

OPINION PACKAGES

EDITOR
Erin Gibson

OPINION EDITOR
Cliff Hicks

EDITORIAL BOARD
Nancy Christensen
Brad Davis
Sam McKewon
Jeff Randall
Bret Schulte

Our
VIEW

Casting stones

Jesus' example not followed by preachers

City Campus has been under siege lately by a few vehement radicals who seem determined to take America back to medieval superstition and human oppression.

No, they're not from Montana. They're the campus preachers who pass damnation and judgment from atop stone benches as students walk to class.

Last week, a student reported a preacher known as Brother Jed to campus police claiming he verbally attacked her sexuality and made lewd suggestions regarding her sexual preferences. She was picked from the crowd for wearing a T-shirt in support of a gay and lesbian film festival.

She walked away embarrassed, hurt and, worst of all, another subject of persecution in the name of religion.

Does everyone remember how cruel Jesus was to people he didn't like? Remember the stories of Jesus slandering those who were persecuted by society? Or when he insulted the weak, the underprivileged or the marginalized segments of an uncaring culture?

Look through your Bible. Doesn't it have to be in there somewhere for a preacher to behave in such a manner?

No.

Whether you believe Jesus of Nazareth was divine or not, his personal philosophy was one of love and tolerance, not humiliation and presumptuous judgment. He dined with the hated tax collectors, befriended prostitutes and offered his love to the lepers and beggars.

Two thousand years later, people who claim to speak on his behalf are condemning total strangers based on their clothes.

These preachers have every right to be on campus and have every right to speak their minds, but they are heretics.

Fire-and-brimstone preachers of eternal damnation make a sacrilege of Jesus' philosophy. This was a man who stopped the stoning of an adulterous woman by stating, "Let those among you without sin cast the first stone."

He didn't attack her. He didn't humiliate her in public or confront her with accusations of sexual impropriety. He certainly didn't judge her based on what she was wearing.

Religion, for centuries, has been an expression of humanity's search for meaning and guidance in a world filled with uncertainty. People like Jesus, Buddha and Muhammad survive today because they offered hope, not more pain.

But most of these campus preachers seem to have forgotten Jesus' most basic precept: Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.

We praise the evangelists who remember this edict.

On campus, the Gideons quietly offer the New Testament with an encouraging smile. They are trying to share their faith through love rather than hate.

How Christ-like.

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.

Mook's
VIEW



DN LETTERS

Park it, Mister

There are times when it seems university critics are right in saying "the university has plenty of money, it's just how it chooses to spend it." The 12 year plan to "... reshape City and East campuses" is a prime example. Yes, it would be "neat" to live and work in a secluded community without the exposures of the real world, but at what price? No benefit has been proposed other than a "pedestrian friendly" setting that would be created.

Surely the students, faculty and staff at this university are mature and intelligent enough to cope with traffic regulation devices such as stop lights, cross walks, etc. that society at large uses for orderly movement of people and cars.

There is a real price to pay for the proposed plan, both financially and in terms of perception. First is the cost of development of the plan. Someone has to pay. Buying of private lands, relocating a sorority, reconfiguring streets, creation of malls, etc. takes real money. What opportunities will be lost or foregone? Could we have better equipped science labs, classrooms, libraries, etc.? If the money is available for the former, it should also be considered available for the latter. This is a one time up-front cost, and it should be realized if funding is available, it could be used for other purposes.

The building and operating costs of the proposed new parking system are substantial. The statement in Tuesday's paper that the garages will cost \$50,000,000 dollars should be a real wake up call. For a perspective, it is interesting to note that this is 2 times the possible cut from the proposed tax lid. This ("... vast change in cost of parking on campus ...") increase in parking fees represents real money out of your pocket as would a tuition increase.

There is a second price to pay in terms of time. Commute times will be more than doubled for university people who live in Lincoln. Most people on this campus commute. Why do we have to contrive schemes to make us suffer the commute times of much more populated areas of the country? There are all sorts of additional time consequences, such as less efficient use of university buildings because early morning classes would become even less attractive.

Finally, one has to wonder if the planners are hearing the winds of change. President Smith has repeatedly warned the university community that in the future, legislatures will not continue to support higher education at the levels of past funding. The university was given

the opportunity by LB1100 to meet serious renovation and maintenance problems that have accumulated in the past because of inadequate funding.

These bonds will have to be paid off in the future by money that will not then be available for other uses (it is scary to have this fund discussed in the same articles about the parking, malls, etc.). There is a huge cloud on the horizon in terms of the petition lid initiative. Contemporary articles voice the concerns of the regents with the spending lid. This is not a time of plenty for higher education.

What message is being sent to the citizens of Nebraska at this time? Is it that the university has the financial ability to create an aesthetic island to shelter students, faculty and staff from the realities of the world but not the financial ability to offer a first-class educational program without full state assistance?

It is almost criminal to say that costs would be paid by user fees and not tax dollars. There are too many user fees already. There has been no evidence offered that the proposed new face will contribute to the education mission of the university. This university needs to rein in "it would be nice" and focus on its primary reasons for existing.

Darryll T. Pederson
professor
School of Natural Resource
Sciences and Geosciences

Equal time?

We are writing to inform the Association of Students of the University of Nebraska about our disappointment regarding the failure of the Homecoming royalty nomination procedure to incorporate the Athletic Department for this year's royalty court. Over the past few years, the athletes have had a track on the nomination ballot to try to diversify the court during the Homecoming festivities.

This year, however, the applications sent to the Athletic Department arrived the day prior to the due date, leaving the athletes virtually no chance to apply for the royalty court. It is our knowledge that ASUN opened up the track to athletes to try to get more of us involved in university activities.

Therefore, we would think they would have granted the Athletic Department a little time to get nominations in order. This was not to be. Essentially, the athletes were left out of this year's activities by the failure to allow proper time to get nominations

taken care of. We feel let down by ASUN's negligence. We understand that future nomination committees will have an Athletic Department member present. However, that does nothing to help this year's athletes who had planned on participating. If ASUN wants to continue to get athletes involved, we would appreciate a little more help to ensure our participation.

Erica Clark
Damon Strickland
seniors
University of Nebraska swimming
and diving team members

It's a sure thing ...

Monday's lead editorial in the DN, "Quite a Gamble," criticized Republican efforts to cut taxes by \$80 billion over five years. It compared their effort to laying down a roll of bills at the craps table at the Kanessville Queen.

The editorial was based on two flawed propositions. One is that projecting future government revenue is not an exact science and therefore we should take no prospective action. The other is that the money for tax cuts belongs to the government. I grant that there is risk involved in projecting future revenues. Life is full of risks, and some are worth taking. The CBO projects that the government will run a \$1.55 trillion surplus over the next ten years. The Republican plan would cut taxes by \$80 billion. This is hardly a crap shoot.

Using the DN's logic, no college student should accept the risk of taking out college loans because our future earnings are not guaranteed. Nonsense. We are autonomous human beings who can weigh risks against potential rewards and make reasonable judgments.

The second proposition, that the government will "give taxpayers money the government doesn't have," belies the fact that the money belongs to the people and not the government. The money in question is not the government's to give. Under our system, the government exists to serve the interests of the people. The people do not exist to serve the interests of the government.

Reasonable people can disagree over the efficacy of the Republican tax cut proposal. By dismissing the plan as an illogical gamble, however, the DN reduces a serious debate on the role of government to mere name-calling.

Timothy J. Thalken
first year
College of Law