

editorial / opinion

# Wesleyan sets example for regents

As Episode #61 of UNL's fight for alcohol on campus unfolds...

UNL students toast Wesleyan's victory...with warm milk.

NEXT WEEK: "More of the Same?"



After the news broke last week that Nebraska Wesleyan University had passed an alcohol-on-campus policy, one UNL student was overheard to say, "Nebraska will probably legalize grass before the regents wise up on alcohol."

While we are not that optimistic about future marijuana legislation, we agree the NU Board of Regents has a history of being unusually stiff-necked in opposing alcohol.

The Wesleyan action has reopened an issue that, while never quite dead, has been dormant since the Legislature shot down a statewide alcohol-on-campus bill in 1974.

Now ASUN and the Council on Student Life (CSL) are making noises about launching fresh campaigns for students' rights to drink (Daily Nebraskan, Oct. 1).

The Daily Nebraskan historically has taken an editorial stance favoring approval of alcohol on campus. That is still our position, and we will support wholeheartedly any efforts ASUN, CSL or other groups may make in this direction.

The Wesleyan Board of Governors set an admirable example for the regents by at once affirming students' rights as adults and the board's own opposition to alcohol in residence halls.

This should show the regents, if nothing else does, that the issue is not and has never been alcohol *per se*. The issue is whether students may consider themselves adults or children in the eyes of the regents.

Until NU's alcohol policy is changes, we are still in the playpen.

Rebecca Brite

## Long hard climb



# Mute, Barbie Doll characters plague TV

There are reasons why I don't watch television movies. For one thing, some movies you couldn't drag me to end up on TV in the 8 p.m. prime time slot. And TV movies are cut, not just bad words and sexy scenes but every 15 to 20 minutes for commercials. I usually find a good book by the time the second set of commercials comes on.

The worst thing about TV movies is their abundance of simpering heroines, struck dumb in admiration of their male costars. I assume they are struck dumb because they have no lines. I like to reserve the right to choose my own propaganda.

Last weekend I saw parts of three movies on TV. One was about an airplane crash—I've seen it at least twice and do not remember the title. I also watched *The Man Who Loved Cat Dancing*, with Burt Reynolds and Sarah Miles, and *Viva Villa*, supposedly the story of Pancho Villa, the Mexican revolutionary.

Each film had a rape scene and featured an almost mute heroine. Besides the plane crash, emergency appendectomy, and baby's birth, the first film also included an "accidental" death. The victim was a lovely, but forgettable girl who was pursued by a no-good rapacious young man and fell over a cliff to her death.

Basic components: innocent, powerless young woman (she has no lines) and defiant, deceptive, powerful young man (he has stolen a gun). I'm not sure which characterization is worse. Is it better to be powerful but depraved, or powerless and victimized?

After watching *The Man Who Loved Cat Dancing*, I can see why this film found its way to TV so quickly. Sarah Miles plays a woman held hostage by a group of thieves. She later leaves the group, with Burt Reynolds, and falls hopelessly in love with him.

She serves him dinner and sits back apprehensively waiting for him to grunt with approval. She tells him she wants to have his baby. This woman has no foresight.

They are 100 miles into the wilderness. They are fugitives. There is no doctor and it's the middle of winter. Burt replies, "Sure, take your clothes off."

Instead of replying, "Forget it, Burt. I just noticed you have the soul of a tuna," she looks slightly hurt and says, "Gee, you aren't very romantic."

This scene alone should be enough to send a person screaming from the television set, but there's more.

One of Burt's chums, another thief, blunders into camp one day, threatens Sarah with a knife and rapes her. After Burt kills him, (Sarah can't bring herself to pull the trigger) he asks her why she didn't call for help. "He would have killed you," she replies. For this line she should win the Barbie Doll award.

The movie tells us women make good pets: loyal, loving, and obedient. However, they seldom act on their own and are always acted upon. Their minds are limited to single-minded devotion to their less than loving masters.

Men are brutal, evil, and murderous. They have no sense of fair play and have no feelings except of lust and revenge.

The third film, *Viva Villa*, is a weird study in crowd psychology. The Mexican people love Pancho Villa, a bandit who drives the Mexican army crazy. Strangely enough, the bandits kill as many Mexicans as the soldiers do and with the same amount of glee.

The women in this film do a terrific job of mime—they say nothing during the entire film.

The rape scene comes close to the beginning. Mexican soldiers come into a house and order the women to get out. The young woman tries to scratch and pull the hair of the Mexican captain and in retaliation, he rapes her.

The message seems to be that women had better follow men's orders or they will be forced into humiliation.

These films are not meant to portray reality, but they are an insidious way of projecting values upon the public mind. They reinforce the male stereotype, the virile courageous man, protector or oppressor of women. These men find their best outlets in action and speech. They have no deep feelings.

Women are always the victims. The films seem to agree with Professor Higgins in *My Fair Lady* that "Their (women's) heads are full of cotton, hay and rags." They do not speak. They feel deep emotions—tenderness, love, sadness and hate—but their efforts at expression are blocked by men.

The effect of such films cannot be gauged. Recognition of the propagandic nature of these films would be a start, but films showing alternate values are needed and there is a dearth of them.

