

# Feminist: not all males are 'chauvenist pigs'

He is stark mad, whoever says  
That he hath been in love an hour...  
Who will believe me if I swear  
That I have had the plague a year?

John Donne

It's Valentine's Day, and if the radio contests for boxes of candy haven't gotten the message across, then surely the empty greeting card racks across town will make the point. At this very moment, frantic husbands and boyfriends are standing wallet to wallet in each of Lincoln's flower shops ready to fight for the last red rose—or yellow rose—or wilted carnation.

And, by this time, every single person on campus should be feeling somehow left out of all this, as if the fluttering of little heartbeats have left them in the lurch. A card to Mom and a pink cupcake complete their festivities.

It is, however, an excellent opportunity to ponder all those heavy topics, such as Love and Heavy Breathing, and it is an equally good chance for what might otherwise be considered a man-hating feminist

## amy struthers broad side

to expound on one of her favorite topics—her man.

That a feminist should feel only disgust at the mention of that three-letter word is a fallacy that accompanies the usual stereotype. And while I have met many a man who merits only that reaction, I

must say I have found at least one who is everything our old friend the male chauvinist pig is not.

One might ask, What does a feminist look for in a man? Then let me tell you what I have discovered. A man who admits he is usually as broke as I am, instead of insisting on paying for everything. A man who opens car doors for me only when they're frozen shut. A man who is as comfortable in a conversation about children or cooking as he is in a conversation about sports or cars. And a man who has a sense of humor about the whole thing, who doesn't let me take myself too seriously.

So this is for all those men who have remained gentle in a locker room that labels them hen-pecked, and can listen to jokes about chicks without believing a word of it.

Happy Valentine's Day, Larry.

## to the editor



Dear editor:

The editorial "MUN session was not fun and games for Indians" expressed a fine sentiment regarding the status of Indians in their native land, one that I personally concur with. It is unfortunate, however, that you chose to express it at the expense of Nebraska Model United Nations. The editorial implies that NMUN delegates were embarrassed to hear Mr. Black Elk speak, happy to see him finish and willing to ignore his appeal to their consciences as representatives of the nations of the world.

First, his presentation was the most courteously received by any of the four-day conference, including that of Sam Jaffe and the two U.N. diplomats. Frank Black Elk received from all, and there were hundreds of delegates present, a standing ovation. The assassination attempt, coming unfortunately directly after the speech, was in no way planned or expected by the staff, and an apology was made from the chair on behalf of the assembly.

Perhaps the worst and most damaging misrepresentation in the editorial concerned what was interpreted as the reluctance of the conference to act on the resolution proposed. Let me explain to your readers a fact already known, but ignored, by you. The consideration of any NMUN resolution involves some advance preparation. The official deadline for submission of resolutions was midnight, Feb. 2. I did not hear from Mr. Black Elk until Feb. 6, and his resolution, together with a request to suspend the rules, was not presented to me until three hours before our scheduled adjournment on Saturday.

To summarize: the staff and delegates to NMUN 1975 bent over backwards to give this man a chance to present his case. Only Mr. Black Elk's own lack of interest precluded us from taking action on his request. If Albers condemns the delegates for not abandoning the business at hand to deal with this resolution during the final moments of NMUN, he condemns himself for not speaking out from his own position as a delegate. He was there.

The fact that he was there also inclines me to believe he deliberately distorted the facts of this matter to facilitate the writing of another angry, self-righteous, inaccurate editorial—his specialty.

Dean Kirby  
Secretary-General

### Knives lethal

Dear editor:

In response to Chip Treen's letter "Police professionalism?" (Daily Nebraskan, Feb. 12), let me

say that it is easy to sit back and criticize when you are not the one being attacked.

Mr. Treen's statement "but only a knife was involved" leads me to ask if he feels a knife is not a lethal weapon. A gun only kills faster and from a greater distance.

The point is that this incident occurred in a narrow hallway not a parking lot or lobby and four men cannot move around in that confined space fast enough to overpower someone moving in for a kill. Would it have been better that the man had killed Det. Buckner and then been overpowered?

Questioning the death of a human is natural and necessary but before passing judgment look at both sides. What would you do if you or a friend had just been stabbed, knocked to the floor, your attacker was making a second lunge and all that was available to you was a pistol?

Eric Seberg

### Literary snob

Dear editor:

"Jota-Tay stiffened as the Pegian monster lumbered into view. Crouching, he raised his ray gun and fired. ZRRGLRMAPF! The beast fell to the earth with a thud." Who would dare to deny the beauty, relevance and socially redemptive value of science fiction writing such as this?

Bruce Nelson tried, but in my opinion he did little more than establish himself among the ranks of unyielding literary snobs. His unprovoked slandering of such a major part of our culture was typical of the all-knowing pseudo-intellectual pretense so often adopted by some when trying to be as grossly subjective as possible.

The only point to his credit was his ability to make foundationless assumptions and to twist quotes so that they appear to mean what he wants them to (which should prove to be very useful in his future journalistic escapades). Granted he is entitled to his own views, but I'd hate to see innocent, impressionable readers adversely influenced by such a close-minded stance that just happened to be in the public eye.

Even "hack" examples of writing (such as given at the beginning of this letter) will stimulate thoughts of the future and will prevent our imaginations from stagnating. But I fear any trace of imagination left in Mr. Nelson's padlocked mind vanished long ago.

Jim Fullerton

### Striking blindly

Dear editor:

Let me, if I may, mercilessly borrow a few of your noble cynic's (that's Bruce!) words: Among the many fads, fanatasies and fanaticisms which flicker through the negligibly intelligent mind of Bruce Nelson is a craving to strike out blindly against all he cannot see.

Actually, I do not believe that Bruce Nelson wrote

that meaningless attack on science fiction. In fact, I am not sure that Bruce Nelson even exists. We have all heard about and probably discounted the theory that a roomful of monkeys sitting at typewriters could, if given enough time, someday produce something intelligible and important, like Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (which Nelson so desperately seeks to convince us he's read). Well, friends, the monkeys have achieved a near success since we now have proof that one of them has produced something that obeys the rules of grammar and punctuation. But alas, it seems they need more time. Their product (or could it really be Nelson's?) is neither intelligible nor important.

Hey Bruce, watcha *Dune* behind that typewriter? When you try to make it in the world of literary comment and criticism, you are truly a *Stranger in a Strange Land*. Grok?

Ladd Petersen

### Narrowminded Nook

Dear editor:

My first suggestion to Bruce Nelson would be to change his column heading to Narrowminded Nook. My second suggestion would be that he await a revival of *The Abbot and Costello Show* as it would provide a better setting for his literary opinions. With his shabby 6th grade argumentative style, Nelson has for the third time in succession confused cynicism with pseudo-intellectual Archie Bunkerism. Nelson's categorical dismissal of the entire science fiction genre reeks of the same "lack of objectivity" he sneeringly attributes to science fiction readers.

I will readily grant the existence of a great deal of junk in science fiction, but what area of literature is free of its share of trash? The English playwright Ben Johnson once suggested that Shakespeare cranked out some of his plays in much the same fashion as Donald Wolheim. You might also note that many of Shakespeare's contemporaries regarded his plays in much the same manner that we do soap operas.

Nelson, I doubt that you have read or written enough to say that all science fiction writers are illiterate, and I would consider anyone presumptuous enough to make such a gross generalization as being truly negligibly intelligent. Your cheap use of out-of-context quotation only further evidences your lack of a sense of journalistic responsibility.

If you look for trash in literature, you find it. If, however, you are intelligent enough to spend your time pursuing the quality material, you will find it. I believe the English Dept. teaches quality science fiction. You, sir, have your mind locked on the trash. Perhaps it is fitting.

Arthur S. Alexander  
John Clark  
John Kamp

