

NEWS STAFF (541) 346-5511

PARKER HOWELL
EDITOR IN CHIEF
SHADRA BEESLEY
MANAGING EDITOR
MEGHANN M. CUNIFF
JARED PABEN
NEWS EDITORS
EVA SYLWESTER
SENIOR NEWS REPORTER
JOE BAILEY
KATY GAGNON
CHRISTOPHER HAGAN
BRITTNI MCCLANAHAN
NICHOLAS WILBUR
NEWS REPORTERS
EMILY SMITH
PART-TIME NEWS REPORTER
CLAYTON JONES
SPORTS EDITOR
SCOTT J. ADAMS
LUKE ANDREWS
SHAWN MILLER
SPORTS REPORTERS
AMY LIGHTY
PULSE EDITOR
TREVOR DAVIS
KRISTEN GERHARD
ANDREW MCCOLLUM
PULSE REPORTERS
AILEE SLATER
COMMENTARY EDITOR
GABE BRADLEY
JESSICA DERLETH
ARMY FETH
RICHARD PRYOR
COLUMNISTS
TIM BOBOSKY
PHOTO EDITOR
NICOLE BARKER
SENIOR PHOTOGRAPHER
KATE HORTON
ZANE RITT
PHOTOGRAPHERS
KATIE GLEASON
PART-TIME PHOTOGRAPHER
JONAH SCHROGIN
SENIOR DESIGNER
JOHN AYRES
JONNY BAGGS
MOLLY BEDFORD
KERI SPANGLER
DESIGNERS
CHRIS TODD
GRAPHIC ARTIST
AARON DUCHATEAU
ILLUSTRATOR
TRACY TERNEY
REBECCA TAYLOR
COPY CHIEFS
EILEEN CHANG
JENNY DORNER
JEFFREY DRANSFELD
JOSH NORRIS
MINDI RICE
COPY EDITORS
STEVEN NEUMAN
ONLINE/SUPPLEMENTS EDITOR
TIMOTHY ROBINSON
WEBMASTER

BUSINESS (541) 346-5511

JUDY RIEDL
GENERAL MANAGER
KATHY CARBONE
BUSINESS MANAGER
LAUNA DE GIUSTI
RECEPTIONIST
JOE BEES
ALAN FULLERTON
RYAN JOHNSON
ROB WEGNER
DISTRIBUTION

ADVERTISING (541) 346-3712

MELISSA GUST
ADVERTISING DIRECTOR
MIA LEIDELMEYER
SALES MANAGER
KELLEE KAUFHEIL
JOHN KELLY
LINDSEY FERGUSON
WINTER GIBBS
KATE HIRONAKA
DESI MCCORMICK
STEPHEN MILLER
KATHRYN O'SHEA-EVANS
EMILY PHILBIN
CODY WILSON
SALES REPRESENTATIVES
BONA LEE
AD ASSISTANT

CLASSIFIED (541) 346-4343

TRINA SHANAMAN
CLASSIFIED MANAGER
KORALYNN BASHAM
AN DO
AMANDA KANTOR
KERI SPANGLER
KATIE STRINGER
CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING
ASSOCIATES

PRODUCTION (541) 346-4381

MICHELE ROSS
PRODUCTION MANAGER
KIRA PARK
PRODUCTION COORDINATOR
JAMIE ACKERMAN
CAMERON GAUT
JONAH SCHROGIN
DESIGNERS

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published daily Monday through Friday during the school year by the Oregon Daily Emerald Publishing Co. Inc., at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. The Emerald operates independently of the University with offices in Suite 300 of the Erb Memorial Union. The Emerald is private property. Unlawful removal or use of papers is prosecutable by law.

■ In my opinion

EVOLUTION is the solution

More than 75 years ago, a teacher named John Scopes fought to teach evolution in the classroom. Astonishingly enough, that battle continues to this day.

It is no longer about getting evolution in the classroom; it is about keeping baseless alternative theories out. The center of this battle is Harrisburg, Pa., where parents are challenging the teaching of intelligent design. They are looking to block the local school board from requiring that high school biology teachers read a statement that presents intelligent design as an alternative theory to evolution and the origin of life.

Intelligent design says that because life is so complex, some higher form had to have created life on this planet. Essentially, it is another theory of creationism that doesn't specifically name God as the higher intelligence. Proponents of intelligent design point out that Darwinism is not able to explain several important things: the origin of life, gaps in the fossil record, the complexity of a cell or the genetic information contained within a strand of DNA. Since these things are not currently explained by the theory of evolution, a higher power must be at work.

Of course, it is true to say that there are gaps in our knowledge, and there are things we, as humans, do not understand, but it is absurd to say that the only explanation for a lack of scientific evidence is divine intervention. How many times in history have humans been unable to explain how the world works? At one point, people did not know why eclipses occurred, what caused diseases or what brought the rain. They simply lacked information, just as we do when it comes to some aspects of evolution. Just because we are not able to figure something out does not mean that the physical evidence is not out there.

Despite any gaps that there may be in the scientific theory of evolution, there are observable facts and repeatable hypotheses to support it: the process of mutation, gene flow, genetic drift and adaptation. Science has credi-



JESSICA DERLETH
FREEDOM RINGS WHERE OPINIONS CLASH

bility because it can be tested, while intelligent design is just a belief, much like creationism.

Leaders in the theory of intelligent design have been working to show that their theory is different than creationism, and it is, though both ultimately point to a higher power. Creationism is based on the biblical book Genesis, which says that God created the earth and its inhabitants in six days 6,000 years ago. Intelligent design comes closer to an accepted scientific theory in that it estimates the age of the earth at 4.5 billion years old and life at least 3 billion years old. This theory purports that evolution can work on a small scale, within a species, but that it cannot form entirely new species.

This theory is good in that it provides a middle group for people who find themselves torn between Darwinism and creationism; I don't see a problem with people believing in whichever theory they see as correct. On the other hand, there is no place in the public school system for intelligent design. When intelligent design points toward a higher power, it is placing itself alongside creationism, which has already been prohibited in public schools.

In 1987, a Louisiana law entitled the "Balanced Treatment for Creation-Science and Evolution-Science in Public School Instruction Act" prohibited the teaching of evolution in public schools unless creation science was taught at the same time. Schools were not forced to teach creation science, but if evolution was taught, teachers were obligated to discuss creation science.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled against this act and the teaching of cre-

ationism: "The Act impermissibly endorses religion by advancing the religious belief that a supernatural being created humankind. ... The Act's primary purpose was to change the public school science curriculum to provide persuasive advantage to a particular religious doctrine that rejects the factual basis of evolution in its entirety. ... The Act violates the First Amendment."

Furthermore, intelligent design advocates are silent about whether the intelligent hand belongs to God, and they try to separate themselves from creationism. This separation cannot be easily accomplished when the theory they support has a religious origin. The argument of a higher power is far from a new concept — in the 13th century, Thomas Aquinas presented design as being one of five proofs of God's existence. The modern concept of intelligent design, which doesn't name the agent of creation, first appeared in Christian creationist literature, including the textbook "Of Pandas and People," published in 1989.

The origins of intelligent design are not the only indicators that religion is behind this theory. Philip E. Johnson, considered the father of the intelligent design movement, has said a few things of interest: "Our strategy has been to change the subject a bit so that we can get the issue of intelligent design, which really means the reality of God, before the academic world and into the schools," and, "This isn't really and never has been a debate about science. It's about religion and philosophy."

The father of intelligent design admits the theory is based on God. It could not clearer; by allowing intelligent design into the school system, we are crossing the line between church and state. It is time that people accept Darwin's theory of evolution as the leading scientific theory and, as such, its dominant place in our school system. Evolution should not be replaced by, or even taught along side, a religious doctrine.

jessicaderleth@dailyemerald.com

■ Editorial

Pink is all the rage in U. of Iowa locker room

The University of Iowa's football stadium gained national media attention this week — not because of a fantastic feat on the gridiron but because of the pink color of its visitors' locker room.

A recent \$88 million remodel of Kinnick Stadium included painting the walls and lockers "Innocence," painting the urinals "Dusty Rose" and laying pink carpet. The renovation continued a tradition started by former head football coach Hayden Fry, a psychology major who decorated the room pink.

Erin Buzuvis, an adjunct law professor at the school, ignited the controversy, calling the locker rooms "sexist and homophobic" on her blog.

She argues that "putting your opponent in a pink locker room is saying 'you are weak like a girl' or 'you are weak like a gay man,'" citing a Wikipedia entry that states pink is "now associated with womanhood."

Her arguments are a clear-cut case of political correctness gone too far.

Many media stories report Fry chose pink because it has a calming psychological effect on opponents, making them less effective on the field.

If this is true, Buzuvis' outcry seems trivial. And in today's world of collegiate athletics, when some teams have two-story locker rooms with special lighting that simulates outdoor weather conditions, a little off-the-field advantage can't hurt.

Buzuvis cites Fry's 1999 biography, "Hayden Fry: A High Porch Picnic," as saying he chose the color because "pink is often found in girl's bedrooms, and because of that some consider it a sissy color."

What she doesn't include is the context of his quote, as reported by the Press-Citizen (Iowa City):

"Also, pink is often found in girls' bedrooms, and because of that some consider it a sissy color. It's been fun to get the reaction of visiting coaches to the color of their locker room. Most don't notice it, but those that do are in trouble."

So much for academic integrity. It seems that Fry did have some psychological theories in mind and that he wasn't primarily motivated by chauvinist tendencies after all.

Buzuvis isn't entirely off-base in her assertion that the school should not continue a tradition started to discomfort opposing players by perpetuating negative stereotypes.

But how negative are these stereotypes? If pink is so demeaning, why didn't anyone vocally complain about the color during the 20-some years it has adorned the locker room? If it makes women seem like little girls, why do women still wear pink?

Buzuvis also glosses over the point that pink is becoming more commonly accepted for men, suggesting it hasn't been truly "reclaimed" — has she been to Gap lately?

Yet, in all honesty, many men would probably still perceive a pink locker room as an insult. And if they see it as an insult, their reaction is indicative of a larger societal problem — that the quality of femininity is seen as a weak or negative trait. Repainting the locker room won't erase this stigma. If anything, it will compound the problem.

The Hawkeye football squad isn't the group that should be laughing over its long-standing pink joke. Opposing players who are rattled by this foolish, out-dated stereotype should have a good, hard laugh at themselves.

■ Guest commentary

Animal welfare relies on us all

Did you know that millions perished because of Hurricane Katrina? The news reports do not share this devastating fact — they are overwhelmed focusing on the thousands of human victims and their dogs and cats. But millions did die — birds, pigs and cows who were trapped in factory farms. Although animal sanctuary volunteers were able to rescue approximately 1,000 chickens (some found alive in a mass grave at Tyson), millions more were abandoned by agribusiness to drown, starve in their heated sheds or be bulldozed into the trash during the cleanup (whether alive or dead).

Sadly, the blind eye the news has turned toward the largest loss of life in Katrina seems reflective of the public's general disregard for farmed animals in everyday life. Despite being surrounded by animal products daily, our attention is not often called to their liv-

ing conditions, so we may be unaware of the desperate need for humane farming reforms. This week we are asked to open our hearts and eyes to acknowledge their plight.

Oct. 2 is World Farm Animal Day, a date chosen to honor the birthday of Gandhi, the Nobel Peace Prize-winning vegetarian who worked to protect all living beings. If you purchase animal products, consider informing yourself about the real conditions animals face at factory farms and slaughterhouses at www.meetyourmeat.com to see if it fits with your values, or (for a happier ending) learn more about the animals rescued at www.farm-sanctuary.org.

Whether the media covers it or not, agribusiness will keep intensively confining and killing animals at rate of over a million an hour (and the number only increases as people switch from red meat to chicken). The misery

of factory farming is an ongoing national tragedy that is happening on our watch — one that has developed behind a mega-corporate curtain — shielded from public scrutiny, with lobbyists who fight any humane legal protection. The time has come to put farmed animals on the public agenda. We can do so both as voting citizens who demand humane farming legislation and as conscientious consumers who choose to buy plant-based proteins instead of products gained at an animal's expense.

The tragedy of hurricane Katrina has brought out the innate compassion in all of us. Why limit that compassion to just humans, cats and dogs? The animals trapped in factory farms deserve and need our support as well.

Carrie Packwood Freeman is a doctoral student in the School of Journalism and Communication

CORRECTION

The summary for the Sept. 29 Emerald article, "Journalism teacher returns from lecturing in Jamaica," should have said Tom Blivins spent three days in Jamaica. The Emerald regrets the error.