

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:
Jeremy Lang
Editorial Editor:
Julie Lauderbaugh
Assistant Editorial Editor:
Jacquelyn Lewis

Friday, March 8, 2002

Yesteryear's Editorial Let's Keep The 'S' In Student Union

The Student Union Board should be commended on its proposal to change the name of the Erb Memorial Student Union. Just as we would like to see community government on this campus, we would like to see the University become an integrated community in other areas too. The facilities available in the Student Union are ideal for bringing together all facets of the University community.

University
of Oregon
125TH
ANNIVERSARY
Originally
published on
March 8, 1967

However, we can also see several hang-ups in the name change, which should be considered before any final action is taken.

The building is supported by student money. If this is to become a community building, we suggest commitment from other areas of the University are in order to help maintain the building and its staff.

Presently SU staff salaries are paid for entirely with student money. According to former director "Si" Ellingson, many staff members spend about one-third of their time on non-student activities. In that case some financial support in this area should be supplied by groups other than students.

The other thing that bothers us is the new name itself. What is the building to be called? Erb Memorial Union is too long. "Erb" sounds like somebody had too much to drink. Memorial Union would become "MU," which is the nickname of a similar building at "Moo U," an institution with which we should avoid confusion.

As far as students are concerned, no matter what the building's official name, it will probably always be the SU. In that case, it might be a good idea to substitute another word beginning with S to maintain the old nickname. Perhaps "Super" Union. Or maybe "Social" Union. With the Legislature in session, we suppose "Sexual" Union is out.

This editorial was taken from the March 8, 1967, edition of the Oregon Daily Emerald.

Letters to the Editor and Guest Commentaries Policy

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.

Conference wasn't politically biased

GUEST COMMENTARY

Philip
Huang

I commend the Oregon Daily Emerald for covering the "Law and Politics of the Death Penalty: Abolition, Moratorium or Reform" conference ("Nun's talk concludes conference," ODE 3/4). Contrary to the claims of critics Steve Doell and Josh Marquis, the conference presented a vast and diverse array of ideas, speakers, and scholarship. The work of the Wayne Morse Center and more than 50 student volunteers made its success possible. The late Senator Wayne Morse — an outspoken opponent of capital punishment — would have been proud.

Aside from Sister Helen Prejean, the top public figures giving keynote speeches were Republican George Ryan, governor of Illinois, Mark Hatfield, our former senator and governor, and University President Dave Frohnmayer, our former attorney general. A "political pep rally," as Doell contended? Hardly, as none of them are running for elective office again. Biased? Perhaps, in favor of moderate Republicans!

I personally attended a panel featuring Greg Horner, a deputy DA who prosecutes

capital murder cases, and Assistant Attorney General Tim Sylwester, who handles death penalty appeals for Oregon. They engaged in lively, yet civil discussion with the ACLU's Dave Fidanque. I am astonished to hear Marquis's claim of "lack of debate," especially since I saw him in the audience.

The Emerald should have covered the first day of the conference. The Los Angeles Times and Chicago Tribune did. Readers should know why the death penalty is still a vital issue. Harvard professor Charles Ogle-tree discussed our shameful history of racial discrimination in administering capital punishment. Governor Ryan explained what changed this death-penalty supporter's mind: While Illinois has executed 12 people since 1977, it has freed 13 people from death row. Marquis alludes to Governor Ryan's po-

litical problems at home. The fact that Ryan is not running for re-election only strengthens the idea that he is acting on his conscience.

In 1984, Oregon reinstated the death penalty. Death penalty proponents have had eighteen years to organize a conference and examine the fruits of their labor. They have never done so for fear of discovering systematic racism, or finding an innocent man. Instead, people like Josh Marquis prefer to speak on "Good Morning America" and browbeat opponents of the death penalty in the press. Steve Doell and Josh Marquis proved at the conference they did not wish to engage in constructive discussion.

Whether we should reconsider the death penalty is a complex question. I urge students to investigate the facts and statistics for themselves, and to keep an open mind and an open heart. The rest of the civilized world, where executions no longer occur, awaits our answer.

Philip Huang is a second-year law student with an interest in environmental and civil rights law.

Emerald wrong about election grievances

GUEST COMMENTARY

ASUO
elections board

In the Emerald's recent editorial about the ASUO denying the press access to vote counting ("ASUO should grant access to vote count, ODE 3/4), the Emerald editorial board made some erroneous claims that the elections board would like to set straight.

The editorial referred to the recent grievance, which stated that the elections board denied the press access to vote counting, and that by doing such the board violated Oregon Public Meeting Laws. Members of the elections board are avid supporters of the rights of the press, however the elections board did not deny them any legal rights. The board was not keeping the press out to be secretive. On Feb. 22 after the primary election voting ended, the e-board did not count ballots. The e-board looked over a printout of results and write-ins obtained from DuckWeb, typed them up and posted

them. These results were then made public immediately following the posting and an editor from the Emerald even received a copy of the printout. If the elections board had used paper ballots then it would have been necessary to have allowed a representative from each candidate, plus the media, to be present; however, once again there were no ballots being counted.

Another point to be made is that according to the elections board's interpretation of the law, there was no violation of Public Meeting Laws. The Public Meetings Law ORS 192.610(5) and ORS 192.630(1), applies

to all meetings of a governing body of a public body for which quorum is required to make a decision or deliberate a decision on any matter. The elections board did not "gather" to make a decision. The board posted results in a window. Any single member of the e-board could have performed the task of looking over the results and posting them.

The editorial also stated that the elections board is responsible for knowing the laws that apply to the elections process. The e-board agrees. Public Meeting Laws were interpreted to the best of the e-board's ability and according to what the board discovered there was no violation of the law. When the elections board requested to see this law, neither the Oregon Commentator nor the Emerald had it available. It is interesting that the media did not know the definitions of

Turn to Election, page 3

Peter Utsey Emerald

