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

COMMENTARY

Editor in Chief: Brad Schmidt Managing Editor: Jan Tobias Montry Editorial Editor: Travis Willse

Monday, October 6, 2003

EDITORIAL

The Captain is the choice for California

Attention Californians: While nobody on the Emerald Editorial Board can vote in your state (and hence in Tuesday's recall election), we still find merit in weighing in on which of the (many) clowns is qualified to run your three-ring circus.

Since announcing his campaign, Ah-nold has received a crash course in American politics: As an actor, you can have your way with barnyard animals and nobody cares. But as a politician, even that gnat you squashed last Saturday will haunt you on the front of the New York Post. Soon after, aliens will abduct your wife and have her love child aboard their starships, which is sure to be reported on the cover of the Weekly World News.

Just days after polls said Ah-nold would likely become the next leader to drive California further into the ground, women came out of the woodwork to accuse him of "groping" and "humiliating" them. Just think: If he's elected, he'll be guilty of groping and humiliating the state of California, too.

But never fear, the woman-ator is sure to bounce back even with allegations that he's sexually harassed everybody between California and the lush, rolling fields of Oz. And hey, at least his wife, Maria Shriver, went on C-SPAN to plug his keen ability to work with children, which will surely come in handy when he starts working with the California Legislature.

Cruz Bustamante's campaign — just as bizarre as Ahnold's ingenious "get sued" strategy — is doomed for failure. His platform: Don't vote for me! Gee, that's effective. Arianna Huffington tried it too, but she couldn't take the heat of trying to lose; she dropped out in late September. As Fox has promised, we'll all learn in their latest traves-

As Fox has promised, we'll all learn in their latest travesty that "Skin" pornos and politics don't mix. But one would think the California recall election was the best thing to happen to Larry Flynt — who is also running for governor — since the evolution of sex organs. We fear, however, that Flynt would probably rule the land with all the brilliance of a dim lightbulb. One possible perk: wild orgies inside the governor's mansion. As America has already learned several times, sex is good for the economy.

Speaking of bodily functions, has anybody seen Gray Davis make any kind of facial expression? We know that Botox is popular in The Golden State, but this is ridiculous. Happy, sad, frustrated, excited, mortally wounded — it's all a blank stare to the "Weekend at Bernie's"-like Davis!

But wait, let's not forget Oregon's own contribution to The Recall. Brooke Adams, a 25-year-old Independent and former student of the University's School of Journalism and Communication, is running on the ever-popular "I'm-way-better-looking-than-Arianna Huffington" platform. Oh, did we mention she is a former Emerald freelancer? Said Adams on her Web site (http://www.brookeforgovernor.com): "Taking bold action, I'll rollback car taxes, fix worker's compensation, encourage business investment, reduce spending and set our state on the right course." Go get 'em, Brooke!

Beyond all the "traditional" candidates and somewhere

Beyond all the "traditional" candidates and somewhere in the brouhaha of California politics, one up-and-comer appeared, and we're positive he'll be the best for California: Captain Morgan.

The Captain, if you don't already know, is responsible for the drunken debauchery of millions, Ah-nold probably included. He can kill the pain, lower taxes and prolong the unhindered Californian breeding capacity — and that's good enough for us.

Of course you have to be of legal drinking age to enter the Web site (http://www.californians4captainmorgan.org), but no word yet on whether you have to be 21 to vote for him.

So if you're registered, vote Captain Morgan for California governor. We'll drink to that!

EDITORIAL POLICY

This editorial represents the opinion of the Emerald editorial board. Responses can be sent to letters @dailyemerald.com. Letters to the editor and guest commentaries are encouraged. Letters are limited to 250 words and guest commentaries to 550 words. Authors are limited to one submission per calendar month. Submission must include phone number and address for verification. The Emerald reserves the right to edit for space, grammar and style.



Steve Baggs Illustrator

Evolving terminology

Don't tell anyone — and I'll deny it if you ask me — but I confess that I like being a Duck. Even before Oregon stomped Michigan, I would occasionally tell people of the pride I take in my Duckdom. And, while I may occasionally get a quizzical look, no one flinches, and no one is offended. It would seem that being a Duck is harmless.

But what if we weren't Ducks?

Certainly there are lots of other options. Were they not already taken, we could be nasty and tenacious Wolverines; we could be fierce Cougars; we could be militant Trojans. Or, we could be Redskins.

Notice the lack of adjectives. What do you associate with the term Redskin? Personally, I don't make any particular associations with the term.

If asked to define it, I'd say it is synonymous with American Indian and Native American. If no one told me otherwise, I'd have no clue that the term Redskin is offensive to many — particularly if they happen to be of Native American heritage.

If asked to suggest the origin of the term, I'd guess that the Europeans who took over this country coined the term in reference to the tans (or sunburns) sported by the folks who were here first. That skin would be singled out as an identifying trait isn't surprising, nor is it necessarily an indication of inherent racism. Skin was one area where the differing attributes of the two cultures would be obvious. After all, one culture was not adverse to wearing abbreviated outfits and allowing nature to have her way with their melanin. The other wore 57 layers of clothing (give or take a few) and dusted the few inches of visible skin with powdered lead to eradicate any trace of said melanin.

Makes sense, right? Wrong.

I've been informed that the term Redskin originally referred to the use by some Native Americans of vermilion paint on their faces. I've also been informed that whatever the origin, the term went from being a descriptive noun to a value-laden racial epithet.

So, if something was an epithet, does that mean that it must always be an epithet?

Language is a funny thing: it evolves. Once upon a time, our Anglo-Saxon ancestors used words like "fuck" and "shit" without blushing. Why? Because they weren't considered profane. Before they moved into the dreaded four-letter-word category, they were just words used to describe happenings in



Jessica Cole-Hodgkinson Huh? What? Really.

the world. Mark Twain freely sprinkled "nigger" throughout Huckleberry Finn without intending it to pass judgment on anyone's worth as a person. Even more recently — before Gloria Steinem — a man could call a woman he wasn't dating "honey" or "dear" without incurring a dirty look or a lawsuit.

Times change. Though "fuck" is still verboten in most polite situations, South Park had an entire episode devoted to seeing how many times they could say "shit"; "nigger" is not a word any thoughtful person would casually toss around; and the man who calls me "honey" had better be older than seventy or someone whose

hand I allow on my knee.

So, what brought all this to mind? Last week, a federal district court in Washington, D.C. determined that there wasn't enough evidence to establish that "Redskin" was disparaging to Native Americans. Now, back in 1999, the Washington football franchise using the name had their trademark protection revoked by a three-judge panel of the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board who determined that "Redskin" violated the provision of the Lanham Act prohibiting the protection of trademarks that are "disparaging, scandalous, contemptuous or disreputable." The ruling last week means that the football franchise will to have their exclusive rights to the name protected.

As I mentioned, I find the word "Redskin" neutral. I don't associate it with any particular positive or negative values. I learned long ago; however, that the rest of the world and I don't always see eye to eye. For some folks out there, when they hear that word, they associate it with bigotry and the corresponding hurt, angry and frustrated feelings.

At the root of all the debate about team names and mascots is a fundamental question: Who should bear the burden of changing their behavior? Should those who are sensitive to the use of a particular term realize that times change and a centuries-old epithet just hasn't got the punch it used to have, or should those inclined to use said epithet and call it harmless put some effort into being more sensitive to the feelings of those around them?

I dunno either. I'm just glad I'm a Duck.

Contact the columnist

at jessicacolehodgkinson@dailyemerald.com. Her opinions do not necessarily represent those of the Emerald.

ONLINE POLL

Each week, the Emerald publishes the previous week's poll results and the coming week's poll question. Visit www.dailyemerald.com to vote.

Last question: Where do you get your textbooks?

Results: 63 votes.

Alternate bookstores: 46 percent or 29 votes.

The University Bookstore: 38.1 percent or 24 votes.

I buy them online: 9.5 percent or six votes.

Don't buy ... don't read: 4.8 percent or three votes.

Borrow from friends or the library: 1.6 percent or one vote.

This week: Do you approve of the new sports arena location at East 18th

Avenue and University Street?

Choices: Yes! It's the perfect location; No — Glenwood or Springfield would have been best; No — Next to Autzen Stadium would have been best; No — The new Eugene courthouse location would have been best; No — The Williams' Bakery location would have been best; None of the above — Things are fine without a new arena.