

opinion
READER

Readers take shots at basketball writer, letter

Don't blame Bergen for basketball loss

Mike Kluck's account of the Nebraska-Athletes in action basketball game (DN, Nov. 11) was a "nightmare" itself to those attending the game, those who understand the game, and those who support what Cornhusker coach Danny Nee is trying to accomplish. It appears that Kluck may not fit into any of those categories.



Worse, those who were not able to attend the game were given a misrepresentation of what really happened.

To Danny Nee's credit, he used the exhibition as an opportunity to improve the depth on his squad. Thanks to incompetent reporting, whatever confidence Jed Bergen may have gained from being called on by Nee was probably negated.

Blaming Bergen for this loss, and one play in particular, is akin to blaming Michael Dukakis' loss on the failure to carry South Dakota. In fact, it is similar to condemning The Daily Nebraskan as worthless reading on the basis of this one article.

Kluck, we are not looking for a journalistic Dick Vitale — especially one with little insight into the great roundball sport. Do us a favor and give us facts, statistics and quotes — and leave it at that.

Jim Boeve
graduate student
mathematics and statistics

Editor's note: Although Mike Kluck did the reporting for the basketball story, it was written by DN senior reporter Jeff Apel. Apel's byline was left off because of space reasons.

Former NU player blasts sports writer

This is in reference to the article that Mike Kluck wrote about the Nebraska basketball team's loss to Athletes in Action (DN, Nov. 11).

I find it very hard to fathom anybody, let alone a so-called sports-writer, to be simple-minded enough to believe that a basketball game can be lost because of the play of one athlete.

People like Kluck who believe a game is lost because of the one play are so ignorant of the game that it doesn't even warrant discussion. I'm going to say what I think, anyway.

As many people know, there are 40 minutes in a college basketball game (that's 20 minutes in each half, in case you didn't know, Kluck). During the course of a game there are many plays and many shots, and to say that any one of the possessions lost a game is idiotic.

It is a combination of plays that either wins or loses a game, not a single possession. If other players wouldn't have made some turnovers or missed some shots earlier in the Athletes in Action game, it would never have gone into overtime.

If you have any trouble understanding anything you have just read, Kluck, feel free to give me a call.

Jeff Rekoweg
former Nebraska basketball player

Get a clue Mike Kluck

This is in regards to Mike Kluck's article on the Nebraska basketball team's loss to Athletes in Action (DN, Nov. 11). First of all, I would like to commend you for quoting the score (104-102 in overtime) correctly. Good work! As for the rest of your

article — how can you honestly say the loss came as the result of one player's (Jed Bergen's) missed shot?

By looking at the statistics, you will see that as a team, the Cornhuskers shot 41-of-87 from the field for 47.1 percent. There were a total of 46 missed shots by the nine players who took them. So, how can you consistently refer to one missed shot as the one that "lost the game" in your "editorial?" Bergen was 1-of-2 from the field, which was a better shooting percentage than the rest of the team.

Wake up, Kluck! There were many mental mistakes that went unreported in your article: Bad passes, a charge and numerous other missed shots in the final seconds of regulation. It just might have been the overtime that contributed to the loss.

In an article about the Huskers' Eric Johnson earlier in the week, he said something that Kluck could use in his future writings; "We win and lose as a team." Take it to heart and use it the next time you decide to report sports.

Lisa Hollestelle
sophomore
actuarial science

UNL grad chastises reader's definition

Andrew Meyer cites a law that bans women from combat duty in the armed forces in a letter (DN, Nov. 14) and pretends that this proves that women demand equal rights but reject equal responsibilities.

First, his facts are confused. This legislation was passed at a time when the (first) Equal Rights Amendment was being debated in statehouses across the country; it was introduced by conservatives as an attempt to squelch public support for the ERA. Most women's groups opposed the bill.

More importantly it's just wrong to say that women don't accept responsibility. If Meyer insists on defining "responsibility" as willing to die for others, I suggest he count the number of women through history who died in childbirth so that their husbands would have big strong sons to help them. That, however, is not the point.

Responsibility doesn't entail masochism. A responsible person is

one who does what she knows is right and does it for the right reasons. It's contemptible to pretend that responsibility is something that can be bestowed on some and removed from others by an act of Congress, just as it's wrong to withhold civil rights from 51 percent of the people just because a lot of politicians say it's OK.

Jim Johnson
Lincoln
UNL class of 1979

Meyer's argument contested as limited

In response to the letter by Andrew Meyer (DN, Nov. 14) about equal rights and equal combat in the military: Meyer, what's your military experience? Obviously, it is very limited.

As a female and a member of the military, I must point out that it would take an act of God and Congress to place women in an "actual" combat situation.

I didn't join the military to prove anything. I wanted to take an active

part in serving my country and as a result of that I have achieved a tremendous sense of accomplishment and satisfaction.

During the course of my training, I have been shot at, gassed and attacked by terrorists. But after all, that was only simulated combat. Do you want me to feel cheated?

Carry on, Meyer. I think your ship's gone out to sea.

Andrea Taylor
junior
human development/rehabilitation

letter POLICY

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor from all readers and interested others.

Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space available. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit all material submitted.

Readers also are welcome to submit material as guest opinions. Whether material should run as a letter or guest opinion, or not to run, is left to the editor's discretion.

Welcome to our

Anniversary Sale



- Coupon -

Use this coupon for an...
ADDITIONAL 10% OFF SALE PRICE
on your purchases of any suit, sportcoat, dress, leather coat, wool coat, cloth coat, or any other coat or jacket.

Valid only thru Nov. 27th, 1988

"Our special thanks to you."

One coupon per person, per purchase must be presented at time of purchase.

Everything and we mean everything is on sale!

Our Biggest Sale of the Fall. Don't Miss It.

This is our BIG sale of the fall. DON'T MISS IT!

Mens Specials

Long Sleeve Shirts values to \$55	\$19.90-24.90
Sweaters values to \$47.50	\$19.90-29.90
large group orig. \$75-90	1/2 off
Sweatshirts and knits turtles, mocks, and polo's values to \$49.50	\$24.90-29.90
Pants values to \$55	\$19.90-29.90
Shoes	30-50% off
Leathers values to \$375	\$198-279
Suits 100% Worsted Wools values \$285-\$475	\$149-279

Womens Specials

Sweaters (Designers included)	50-60% Off
Knits values to \$64	\$39.90
Blouses values to \$82	\$19.90-49.90
Sweaters values to \$100	\$29.90-49.90
Pants values to \$110	\$29.90-49.90
Skirts values to \$98	\$29.90-49.90
Shoes and Boots	50-60% Off
Jeans values to \$56	\$19.90-29.90
Dresses	50-60% Off

the Post and Nickel

Downtown Lincoln at 144 N. 14th