

# COMMENTARY

Newsroom: (541) 346-5511  
Room 300, Erb Memorial Union  
P.O. Box 3159, Eugene, OR 97403  
E-mail: editor@dailyemerald.com  
Online Edition:  
www.dailyemerald.com

Editor in Chief:  
Jessica Blanchard  
Managing Editor:  
Michael J. Kleckner  
Editorial Editor:  
Julie Lauderbaugh  
Assistant Editorial Editor:  
Jacquelyn Lewis

Tuesday, November 13, 2001

## Editorial

### ASUO Executive should be both seen and heard

What ever happened to Nilda Brooklyn and Joy Nair? The ASUO president and vice-president have all but disappeared from view as the term has progressed, and one of their campaign promises seems to have vanished almost as quickly.

In the spring, the pair promised to engage apathetic students in ASUO activities in an attempt to call attention to the good deeds of student government. This public relations campaign is nearly nonexistent, with the only visible promotions done in preschool sidewalk chalk on walkways.

Not only are students literally walking all over ASUO's sidewalk ad campaign for their Friday night movies, but in a rainy state like Oregon, it's simply impractical to promote student government with colorful chalk. The messages just wash away, along with any practical hopes of getting students involved in ASUO activities.

The latest ASUO election has not been advertised very successfully, either. Small fliers encouraging students to vote are at best ineffective and at worst a gross waste of paper. Although former ASUO President Jay Breslow didn't have the best public relations tactics, either, at least he had a monster-sized ballot box outside of the office to let students know it was time to vote. Our current executives should take a cue from Breslow and find a gimmick to get voters interested. Perhaps offering students a coupon for a free pastry at Greatful Bread when they voted would increase turnout. It would certainly be a sweet use of incidental fees.

The women seem to never be available and often decline comment to reporters. By running a somewhat inhospitable office and not stating their side of stories, the executives can be cast in a negative light in the minds of students.

Now that former ASUO controller Justin Sibley is planning to file a wrongful termination grievance against the executives, the time has come to answer charges. If they don't act quickly, the pair may be falling into a dangerous trap of negative publicity that could be difficult to recover from.

Brooklyn and Nair are having a hard time getting people interested in ASUO because most people don't know who they are. By hiding in their office, they are separating themselves from average students and creating a huge rift between the ivory tower of ASUO and reality.

## Editorial Policy

This editorial represents the opinion of the Emerald editorial board. Responses can be sent to [letters@dailyemerald.com](mailto:letters@dailyemerald.com). Letters to the editor and guest commentaries are encouraged. Letters are limited to 250 words and guest commentaries to 550 words. Please include contact information. The Emerald reserves the right to edit for space, grammar and style.

## Editorial Board Members

Jessica Blanchard editor in chief	Julie Lauderbaugh editorial editor
Michael J. Kleckner managing editor	Jacquelyn Lewis assistant editorial editor
Gabe Shaughnessy community representative	Grant Leffler community representative

Thomas Patterson  
newsroom representative

It seems like it gets harder and harder to get out of bed each morning. The temperature is dropping and project due dates are looming, government is expanding and job markets are shrinking. Sometimes I feel wound so tight the muscles in my jaw start to ache from gritting and grinding my teeth. There is one thing, though, that still brings a



Aaron Rorick  
Columnist

smile to my face: the shortcomings of others. The following little treat greeted me the other morning on CNN:

"A young woman slapped Prince Charles in the face with a flower on Thursday in Latvia while he was touring the Baltic nations to commemorate Britain's recognition of their independence from Moscow a decade ago. The gesture was meant to protest Britain's role in the U.S.-led bombing of Afghanistan."

I would like to point out all the ways this gesture is stupid and wrong, but first here's a little assorted knowledge on Latvia (I sure as hell didn't know anything about it): The Republic of Latvia is located in Northeastern Europe on the Baltic coast, on a historic trade route between Western Europe and Russia. Its climate is moderate and rainy. Forests cover more than 44 percent of the nation, and it has — get this — the largest otter population in Europe. There's a claim to fame. The official language is Latvian, a non-Slavic, non-Germanic tongue similar only to Lithuanian. Latvia is a democratic parliamentary republic, population 2,375,000, more than half of them indigenous Latvians of the Lutheran persuasion. The capital, Riga, where the flower-slapping took place, was founded

way back in 1201 and is home to a third of the populace.

I can only assume that the woman, because she opposes British involvement in Afghanistan, was trying to advocate peace in the region. So, to show her love of peace, she decided to hit the future King of England. And she did it while Chuck stopped to talk to a group of children, no less. What kind of message is this sending them? "Hey kids, what do we do to visiting dignitaries? Attack them with vegetation! And how do we show our love of peace? With small acts of violence!"

She used a flower, too! Was the irony supposed to appeal to Charles' superior British wit? What, couldn't she find a dove for an encore, carve a peace sign into Tony Blair's forehead? That would probably be more effective, seeing as how Prince Charles has exactly zero say in British foreign policy.

As the woman was being led away by two armed police (I don't know if she will be charged with anything), she was quoted as calling Britain "the enemy of the world." What world? The Third World? Sure Britain used to own half of it, but that was years ago. I thought the only people with a grudge against the British these days are the Irish. If anybody's the enemy of the world now, it's Americans. The British are just riding our coattails. Give credit where credit is due, lady.

Furthermore, this protester refused to give her name or age. So she's proud enough of her beliefs to walk up to the

## QUIZZICAL FAME



Steve Baggs Emerald

Prince, on camera, and swat him across his ugly mug, but she's too modest to attach her name to the act? Is she trying to avoid the publicity? It seems to me that publicity was her motivation because I don't see what else she hoped to accomplish.

The woman was carted off, and Charles, bewildered, continued down the street mingling with bystanders. The bombing in Afghanistan continues, with British and Latvian support, and another idiot gets her 15 minutes. I, for one, suddenly feel better about myself.

Aaron Rorick is a columnist for the Oregon Daily Emerald. His views do not necessarily reflect those of the Emerald. He can be reached at [aaronrorick@dailyemerald.com](mailto:aaronrorick@dailyemerald.com).

## Letters to the editor

### 'Eye for an eye' blinds our society

It is sickening to hear a fellow University student state, "Civilians must die if our enemies are forced to surrender and American lives are to be saved" ("We must annihilate states that breed terrorists," ODE, 11/1). Although I've heard sick ideas concerning the terrorist attacks lately, this is one of the worst.

Where do Americans get the idea revenge comes before intellectual thinking, that "an eye for an eye" is sound philosophy? Do Americans honestly believe mourners of the dead want payback for what's happened to loved ones? Wouldn't they prefer a nonviolent approach, so no more people would have to suffer?

Killing more innocent people in other countries won't protect innocent American lives. It puts us in greater danger. Victims of American attacks will react by seeking payback, as our president and most Americans have. Besides, attacking civilians in another country is terrorism on our nation's part and shouldn't be justified as something better.

The Bible teaches us to love our enemies. Loving our enemies will make this world better. "For if you (only) love those who love you, what recompense will you have? Do not the tax collectors do the same? And if you greet your

brothers only, what is unusual about that?" (Matthew 5:46-47).

To encourage peace, we must love those who love us already, but also those who hate us. Only by doing this, people change. The world becomes more peaceful, as opposed to a constant state of war.

Pat Mackey  
freshman  
Japanese, music

### No more shady deals

It is clear to me that University students need to claim the political power at their fingertips. Ignorance will cause your rights to be gradually stripped away. If Linda Dievendorf is being terminated against the will of students, that must not stand. This is your campus.

Right now I am putting together a town hall meeting to address pressing energy issues. If students took the time to attend, they just might find I have orchestrated a venue where they could have their unfair energy tax repealed.

I've had enough of shady deals around here, and I've compiled the information to stop it. In politics, money helps, but facts are what ultimately move mountains. No more of the 112 homes owned by the University on Moss, Villard and Columbia will be destroyed, moved or sold for \$1 each. The 10 homes that have been empty for years are going to be cared for by the historic preservation students who attempted to study them one year ago. Classic low-

rent bungalows are worth the effort.

Also, Sprint, sorry about your cell tower at 1404 Villard. I told you last summer that site wasn't going to work out.

Zachary Vishanoff  
Eugene

### Front page photo a bad decision

Poor choice!

On the same front page as an article covering the perceived slander of a religion (Wicca) by a TV station, the Emerald published a photo profaning what is sacred to another religious group ("She's a 'Virgin Virgin,'" ODE, 11/2). Is there anything more sacred to the world's more than one billion Christians than Jesus Christ and his mother? You chose to publish a photo that should disappoint and disgust every Christian. I was certainly offended.

What was the purpose of this display? To show people having fun going to a movie? Is this an example of the current philosophy of America: nothing is sacred, anything for a laugh? I'm all for free speech and for the press's freedom to publish whatever it chooses. I am not saying that the Emerald didn't have the right to publish this photo. I am saying that it showed poor judgment and a lack of consideration, or purposefully chose to be offensive to many readers.

Steve Posegate  
doctoral student  
music education