

# opinion/editorial

## Female editor sets policy for X-rated advertisements

The fact that the Daily Nebraskan accepts advertising for X-rated movies came under attack at Wednesday's ASUN meeting, supposedly because two women on campus complained to Willie Watters, a senior political science major.

Watters charged that the paper, apparently because it accepts such advertisements, is insensitive and unaware of the feelings of UNL students.

There are about 22,000 students at UNL. There are about 75 students on the Daily Nebraskan editorial staff.

Thanks are in order for Mr. Watters, who took it upon himself, as a favor to the women, to bring this burning issue to the attention of student government and the paper.

Thanks also are in order for Mr. Watters for offering to pay admission to an X-rated movie so our student senate could attend. We are thankful Watters did not propose using student fee money for this purpose. We wonder if he had any takers.

It is abundantly clear that an advertisement for an X-rated movie is different from an X-rated movie.

In fact, advertisements for turkeys are different from actual turkeys.

The Daily Nebraskan editor in chief, who is a woman and has never been to an X-rated movie, has the final word concerning X-rated movie advertisements. Her policy is that if the illustration in the ad reveals considerably more than the cleavage of a woman, the ad will not run.

It should be pointed out that this newspaper is not delivered by children. The editor assumes that our readers—toward whom Watters claims we are insensitive—are mature enough not to be traumatized by the sight of cleavage on newsprint.

Apparently, the advertisements

have aroused Mr. Watters' curiosity, since he said he did not know anything about the movies, as of Wednesday. We would suggest that this is effective advertising.

Watters said he brought the matter before ASUN because it is a matter of responsibility and because students own the Daily Nebraskan. Actually, through their student fees, students finance, and therefore own, 8 percent of the paper. Advertising pays the other 92 percent.

We would suggest that any responsibility for these allegedly offensive ads rests with the paper's editor, and has been met.

—Randy Essex

## English instructor's rebuttal charges DN with misconduct

By Michael Zangari  
Ombudsman

A summary rebuttal of charges presented in the Daily Nebraskan concerning English 253A, Women and Poetry, has been prepared by English Instructor Maria M. Lemon. It includes a specific paragraph by paragraph response by Linnea Johnson to the initial (Sept. 27) article, and six signed statements alleging misconduct on the part of a reporter that interviewed them.

The following are excerpts from the text of the rebuttal, and should not be considered the full rebuttal, or the direct order of the arguments, the analysis is that of Maria Lemon, and not of the Daily Nebraskan. Starred items are Ombudsman insertions.

**Sept. 27; "Class votes out male members"**  
Quotes attributed to Linnea Johnson are not statements she made.

\*Concerning Wordie Wright

(a) he did not want to charge Ms. Johnson with any unprofessional or discriminatory conduct (the DN says Wright said he "did not have time" to file charges); (b) his decision to take the class by independent study was his own, resulting from his feeling unwanted by some members of the class; (c) no vote had been taken to exclude men; (d) Ms. Johnson did not suggest such a vote; (e) he did not want to talk to any reporters and had been avoiding reporters since the DN story appeared Sept. 27 (see also Oct. 4 Lincoln Journal).

**Sept. 28; "Investigation" and "Probe"**

On Sept. 28, the AP story, prompted by the DN report, appeared in the Omaha World Herald (Headlined with "Investigation") and in the Lincoln Star (Headlined "Probe"). The AP story correctly quoted John Robinson as saying he was "looking into the matter" but, before the quote, described him as having said he would "investigate" the Daily Nebraskan report.

**Oct. 1; "English Chairman examines expulsion"**

On page 1, the DN printed its version of the AP story. The page 1 placement and the organization of the article reemphasized the allegations as having substance. Its first paragraph asserts "he is looking into the situation in which two UNL students were voted out of women's poetry class because they were men." The second

paragraph begins "the incident occurred." **Oct. 1; "Excluding men from UNL under scrutiny"**

"Investigation" was not John Robinson's word. No official investigation of an instructor's conduct of a class can be or should be conducted unless an official charge has been made. Robinson, appropriately and responsibly, said he would be "looking into the matter promptly"—"the matter" being the allegation in the DN, NOT a charge a student had made, since Wordie Wright had not (and still has not) made a charge.

**Oct. 4; "Daily Nebraskan charges disputed"**

The Oct. 4 Lincoln Journal and the Oct. 5 World Herald (UPI) and the Oct. 5 Lincoln Star reported Dean Larsen's summary of Robinson's findings: "It is unfortunate that the male student felt 'excluded.' Arrangements have been made for him to receive instruction and complete the course in a context which apparently makes him more comfortable—namely through individual study with the instructor. I think that no vote was taken (to remove the students). Certainly they were not told to leave by the instructor." Larsen also said Robinson had followed up the story which appeared in the Daily Nebraskan. Larsen did not say "investigation."

**Oct. 5; "The Daily Nebraskan Begins to Imply coverup"**

The inclusion of Kovanda's statement that no vote was taken was the DN's FIRST suggestion that a vote *might* not have been taken. Earlier, reporters had not bothered to ask other students of the class what had or had not happened. They had, however, interviewed Catherine Kidwell, who is not a student registered in the class but who had visited it on Aug. 29 and who does not visit it. Ms. Kidwell told those reporters that no vote had been taken, but they simply argued with her and did not report her comment.

It is significant that the DN, NOT Chairman Robinson, should have interviewed many or all of the class members before even considering running the Sept. 27 story. It would not have been appropriate of the instructor to have given the reporters a list of the registered students—that would have been an invasion of their privacy. But a reporter or reporters could have come to the class, stated the rumors they were investigating, and asked students to talk to them either during or after—

preferably after—the class.

**Oct. 9; "12 poetry students not contacted in investigation"**

Pat Dean's comment that Ms. Johnson said it would be illegal to exclude anyone from a class is buried at the END of this story, on page 11.

The fact that ten students interviewed by the DN said no vote was taken is buried in the story, AFTER the statements that Robinson did not "investigate," and AFTER the paper quotes Kindra Foster, who dropped the class, as having said Ms. Johnson suggested a vote.

\*\*\*

In addition the Daily Nebraskan has received a complaint of misrepresentation from one of the "unnamed sources" in the Oct. 9 story "12 poetry students not contacted in investigation."

She says she said (in full context) "I really don't know if that was why taking a vote was brought up, but that may have been the result. They (the men) might have been intimidated by it." She also said that she didn't say for sure that 10 to 15 students dropped the class, she said "Quite a few people dropped the course, there seemed to be many more students there on the first night of class."

## letters

The following accurately describes the events occurring Aug. 29, 1979, between approximately 7 and 8:45 p.m., during the first meeting of En. 253A, Women and Poetry (the bracketed statement is attested to as witnessed only if an asterisk or star appears after a signature):

The meeting began with a thorough discussion of the course requirements, texts, the sort of poetry to be read, the fact that students also were to write poetry, etc. In the course of this lengthy discussion, which also raised some issues which are raised by the assigned readings, several women students said they would feel uncomfortable discussing such issues and reading their own poetry if men were to be present.

A short discussion of that issue followed, the point of which was to isolate particular areas of concern and to outline how to deal with them so that the class members could all work together, whatever their personal feelings, and the instructor explained that the class could not be restricted to only women students. The men seemed comfortable during the discussion and, in fact, expressed support of the women's concerns and volunteered to take the class by independent study.

At about 8:45 the class adjourned for the normal evening classbreak [the men at this time set up appointments with the instructor to complete the course by independent study], after which the men did not return. No vote was or had been taken to exclude the men from the class. They were not excluded by either the students or the instructor. Given the nature of women's issues, it is not unusual to see either men or women become uncomfortable when they are discussed, but if the men felt uncomfortable with either the nature of the women's issues necessarily included in the course, or the feelings expressed by the women students or by the poetry about such issues, they did not indicate that.

\*Patricia C. Dean  
Martha Colvet  
\*Kathleen E. Fey  
\*Patricia L. Kovanda  
Patricia L. Gentzler  
Mary S. Kennedy

Vicky L. Reed  
Judith A. Sornberger  
\*Julia L. Geier  
\*Morgan Becker  
\*Linnea Johnson  
Melanie Hatfield

Present 8/29/79, but not 10/10/79 to sign or not sign the above, were six registered students and one guest. One 10/10/79 registered student present was not present 8/29.

More letters on page 5

## Landlord, tenant understanding prevents difficulties

By now many students who rent apartments have probably encountered difficulties of one kind or another with their landlord. Some of these problems stem from ignorance of what one's rights and responsibilities are and may have been preventable. The following are some general rules and suggestions that may prove helpful:

### guest opinion

—The landlord has the responsibility to maintain the premises and keep it in fit and habitable condition.

—The tenant is responsible for keeping the premises in

clean and damage-free condition and upon termination of the tenancy place the dwelling unit in as clean condition, excepting ordinary wear and tear, as when the tenancy commenced.

—The tenant is expected to stay for agreed time period and will incur legal liability in the event he or she fails to do so. Likewise, the landlords must provide the dwelling unit for the agreed time and at the agreed price.

—The tenant's request that repairs be accomplished should be in writing and a copy should be retained.

—The tenant's notice to terminate the rental agreement must be in writing and must be received by the landlord at least 30 days prior to the periodic rental date specified in the notice. This means that if rent is due on the first of the month, then the notice must be received no later than

the first day of a month. The 30 day notice is required even if your lease is set to expire and is required even if there is no formal lease. The 30 day notice does not excuse the tenant if time is still remaining on the lease.

—Security or damage deposits cannot exceed one month's rent but the landlord may require an additional one fourth of one month's rent for a pet deposit. Upon termination of the tenancy, the landlord may apply the deposit to rent owed and damages and cleaning expenses. The landlord must return the balance, if any, and a written itemization of how it has been applied with 14 days after demand by the tenant and designation of the tenant's forwarding address. Disputes over security

Continued on Page 5