

CONTACTING US

NEWSROOM: (541) 346-5511
 ADDRESS: Oregon Daily Emerald
 P.O. BOX 3159
 Eugene, Oregon 97403
 E-MAIL: ode@oregon.uoregon.edu
 ONLINE EDITION: www.uoregon.edu/~ode

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
 Sarah Kickler
 EDITORIAL EDITOR
 Mike Schmierbach
 NIGHT EDITORS
 Laura Cadiz
 Sarah Kickler

PERSPECTIVES

Using the censor's shears in the new year

Welcome to 1998. For those of you who lost consciousness some time in late 1996 and are just now struggling back into reality, 1997 was roughly 365 days long, and every day was packed with goodness.

Goodness has different meanings for different people. For me, it means a swirl of vaguely unpleasant, half-recalled events that would be better left in the foggy past.

Government leaders, corporate heads and the smiling collection of media commentators who are waiting to slime their way to a juicy post advising presidents how not to get caught have a different idea of what goodness entails. For them, the new year is an opportunity to highlight the porcelain sparkle of the toilet bowl that was the past year.

Such revisionism requires a little censorship, a lot of spin control and a fair amount of what George Orwell termed "newspeak." Events are conveniently forgotten or cloaked in the most sweet-smelling rhetoric available.

Well, if they can alter history, so can I. I don't want to forget about labor or environmental abuses, however. I just want to make sure that I never have to read about a select number of stories again.

The best solution I can think of is to steal an idea from Matt Groening. We had the same journalism teacher — shared the same suffering — and I certainly think life is hell.

Therefore, I feel entitled to present my 1998 forbidden words list: What follows are words and phrases I hope never to read or hear again. If all goes well, this will eliminate talk about the stories that go with them.

Mike Schmierbach is the editorial editor for the Emerald. His views do not necessarily represent those of the paper.



Mike Schmierbach

advisory ratings,
 alternative-anything,
 America's Favorite Fries,
 amphitheater, *awareness,*
back to the books,
ballroom dance, Big Stink,
Bill Sizemore, binge drinking,
 Buddy, the presidential pooch,
Chumbawamba, corporate donors,
 cyberjournalism, *Diana, the people's princess,*
downsizing, Dr. Death, *electronica,*
fatally flawed, faux-anything, focus, Gardenburger,
Generation Next, Generation Y, heroin chic, I can,
 the Information Age, *Information Superhighway,*
 just do it, *the Lincoln Bedroom,* love,
M.I.B., medical marijuana, *the militia movement,*
millennium bug, Must See TV, *NAFTA,*
 near miss, *P.C.,* pepper spray,
proactive, quasi-anything, riot,
 road rage, *septuplet,* ska,
Spice-anything, swing, *task force,*
 tear gas, *trip hop,*
TV newsmagazines, Unabomber,
underwhelmed, victim mentality,
virtual pet, work/are,
 zeitgeist



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

McDonald comments misleading

In response to the comments made by Duncan McDonald (ODE, Dec. 4) about student protest of corporate influence on campus, what exactly does McDonald mean by stating that "you have to be able to think to use the standard of a reasonable person" when referring to student protesters? McDonald has not only made an offensive attack on students, but he has demonstrated obvious disrespect for the students that actually do think and have the skills to be critical of the growing trend of corporate influence on campus.

McDonald denounces Student Action for Labor and Equity as having an agenda. Well, we certainly do: Our agenda is to educate the students of this campus on the growing influence that private and corpo-

rate donations have; our agenda is to build a movement that will challenge the presence of corporate funds in the University; our agenda is to make sure this University accepts money that is clean — money that comes from sources that are socially and environmentally acceptable to the students.

Further, McDonald claims that "to be generous ... they are misinformed." Not only is this another diminishing and degrading attack on his part, but it is also not true. How exactly is it that we are misinformed? For isn't it true that there is a growing number of questionable private and corporate donations being made to the University that do have strings attached? McDonald cannot deny the fact that Phil Knight's \$25 million donation included a \$1 million salary increase for University President Dave Frohnmayer is a serious

dubious practice. Indeed, the fact that our president is being paid a million dollars by the CEO of one of America's largest corporations is a seriously questionable ethical practice.

The need for a student-faculty review committee that would evaluate private and corporate donations of more than \$10,000 on social and environmental criteria does exist. For how truly reliable can the present committee be in discerning environmental and social concerns in private donations when it is made up of "deans, directors, the University president as well as representatives from the Department of University Development and the Oregon Foundation"? Don't these individuals have a very specific perspective? And, more important, do they really represent the views of students and faculty?

We are asking for the opportunity to

have representative input in the acceptance of private monetary gifts; we are asking for our social and environmental concerns over private donations to be addressed appropriately. We see this as being done through the establishment of a student and faculty committee that will review all donations of more than \$10,000. Is it fair to deny students this type of representation when we not only constitute the biggest population on campus but are also the biggest source of income for the University?

McDonald has an agenda and a job to do as well. He is the person who is in charge of bringing in the big corporate donations on campus. As such, we should be careful in our understanding of his "comments" and his "views."

Claudia Villena
 Student Action for Labor and Equity