

 letters to the editor

I was extremely happy to see that Mike Cordell was so amused by the LSD party that it prompted him to write in and add his worthy opinion about the ASUN elections. His doing so gave me more than enough reason to write this one. Mr. Cordell wrote a letter that was printed in last Monday's paper, expressing his views on the "joke" party (as he calls it), and really brightening up everyone's day with his witty criticisms.

Although there are several points with which I agree in Mr. Cordell's letter, such as the "Broad, sweeping, unoriginal goals" and "mundane proposals" stated by the US party, there is one little point which he has carefully overlooked. The basic platform. He has obviously never read the platform of the LSD party, because if he had, he would be a lot less amused than he clearly is. Giving students rightful control of this university is a proposition that can really work for the students, rather than just the Greek system. If only he would read the letter, he would find that it (the platform) is an honest, concise approach to student government. To date, no other party had hung up their beliefs and goals in the form of a platform for all the students to see. The platform of the LSD party is hanging up all over the campus. I think that what has happened here is a clear case of neglecting to read into some issue before criticizing it. I also think that Cordell made a sizable mistake in calling LSD the "joke" party. It seems to me that they are about the only ones who are serious about the election, Cordell himself included. Criticism does not bother me, for as an artist I deal with it every day. Subjective criticisms, of the type used by Mr. Cordell, seem to be an ineffective and useless means of accomplishing anything.

Cordell stated that a party employing "intelligence and logic might be nice." LSD never made the claim to be a "nice" party. They were more concerned about their goals and proposals than their appearance. But if Mr. Cordell is that concerned about a party's appeal on the grounds of intelligence and reason, I suggest that he first read the LSD platform, then form his own party, based on his concept of intelligence and reason. In this way, he will be able to insure the formation of the ideal political party. Perhaps you should not use your own name, though, Mr. Cordell, since that aspect of the "joke" party has not yet been realized. And while you're having fun with your new name, you might also consider a name for your party too. Eggshells, Inc., for example, might be a good one, but that's pretty drab for a name. I think this might be a more appropriate name in your case: SCCS—Subjective Criticism by Closed-minded Students. Who cares if you don't get anything accomplished while you're in office? At least you and your organization will have lots of fun polishing your keen wits, and isn't that more important to you anyway?

Remember, Mr. Cordell, it's fun, it's easy and even someone like you could conceivably win. So bring your party to the polls, and we'll see who's really the "joke" party.

With that thought in mind, I hereby announce my candidacy for senator in the Let Students Dominate Party. Needless to say, LSD is no joke.

Donald Craig Lee
Junior, Art

Head pattings

As lifetime sufferers of male oppression and exploitation, it pains us more than a little to be subjected to attacks by "territorial" men (See Jack R. Anderson's letter, *Daily Nebraskan*, Feb. 7, 1980), jealously guarding precious male prerogatives, all the while adamantly proclaiming that they are on our (womyn's) side. It's just that they would like a little recognition that—gee, it's rough being a man, too. And gosh, since we're all in this together, after all, isn't your refusal to submit to our terms for finding answers—um, unreasonable?

In reality, however, the purpose of Mr. Anderson's letter was not to offer his counsel or cooperation. The true message lies in his vehement denial of any responsibility for womyn's "difficulties." 'I'm not to blame,' he says, 'So get off and stay off my case.' Mr. Anderson firmly disavows any intent on the part of himself or any other males for whom he speaks to "ruin" anyone's life—although we would submit that he does intend to run the lives of others. Yet even the law, that staunch protector of male privilege, assigns responsibility for actions which result in discrimination (read 'oppression') regardless of any stated motive. One can only conclude that the product of one's conduct is intended reason the courts, especially when nothing is done to avoid, mitigate, or negate the discriminatory/oppressive result. As a "veteran of the 60s," Mr. Anderson will undoubtedly recognize the old saw, "If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem."

Yet this is not precisely our point. We examine in particular Mr. Anderson's statement, "The answer to a problem is not to ignore it" (leaving aside the fact that he has just labeled himself the problem—the point on which we all agree). Mr. Anderson had argued himself into a corner by first asserting that ignoring the problem (him and other men like him) is not a solution; yet when we do ignore him, he complains that we are boring, repetitive, and sexist.

Perhaps the solution to Mr. Anderson's dilemma, being called a chauvinist is not to silence the womyn perspicacious enough to identify his womyn hatred and oppression of them, but to consider which of his many questionable behaviors needs excision.

What Mr. Anderson seems to disapprove of is our

tactics, i.e., dealing with our oppression, but ignoring him. He wants our attention, our concern, our intelligence (but not our opinions) and our "maternalism." If we were to grant him these amenities, which if one looks closely enough are the amenities traditionally exacted by men from womyn, supposedly we would reap the benefits of his support and approval. However, feminists are not seeking male approval, but solutions to the problems we face—problems which have been and are engendered by men. Frankly, we have neither solicited nor appreciated Mr. Anderson's tactical strategies, but regard them as paternal head pattings which are condescending at best, and are crass, retrogressive, and blatantly sexist at worst. We are not intimidated by the threat of Mr. Anderson's ultimatum—backlash, and increasing male homosexuality, which is neither our concern, nor necessarily a negative "consequence." We do not want Mr. Anderson's advice, his strategies, or his cooperation. If he truly supports womyn's autonomy, then he will respect our desire to choose our own goals, our own strategies, and our own allies.

Roxanne M. Claire—Law College
Linnea Johnson—English Dept.
Cynthia McGowan—English Dept.

Businessmen 'like foxes'

The recent B-Week lectures by representatives of Mobil Oil, Dow Chemical and 3-M, were an absolutely fascinating study. They were a classical example, on a breath-taking international scale, of the old story in which the sly fox smiles and soothingly tells the dumb chickens to trust him, because he knows all about raising chickens and keeping them safe and fat—hoping all the while that they won't notice the feathers around his mouth and the fowl-shaped bulge in his stomach.

When will we learn that the only interest of foxes is eating chickens, and the only truth they know or understand is that which improves the kill.

Larry Doerr
Campus Minister
Commonplace-UMHE

Africa should participate

No one will congratulate the Soviet Union for its invasion of Afganistan. Everyone has reason to believe

that it's wrong. But I am not a fan of mixing sports with politics. Maybe the 1980 Moscow Olympics will be the last world sports. Anyhow, what ever happens, I oppose the idea of involving African countries in the Olympics boycott. What we have in the world now is a struggle between the super powers and each one of them is guilty, either at one time or the other of the same offense (invasion). The United States and the Soviet Union are both known for the scramble for power and their policy to sabotage the so called 'third' world countries. I don't think the U.S. will refuse an offer to keep hold of Afghanistan either by diplomacy or military suppression. Only this time the Soviet Union moved faster.

What is bothering me most is the idea of manipulating African nations to join the Olympic boycott. The nations should be left out of any political struggle by the super powers. If the United States intended to boycott the Olympics, it should do so alone or by persuading its allies, but not Africa. Africa should take to its own course and be free from persuasion by any foreign power. The boycott of any activity by African nations must be solely for their own interest and not for the interest of a power struggling nation.

The United States never supported African nations when they boycotted the Montreal Olympics. In fact they blamed the O.A.U. (Organization of Africa Unity) for mixing sports with politics. Why is the United States persuading Africa to do the same thing now? Why is Africa often remembered at the time of economic exploitation and or power struggle? Don't tell me the human rights violation in any part of the world is greater than that in South Africa and don't tell me that the so called Human Rights Organization which only looks into human rights in communist countries, is too blind to see violations in South Africa. Nigeria and its energy contribution to the U.S. economy is not even valued, not to talk of aid from the United States.

The United States completely isolated Africa in its struggle for freedom to talk when its efforts were sabotaged. I think it is a waste of time and strength as already mentioned by the Nigerian Government to persuade it to boycott the Moscow Olympics. The United States should accept the independence of African nations and should realize that Africa is a continent and not a nation.

A. Jones
Nigeria
Junior, Mechanized Ag.
More letters on page 6

KING of Jeans

SALE

Today through Saturday only

<p>Levi's Straight Leg Denims (Sizes 27-46") Reg. \$18.50 Now \$13.99</p> <p>Kennington & Campus Shirts Reg. \$18-21 Now \$11.99-12.99</p> <p>Navy Painters' Pants Reg. \$16.99 Now \$12.75</p> <p>Flannels Reg. \$8.99 Now \$5.99</p> <p>Ladies' Tops Reg. \$13-28 Now \$8-17</p>	<p>Levi's Recycled Denims & Cords Reg. \$12.99 Now \$9.99</p> <p>Painters' Pants (White, Yellow, Lt. Blue, & Khaki) Reg. \$14.99 Now \$10.99</p> <p>Kennington & Other Famous Brands Long Sleeve Knit Shirts Reg. \$13-21 Now \$8-13.99</p> <p>Alaskan Flannels Reg. \$15 Now \$10.99</p>
--	--

 **KING of Jeans**

Underneath Douglas III at 13th & P