

opinion
READER

Readers respond to 'sexist' comments by student

Women won't stop fighting because of menstruation

At first, I thought Joe Davis' letter (DN, April 20) must be a joke -- "Women suited for kitchen duty, not combat duty." I kept reading, but there was no punchline, no interesting twist.

Davis admits that women are in combat in other countries, but he continues with "the American society has always viewed and treated women as something less than men." This is true. But, unlike Davis, not all of us agree that it is a good thing. Women are, and have been, working to change these ignorant attitudes. Women are not innately "something less than men." Do not attempt to tie us down -- we will not let you.

Let's assume for a minute that Davis' picture of male nature is correct. Women could indeed be a distraction for sex-starved men. But let's not forget about all the other distractions. If men do have no self-control, as Davis suggests, what's to keep them from raping village women, "whores," or each other? What's to keep them from masturbating when they should be fighting? If Davis is correct about men's lack of self-control, perhaps we should exclude men from combat.

Davis is also obviously ignorant of the effects of the menstrual cycle. Personally, I know of many women who are not bed-ridden during their "period." You're right, Joe, the war won't stop when a woman has her period. But the woman won't stop either.

Jennifer Petray
graduate student

Testosterone poisoning cause of Davis' attitude

Joe Davis, have you seen a doctor about your terminal case of testosterone poisoning (DN, April 20)? I recommend it.

Nanci Rivenburg
junior
biological sciences

Letter is proof Women's Center needed at UNL

To everyone who has ever uttered (or even imagined) the question "... but why do we need a Women's Resource Center?" may I direct your attention to Joe M. Davis's letter (DN, April 20).

As long as there are people in this society (and no, Joe Davis is not alone in his myths and misinformation) who believe that women are "naturally" weaker and more emotional;

as long as there are people who persist in blaming women for the action of others (i.e. "horny men" getting killed because they can't leave women alone);

as long as there are people who will justify mistreatment of women by saying "that is just the way it has always been";

as long as there are people who insist on using stereotypes and worst-case scenarios to keep women from being given equal chances and opportunities;

as long as one in every three women will experience rape or sexual assault in her lifetime;

as long as there are people that feel women are "somewhat weaker and better suited to domestic activity";

as long as conditions in our society exist which allow people like Joe Davis to develop such misinformed, misguided and appalling attitudes toward women;

we will need places like the Women's Resource Center. A place where women can come together with common concerns, support each other and learn ways to reach goals and achieve opportunities that the Joe Davis' of the world would deny us.

No, Joe Davis, we are not getting "carried away." In fact, we are being quite polite about all of this. As long as there are people like you, Joe Davis, women will continue to scream in protest. Thank you for giving us (and CFA) ample evidence that we need a Women's Resource Center.

Gina Matkin
coordinator
Women's Resource Center

P.S. Your myth that women with PMS are incapable of combat could be dangerous. . . .

Comments written only to capture strong response

When I first started reading the letter by Joe M. Davis, sophomore, criminal justice, (DN, April 20) I became angry.

Then, of course, I realized that Joe's opinions cannot possibly exist in an adult, mentally functioning, human male's body, and this diatribe was created to only agitate and elicit powerful response.

Sorry Joe, it didn't work here. Your statements are too outlandish to be given serious consideration and then argued against. If you really feel that way about women, I doubt you would be attending an institution of higher learning where one of the by-products (hopefully) is open-mindedness.

It is wonderful that you have such creative writing skills. Much reform is needed in the criminal justice system, and I am sure you will make wonderful contributions. Instead of using your energies for this unconstructive essaying, why not start working on some real problems. At the very least you could use your time studying for finals.

Rene Bailey Humber
senior
geology

Sheer strength not only thing needed in combat

Mr. Davis' prehistoric attitude about women in the military and women in general (DN, April 20) lacked evidence. Having been in the active Air Force for the past 2 1/2 years, I, too, feel that there are certain valid arguments pertaining to women in combat. But Mr. Davis discussion focused on ignorant, chauvinistic statements.

He claimed that women are much too emotional for combat and that, under torture, they would break. Since when do women have a corner on emotion? It is a fact that every man, without exception, held prisoner in the Hanoi Hilton prisoner of war camp during the Vietnam war broke. Every single man. And I know this for certain, having spoken to one of the inmates in person.

As far as physical competence, I agree that men have a greater potential in regard to sheer muscle strength. But I disagree with Mr. Davis in that this sheer strength is entirely necessary in combat. Hand-to-hand combat is only one facet of war. In fact, it has been shown that women are physically able to withstand more G-forces than men. This is the main factor that hinders fighter pilots. Thus, women have the potential to be better fighter pilots than men.

Actual combat, even during a war, is also just part of the big picture. I would hope, though not expect, that Mr. Davis will agree with me when I claim that women are at least as equal intellectually to men. In this regard,

women perform a multiple of duties that support the mission of the armed forces with a great degree of accuracy and excellence. These duties include for example, intelligence and logistics, just to name two, and require a great degree of intellect as opposed to Mr. Davis' degrading suggestions of "cooking and office work."

It frightens me to find a man who not only believes that "our country has viewed and treated women as something less than men" and also actively supports such a country. If I shared his view, I would never have voluntarily joined its military and celebrated in the freedoms that America brags -- I hardly call that sort of oppression freedom.

In his own words, the vast majority of women are soft and weak. I hope he finds one that will put up with his inane attitudes. I hope he finds a woman that agrees with him in that it is all right for men in the service to "go into town and get a whore." I hope he finds one that is willing to do his domestic work and that, due to her monthly "disability," they won't stock in Advil. And if you, Mr. Davis, are a member of our armed forces, I hope you become enlightened before America really needs your support.

Lisa Giddings
junior
math/economics

Insulting women won't help Davis make new friends

I am writing in response to Joe M. Davis' letter (DN, April 20) about "Women suited for kitchen duty, not combat duty." I have three points I would like to make.

First and foremost, I think that if Mr. Davis had any female friends before he wrote the letter, he doesn't anymore.

Second, I think his example of carrying combat gear through 30 miles of snake and leech-infested swamp makes two points in itself. One, that it would certainly scare me to do that, and I think most of my friends (men and women, just to clarify) would agree, and two, that only an idiot would walk for 30 miles through such conditions. It seems to me that one would become very sick from such an activity and that as long as you are walking 30 miles, you probably could walk an additional five or 10 to get to higher ground to avoid the swamp.

My third and final point is this. Mr. Davis doesn't want women in the military, but a group of horny barbarians who would "pull a few trains" on their fellow personnel is a quality representation of men in the military? I think not.

Mr. Davis makes a lot of assumptions. Congratulations to the women of the world who have been involved in the equal rights movement.

Brian Gordon
junior
education

Women at UNL haven't listened to sexist males

My response to the letter (DN, April 20), on soft, weak women, as per Joe M. Davis, sophomore, criminal justice, is as follows:

1). My first thought was, did your girlfriend dump you and join the military? And was that the reason you were striking out at the women of the world?

2). What simple-minded, self-centered, male-chauvinist person could be enrolled at the university?

I would like to suggest that you take a stroll over to the Administration Building and look on the bulletin

board between rooms 127 and 129. Thank goodness these women among the few didn't stop to listen to males in the world like you.

In my opinion, the world would be a lot better place to live in if controlled by women. We all know God created Man first and Woman second -- to correct his mistake.

K. A. Waldman
staff

Davis' comments insulting to women and to real men

When I read Joe Davis' letter (DN, April 20), I thought it was the most sexist, insulting and ridiculous thing I have ever read. It was not only extremely insulting to women, it was also insulting to the REAL men in this world.

You seem to think that women in the military would "provide a dangerous distraction for the males in the company" because in your opinion men have this uncontrollable sexual need that must be satisfied. Since there just happens to be a few women in the same company, then it's OK for the "entire unit of horny men" to use these female individuals as objects to satisfy their sexual "needs?" This, Mr. Davis, is a frightening attitude that seems to be strangely related to the attitudes of many rapists, convicted or unconvicted. In case you are unaware of this, no sexual desire is uncontrollable unless you have a very serious problem.

You also insist on repeating that you feel women are naturally weaker than men. Let me as you, then, ask if that is why you think it's OK for the "unit of horny men" to "have their fun" with the women of the company? The only weak thing I can find with your letter is the mind that was behind all of your sexist thoughts. It is disturbing to find out that there are people like you in the world, but it is even more disturbing to know that there is one right here on our own campus.

Sheryl Radke
sophomore
music education

Davis uninformed about woman's job in armed forces

I'm writing in response to Joe Davis' letter (DN, April 20) concerning women in combat. First of all, Joe's letter started out with some good points, but by the end of it Joe made it quite clear what a close-minded, arrogant pig he is. Joe's attitudes reflect the opinions of society many years ago. This is the '90s, Joe. There are thousands of women serving in the armed forces today, and they are doing a great job at it. I agree with Joe that women should be physically qualified before they are allowed in combat, but I do not agree with the rest of his opinions.

Joe's comment about troops being able to find a whore during peacetime totally degrades the men serving in the military, and I am glad he is not one of them. Maybe he is the type to go looking for a whore, but I know a lot of military personnel who are not out to find a common whore every chance they get. I think many military families would be and should be rightfully offended by his comment.

I would also like to point out to Joe that women go to boot camp, Officer Candidate School, and the Basic School, and they do not get a week off just because they have their periods. Joe's comment on that really showed how ignorant he is. Maybe he hasn't noticed that women work every day of the month at military and civilian jobs regardless of whether or not they have their period. His comment on this was totally irrelevant to the debate about women in combat.

Also, women are not the only ones who would try to rescue a buddy in

combat. Many men would react in the same way and have acted this way in past combat situations. Since Joe is not a woman and has not been in combat, I would like to know how he can say that is the way a combat situation would be.

Being exposed to the military throughout most of my life, I have encountered a few men who had similar opinions, but never in my life have I come across someone so uninformed and uneducated about the important role women play in the military. Women are an important asset to the armed forces and they are quality personnel, both enlisted and officers. These women are willing to serve their country and are doing a fine job of it. Many men aren't qualified (or willing) to fill the positions these women do. Are you that qualified, Joe?

In closing, I would like to say to Joe: If you are ever in combat serving our country (heaven forbid) and get wounded, I hope the female nurse that is supposed to help you spits in your wounds.

Deborah D. Robinson
sophomore
undeclared

P.S. What is Alice gear, Joe? Perhaps you meant 782 gear or deuce gear. Get the facts right before you open your mouth.

Simple-minded men place all women in one category

In response to Joe M. Davis' letter (DN, April 20), I'd like to respond by saying "the Marion Cunningham days" are over! Wake up! This is the '90s, not the '60s. You're way too young to have closed-minded, male-chauvinistic attitudes toward women.

Women have never been considered equal to men. Past history confirms this. We have only had the right to vote for about 70 years, whereas you guessed it, the male has been voting since the beginning of time.

I firmly believe women should have the CHOICE, whether to fight in combat or not.

The reason women are viewed as "somewhat weaker and better suited to domestic activity" is because simple-minded men, such as yourself, put ALL WOMEN into one category. It's men like you that firmly believe the only reason women are attending this university is for their Mrs. degree.

As for men being "horny," just because women are in the armed services doesn't give men the right to "pull a few trains." We need qualified people in the service, whether men or women (it doesn't matter); however, we don't need rapists in the service.

It's a well-known fact that women have a menstrual cycle. And, yes, women tend to be bitchy and moody. You would be, too, if you had cramps, bloating, tension, body aches and pains; however, God blessed women with the ability to bear children.

Your views on today's women are totally unrealistic and behind the times. Today's women have the opportunity to pursue their potential, whatever that may be.

I'll agree that overall, women tend to be smaller than men, but as a male friend pointed out to me, this position is rather moot since machine guns are used, rather than hand-to-hand combat.

I'd like to conclude by saying, in today's male-dominated world women should have the right to make choices for themselves, and if that includes joining the armed forces, then they should be CONGRATULATED, not DISCRIMINATED against.

Christine Ryan
senior
elementary education

P.S. The general consensus is that you must have been really bored in order to write such an asinine letter.