

OPINION PACKETS

EDITOR
Paula Lavigne

OPINION EDITOR
Matthew Waite

EDITORIAL BOARD
Erin Gibson
Joshua Gillin
Jeff Randall
Julie Sobczyk
Ryan Soderlin

Our
VIEW

Urge to overkill

Group should not suffer for individuals

Stealing is never a good idea. It is a crime. There is no doubt. Those caught stealing should be held accountable under the law. No question.

Four fraternity members were cited for theft early Tuesday morning. Police claim they stole \$110 in boards from a construction site on North 14th Street. If they hadn't been driving their Chevy S-10 pickup too fast — and had been able to keep the wood in the truck — they would have gotten away with it.

But the sharp eyes of the Lincoln police are all around. Criminals, no matter how petty, beware.

In our society, four young men stealing lumber in the early morning hours hardly turns a head. Crime-related headlines are usually meant for shootings and murders, drugs and other scourges of society.

But since these four were from the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity, and they were stealing wood to make a homecoming float, the news media picked up the story.

Any other day, any other circumstance, any other young men, this story would never have made it out. Thefts from construction sites are reported constantly, and nary a word is written or said about it.

For the actions of four initiates, the entire fraternity was disqualified from the homecoming float competition.

That's silly.

And judicial affairs administrators are talking about possible Student Code of Conduct violations.

Is that really necessary?

Are we overreacting?

And why is that?

This smacks of Sigma Chi. When that fraternity brought hordes of criticism upon itself and the university for burning a cross, the administration grossly under-reacted. Some argue they didn't react at all. And the administrators were roundly criticized.

Now, it seems to us, the administration is bringing the hammer of justice down upon a fraternity as an overreaction to their own past mistakes. We let one get away, we can't be merciful on the others, right?

They are swatting flies with Buicks.

Sigma Alpha Epsilon should not have been kicked out of homecoming competition for what four of their members did. At worst, they should have been forced to put a sign in their yard that said "We stole to build this float, and we got caught." A little public humiliation goes a long way.

The house should have been allowed to compete — the four offending members should not.

The individuals will have their day in court, the group will not.

Judicial affairs should let the courts do the punishing in this case.

And Sigma Alpha Epsilon should go to the lumberyard and pay next time.

Haney's
VIEW



DN LETTERS

Sex Education 101

It seems I read Gregg Madsen's columns with a greater sense of bewilderment each week. There seems to be a dream utopian world in which he lives where premarital sex, smoking, and drinking have simply been abolished.

They haven't. They won't go away. Better education and a more relaxed attitude to it all is the only answer. Take the example of the Netherlands, where the legal age of consent is 12. They have the lowest rate of teen-age pregnancies in Europe, mainly due to superlative sex education and an open and frank attitude from an early age.

The same argument can be applied to Madsen's other pet hate of the extreme dangers of alcohol. Having recently moved to the United States from the UK, I find it quite staggering that someone coming to a university at the age of 18 is not allowed to buy alcohol. These people are old enough to vote, drive, fight (and die) for their country, get married, have children, etc. Yet they can't buy a bottle of wine.

It seems something is very wrong. In my home country, and elsewhere in Europe, buying alcohol from the age of 14 is perfectly normal. Banning alcohol until you are 21 merely encourages the binge mentality that seems to occur here when you hit that age. That is not to say binge drinking and deaths don't occur, but on the whole the approach is balanced. Families share bottles of wine over meals with their children. In this way a sensible attitude is established.

I feel it is time for better education and the introduction of more liberal, yet responsible, attitudes in what is meant to be the home of the free.

Peter Dampier
information technology support

More Sex Ed

Dear Gregg Madsen, You are so right, abstinence really "is the only 100 percent effective cure for all STDs and unwed pregnancies." Maybe I have not caught the irony or the complexity of the concept? So simply put, you really mean that if I never ride in a car, I will be 100 percent sure not to get hurt in a car acci-

dent? Or if I never swim, my chances of drowning will be zero? But wait! Here is a good one — what if I never fly on a plane? Will I be 100 percent sure to avoid a plane crash? That's truly fascinating, I could continue all day long.

I send you my most cordial greetings, in the hope you can shed some light on these and other pressing issues in your next insightful column.

Simone Sinigaglia Liverani
graduate student
journalism

Just be

Mr. Anderson of late seems more interested in the Daily Nebraskan than his own studies, for his interpretive abilities fall far short of developed.

Mr. Carson was not using "queer" as it is intended — negatively — but because the "Night Chalkers" used it and to emphasize a point. Nor was he suggesting that homosexuals stay in the closet, but that if they, and anyone for that matter, are happy with who they are, they need not reveal their preference to anyone.

Most heterosexuals do not talk about their sexual preference because to them, it is not the primary topic on their mind — it simply is. I find it absurd to promulgate the notion that heterosexuals created homosexuality to define themselves, as if heterosexuality exists only in the light of homosexuality.

Writing "Shakespeare was gay," while bold, is not correct. Shakespeare may have been gay, that is true, but his sexual preference is not a matter of historical record, therefore not substantiated as fact.

Gay rights rallies, just as vegetable rights and peace rallies, are great, but the people that need to change their beliefs and attitudes are not there; they are bashing out car windows in the parking lot during the rally. Fear, hatred and ignorance will not be changed by your coming out, it will only validate and serve to further a cause created by the politically motivated with something to gain by discrimination and violence against you.

Nolan Carson
College of Dentistry

In his defense

Although Anderson makes some valid points, in "Chalking the bard," (Wednesday's DN) he seems to have missed the integral point of my argument.

I wrote the response to condemn the anti-homosexual chalkings and to argue that the chalkings could have been and probably were anticipated by the Gay Lesbian Bisexual Transgender organization. This is to say that the group knowingly provided the stage for the anti-homosexual voice.

The interesting thing about this is that after the "anticipated" anti-homosexual activity, the Gay Movement used this negativity to validate or confirm their necessity.

Should not a homosexual "come out" to intimate, trusted friends and not to the public, which has no reason to know or care about someone else's sexuality? This is not a "clandestine, elaborate subterfuge" or oppressive act. It is normal to talk to intimate friends about relationships, any kind of relationship. Being rejected by someone due to sexual preference says more about the person rejecting than the person being rejected.

But, don't assume that everyone is against homosexuals, the defensive assumption on which the gay movement perpetuates itself.

Also, I must say it is ineffective to use gay-bashing as a reason or paradigmatic example of why we need discourse or forums on gay equality. There are laws against hate crime, which obviously includes crimes against homosexuals. But you cannot pass tolerance edicts. People are always going to hate someone or something. No matter how many times we "take back the night" or hold hands and sing "We shall overcome," hate and intolerance will remain. Rallies and forums held to promote tolerance are held by tolerant people and attended by tolerant people drinking coffee and waving flags all in the name of tolerance. Where are the intolerant people, the people we really fear?

Benjamin D. Carson
graduate student
English

Editorial Policy

Unsigned editorials are the opinions of the Fall 1997 Daily Nebraskan. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, its employees, its student body or the University of Nebraska Board of Regents. A column is solely the opinion of its author. The Board of Regents serves as publisher of the Daily Nebraskan; policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. The UNL Publications Board, established by the regents, supervises the 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 student employees.

Letter Policy

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor and guest columns, but does not guarantee their publication. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit or reject any material submitted. Submitted material becomes property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned. Anonymous submissions will not be published. Those who submit letters must identify themselves by name, year in school, major and/or group affiliation, if any. Submit material to: Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St. Lincoln, NE 68588-0448. E-mail: letters@unlinfo.unl.edu.

P.S. Write Back

Send letters to: Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 "R" St., Lincoln, NE 68588, or fax to (402) 472-1761, or e-mail <letters@unlinfo.unl.edu>. Letters must be signed and include a phone number for verification.