

Olympic tragedy

Daily Nebraskan editorial policy is the product of an editorial board consisting of Editor-in-chief Jim Gray, Managing Editor Tom Lansworth and News Editor Randy Beam. Individual editorials represent the views of the writer but not necessarily those of all editorial board members.

The dove of peace had one of its few remaining feathers plucked Tuesday as the most brazen and senseless international crimes virtually destroyed the Summer Olympic Games and any ideas of future understanding-through-competition.

The insane assassination of 11 Israeli Olympians must be classified as the most bloodthirsty of crimes—the epitome of the entire strategy of revolution-through-terrorism. Murder—any murder—is an irrevocable waste, an undoing of all mankind's good work.

But the terrorist-murderers killed more than humans. They have, for the present, extinguished any hope of international

cooperation. They destroyed a last refuge from international crime.

In the past, the Olympic Games have conspicuously lacked political barriers. Once in an Olympic atmosphere, sportsmen left political differences behind and competed on an even level—individual against individual.

For over 30 years, the games were the paragon of international cooperation. Minor skirmishes developed in the past, but they were always dealt with in the spirit of cooperation. Three times the games have been cancelled by world wars. But the games themselves have been remarkably free of political terrorism.

This year was different. Politics forced its way into the games early, disallowing Rhodesia its right to compete. And once the spectre showed its head, the outcome was, perhaps, inevitable. Political maneuvering, it seems, breeds terrorism.

It is remarkably ironic that the last time the Olympics became a political arena was also in Germany—36 years ago. In the 1936 Olympics Adolph Hitler used the games to display the prowess of his Aryan race and to further discriminate against non-Aryans—specifically blacks and Jews. It seems amazing that the 1972 Olympics could become a battleground over the same two prejudices.

But now that they have, another major issue is brought to mind. U.S. Olympic discus thrower Jay Silvester hit the heart of the matter when he predicted "They're going to kill the games."

Admittedly, chances are that the games will continue in years to come. But the question is whether they should.

As they were in the past, the games were a worthwhile undertaking, a small display of the possibility of cooperation. But as they are now, they are worthless—another violent, chaotic, political shell game.

To continue the games as political set-pieces would be a great injustice to the world. They must change or be abolished, for the future's sake.

Fund fiasco

In a fairly typical move this week, the federal government's ACTION agency decided to remove funding from the Nebraska Opportunities for Volunteers in Action (NOVA) program.

The UNL program, rated among the top few of those sponsored by ACTION, does not deserve such treatment. Last year, in its initial year of operation, NOVA proved itself a worthwhile and constructive program.

By no means should the NOVA program be allowed to expire. Alternative funding for the program must be sought from all possible sources—including other federal agencies, foundations and private contributors.

If all attempts at funding the program should fail, the responsibility for funding the program should be taken by the University.

If the University abandons NOVA at this critical juncture, it would be a sad end indeed for a valuable program.

Jim Gray

Stereotypes limit women's opportunities

A woman, depending upon whom you talk to, is a passive, dependent creature, often illogical, unreliable and inconsistent. Although she may be good with her hands, intuitive and compassionate, she is over-emotional, overreacts under stress, is sexually threatening and by her very nature tends to need protection.

A man, on the other hand, is resourceful, innovative, aggressive and decisive. He is dependable, quick thinking, strong at all times and ever mindful of the dominant leadership role he must assume. It is natural that he be the family patriarch, provider and protector.

Of course, in the unlikely event any individual deviates from this pattern, a simple explanation can be provided. If female, this individual is either an unfortunate neurotic in need of immediate re-education to her proper social role, or else she must be an embittered, cold "womens' libber," unmarried, unattractive, undoubtedly having missed the boat. Very often these two types coincide.

But, obviously, if this misfit is male, he must have experienced a peculiar childhood resulting in over-identification with his mother. Such deviants should not be tolerated. Anatomy is destiny after all is said and done.

That's the way it used to be until a Southern member of the U.S. Senate tried to kill the Civil Rights Act. He jokingly inserted the word "sex." To his surprise, and the surprise of others, the bill passed as amended.

This was the first time since the 1920 passage of the 19th amendment, the only reference to women in the entire constitution, that legislation affected the American woman so profoundly. For over forty years an equal rights amendment had bounced back and forth between the House and Senate and had never been passed.

Groups of women organized, lobbied and by 1972 the 26th amendment, or Equal Rights Amendment, was passed by both the House and Senate. It only awaits ratification by three-fourths of the states before it becomes law.

But for the majority of women, life and its economic situation has not really changed. The National Organization of Women has painted a bleak picture. Fifty-one per cent of the population is female, and yet for all intents and purposes, women are accorded a minority status.

Twenty-nine million women work, and two-thirds of these work at menial, repetitive, and unchallenging jobs. Forty per cent of all working women work because they have to, they are their own sole means of support, and fifteen per cent of working women are heads of households.

Yet, full-time women workers earn an average of 40 per cent less than men in similar jobs in every working category. And, half of all working women earn less than \$3,700 (\$3,300 is the poverty level) with 1.4 per cent of working women earning over \$10,000 compared with 13 per cent for men. This wage gap is not decreasing but continuing to increase as it has for the past 25 years.

Perhaps the most significant inequality of all lies in education. Women with college degrees earn about the same as



men with high school educations, and even when their educations are equal, men earn about twice as much as women.

On Saturday August 26th, Women's Equality Day, approximately 300 Nebraska area women and men met in Omaha to discuss these issues so important to women. Sponsored by NOW, the Women's Equity Action League and the Nebraska Women's Political Caucus, working and professional women, students and housewives all participated in workshops dealing with job discrimination, women's rights, welfare and the past and present women's movement.

Emphasizing the economic and job inequalities that face most women, the artificial limits imposed on both men and women by traditional sex roles and stereotypes, and the resources available for help or reinforcement in dealing with these problems, this conference opens the possibility of a united effort to approach the Nebraska woman's difficulties in a special way.

Whatever is this state coming to?—a question posed rather cynically by a conference observer, yet one mixed with more than a glimmer of hope.

michele
coyle
mind
games