

You can run, but you can't hide

Sexism still exists in different form



KAY PRAUNER is a senior news-editorial major, assistant copy desk chief and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

And let's say this aforementioned attachment is, oh ... an "ism." What's an "ism," you ask? Let's just say it's sex with a twist. It's no secret, trust me. In fact, I know we've all encountered sex of this sort – and, unfortunately, at quite a vulnerable age.

Before you prudishly wave this aside, I want you to try something for me. Imagine yourself placing this "ism" right next to your sex.

So this sounds perverse? You bet it is. This is sex in its raunchiest of forms. This is the type of sex for which we often feel guilt, shock, embarrassment and remorse. This is the type of sex that gives me goosebumps of Andean proportions.

Certainly this is a concept that has been around the block countless times. It's as ancient – and by the same token as jaw-slackening – as the *Kama Sutra*. By no means is sexism a new – or for that matter, rare – breed.

But in a sense, the sexism of which I speak is new. Even though women have managed to shatter the mythical glass ceiling, and men have whipped out their dustpans and whisks to help clean up the mess, sexism has not disappeared. In fact, it has evolved into something drastically

different from days past.

I guess one could say that sexism has undergone a sort of conceptual Darwinism, emerging in a more robust form, marking its collected territory, and wielding a new pouch of finely honed skills for survival. It also could be said that we have enabled sexism to alter its appearance so drastically that one can no longer sense how or in what form it continually lurks overhead and underfoot.

And when sexism leaps from its respective crack or crevice, we see that it has transformed into, well, an overwhelmingly adaptable, highly advanced beast. And this beast is not selective when stalking its prey. It attacks men and women alike.

For example, a recent study by the University of Ottawa on Ontario surveyed 123 men and found that 80 percent, or 95 of the subjects, feel extreme levels of anxiety and uncertainty around women in upper-level management positions. According to the survey, this sexism – although more covertly applied under its new guise – strips women of mentoring and networking opportunities normally doled out to men in similar career positions. And as the problem esca-

lates, the animosity that women commonly feel toward their male co-workers continues to be fed by such misunderstandings, even though in most cases men don't realize they're helping to shape these misconceptions. In fact, neither men nor women can determine for certain whether or not sexism is the catalyst for such distress. Hence, workers find their careers rife with much more than the usual confusion or general malaise – they find themselves face-to-face with the beast.

This new strain of sexism (dubbed neosexism by the Ottawa study) comes forward because it fails to manifest itself in any certain discernible manner – especially to the many career-hounds who believe they are far too developed to exude something as pedestrian and passé as prejudicial stereotyping.

These people need to remove their White Album glasses for a moment and closely inspect the situation. This problem cannot be solved by the adage "ignore it, and it will go away."

Of course, we haven't completely brushed off sexism; we've attempted to create a universally protective shield by unfolding our neo-

PC/Renaissance-worker umbrellas. But as with those pesky gremlins, all it takes is one tiny water-leak for the beast to multiply.

So what can we do to protect ourselves? I mean, this implicates a complication in – dare I say it – our sex lives, or in other words, in our experiences as men and women trying to work together. And if politically correct, supposedly aware career superhumans can't dominate the trend, who can?

Well, since sexism is changing at such an alarming rate, perhaps our best defense would be to change as well. Maybe if we were to weed out our weaknesses, i.e. misunderstandings based on our maleness or femaleness, we could once again take up the dominant gene.

I think that simply by being aware of this new form of sexism we are wielding our most lethal weapon. If we expect that sexism continually sits poised to pounce, it can no longer take us by surprise. And if we force ourselves to beware the beast, we will be fully equipped to put forth our best efforts and assets – à la natural selection – so as to conquer, rather than divide.

I need to ask a favor of you.

I'd like you to set aside whatever you're doing, and – I know this may be taxing – think about sex.

I'm not talking about knock-over-lamps-as-you-hurl-undergarments-and-scramble-toward-the-nearest-designated-coital-corner sex. I'm not setting up a fantasy forum, here.

I'm asking you to think about something with true significance – your *very own personal sex*. And then consider this sex of yours ... with an attachment.

Watch that mouth

Profanity reveals something about character



GREGG MADSEN is a senior news-editorial major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

that make them losers? Are we to believe that profanity is now acceptable?

Let's face it, words are powerful, and a profane word holds more power than any other kind of word. It is supposed to show extreme emotion, but today profanity has become a staple in many people's sentence structure. Too

many of us have trouble completing a sentence without inserting some choice expletives to enhance how we sound. Many of you may be cussing a blue streak at me as you read this.

It used to be that you could ask someone: "Would you say that word if your parents were here," and the person would see the problem with their language.

But today, that doesn't seem to work because the same words are coming from parents and bosses and even professors in the first place. Profanity has permeated all socio-economic classes, races and both genders. Ask yourself if you would use your normal vocabulary were you to talk to a room full of elementary schoolers. Would your words change? If they would, maybe it's time to evaluate what's coming out of your mouth.

The thing we need to understand is that profanity doesn't just affect those who hear it. It affects you – or, more accurately, it shows a deeper problem. If your speech is the language of your soul, and your language is trash, then what is hiding down there inside your heart?

Your language is as clear a reflection of your character as any other trait.

And we can all agree that character is a major factor in winning, can't we? So why should the Raiders be condemned for trying to improve the character of the team? They shouldn't.

Maybe next week, Time will list former UCLA basketball coach John Wooden in the "loser" section. Wooden didn't tolerate any profanity from his players, and he was such a loser that he led the Bruins to 10 national titles in a 12-year span and compiled a "loser-ish" 620-147 record. In his 27 seasons at UCLA, Wooden earned the nickname: "The Wizard of Westwood." Maybe Time will rename him the loser of L.A.

We can now call Tom Osborne a loser, too. After all, Osborne doesn't accept any profanity from his players, either. Ironically, most of Osborne's players don't think of him as Time might; rather, they respect and appreciate him – not just because he holds their playing time in the palm of his hand, but because they honor Osborne the man as much as they obey Osborne the coach.

Osborne and Wooden's clean language – whether you like it or not – has had a huge bearing on the respect their players have for them. They prove to their players, and to all of us, that a person can live a profanity-free life.

It doesn't matter that Osborne and Wooden are associated with college athletics. The Raiders are supposed to be a professional team, so why not act as such? Just because their players are older doesn't mean they shouldn't be subject to keeping their mouths clean. There are banners lining the stadium in Oakland which say, "Dedicated to Excellence." The Raiders' new rule is a big step in that direction, no matter what the so-called mainstream might say.

Time should include itself in its next "losers" section.

The Oakland Raiders are losers.

At least according to last week's Time magazine they are.

In its weekly feature, "Winners and Losers," Time gave the Raiders a thumbs down.

The problem here isn't just the idiocy of Time having a weekly judgment section. It's the reasoning behind the "loser" label. Time said the Raiders are losers because the coaching and management has vowed to crack down on profanity amongst the players.

That makes sense.

Raider management and head coach Joe Bugel make a disciplinary decision that they feel will help their team win, and for their efforts, they get to be known as losers. It's a perfect example of the fear of discipline that has become so prevalent in our society. More specifically, it seems that any discipline that has a hint of morality near it is automatically shot down and any supporter is quickly labeled out of touch or – in Time's eyes – a loser.

Time wasn't lashing out at Bugel and the Raiders because they made a rule, but because of the substance of that rule. The Raider management wants a team that doesn't talk like a crew of sailors. Does



AMY MARTIN/DN