

opinion/editorial

Soviet troop issue warrants only moderate action

In recent weeks, the controversy over the Soviet troops in Cuba caused many people to believe that the United States should force a showdown with the Soviet Union.

President Carter's speech Monday night was welcome reassurance that such action will not be taken.

It had been admitted weeks before that it was unlikely that the Soviet Union would withdraw the troops. Apparently there is little reason for them to do so. After all, the troops

had been in Cuba since the early 1960s, but were only recently identified as a combat rather than a training unit.

There have been calls for action ranging from doing nothing at all to installing a complete blockade of Cuba.

Granting that something needed to be done so that the United States did not lose face, the ideal situation would have been for the Soviets to agree to eliminate the unit by dis-

solving the brigade, assigning key personnel to advisory duty and distributing tanks and artillery to Cuban forces. That would have resulted in a situation similar to our use of advisers in Vietnam.

But Carter's response is just as appropriate. His move to establish a headquarters unit at Key West, Fla., to increase surveillance of Cuba and to increase aid to Caribbean Islands (apparently to offset Soviet influence in the area) solves the need

for the United States to save face while at the same time not pushing the issue to antagonism. This minor diplomatic squabble is not a major crisis and warrants only moderate action.

As Carter said, "the greatest danger to American security tonight is certainly not the two or three thousand Soviet troops in Cuba. The greatest danger to all nations... is the breakdown of a common effort to preserve the peace, and the ultimate threat of nuclear war."

Red fever starts in rural Nebraska

The heart of Big Red mania stems from something small and colorful.

Small, meaning the many class D-2 highschoools in Nebraska, and colorful meaning the only color in those towns on Friday or Saturday nights.

shelley smith

Last weekend the color was purple and the D-2 school was Filley.

Not many of us had ever seen an eight-man football game. We couldn't imagine life without tight ends or defensive backfields. And we never could have possibly imagined Filley, Nebr., on a home football Friday night.

It was the season's hottest rival match-up. Top ranked Filley vs. division D-1 third ranked Adams.

And tempers were hot. Last year Filley beat Adams 16-14 to end the Hornets 46-game winning streak. The last time Adams had lost was to Lewiston 18-16 in 1974.

As we neared Filley, electricity shot through the air, and as we turned the corner by the Filley Tavern all we could see was a haze of purple heading toward the field.

The Adams people were also out in force, and seemed as hot as they looked clad in their bright red.

Cars lined the field, and parents sat in the bleachers, the announcer started the record of the Star Spangled Banner, and then started it again when he missed the beginning.

The teams were ready to play. Adams jumped to an early lead, and led the Wildcats 18-6 at halftime.

There were several delays in the game, one to chase a dog that Filley fans named I.M. Dog off the field, and another to carry injured star Alan Wiese (they named him I.M. Wiese too, for his consistent 100-yard rushing games) off the field.

But, Filley fans never lost hope in their team. Even when down by 20 points, the fans still cheered hard and watched with anticipation—and hope.

If Filley would win, the town would bring down the Tavern. The Filley players, after a win, file into the Tavern while the town's people stand on chairs and tables, and cheer with hysteria.

But, Filley lost 26-12 and the tavern was just a little quieter. Folks talked over the game, and reminisced about last year's win. And the big question was whether Wiese would be able to play Friday against Diller.

But what most of us remembered most was not that Filley lost to their arch rival. It was not so much that Wiese got hurt, or the worries about Diller.

What we remembered was the spirit of the town. Their loyalty, their style and their spunk—even when things were looking glum for the Filley Wildcats.

The heart of Big Red mania does lie in something small and colorful, and it is those schools and towns who spark the beginning of Big Red loyalty throughout the state.



letters

Expulsion ironic

The incident in the English 253A class, as reported in the Daily Nebraskan on Sept. 27 is, to put it mildly, outrageous. I question the intellectual and moral character of anyone who supports the action. In the last 10 years, we (myself and others) have poured our energies into the destruction of such exclusionary custom in the academic world. Among other things, we attacked the status of ROTC on campuses on this account, contending that the use of public money, and offering of public university academic credit for courses that were not "open to the public," was inappropriate and illegal. Our particular focus at that time was that since ROTC was not open to women, the ROTC courses were not open to women, and thus not open to the public. We fought. We won. Title IX was the icing on the cake. Then, on Sept. 27, I read the Daily Nebraskan and I gnashed my teeth. Apart from the sexism, the discrimination, and the illegality, this action is a subversion of academic integrity.

In other words, if class members are inhibited by Mr. Wright's presence, that is their problem, and should not be made to be his problem. I do not mean to be harsh, but we all live in the same world.

Ellen Abart
Graduate, Civil Engineering

Class member responds

The mistreatment of male students in Women in Poetry class is an example of that old saying "You scratch my back, I'll beat yours." It seems ironic that having considered poetry by women of a sufficient literary distinction (which, I think, it is) to provide a sub-genre course to aid students in understanding the special contribution of women poets, a teacher should deny students the chance to profit by her own special understanding of the topic, especially those students who have least comprehension of the particular sensitivity of women, i.e., men. This is the equivalent of denying women the right to take any courses dealing with English literature before 1830, simply because there was only one female poet of any note during that whole thousand-year period.

The men who signed up for the class should be congratulated for their interest. There is nothing in the course description published by the English department that indicates that the class is exclusively intended for women. The requirements are essentially to read poetry by women and to write poetry about women: certainly nothing that men are incapable of doing. In fact, quite possibly, a majority of the poetry written in English is about women, written by men.

That female class members should vote to exclude male members because of fear of embarrassment while reading their poetry makes one wonder just what kind of "poetry" is being written. Invective and expletives are better confined to late-night cow sessions (well, what's the feminine of bull session?) than introduced into English classes. The special perception and sensitivity needed to write poetry about women is rare, but not restricted to women. Nor is that perception found in poetry by women merely because they are women. It is rather because they are poets. Almost 400 years ago John Donne wrote "I am two fools: for loving and for saying so in whining poetry." That his "whines" are still read is evidence that embarrassment can be overcome.

With apologies to fellow graduate student Ms. Johnson I suggest that she invite her male students to return to class. Failure to do so may jeopardize any other special interest courses we wish to teach.

Ed Christian
Department of English
Continued on Page 5

