

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Back to reality

With the thrill of Nebraska's win over Oklahoma fresh in their minds, many Nebraskans turned their television set on last Friday expecting to thoroughly enjoy NBC's "Chronolog," which was featuring a documentary on Cornhusker football.

But something went wrong. The glow of the Big Red mania palled as television viewers beforehand were treated to a segment on the human misery surrounding the situation in Pakistan.

A Johnny Rodgers punt return or a Jeff Kinney touchdown run seemed rather insignificant and meaningless after one had viewed in living color the atrocities of the Pakistan army and the stench of the living dead in refugee camps in India. After viewing the trouble in Pakistan and India it seemed that football crazy fans in Nebraska and the rest of the nation were living in a dream world.

Undoubtedly the craze over football does serve as an escape from the problems of the world. But in many ways this is good since life would be very depressing if people didn't have something to turn to as a temporary diversion from problems.

Football in Nebraska has served a very important function. It has provided thrill and recreation to the fans. It has helped unify the state since football is about the only thing Nebraskans seem to agree on. It has been a source of pride to a state that seems to suffer from an inferiority complex. And it has put Nebraska on the map of the nation.

Football is important to Nebraska, but it should not blind the state to pressing problems. After all, football is only a game.

Open the doors

This October the NU Board of Regents hammered out their decision on the controversial conference on human sexuality in closed sessions.

However, this was nothing new since the Board regularly meets behind closed doors to discuss important issues. When the Regents do have public meetings, the sessions usually lack extensive debate and often appear to be well rehearsed.

The UNL chapter of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) recently joined a growing list of groups who feel the Regents are violating the spirit of the state's "open meetings" law. In a letter to President Varner the AFT said: "Testimony at Professor Stephen L. Rozman's trial and other available information raise serious questions concerning the Regents' use of 'public' meetings to 'arrive' at decisions already made in private."

The need for greater public debate stems from the fact that the public needs to know not only the decisions of government, but the reasons behind the decisions. The performance of the Regents can only be adequately judged when the rationale behind a decision is known, the competition of ideas that produced it and the alternatives that were open.

The Board's extensive use of closed meetings is occurring despite campaign statements by four Regents who won election last year that they believed in open meetings and public debate of issues.

The Regents' extensive use of closed sessions has gone on too long. If the campaign statements are to mean anything, the Board should open its door wider to the public.

Gary Seacrest



"But, Geewhiz! What'll I do for an encore?"

Canada doesn't want to play USA

by Evert Clark
Newsweek Feature Service

OTTAWA—The border between the United States and Canada has always been referred to proudly—by both sides—as the longest peaceful border in the world. In fact, in the 104 years since Canada became a nation, Americans have come to regard it almost as the 51st state—a quiet, friendly country thriving on its proximity to the U.S.

Now Canada is rebelling at its image as the U.S.'s obedient stepchild to the North. In public statements and private meetings, Canadian officials are letting the rest of the world know that their country has muscle and a mind of its own.

The result has been a distinct worsening of U.S.-Canada relations, and the two countries are beginning to behave like housewives who loathe the fact that they are forced to share the same back-yard fence.

Where once Canada could logically have been expected to toe the U.S.'s foreign-policy line, the government of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau has been railing against American involvement in Vietnam and American policy toward Cuba.

Where once Canada would have been among the first countries to support the U.S. in the United Nations, it was recently one of the first to oppose the unsuccessful American position on dealing with Communist China's admission to the UN.

The American twitch that set off the latest outburst of anti-U.S. feeling in Canada was the 10 per cent surcharge on imports announced in August by President Nixon. Canada has long been America's foremost trading partner, closely linked with the U.S. economy.

American industries and individuals control all but 5 per cent of Canada's automobile industry, all but 10 per cent of its electrical industry, all but 15 per cent of its mining industry and all but 40 per cent of its chemical industry. Nearly 70 per cent of Canada's total exports are sold to the U.S., accounting for 13 per cent of its total gross national product.

Canadian officials are convinced that the surcharge will cost Canada some \$900 million in the next year alone and will mean the loss of about 90,000 jobs—an alarming figure in a country where the unemployment rate is already 7.1 per cent.

So economic resentment is perfectly natural. But Canadians are worried about much more than just

diversifying their economic base away from the U.S. "They are complaining about pollution from our tankers, thermonuclear tests at Amchitka Island and environmental problems along the border," says one U.S. official.

They are also worried about the inundation of their country with cultural Americana. Through the years, many of Canada's communications media have become so thoroughly Americanized that the rich Canadian cultural heritage is rarely presented to the people.

Canadian radio and television stations have traditionally borrowed heavily from the U.S. to supplement the meager diet of programming produced domestically. The Top 40 musical hits on radio usually were all written, performed and produced by Americans.

But now the Canadian Radio-TV Commission has issued new fiat designed to Canadianize broadcasting. By October 1972, both the government-owned Canadian Broadcasting Corp. and the privately owned CTV network will have to reorder their schedules so that at least 60 per cent of all programming is Canadian.

And the Top 40 records will take on a definitely Canadian accent. A minimum of three out of every 10 records played on music programs will have to be performed by a Canadian singer or packaged by Canadian producers.

And there has recently been a major public outcry against the so-called "Americanization" of Canadian education. As of 1970, Americans held more than 25 per cent of all university teaching jobs in the social sciences, and in some departments at some schools they comprised more than half the whole teaching staff.

Despite all the bitter recriminations, no one suggests that any truly damaging rift between the two countries is imminent. "We are quite concerned about our independence, our continuing existence as a country," says one member of Trudeau's government, "but this does not mean that Canada is turning its back on the U.S. I don't think there could be any doubt as to where we would stand when the chips were down."

Still, the days of placid good-neighborliness are gone, and probably for good. And to many Canadians, their country's new posture makes eminent good sense. "After all," says one, "we became a country in the first place because we didn't want to be part of the U.S."



greg hickman
Men's liberation

Greg Hickman is associated with a new UNL student group called "Brother," an offshoot of men's liberation.

We have a unique chance at this point in time, to stop and really check out what our culture is all about. Further, it seems to me that this "checking out" should be one of the major aims of education, particularly higher education. But it is not and you and I had damn well better take that on ourselves.

The first place we have to start is with ourselves, not institutions, systems or establishments. We have to find out where we are. That may not be too easy.

Women started in fairly loud, but non-violent revolt after thousands of years of harsh treatment by both men and society. And they are going about the business of creating a humane egalitarian society out of this heap we now have.

Men have reacted in ways that have totally covered the spectrum of rationale, indignation, heated protest, hardline chauvinism, even violence.

One the other side, the feminists have also seen attempts at honest understanding, passive indifference, quiet

sympathy. There have been a radical few that are sincerely and actively seeking to do what can be done to make some of these changes part of reality instead of talk.

We are starting a new student group on this campus called "Brother." Although we are an offshoot of men's lib, we basically want to further what we think is a people revolution in this country.

We think that the feminists can't do it themselves, men and women have to force themselves, and let each other abandon the stereotypes that strangle us all. What we call "society" is made up of men and women.

The group wants to serve as a forum by means of rap sessions, panels, talks, guest speakers, Free U. classes. We are even in the process of organizing the second annual "Master America Pageant", so ably put on last year by the Informer.

This pageant seeks to serve as a satirical put-down of flesh peddling. If people respond

honestly, we will be here to stay. We need each other to love, feel, talk, to be ourselves and to see that this society has alternatives to the different life styles humans require.

We must all recognize that there have been injustices on both sides and usury all around. Men have been locked in just as harsh a stereotype and role as women have. We men are guilty of a lot, so are women.

We want to look at the conditions, traditions, logic(?) that say men will not be emotional, that we must live up to the "what kind of man reads Playboy" image, that you have to be a football player to get along with the beautiful girls—or anyone else.

I won't repeat the hurts of womanhood. They are fairly well out in the open and wrong, and we want to help.

Men are oppressed in other ways. Men take no part, or little part, in raising the children of our society. Sex role separation prohibits both



jeffrey hart
Where professors lead



During the 1950's, when I was a senior at Columbia, a group of us asked one of our professors what it was he wished to produce as a teacher. Did he want to produce other men like himself, college professors, experts in some aspect of English literature?

No, the Columbia professor replied, he did not necessarily desire to produce other literary scholars like himself. What he wanted to produce, he said, were men like Walter Bagehot. This Victorian Englishman had been an accomplished essayist and classicist, but also a public man. He had been active in politics. He could write with equal authority not only on Milton or Virgil, but also on the British Constitution or on foreign affairs. In his career he joined the study to the public forum, literature to politics.

Often, during the past few years, I have pondered that reply. We habitually affirm that in the United States civilians ought to have the last word on military matters and on decisions affecting national security. Yet, on the other hand, it seems to me that our colleges and universities are signally failing to produce a body of informed opinion capable of thinking responsibly about world affairs.

These thoughts have been stimulated anew by a conversation I have just had with a Dartmouth senior in my office. He is intelligent, he is adept at the interpretation of literature, but he does not have much notion at all of how the world looks to the men responsible for formulating policy. I found him to be almost entirely private in his interests, and in this to be disturbingly typical. His sentiments on public matters turned out to be merely carapace-like defenses of that privacy.

He knew, he thought, that the Vietnam war had been a "mistake"—though he was mute when asked what options he thought the policy makers actually had in the early 1960's when

our engagement began, or what course of action as the war developed would have been preferable to the one actually pursued.

National mobilization in 1965? Tactical improvements? No, the war is "immoral", and we should concentrate on "domestic problems"—opinions he had reached not by sober reflection but by a process of osmotic absorption from the surrounding culture.

I tried to cut through this cant. In the early 1960's, I noted, the policy-makers in Washington faced the real prospect that a constellation of Communist powers was emerging in East Asia and the Pacific Basin—China, North Korea, North Vietnam, along with a Communist-aligned Indonesia under Sukarno. Such a grouping, it was entirely likely, would organize the dynamics of Asia against us.

Through political momentum—demographic, economic and military—such a grouping might easily attract to its side the industrial power of Japan, subvert the Philippines, absorb India, and gaze with intense interest on the empty spaces of Australia. As Walt Rostow has written, the result could easily have been World War III.

That a plausible case could have been made for such a scenario, and that Vietnam decisions played a part in preventing its realization, came as a dazzling revelation to my college senior—whose IQ, after all, places him within the upper one per cent of the American population.

My point is that we are producing in our colleges and universities a student population overwhelmingly private in its interests, and lacking any conception of the realities of international relations. This being the case, it is difficult to see how our national interests can be sustained over the long pull, or how we can stay the course in the challenges that are sure to arise even after the end of the Vietnam war. Distributed by King Features Syndicate.

factory trained mechanic
VOLVO major/minor repairs
475-9703
27th & Orchard
OLSTON'S 66
free wheel balancing with purchase of any VW snow tire.

EUROPE NEXT SUMMER?
It's possible on the money you can earn selling a line of high quality cassettes and reel-to-reel audio tape. One of the leading manufacturers of magnetic tape is seeking an on-campus representative. Unique promotional materials and advertising support in this publication will be provided. Interested? Write, giving complete personal data and type of recording equipment you use.
Mr. M. H. Barkman
Specialties Sales Manager
WABASH TAPE CORPORATION
P. O. Box 128
Huntley, IL 60142

UNION WEEKEND FILMS
now showing
Bob and Carol and Ted and Alice
starring
Robert Culp Dyan Cannon
Elliot Gould Natalie Wood
Friday and Saturday,
Dec. 3 & 4
at 7:00 and 9:00 p.m.
Admission: 75¢ with student I.D.
Union Small Auditorium

NEBRASKA UNION ORANGE BOWL TRIP
\$272.50 (292.50 each for faculty, staff and married students)
***5 NITES LODGING
***ROUND TRIP JET TRANSPORTATION
***GAME TICKET
***PARADE TICKET
***INSURANCE
***BUS TRANSPORTATION
***BAGGAGE TRANSFERS
December 30, 1971 to
January 4, 1972
Deadline: noon Dec. 17, 1971
Reservations are on a first come-first-served basis with the total amount paid in full. Trip is open to students, faculty and staff and their immediate families only.
SIGN UP IN ROOM 123, NEBRASKA UNION PROGRAM OFFICE

THE DAILY NEBRASKAN
Telephones: editor: 472-2588, news: 472-2589, advertising: 472-2590. Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Nebraska. Subscription rates at \$5 per semester or \$9 per year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during vacation and exam periods. Member of the Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service. The Daily Nebraskan is a student publication, editorially independent of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government. Address: The Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.