

# OPINION PACKETS

**EDITOR**  
Paula Lavigne

**OPINION EDITOR**  
Joshua Gillin

**EDITORIAL BOARD**  
Brad Davis  
Erin Gibson  
Shannon Heffelfinger  
Chad Lorenz  
Jeff Randall

*Guest*  
**VIEW**

## Standing strong Hussein should comply or face war

Indiana Daily Student  
Indiana University

Bloomington, Ind. (U-Wire) — The Clinton administration has come under some recent criticism for the lack of support for military stationing in the Middle East. While the number of Middle Eastern countries publicly supporting the United States is certainly nothing to brag about, the United States, with increasing numbers of Western allies coming to its support, should be confident in its firm position against Iraq.

Secretary William Cohen's recent trip to the Middle East in an attempt to drum up support for military action against Iraq might appear to have failed because only three nations — Oman, Kuwait and Bahrain — are publicly supporting (though not embracing) the possibility of U.S.- and British-backed action against Saddam Hussein. These public stances shouldn't give the impression that the vast majority of Middle Eastern nations oppose action against Iraq. Many regional leaders downright despise Hussein but are afraid any backlash from Hussein will fall upon their own people. Despite this absence of support from major U.S. allies such as Egypt and Israel, Secretary of State Madeline Albright, after meeting with representatives from various Gulf States, said the United States should use force.

The United States is also gradually gaining more support from Western nations. France has recently joined Great Britain and the United States, making three out of the five members of the U.N. Security Council supportive of a military operation. In addition, other allies, such as Canada and Australia, pledged their support Tuesday to the possible U.S.-led action.

This pressure is needed now more than ever. Analysts say, somewhat paradoxically, we will come closer to a diplomatic end to the situation because of the increasing threats of war. They say Hussein has been backing down little by little the closer we come to a military confrontation.

But this game of wait-and-see can't go on forever. Intelligence information has shown us Hussein does in fact possess numerous chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, including some Western powers have never heard of. We can't let Hussein try to circumvent the law and avoid inspections any longer. The ultimate decision as to whether or not we go to war will be up to Hussein. To show him how serious we are, we must continue to stand up firmly to his threats and to rally others in support of an end to the standoff.

Hopefully, military action will be a last resort, and this end will be a peaceful one.

**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@unlinfo.unl.edu.

*Haney's*  
**VIEW**



**DN LETTERS**

**Toeing the line**

As I have sat back and watched the events of the past week unfold regarding Dr. Hibler's e-mail, I have been reminded of something that noted African American scholar and activist W.E.B. DuBois said many years ago. DuBois said, "The problem of the 20th century will be the color line." Truer words have never been spoken.

The people who know me in this community know that I work hard to do a great deal of diversity and cultural education on this campus, in this city and around the country. Frequently, I talk to people about the challenges of realizing our common destiny as peoples from different places in the world now joined together on this blood-stained soil. Often what I say in my presentations means absolutely nothing to the person who for one reason or another has made the conscious decision to tune out the inevitable. And often, more now than in the past, my message hits home with that person who allows their heart to be touched by the fact, not fiction, of what is truly this country's ugly side. As I reflect on some of my success with reaching people and as I read the cards and letters from people who "got it," I realize one simple thing. It's my approach! It's the way that I say what I say that makes the difference. It's the fact that I am willing to be real and tough, but rational and thoughtful.

Now, don't get me wrong; sometimes I scream and yell at folks for what appears to be outright ignorance. But then I realize, I was ignorant, too, once. I used to refer to my African American brothers and sisters as "nigger," thinking that is what we do. I used to call people — black, white, rich, poor, it didn't matter. You see anyone can be called a "nigger," it just depends on who is doing the calling. Yes, I was ignorant, too. I used to be mad at people who called me "nigger," but did not look like me and not mad at the people who called me "nigger" and did look like me. Yes, I was ignorant too.

What's the bottom line as I see it? Well, it was Dr. Hibler's approach; it was all wrong. What Dr. Hibler did was cross a cultural line that says, "African Americans can call each other 'nigger,' but other people, especially white people, can't." You know, "I can call my brother stupid, but don't you." It's the same thing in principle. Personally, I don't like what he did, and I know what he was trying to do.

It's called "getting a rise," and it worked. Actually, it worked so well that his anti-war message has been drowned out by the one thing, among many, that

this country has never fought effectively — racism.

Dr. Hibler may have something significant to say about the United States and this country's seemingly perverse desire to engage in military conflict. But few will ever really hear his message. Why? Because he crossed the line — the color line. So, I say to myself, "DuBois was right; it's still the color line. In 1998, regardless of what people say to the contrary, it's still the color line."

**John Leonard Harris**  
special assistant  
office of the vice chancellor for  
student affairs

**Do the "right" thing**

(Andrea Shahan,) to say that liberalism is responsible for Mr. Meredith being able to enroll at the University of Mississippi is ludicrous ("The liberals strike back," Friday). To say that liberalism is responsible for ending segregation is just too much to swallow.

I believe it would have happened despite any one person's ideology because it was immoral and stupid. The people who fought against segregation were not just liberals or conservatives or Republicans or Democrats.

The contention that conservatives want people to "sink or swim" is just clichéd garbage. I suppose you would have wanted us to go on with a program that cost \$5 billion and has had no real effect on poverty. The programs you so dearly love to take credit for are not need-based, they are race-based and do nothing to help people with the core problems of poverty. These programs are nothing but a tool of the left to say, "Vote for me; I will keep the handouts coming. They want to starve you."

This kind of rhetoric divides this nation by promoting class envy. Saying that these race-based programs were responsible for the success of Clarence Thomas and James Meredith discounts their hard work and personal sacrifice.

Why is it if a person of color is successful, he made it because he had "your" program's help? Isn't that saying that they could not have done it without "your" help? Isn't that just a little racist? These men do not want to deny help to anyone who needs it. It is the fact that these programs you so dearly love to take credit for are race-based and not need-based so they are inherently racist... by denying others an opportunity because they are not of a particular race and showing preference to another because they are of a particular race. I hope you see the

error of your ways, although your intentions are good, the means are unjust.

**Wallace McNabb**  
Lincoln

**Grading gripes**

Regarding "Our View" from Thursday's edition:

On the subject of grade inflation, too many have made the generalization that there are few if any study areas at this institution where grades are earned, not just doled out above the average. Though true for certain departments, it is dangerous policy to apply a firmer fist across the board to all departments.

Having never taken a political science course, I cannot comment on their excellence. But grades earned in mathematics and engineering courses and a majority of science courses are inherently defined by the material they encompass to match grading to the proportional level of understanding. As those in math-related majors will tell you, survival in calculus cannot be secured with memorization. Critical thought, phenomenon analysis and puzzle-solving — the praised characteristics of the political science department — are the basis of engineers' future work; problem-solving and trouble-shooting are what they do. Only hard work and practice — i.e., studying, projects, and homework sets — will earn the grade.

Several courses I have taken, particularly in the physics and chemistry departments, are already set on a curve, so that the class average sits around a C or C+. Even in upper level courses, where the crossword fanatics have long been "weeded out," students are still evaluated to put the average around 70 percent.

I implore Chancellor Moeser and the faculty of all departments to examine grade inflation and evaluation of student work with caution and scrutiny, not generalizations, and to aim efforts at lowering the campus-wide GPA by altering individual department GPA, not by lowering every student's GPA.

Anyone feeling underchallenged by their department or that their GPA could use some "variety" to the right of the decimal is invited to hone their analytical skills by taking a few courses from the engineering college; you won't be disappointed.

**John Kastning**  
junior  
chemical engineering and  
German