirror, it serves as a reflecting eye on current events and issues of opinion for students as well as many off campus.

As prominent public figures, football players and coaches come under the gaze of that eye — both for praise and for blame.

They are subject to criticism and caricature in ways that most of us will never have to face — it goes with the territory.

That is something they have to deal with. They are certainly allowed to complain about it.

There is even a forum within these pages for people with complaints against the paper.

The Daily Nebraskan will never shrink from printing letters or guest columns critical of the paper. That's just part of its job. Because the Daily Nebraskan's responsibility is to its readers.

And it will continue to meet that responsibility as it has consistently done for years.

Editorial policy

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Fall 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.



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Bravo, things grow

A huge bravissima to Jessica Kennedy for her wonderful piece on our in-house landscape artists. Given the fact that our campuses have an overabundance of characterless or sadly derivative buildings, the wonderful landscaping really softens those architectural blows to the gut. The next time you see a landscape worker hauling a hose around or doing some pruning and weeding, give him or her a pat on the back and thank them personally. This praise is long overdue.

James Hejduk
Associate professor of music

The Bible tells me so

Jim Senyszyn (letters, Aug. 29) was right when he said that the Bible is anti-family. But he gave only a few particulars to support his view, which enabled Michael Dalton (Letters, Aug. 31) to rebut with a quotation and some apologetics.

The two statements often quoted as pro-family: "Honor thy father and mother" (Exodus 20:12) and "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder" (Mat. 19:6, Mark 10:9) become just empty slogans when considered alongside the many specific anti-family statements and actions countenanced in the Bible:

● Right from the beginning, the bearing of children is made a punishment: "In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children" (Genesis 3:16.) I thought that "family values" meant for children to be a blessing rather than a curse.

● Abraham actually started to kill his young son because God told him to — and that's presented as a virtue (Gen. 22:1-12, James 2:21.) It's not at all uncommon to read of parents refusing medical care for their deathly-ill child because of some biblical passage.

● Most of us would say that incest is against the interests of the family. Yet Lot, whom the Bible considers to be a very good man, had sex with his two daughters (Gen. 19:33-36) and there is no punishment for either Lot or his daughters.

Of course the poor girls had no mother to guide them because some time earlier God got peeved and killed her. Along with the two men

who were engaged to marry them (Gen. 19:14-26.)

Lot had previously offered the virgin girls to be used by a mob at Sodom. St. Peter called Lot a "righteous man" (Peter 2:8.)

● Jesus ridiculed his own mother in public: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" (John 2:4) in direct violation of the commandment about honoring one's parents. On other occasions he refused to see his mother and brothers, answering their request with a wisecrack (Matt 12:46-50), and when someone praised Mary, he disagreed (Luke 11:27-8.)

● And although half of a family consists of women, the Old and New Testaments have approved of degradation of women enough to make a book on that subject: "Woe to the Women — the Bible Tells Me So" by Annie Gaylor, 1981.

Edgar Pearlstein
Professor of Physics, Emeritus

Abortion war

In 1862, just five days after the Sept. 17 Battle of Antietam, then-President Lincoln issued a preliminary proclamation announcing his intention to free Confederate slaves.

It was arguably a blatantly unconstitutional seizure of property, especially following the 1857 Supreme Court decision in Dred Scott, which ruled that the words of the constitution were not meant to apply to Negroes.

But it was not the first time a president ignored the court, and there is no reason it cannot be done today.

Today, this nation stands guilty of the blood of tens of millions of its children, with millions more women and men psychically scarred for life by their complicity in prenatal child-killing.

It is time for a decisive, principled and precedented overruling of the Court to free the nation from this horrible disgrace, which hangs on the obscenely familiar fiction that the word "person" does not refer to unborn babies.

The basis for the choice to discriminate has simply been changed from skin color to physical maturity, but the choice has been applied in much deadlier fashion.

We need not endure another

baptism by blood to give the nation this new birth of freedom from abominations. Only a peaceful victory at the polls is needed for a truly pro-life president, openly pledged in advance, to ignore the despicable Roe v. Wade and use federal resources to shut down the killing centers.

Where is the emancipator who will free us from this curse?

Alfred Lemmo
Dearborn, MI

East vs. West

I am a resident of Burr Hall and I feel the urge to respond to the article (Roomies hope for city home, Aug. 31) regarding two "refugee" students who are very unhappy about living in Burr.

This article reinforced stereotypes about the residents of East Campus and created stronger division between the two campuses. I'd like to disprove some of these misconceptions.

The bus ride from East Campus to City Campus takes 10 to 15 minutes and drops residents (dry and warm) off right by their various classes. The walk from Abel-Sandoz, where the two residents said they would prefer to live, also takes 10 to 15 minutes (I know, because I lived there last year.)

Although it is true that the Selleck cafeteria is open later than the East Campus dining service, all of the other cafeterias on campus (including Abel-Sandoz) hold very similar hours to those on East Campus.

And guess what? Not everyone on City campus wears Girbaud jeans. I saw many students sporting Wranglers, cowboy boots and hats in Abel. Does this mean you won't be happy living on City Campus either, because not everyone dresses and acts just like you?

I don't own a single pair of Wranglers and all my classes are on City Campus.

People choose to live on East Campus because there is a wonderful community atmosphere present.

People feel friendly and students feel happy and safe.

Jisella Veath
Sophomore
English and communications