

Leaders needed to direct ASUN

Apathy is a mask that each of us wears at one time or another. We can depend on students being apathetic with the same accuracy as we can depend on the weather being cold tomorrow.

However, we cannot hide behind the mask of others.

"It is very hard to represent the students if they don't tell you what they want," says ASUN President Bill Mueller.

Perhaps this is Mueller's excuse for ASUN's ineffectiveness, this year. ASUN Senate has had a hard time getting together this semester. A quorum is a rarity. Swearing in new senators seems to be a regular part of the agenda.

ASUN needs leadership. The senators cannot be inspired by a massive student body that is reticent to speak.

Whether students are too busy minding their own business or simply bored with student government is not an excuse upon which ASUN should rely.

When we elect a student to be our ASUN president and our representative at the NU Board of Regents meetings, we are electing a leader to voice the concerns of the student body.

A leader's main job is to inspire his or her followers. We are not electing a follower or a person simply to listen to a heartbeat and record it.

The ASUN president cannot wait for a war to incite students as it did 10 years ago. The ASUN president is a student, too, and his or her reactions as a student should be in tone with the rest of the student body.

The president should lead the ASUN Senate. Senators need inspiration from their leaders to make them want to attend meetings and take pride in their elected positions.

ASUN elections will take place next month. Let's hope we elect a leader.

ralph



Theodore M. Bernstein

Customary use of custom confusing

No limits. One of the most misused words, even among the educated, is *parameter*. As defined in *Webster's New World Dictionary*, it means "any constant, with variable values, used as a referent for determining other variables." Is that all clear? Apparently it isn't to many people. A great many, misled by the sound of the word, think it means *perimeter*. Example: "However broad the 'general education' of the past might have been in terms of disciplines, it still operated within the *parameters* of the

Out in the field. Two classes at a school in Pennsauken, N.J., heard they were going on a *field trip* to Philadelphia. According to Terry Natale, a speech pathologist at the school, one student asked whether *field trip* meant they were going out to a field and was told that the phrase meant a trip outside the classroom to get information firsthand. That answer was, of course, correct, but Miss Natale asks how the term came about. The word *field* originally meant, and still means, a tract of open land. But centuries ago it took on a figurative sense of an area in which practical work is done, an area of practical activity as distinct from one of academic study. When the term was first used one knoweth not.

Tough cases. We now run into some controversies between Miss Thistlebottom and Mr. Goodwriter. Four sentences have been sent this way by A. Lascola of Buffalo, who asks which pronoun to use in each instance. Here are the troublemakers:

1. That's supposed to be *me* (I?)
2. It should have been *she* (her?)
3. It must be *me* (I?)
4. Everyone would like to go, even *us* (we?)

Half a century ago teachers would have insisted that all those pronouns would have to be in the nominative case; therefore: 1. I; 2. she; 3. I; 4. we.

Nowadays most good writers would probably vote this way: 1. *me*; 2. *her* or *she*; 3. *me* or *I*; 4. *we*. The least controversial item is No. 4, probably because everyone senses a kind of ellipsis there: "Everyone would like to go, even *we* (would like to go)." In the other instances much would depend on how formal and rigid the writing surrounding these sentences was and how conservative the writer was. In any event, times change and so does usage to a limited degree.

(c) 1977 Theodore M. Bernstein
Special Features

classical Western culture." The word doesn't mean boundaries, limits or perimeters; it means *er . . . um . . . y'know*. Avoid it unless it lies within the perimeter of your technical education.

A word to the customer. Two letters that arrived almost simultaneously asked about the word *custom* as used in "custom tailoring" and "custom-built home." One letter, from Marion Maratea of Philadelphia, asked how it is that we use *custom* in phrases like "custom tailoring" when the dictionary defines the word as meaning tradition or habit. Read on in the dictionary and you will find that the word also means made to one's order or one's own specifications. That meaning is not at all far-fetched because underlying the word *custom* is the Latin root *suus*, meaning one's own. That meaning also is the basis of the word *custom* in "custom-built house," which refers to a house built to the customer's order.

bernstein on words

Mary McGrory

Vance silently fills Kissinger's shoes

His predecessor always surged in, surrounded by bodyguards, like a gangster or a rock star. Cyrus Vance ambled in alone for his first press conference and was at the podium, peering over his half-glasses, before anyone realized he was in the room.

The torch of American foreign policy has passed from the most imperial and theatrical secretary of state in history, whose every whim and quip were chronicled by a worshipful press corps, to a calm, gray-haired professional, who apparently expects to be treated like an ordinary mortal, not a super-celebrity or a sovereign power.

At the last, Kissinger, in his greed for notice, was reduced to accepting a uniform from the Harlem Globetrotters—anything to delay the dread moment when the spotlight would be turned off, and the curtain would go down. Kissinger loved the power, the jets, the limousines, the adulation. His Secret Service protection is being extended to soften the withdrawal pangs.

Kissinger's abiding problem, apart from his ego, was his distrust of democracy. No one was more nettled by its inefficiency, its tedium, at home and abroad. He made

congressional intervention. He is, he declared, quite looking forward to it.

That's style, of course. But what of substance? What will this country's attitude be towards people in other countries who speak up for freedom? Kissinger regarded Solzhenitsyn as a nuisance, like the war protesters who so hampered Kissinger's four-and-one-half-year search for peace in Vietnam, like the senators who blocked his way to further adventure in Angola.

The first time out on his vexing and central question of foreign policy, the Carter administration spoke out clearly, unequivocally—and then retreated.

Last week, to the satisfaction of those Americans who think we should stand for human rights, the State Dept. . . . the Soviets to lay off Andrei Sakharov, the valiant Nobel laureate who is facing new and more sinister oppression from his government.

Alas, it turned out to be a clerical error. That is, some underling, admirably liberal-minded, in the European Affairs Bureau, had seen in the threat to Sakharov a clear violation of the Helsinki Accords, and put out the proper response.

It may have been bureaucracy's finest hour. But it caused consternation at the top. Jimmy Carter, on being advised of a howl from the Soviet ambassador, made a mealy-mouthed statement which at once said, "I wish I'd said that" and "I wish it hadn't been said."

Vance wants normalization of our relations with Cuba, Vietnam and other small countries that Kissinger saw as intolerably disrespectful to American strength and face.

It is good to have a secretary of state who promises to act openly and speak on the record, who won't tap his friends or record his telephone calls. But the most heartening aspect of the Sakharov episode is the evidence it offers that in the State Dept., at the lower levels anyway, there are people who in spite of the unilateral Kissinger years, continue to believe that treaties, even the Helsinki Accords, mean what they say, and that America has the right and obligation to say a word for brave men who are in trouble for saying what they believe.

washington winds

friends with dictators, in Vietnam, Chile, China, South Korea. He made a secret of everything but his resentment of the "meddling" which is prescribed by the Constitution in the management of foreign policy.

He felt so strongly about the need for one-man rule that he prevailed on Gerald Ford in his farewell State of the Union to include a reproachful passage about "the regrettable tendency towards congressional intrusion into, or obstruction of presidential responsibilities"—a final warning against the dangers of democracy.

Vance, by contrast, seems perfectly willing to tolerate

letters

'Good job, Joe'

After about two weeks of constant complaining about Nebraska's basketball team and coaches, I think that it is about time that someone comes to the rescue. I am an ex-basketball coach from the early 50s to the late 60s, 1969 to be exact.

I was fortunate to have a basketball system, students, fans, band, players, as well as assistant coaches that appreciated what we as a team, school were trying to do.

Unfortunately, I can't say that about the students and some basketball fans here at the University of Nebraska. I haven't been in Lincoln for very long, only about six years, but I feel that the Nebraska coaches (Joe Cipriano, Moe Iba, Mr. Porter) and the players are getting a bum deal from the fans at NU.

I do not know Coach Cipriano personally, but I've gone to every home game the past six years, and some out-of-town games to boot. And I feel that he is a very capable coach, and is doing a fine job.

Having coached in junior college nine years, I know what it takes to coach and play a game of basketball. Obviously most of the Nebraska basketball fans don't. It takes hard work, tremendous effort, and dedication, which everyone on the Nebraska staff possess.

Personally, I know this letter will not change anyone's attitude, because your attitudes are too far gone and ridiculous. I wrote this letter to let you know that there are some basketball fans in Lincoln and in the state who think Joe Cipriano is a fine coach, and should be applauded for his efforts.

Last Wednesday I had some of my old assistant coaches from Des Moines. It was the Kansas game, I was embarrassed to say the least.

Had I been a recruit, sitting in the stands that night seeing and hearing my prospective coach and teammates booed off their own court, I would never come and visit that school again.

You so-called fans have done more to hurt Nebraska basketball than any Coach ever could.

Joe, is a fine coach and deserves more than his share of respect from his people. But from most people (who this is directed at) he'll never get it. So that is why . . . the people in the know say Good Job, Joe.

In conclusion, there are many people, who feel this way, not just a few. Nebraska basketball is sound, and is played this year the only way it can be and that is patient. That, my friends, takes coaching. Anyone can hand a ball to a bunch of guys and say—Go to it.

Gene Krugler