

editorial

Speaker funding inches through unclear definitions

Score one for speakers. In their 1978-79 budget recommendation, the Fees Allocation Board has included some money for a speakers program. In case you forgot, the NU Board of Regents told us at their Feb. 18 meeting that mandatory fees could not support a speakers program.

In a report to FAB, a subcommittee stated that they see no reason to not budget for a speakers program next year. Actual allocation to the Talks and Topics committee or any such counterpart is pending a regent definition of "speaker." Lord knows

when that will be, since speakers were not even discussed at this month's regent meeting.

Obviously, the 5,000 signatures on a petition supporting mandatory fees for speakers meant something to FAB members. Obviously, the same 5,000 signatures meant something else—or perhaps nothing—to the regents.

But in any case, at least the money for a speaker program is there if needed.

The next step is to define speaker and then see how that definition fits

with FAB's allocation for Talks and Topics.

It looks like this is going to be a long, tangled process—possibly so lengthy that nothing will be finalized until after the semester ends and the majority of students have left UNL.

If such is the case, the earliest we could have a speaker—if, in fact, they are even allowed—would be probably spring '79.

Reviewing this complicated process, we applaud UPC and FAB for working within such nebulous guidelines.

However, we cannot help but be frustrated by the whole process.

The regents have complicated the speaker issue and as yet have done nothing to help clear it up. It's hard to work with budgets that may/may not include a speaker program. So far, it looks like speakers will still be around, funded by mandatory fees.

But it's hard to work with maybes. We need a definite, clear-cut solution to this problem now, while students are still around to voice their opinion.

Language loses all 'person'-ality through non-sexist words

What can you say about a society which measures the level of cultural acceptance of a new trend by how quickly it enters Johnny Carson's monologue or gets used in a commercial?

I suppose that finding out about a new fad by "Carson's Barometer of Fad Acceptance" is as good a way as any, but finding out that we have somehow gone wrong via an Alka Seltzer Commercial makes me a little uneasy.

michael zangari

Well, to make a long story short, we blew it again. Remember when there were high hopes that the word "person" when used as a tag for traditionally male-oriented occupational titles, would help raise consciousness?

Initially, it seemed to raise more eyebrows than consciousnesses, but somehow it crept into the vocabulary anyway. It now has made it's way into the wonderful world of advertising, and it is just about

ready for burial.

Witness: a new Union Pacific Railroad commercial. (Over the catchy and very cute Union Pacific jingle) The camera sweeps over the happy and busy workers, "Joe Blow: Switchman", "John Doe: Lineman", (the camera continues it's sweep of various men until it comes to a woman employee) "Jane Q. Public: Lineperson."

There are other commercials that use the same line, of course, but somehow this one seems to be the most graphic in it's reflection of what has come to be.

It's obvious isn't it? "Person" means woman. There are businessmen and businesspersons now (The business person is the one in the pantsuit.) We've come a long way, baby.

The capper comes in the form of a California survey. The new one says that in nearly all cases where it is used, when "person" is inserted, it is used as a reference to a woman. The same survey tells us that "Ms." has now replaced "Miss" (in most cases "Mrs." still is used for married women.)

Admittedly, I dislike the "person" label. I prefer the simple tag "woman" where it is appropriate, but would use anything if I

thought it would even things out a bit.

I hope we are far enough along that we do not automatically assume that a doctor or lawyer is a man, or assume anything about anyone.

Whatever the case, get ready for the next onslaught. A man at the University of California at Berkeley has just received a grant to explore the possibility of inserting

the new word "E" into the language instead of he/she.

Are you ready? "Meet Ms. Sally Sadhorse. E is the new batperson for the Yankees. E works with John Jetison "the businessman of the bat" as he is affectionately know..."

Why do I feel like I'm drowning in a symantic cesspool?



letters to the editor

The ASUN Electoral Commission would like to inform the students of UNL of what happened in the reporting of the 1978 election results.

At approximately 2 a.m. March 16, the Electoral Commission contacted the Daily Nebraskan and reported the election results for the ASUN executives, the student fee referendum, and the senate positions in all colleges except Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Graduate.

At that time, the Daily Nebraskan representative did not want the vote tally for the senate positions, although we offered to give them to her.

The Daily Nebraskan was informed at that point that the SOAR party had won all the senate seats, except one in the College of Home Economics. The Daily Nebraskan also was notified that the rest of the results would be available as soon as possible after we met at 6 p.m. Thursday, March 16 to finish counting.

The Electoral Commission had been working for 21 hours straight, and we were so tired that we decided to finish counting on Thursday evening to ensure accuracy.

The Electoral Commission could not meet earlier than 6 p.m. Thursday because of class and work conflicts.

At approximately 8 p.m. March 16, 24 hours after the polls closed, the Electoral Commission notified the Daily Nebraskan of all senate position results, and also partial results for the advisory board positions. The Daily Nebraskan informed us that Friday's issue already had been sent to the printer and that it was too late for the election results to be included.

The Electoral Commission feels that the Daily Nebraskan staff should have waited for these results. The Daily Nebraskan knew that the returns would be available Thursday evening, and we also are aware that the Daily Nebraskan can easily include

any news it receives prior to 9 p.m. in the following day's issue (such as actions taken at ASUN and CSL meetings).

The Daily Nebraskan was able to wait until 2 a.m. to find out who won three executive positions, so it is difficult to see why it could not wait until 8 p.m. to find out the winners of 35 senate positions. The Daily Nebraskan easily could have informed UNL students who their ASUN senators were in the Friday issue.

We would also like to point out several errors in the Friday, March 17, editorial. The Electoral Commission announced Thursday morning not Thursday night, that the election results would be available on Thursday night.

In addition, most of the ASUN Senate winners were notified of their election on Wednesday night or on Thursday by president-elect Ken Marienau. The Daily Nebraskan is not the only way that news

travels on campus, so we doubt that too many senate winners are "holding their breaths".

President-elect Marienau was notified of the senators who had won at around 2:30 a.m. Thursday morning, right after the Daily Nebraskan was called, and we imagine that he got started on his "senate groundwork" before the editorial was even published.

We admit that there was a communication breakdown between the Daily Nebraskan and the Electoral Commission concerning the publication of the election results, but before the Daily Nebraskan points its finger at the Electoral Commission as the source of all blame, it should realize that three of its fingers are pointing back at itself.

Ken Christoffersen
Lori Von Minden
Steve Korff

Richard Johnson, ASUN Faculty Advisor



The Daily Nebraskan printed what was available to us within our deadlines. On election night, the Electoral Commission agreed to call the Daily Nebraskan when they had tallied the votes.

Arrangements were made two weeks in advance to accommodate election night results.

Results were called in beginning at 2 a.m., four hours after the paper's final deadline.

Senatorial votes were not printed because the commission had not made a final count. To ensure accuracy, the final tally was needed.

Continued on page 5