

Daily Nebraskan

Editorial Board  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Amy Edwards, Editor, 472-1766  
Lee Rood, Editorial Page Editor  
Jane Hirt, Managing Editor  
Brandon Loomis, Associate News Editor  
Brian Svoboda, Columnist  
Bob Nelson, Columnist  
Jerry Guenther, Senior Reporter

## Get on the ball Time running out for ASUN Senate

Put your boots on folks; it's getting a little deep in the Association of Students of the University of Nebraska office.

After one of the weakest performances of ASUN senates in recent history, ASUN senators and executives have the gall to pat themselves on the back for a job well done.

ASUN President Bryan Hill said he thinks the attitude of this year's senate has been more progressive and less conservative than previous senates.

Hill used as an example the fact that this year's senate passed an amendment to add discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation to the anti-discrimination clause of its bylaws.

While the move was commendable, it was long overdue. ASUN didn't pass the anti-discrimination amendment until Wednesday. And the amendment was one of the very few worthwhile actions ASUN has taken all semester.

Only 20 ASUN bills have been introduced during this semester. Out of that 20, nine bills were approvals of student organizations. Of the remaining 11 bills, only four were worthwhile: the aforementioned anti-discrimination amendment; two bills encouraging AIDS education and an AIDS support group; and one establishing the ASUN Parking Task Force.

A few senators are putting forth an effort. But even those senators are working at the minimum required for a successful year.

ASUN has only a few more weeks during second semester to redeem itself. In order to escape this year with even a mediocre rating, senators need to get on the ball.

— Lee Rood  
for the Daily Nebraskan

## God is the real solution

The introduction of these "new" relaxation and imagery techniques into the public schools is just another slice of bologna added to the educational diet of today's student. These ideas claim to help the student cope in today's society but don't seem to help the student at all.

Instead of dealing with the goal at hand, the student is taught to visualize himself reaching a goal in his mind so he can feel more confident about himself. What happens when the student becomes so dependent on these imaginary victories that he gets nothing accomplished in real life? What will his self-image be then?

They also claim that the relaxation techniques help to relieve stress. What happens when the student comes out of his perfect fantasy world and is faced with the reality that the paper is still due or that his parents are still fighting? The meditation doesn't do away with the situations, it merely postpones them.

It seems that the only secular way to relieve stress is to concentrate on real goals. Only when these goals are reached will you be rid of stress. The problem with this is that when one thing is finished, another presents itself.

Apparently, there is just one proven way to relieve stress: realize that God is in control of everything and that he has a plan for you. You can either accept this and fall into line with his plan, or you can reject it and try to find peace in something else.

Another slice of fantasy being

served by public schools deals with Christmas. It seems highly hypocritical for the schools to celebrate a holiday but forbid the teachers from teaching the true meaning of the celebration. Children now grow up believing that they get a week off from school to worship an overweight, unshaven man who comes down a chimney and a man with a cornucopia pipe, a button nose and two eyes made out of coal.

Why are the schools afraid of teaching the proven historical fact of the birth of Jesus Christ? Aren't schools supposed to teach facts and not myths? It can't be considered "pushing your beliefs" on someone if you're merely presenting the facts. The schools seem to be worried that if they reveal the fact that Jesus was born, it might lead to the revelation of the fact that he died as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. As a result, some students might realize their sinful nature and that their eternal salvation is through Jesus Christ and that faith in anything else is futile.

I'm not trying to force my "religious values" on anyone, but I am asking you to have an open mind about an old concept: the Bible. Why is it that they say you have an open mind if you look toward anything but God; but they say you have a closed mind if you look toward God?

Merry Christmas UNL.

James McIntyre  
junior  
political science



## 'Superstar' needs to be defined

Sitcoms, silly movies, Pepsi ads don't add up to superstardom

In an excited voice, the TV announcer urged us to stay tuned for the news show because we would be treated to a live interview by Gene Siskel with "superstar Michael J. Fox."

Suddenly my mind was a blank. I couldn't place someone named Michael J. Fox. So I asked the blond if she could refresh my memory as to the identity of this superstar. I rely on her in such matters because she occasionally reads People magazine.

"He's a young actor," she said. To my embarrassment, that information didn't help. I still drew a mental blank. So I asked if we had ever seen superstar Michael J. Fox perform.

"Sure," she said, "he was in 'Back to the Future.'"

Ah, yes, now I remembered. It was a silly but entertaining movie, although I don't remember if he was going forward or backward.

"A sequel to that just came out," she said. "And he is in some Pepsi commercials."

And that's why he is a superstar? "I guess so. He used to be in a sitcom, and now he's on the cover of People."

How about that? Michael J. Fox, superstar, and I didn't even know. I'll have to pick up more supermarket newspapers.

Not to take anything away from a young man who has been Back to the Future twice, and is in soda-pop commercials, but it seems to me that bestowing the title of "superstar" on him may be premature.

I'm not sure what the precise guidelines are to become a "superstar," but when I hear that word, some show business names come to mind: Fred Astaire, Humphrey Bogart, Katherine Hepburn, Spencer Tracy, Clark Gable, Marilyn Monroe, Marlon Brando, Bette Davis, John Wayne, Cary Grant, Gary Cooper, Paul Newman, Robert Redford, Frank Sinatra, Robert

DeNiro, Bob Hope, Bing Crosby and Bill Cosby.

Some of them have been dead for many years. But just about everyone still recognizes their names and talents.

So if Michael J. Fox is suddenly a "superstar," what do we call Sinatra, who has been a world famous singer-actor since the 1940s? A super-doooper-star? A galaxy-star?

Actually, most of them were never called "superstars." They were simply "stars." You were either a star, which meant you were very famous, or you were just him or her, whosis or whatchamacallit.



Mike Royko

I'm not sure when the title of "superstar" came along, or who decides when someone goes from being a "star" to a "superstar." Siskel and Ebert? People magazine? Is it based on how many Oscars you win or how much money your agent can demand?

Maybe the measure is how many times your name appears in the nation's gossip columns or you are invited on the Johnny Carson show. If that's the case, Zsa Zsa Gabor is a superstar but Laurence Olivier wasn't.

It might have started in sports, possibly when what used to be known simply as the professional football championship game became the super-inflated Super Bowl.

That always struck me as presumptuous of football. Baseball, our national pastime, doesn't call its championship the Super Series. Basketball doesn't call it the Super Hoop. In fairness, the bowling champion-

ship would be more justified in calling itself the Super Bowl, since that's what the sport does. Football should call its big game the Super Foot.

My guess is that the "superstar" designation was originated by sports announcers, Earth's most excitable creatures.

There was a time when an athlete had to be of Hall of Fame stature to be known as a mere "star." Anyone else was called a "good player."

This last baseball season, Will Clark had a year that would have made a Babe Ruth consider retirement, caused Ted Williams to check into the Mayo Clinic for observation, and humiliated Hank Aaron. But Clark was elevated to "superstar" status by the broadcasting hysterics.

Or could it be that it's a side effect of inflation, that in those decades when new cars jumped from \$2,000 to \$20,000, a .240 hitter was inflated from mope to star, and .280 hitters were promoted from being "good players" to superstars?

And now a young actor who does a TV sitcom, a couple of silly but commercially successful movies and a Pepsi commercial becomes a superstar.

Can this be part of the decline of our once-great nation? Does history show that mediocre chariot drivers and cowardly gladiators were hailed as "superstars" before the fall of the Roman Empire?

If so, to prevent further decline, we should create some national standards for superstardom. We must clearly establish the difference between a superstar and a star, and a star and a whosis and whasis.

I would not take on the job, myself. It should be done by a panel of experts -- possibly the nation's gossip columnists, disc jockeys, sports babblers, gate-crashers, talk-show hosts and champion couch potatoes.

Until this is done, though, I have my own standard.

(C) 1989 by the Chicago Tribune

## editorial

Signed staff editorials represent the official policy of the fall 1989 Daily Nebraskan. Policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. Its members are Amy Edwards, editor; Lee Rood, editorial page editor; Jane Hirt, managing editor; Brandon Loomis, associate news editor; Jerry

Guenther, senior reporter; Bob Nelson, columnist; and Brian Svoboda, columnist.

Editorial columns represent the opinion of the author.

According to policy set by the regents, responsibility for the editorial content of the newspaper lies solely in the hands of its student editors.

## letter

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.

Letters and guest opinions sent to the newspaper become the property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned.

Anonymous submissions will not be considered for publication. Letters should include the author's name, year in school, major and group affiliation, if any. Requests to withhold names will not be granted.

Submit material to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 F St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.