

opinion/editorial

Daily Nebraskan recognizes coverage inadequacies

The Daily Nebraskan has been criticized for not being more concerned with campus activities. Generally 80 percent of the stories published cover campus events or organizations. The other 20 percent can be classified as news or features outside the university that would interest the university community.

The concept that the Daily Nebraskan is not concerned with campus activities is absurd. It is our duty and responsibility to inform the university community about what is happening on campus and that's exactly what we do.

However, it is not our duty to feed any special interest group's ego or become a public relations news-

letter for any such group.

If negative or positive facts are learned about a group or event, which in our opinion constitutes news, it is the paper's responsibility to print these facts.

Another issue has been raised claiming that the Daily Nebraskan ignores east campus events. We went through our files and found 47 stories from this semester which were related to east campus.

These stories cover most aspects of east campus and include such events such as UNL's Agricultural Symposium, Sadie Hawkins Dance, Ag Careers Day, a UNL audiology department feature, Ag Men's Run to the Rockies, an informative

piece on this year's continuing dental education program, Leon Jaworski's speech at the Law College, ASUN's book exchange in the East Union and many more.

We realize that East Campus is a gold mine of stories and we have not covered everything possible.

We have advertised for an East Campus Bureau Chief and we have not found anyone who is qualified and wants the job. However, we do have a reporter who enjoys her beat and turns in a variety of stories concerning east campus.

And the Daily Nebraskan welcomes story ideas from people and we use the ideas that we consider of news

value or interest to the university community.

If people are upset with the Daily Nebraskan's coverage on a particular event, they are entitled to state their opinion and many write a letter to the editor to air their complaints. We try to run every signed letter as space and timeliness permits.

But it is the editors' responsibility to judge what constitutes news and is therefore printed in the paper.

The Board of Regents in 1918 recognized this fact, stating: "The editorial policies of the Student Publications shall be entirely in the hands of student editors and no faculty member or university officer shall interfere in such policies. . ."

Bold, proud feminism of Margaret Mead misunderstood

Washington—Many of the tributes to Margaret Mead in the past week hailed her as a bold and proud feminist. A number of admirers echoed the sentiment of the *New York Times*, which noted that Dr. Mead's feminism was of such ardency that "she married and shed three husbands without taking their names or subordinating her work to theirs."

Colman McCarthy

world than any other organization."

Mead's feminism was never reducible to bumper sticker jargon. She understood that abortion needs to be as legally available to the poor as the rich, but to leave it at that was to allow the discussion to dangle. Instead, she argued, "We should not be promoting abortion as a way of life. To argue for a woman's right to abortion is absurd. Women have a right to institutions which will see to it that they never have an unwanted child."

Discipline to routine

Changing institutions has little to do

with the headier thrills of the movement—writing feminist novels, applauding films which wives walk out on husbands or marching at the next ERA rally. Instead, it demands much of the same discipline or fidelity to routine that marked Mead's career. Nothing lasting can be created without it. She didn't become a redoubtable social critic by accident. She embraced as necessary all the dryness and tedium demanded by her profession. She worked through it.

By doing so, she created a bond with other women who refused to be defeated

by the dryness and tedium of life, whatever role fortune or Providence put them in. Women who are homemakers (a word Mead didn't think insulted anyone), factory workers or paraprofessionals are liberated not when they have the power to shed the painful but when they use the pain to grow into fuller human beings, and move on from there. Anyone, woman or man, who thinks that pain can be avoided inevitably learns that growth, too, has been avoided.

(Copyright), 1978, The Washington Post Co.

If those are some of the standards by which feminists should be judged—marrying, shedding husbands and keeping a maiden name—then the towering Sisters of this century are Elizabeth Taylor and Zsa Zsa Gabor. And the lowest of rank must be given to unmarried Gloria Steniem and Betty Goldstein Friedan, who was divorced from her husband but not his name.

Valued marriage

The case for Margaret Mead's feminism has nothing to do with her failed marriages. I have read much of Mead's work and heard a few of her lectures and I never had the sense that she took pride in marrying and divorcing three times. If anything, these personal misadventures were regretted.

Her 55-year career in anthropology, by which she became a one-person dynasty, had been a powerful examination of relationships within families and what they mean to the stability of the individual and community. But here she was herself—the taker of three husbands by age 34. She couldn't help being wounded, nor could she avoid the sorrow of getting little emotional benefit from an institution—marriage—that she emphatically valued intellectually.

Sign of toughness

That is nothing new among intellectuals. Theories are beautiful, reality messy. The social scientist who can write the stunningly profound book on the decay of society can be helpless at home to understand a spouse's depression or the children's drift into purposelessness.

The spirit of contemporary times has become a public address system for the tinny message that bouncing in and out of marriages, affairs and beds is a sign of toughness. To link Margaret Mead with this absurdity is to misrecognize the toughness that her feminism truly did have. Its strength came in criticism and balance she brought to the current renewal of the women's movement. She refused to encourage women to believe the cant that their victimization excused them from the demands of intelligence and grace.

Don't hiss

She had been around too long to get carried away by what seemed to many women in 1968 as a "new" issue. In 1970, with the sisterhood's novices in high fervor, she bristled when, during a lecture, a listener hissed at the mention of YWCA. "Don't you go ssst," Mead said, "don't you dare hiss at the YWCA, which has educated more women in more areas of the



letters

Wednesday, Nov. 29th was declared Palestine Day by the United Nations. This may not mean anything to you unless you are familiar with the Palestinian issue. But to the Palestinian nation this means a lot of things.

It means that we are no longer considered as terrorists, roaming the world, blowing up things and killing people, but as a nation with a just cause. This is a giant step forward for the solution of this problem because the world will recognize us as a people fighting to regain their land and their pride. This will show our opposers that there is such a thing as a Palestinian nation.

It comes as an answer to a statement by the ex-Israeli prime minister, Golda Meir, when she said that there is no such thing as a Palestinian nation. It also shows the rightness of our cause and our struggle and that we don't fight for the sake of fighting, but for something much greater than that—our land and our identity.

For the Palestinians, this day is a day for celebration and jubilee because after 30 years of world indifference, the name Palestine will be heard all over the world, and because we Palestinians will be recognized as a nation with a just cause.

I ask you to join our celebration by asking you to accept our cause as the right cause, and our people as a nation struggling to establish a democratic, secular state in Palestine.

If you feel that this is sufficient information, please feel free to ask any Palestinian

student; you will see him on campus walking with a big smile on his face, a smile of content, satisfaction and victory.

Tareef Nashashibi

Organization idealistic

The letter from the Organization of Arab Students/Nebraska is an excellent example of the abandonment of reason and reality in favor of the twilight world of idealism.

Every paragraph flings rhetoric and the old cliches used by the dreamer to define and solve every problem. Everything is so neat and simple. Their justice is obviously the only justice and it's only those racist Zionists and the nasty imperialists which are preventing them from implementing the "only" solution (The Final Solution?) to the Palestine problem.

Hell, they're not even prejudiced. They got rid of that in their arduous struggle to "liberate" Palestine from the racist Zionist movement.

You see, Israel isn't really a state. It's just a Zionist movement. The only solution is, of course, the establishment of a free democratic Arab Palestine State. A state where all men will live in peace, justice and freedom, regardless of religious preference. Every one can see how it worked in Lebanon.

Before submitting my remarks to the *Daily Nebraskan* I allowed several Arab students to read it. They pointed out that my letter implied I was strongly anti-Arab and Pro-Israeli. I would like to make it clear that I am neither. The point in writing my letter was to emphasize the unrealistic approach the Arab students are taking in their policy toward Israel.

Like most other controversies, there are two sides, both of which have supportive arguments. Justice for one is usually at the expense of the other. Compromise is the only road I suggest for both Israel and the Palestinian people. The dogmatic insistence that Israel be destroyed as a state will only forment further unrest. Likewise, the failure of Israel to accept the Palestinian people as a national entity will also forment further unrest.

Charles J. Rosvold
Microbiology, Chemistry, Chemical Engr.
5th year senior

Sponsorship explained

After the article on the Daniel Ellsberg lecture appeared in the *Daily Nebraskan* (11/29), there has been some question concerning the sponsorship of the program. Because the Voluntarily Funded Speakers Account is a new development, an explanation of its function and the role of those groups contributing to it is necessary.

Continued on Page 5