

Tuesday, November 4, 2003

EDITORIAL

Residence hall site selection bad for future

In three short years, a handful of University students will have the opportunity to live in a new, state-of-the-art complex aimed at providing space for both living and learning. The building — or buildings, depending on final architecture plans — will be a boon to campus because, quite simply, it will be the first residence hall constructed for student living since 1963.

This addition is the greatest necessity for recruiting new students to the University. The seven existing residence halls have such a bad reputation that The Princeton Review ranked the facilities as No. 2 in the "Dorms like Dungeons" category. The new hall, currently called a "living and learning center," will consist of rooms sized at about 225 square feet. Most University residence hall rooms, with the exception of those in H.P. Barnhart Hall, are about 150 square feet.

The University also will be able to distribute the on-campus population and begin renovating some of its aging buildings. So, it can be assumed, all incoming students will benefit from the decision to build a new residence hall.

What's unfortunate about the situation, though, is the location for the structure: It's going to be built between Earl and Walton complexes, where tennis courts currently sit.

It's certainly not a conspiracy, but it should be noted that on-campus tennis courts are quickly disappearing. The new basketball arena will displace existing tennis courts, and now the new residence hall will do the same. The courts will find new homes, we're sure, but still, is there no value in tennis?

Well, there is value in tennis, as there are in many other things. But what it comes down to is which is more valuable. Does building a new arena in the heart of campus have more value than existing tennis courts? To administrators (and the Editorial Board), it does. Does building a new residence hall in the heart of campus have more value than existing tennis courts? To administrators, it does. To the Editorial Board, it does not.

In actuality, the tennis courts aren't the issue of contention. Instead, it's the usefulness of the space. The argument made by administrators is that a central location is necessary to help create the "living and learning" tie — faculty won't visit a structure too far from the heart of campus. University President Dave Frohnmayer ultimately agreed and selected the Walton/Earl location.

But the question that begs to be asked is this: What's more important, making the "living and learning center" work or saving land to make the University work in the future?

Individuals on the Campus Planning Committee expressed concern that the space should be kept for future growth, specifically academic. University Planning Director Chris Ramey was vocal in noting that the proposed structure was far too big of a building for the land designated. If the administration was willing to revise the land-use policy to build a residence hall, shouldn't the land also be evaluated for other buildings that it could possibly host under the new guidelines?

That question never really got answered, and now we are left with only second guessing. But what doesn't involve hypothesizing is the factor of growth.

The University will expand and so will its student body. More space will be needed for academic buildings and more space will be needed for housing. Housing already exists in the East-campus area, and the University owns a plethora of East-campus land, so that vicinity should be the location chosen for additional housing.

Teaching facilities are in the center of campus but also run East of the EMU on East 13th Avenue and at Straub Hall. Academics should be in the heart of campus, but they should have the ability to move Eastward as needed.

Yet under the newly established paradigm, housing has gone inward, meaning that when the time comes, academics will be forced to move outward.

A new residence hall clearly needs to be built, but Frohnmayer and administrators greatly erred in its placement. In half a century, it will be apparent that the land should have been saved for academics and that the residence hall should have been built in the East-campus area, across from Bean Complex on the outdoor basketball courts.



SOME THINGS CANNOT BE RETURNED WITH INSURANCE

Steve Baggs Illustration

Continued torture

I'm a lover, not a hater. So I hate only three things in this world: 1) the New York Yankees, 2) infomercials and 3) TBCs.

I know, I know. You don't know what a TBC is. That's because I made it up. TBC stands for "to be continued..." A TBC is a movie that doesn't end in the normal two-hour time window. Which means it needs to be split into two movies, or three or eight. And, most conveniently for Hollywood, you have to pay full price every time.

Forget SARS. Never mind anthrax. The TBC is the newest plague ravaging our nation. And it's a plague of the mind.

Let me give you an example, and it may be painfully familiar. I read the Lord of the Rings trilogy, sort of, in a time before time. I mean middle school, of course. I didn't like it that much back then, but for some reason I was excited when I heard about the supposedly epic, supposedly intricate trio of Lord of the Rings movies coming out.

I plunked down \$9 to see the first movie in a land far, far away. I mean Seattle, of course. I hated it. I would have rather sat through three hours of "America's Funniest Home Videos" reruns. At least Bob Saget doesn't have pointy ears and talk all funny.

And yet, I felt oddly pulled to the second movie last winter. Like the Force was calling me. Catch the Star Wars reference? Yeah, Star Wars is the king TBC, the granddaddy of all TBCs.

Anyway, the short version of the story is that I spent another three hours and another \$9 on part two of the Lord of the Rings tri-

gy. Soon, I'll do it again for the last part.

I'm no math major, but I count nine hours and \$27 that I'll eventually spend on movies I don't particularly like. That's very uncool.

TBCs are everywhere. You know 'em. The Matrix. X-Men. Harry Potter. Kill Bill.

More than a sequel, a TBC makes you



Peter Hockaday

Today is Hockaday

think you absolutely must, without thinking about it, without hesitating, see more of the same movie.

Sequels and TBCs are in the same family, but they're married in. Sequels are easy enough to filter. I didn't really like Deuce Bigalow: Male Gigolo, so I'm pretty sure I'm going to avoid the sequel, Deuce Bigalow: European Gigolo. Yes, that is an actual movie that is actually in development.

On the other hand, I will patronize sequels for good movies, like Mission: Impossible. I like to think of movies as a store, and if I like the service, I'll come back. If not, you'll never see me again.

But TBCs are like the Wal-Marts of the

movie world. You'll keep coming back, no matter how good the service is, no matter how much you hate it when you're in the bike section, which is two aisles from the bedding section, which is two aisles from the jewelry section.

I get the same feeling of dread whenever I see "to be continued" on a television program. Shows like "24" use this tactic practically every week. Every episode finishes on the edge of an emotional, or sometimes even physical, cliff.

But a television show doesn't cost \$7.50. You don't spend \$3 on gas and \$25 on popcorn and a medium soda (no, I don't want the large for a quarter more, thank you). Going to the movie theater is an experience, one that I enjoy and cherish. I love walking out of the movie theater feeling good about the movie I've just seen.

I never get that feeling after a TBC. Every time I see a TBC, I have the same thought I had walking out of "Kill Bill: Volume I."

"Dammit, now I have to see Volume II!" So, that's that. Aren't you amazed I was able to write a whole column about such an inane subject? Well, I have even more material that I'm not using here. I'm saving it for part two, which is coming out next summer, probably Memorial Day.

To be continued... Just kidding.

Contact the columnist at peterhockaday@dailyemerald.com. His opinions do not necessarily represent those of the Emerald.

1933 ODE article shows foresight

This is not the first time the Emerald has been in hot water for its portrayal of Jews. I was doing some research in old issues of the Emerald and happened upon

GUEST COMMENTARY

a series of articles from Oct. 12, 1933 titled "The New Germany."

A disclaimer was run above one article saying how much "dissent" it had caused on campus. The series was written by Richard Neuberger, who had been the editor of the Emerald the previous year. He spent his summer vacation in Germany. Hitler's Nazis had risen to power and were actually admired by many people outside of Germany.

Neuberger's reports in the Emerald tell of the madness that was gripping Germany. In town after town he witnessed the atrocities against Jewish people of all ages. While visiting the university in Heidelberg, an old professor pleads, "America must help us. This is not alone a fight of the Jews. It is the battle of everyone who believes in democracy and freedom." It would be seven years before America listened. Six million Jews died.

Sometimes it may seem to those of us who have never experienced racial hatred

that Jews are hyper-sensitive. However, these Emerald articles written in 1933 show how long the world stood by, knowing what was happening and doing nothing.

This young former staffer had courage, foresight and a bright future. Neuberger graduated in 1935 and was later to be elected to Congress from Oregon. Perhaps his articles about the rise of anti-Semitism in Germany could be reprinted in some university publication or put on a Web site. They are too good to be forgotten.

Steve Williamson is a research assistant at the Center for Electronic Studying in the University's College of Education.