

OPINION PACKETS

Our VIEW

Renovation renewal

NU restoration project aids disabled students

Last year, a disabled person couldn't have signed up for a class in Burnett Hall; it didn't have an elevator.

But this year, because of UNL's commitment to meet federal requirements, that person could have easily attended a class in Burnett Hall; a new elevator was installed when the building was renovated.

With the possibility of new construction and renovation of five buildings on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus, administrators have pledged to make necessary accommodations for the disabled.

A new legislative bill, proposed by Sen. Dan Lynch of Omaha, would allow the University of Nebraska to purchase about \$79.5 million in bonds for renovation projects on all four NU campuses.

Along with renovations to make buildings more energy efficient and modern, the university will take steps to ensure an environment conducive to learning for *all* of its students.

The Daily Nebraskan supports UNL's commitment to people with physical limitations.

To remain at the forefront of major universities, UNL is aware that all citizens must have access to its buildings.

While some universities are obsessed with adding more and more computer terminals and chemistry labs, UNL is making sure the services it currently offers are available to everyone.

The university has demonstrated its commitment to increased access by plans to replace both Lyman and Bancroft halls. Because of the way these buildings were constructed, it would not be feasible to renovate them to increase accessibility.

Instead of simply deeming accessibility impossible for the two buildings, new buildings will be constructed, which will increase both energy efficiency and accessibility.

The university should be committed to equal access, not only because of federal government mandates as part of the Americans with Disabilities Act, but also because it is simply the right thing to do. As a land grant institution and a major research university, UNL has a responsibility to allow all citizens an opportunity to learn.

And although UNL is ahead of the game, buildings such as Neihardt Residence Hall and Mabel Lee Hall, which have not been slated for renovation or replacement, also need to be examined and have necessary changes made to comply with the ADA regulations.

If UNL continues in its commitment to the disabled, it may become a viable option for those disabled students now leaving the state to attend universities with facilities that meet their needs.

UNL has pledged to increase diversity and attract brighter students - and with the continued commitment to the disabled, the university will fulfill its mission to serve all people.

Haney's VIEW



DN LETTERS

Can't we all just get along?

You know, I was really happy with the decision of Nebraska and Michigan sharing the national title. There was nothing more fair in my mind, considering you can't vote a team #1 unless they actually PLAY each other. In response to "Are you on Dope" article (Jan. 13), I can answer your question. YES, if it wasn't Osborne's last game, I think we STILL deserved a SHARE of the national title! Notice I said "share," not the full title, just as Michigan deserves a "share." We both went undefeated. We're both No. 1!

You also mentioned Michigan has the tact not to "run up the score." Is that what happened?? Are you saying you didn't want to win by a bigger margin? Or did you just happen to have a little difficulty with that game? It's okay, Michigan. It happens to the BEST of us! We were #1, then had a close game with Missouri, so what happened? We get moved to No. 2. Do you think THAT is fair? We still WON the game! Also, unless you have been living under a rock, I'm sorry, but that seems to be the way the pollsters vote. Either you clobber a team, or you lose votes. Think about it.

If we really want to settle who is No. 1, let's play a game. If Nebraska loses, then fine. You were right, and I'd say let's give you the full title. But until No. 1 plays No. 2, YOU can't say you're No. 1, just as we can't say we're No. 1.

You should be happy you have a national title, shared or not. WE are. I think most of Nebraska even thinks it was the only fair thing to do! You deserve it, but so do we!

Talk about being a "sore loser" or "whining" as you say Scott Frost was doing. Please rethink your statements and, for heaven's sake, try to be happy for what you have. Besides, there's always next season. So good luck to you!

Stacey Helget
Lincoln

More Michigan musings

In (the Jan. 12) excerpt from the Michigan Daily (Winter of discontent), there was an omission of

important facts and some statements that were incorrect:

1. Calling Division I football coaches "boneheads" when it comes to credibility is appalling. It is as appalling as considering a bunch of journalism majors (AP pollsters) experts.

2. It was stated that, "No No. 1 team has ever won a bowl game and slipped in the rankings." That is not true. The same thing happened to Colorado in 1990 when they won the Orange Bowl against Notre Dame.

3. Missouri is not a mediocre football team. They finished ranked in both polls. Michigan had a four-point nailbiter with Iowa, who coincidentally, was not ranked in the final polls.

4. Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota and Northwestern are just as weak if not weaker than the Big 12 doormats.

5. Akron and Central Florida are not Division II schools, they are Division I.

6. No matter what players were ineligible or injured, Penn St. never could have beat Florida.

7. While fans in Lincoln have been celebrating, some are angry, as well.

8. NU finished No. 1 in both national computer polls (the only unbiased polls), while UM finished third and fourth.

It is sad that we rely on polls to determine national champions, but since we do, pollsters should have voted for the one team that would be favored against every other team in the nation. Oddsmakers would make NU a heavy favorite versus UM. They are obviously unbiased since their jobs depend on being right (unlike the AP voters and Bob Griese).

Chad Kamler
freshman
electrical engineering

The King and I

As an American and a student, the letter from Mr. John Harris (Well allow me to retort, Dec. 12, 1997) in our school's newspaper appalled and amazed me. While he covered and misinterpreted several concepts, I

will focus on why I disagree about a student holiday for Martin Luther King Jr.

As an essential point, Mr. Harris tells us that King left behind an indisputable legacy despite his scholastic faults. I will not argue that point. However, according to the letter, King "gave his life fighting for the rights promised to him in the documents that govern this land." Two paragraphs down, we learn "none of the 'founding fathers' did that. Not Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Franklin, Lincoln, none of them." Excuse me? Do you mean that Lincoln, the man who set the slaves free with the Emancipation Proclamation, died naturally? What about John Wilkes Booth and Ford's Theater? If King died a martyr, then Lincoln certainly did also!

Then we have the founding fathers. Had Britain won, King George III would have demanded the Revolution leaders' heads on a silver platter! These men risked their lives in order for all Americans to be free. Do you decry their actions simply because they were all free, white and 21 (or more)? Please take Communication Studies 211 and learn something about cultural relativism and taking people's accomplishments in their own context.

I think a student holiday for King is fine as long as we honor others who have given us a great deal also. Perhaps instead of a King holiday, we ought to have an American Civics day where we honor and remember all those who have gone before us. True, we have the July 4th holiday, but we seem to want something during the school year. Besides, this would be a great opportunity for students to learn about government in action today. We can all learn how to become involved in the political process. Dedicate the morning to honoring the past, then deal with current needs in the afternoon. I can handle that idea. Either that or drop the whole extra holiday idea. We really do not need it.

John Flaherty
senior
meteorology

Editorial Policy

Unsigned editorials are the opinions of the Spring 1998 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@uninfo.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@uninfo.unl.edu>. Letters must be signed and include a phone number for verification.