Satire D.O.A

Don’t joke around. You might hurt someone’s feelings

Plus: Title IX, The ASUO Retreat, Suicide
The Oregon Commentator is an independent journal of opinion published at the University of Oregon for the campus community. Founded by a group of concerned student journalists Sept. 27 1983, the Commentator has had a major impact in the “war of ideas” on campus, providing students with an alternative to the left-wing orthodoxy promoted by other student publications, professors and student groups. During its nineteen-year existence, it has enabled University students to hear both sides of issues. Our paper combines reporting with opinion, humor and feature articles. We have won national recognition for our commitment to journalistic excellence.

The Oregon Commentator is operated as a program of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon (ASUO) and is staffed solely by volunteer editors and writers. The paper is funded through student incidental fees, advertising revenue and private donations. We print a wide variety of material, but our main purpose is to show students that a political philosophy of conservatism, free thought and individual liberty is an intelligent way of looking at the world — contrary to what they might hear in classrooms and on campus. In general, editors of the Commentator share beliefs in the following:

• We believe that the University should be a forum for rational and informed debate — instead of the current climate in which ideological dogma, political correctness, fashion and mob mentality interfere with academic pursuit.

• We emphatically oppose totalitarianism and its apologists.

• We believe that it is important for the University community to view the world realistically, intelligently and, above all, rationally.

• We believe that any attempt to establish utopia is bound to meet with failure and, more often than not, disaster.

• We believe that while it would be foolish to praise or agree mindlessly with everything our nation does, it is both ungrateful and dishonest not to acknowledge the tremendous blessings and benefits we receive as Americans.

• We believe that free enterprise and economic growth, especially at the local level, provide the basis for a sound society.

• We believe that the University is an important battleground in the “war of ideas” and that the outcome of political battles of the future are, to a large degree, being determined on campuses today.

• We believe that a code of honor, integrity, pride and rationality are the fundamental characteristics for individual success.

• Socialism guarantees the right to work. However, we believe that the right not to work is fundamental to individual liberty. Apathy is a human right.
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Satire in America

Satire often comes under scrutiny by those who don’t understand it or who don’t appreciate it. But it’s time that we lighten up and understand the importance of humor
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By Melissa Hanks

16: Title IX: Causes More Problems Than it Solves
Track coach Sally Harmon is suing the University for discrimination. Does she have a case? And should Title IX even exist anymore?

By Ben Hartley

18: Suicide Solutions
What the administration should do to prevent students from offing themselves

By Tyler Graf & Olly Ruff
This is zero hour for the Oregon Commentator. For the past three months, this publication has come under attack from members of student government, sundry student groups and ill-tempered individuals. We've been called bigoted, obscene and disrespectful. Secret meetings have been held with administrators, letter-writing campaigns have been instituted and grievances have been filed.

Frankly, these people hate us; they consider us their enemies. But why? Is it our pro-gay marriage stance? Or have we ruffled their feathers by insisting that drug decriminalization is superior to the costly and impotent War on Drugs? Have we bewildered them by being more in line with P.J. O'Rourke, Shelby Steele, Milton Friedman, Chris Hitchens and Friedrich Hayek than Michelle Malkin, Rush Limbaugh, Anne Coulter and Michael Savage? Are we, perhaps, not the conservatives they envisioned?

Nope. I doubt that our enemies even read this publication. They have a nebulous understanding of our political outlook, based on the words “conservative publication” in our mission statement, and that's good enough. Clearly, they're too closed-minded to look past the label (or look past their own preconceived notions of what a conservative is) to view the underlying ideology of this magazine. If our enemies think that a group of individuals that supports gay marriage, drug decriminalization and pornography -- not to mention a group of that vociferously defends the First Amendment with every molecule in its collective tar-blackened lungs -- is a propagator of bigoted hate speech, then they will have an eye-opening experience in the real world. Or perhaps these people are priming themselves for profitable careers as personal offense takers -- cogs in the special interest lobbying machine.

I think I hear the Rainbow Coalition calling.

And this is what makes this situation so frustrating. Are our critics -- our enemies -- so detached from the real world that they expect everyone to take their ideas seriously, to respect their viewpoints no matter how inchoate, frivolous or silly?

Inevitably, content complaints are directed at our humor. We have often been described as “sophomoric” -- though I think the word they're looking for is “sub-sophomoric”, as we have freshmen on staff who take the word sophomoric as a compliment -- but more recently the label “hateful” has been added. And let's not forget the claims that we promote violence.

The reason for this is the result of targeting a student senator, Toby Hill-Meyer, for mockery. Hill-Meyer happens to be a self-promoted gender queer. We never mocked Hill-Meyer for his being different. We mocked his politicizing of his being different. Hill Meyer insists that everyone use the pronouns ze (he) and hir (him), because he “doesn’t fit into traditional gender roles”. We have simply addressed his dogmatic insistence that by unilaterally declaring himself to be of a nebulously defined new gender, with its own set of pronouns, he immediately attains the status of an oppressed minority -- a minority of one. The last thing we need at this university is more navel-gazing faux oppression.

Satire has the power to offend. We clearly understand that. And we are not so egotistical as to believe that every joke, every satirical jab we make is Swiftian. However, we are strong believers in dialogue -- even if that dialogue takes a bemused tone rather than rapt seriousness.

So here's our offer, made publicly and in the spirit of a free press: Toby, if you're that pissed off, we'll give you a page to run in our long-running Another Perspective slot. You would receive 500 – 700 words in every issue, unedited. Say what you like, as long as it’s legal. This is our olive branch. Take it or leave it.

As an unstipended student group, we can't offer you remuneration, but we can offer you a voice. That's what we're here for, after all.
How is Our News?

One Word, Friend ... Rockin!

Looking For ...

Writers
Copy editors
Design nerds

Sycophants
Artists
Free spirits, man

Jan 27, 2005
A Message From the Standards and Practices Editor

The OREGON COMMENTATOR strives for journalistic excellence, but every once in a while it stumbles. Journalism is not an infallible profession. Sometimes mistakes are made. But when this occurs, the OREGON COMMENTATOR takes the initiative to redeem itself. Sadly, this is one of those moments when we must redeem the honor and integrity of this mighty University institution.

It has come to our attention that certain facts from a news article that ran in our summer issue (Sept. 2004), titled “Sudsy Lives”, were erroneous. The story detailed the resurrection of the OREGON COMMENTATOR’s mascot Sudsy – a sentient mug of beer – who had died earlier in May.

The quote “Holy tap-dancin’ Jesus on a pogo stick. Are you shittin’ me, dude?” was misattributed to senator Toby Hill-Meyer. These words were in fact spoken by Quentin Crisp.

Later in the same piece, the OC alleged the presence of the Sovereign Grand Inspector General at a secret meeting of UO administrators. He was described as a “levitating head … a mustachioed ovoid …” This was a mistake. He should have been referred to as the Grand Sovereign Inspector General.

The OC misreported the facts surrounding the ASUO Sunriver retreat. In the article, the reporter stated that the OC’s zombified mascot, Sudsy, had orchestrated an “illegal game of Twister that left all participants sticky with beer and crazed with filthy, lustful thoughts.” In fact, the members of the ASUO were playing a placid game of Parcheesi. It nonetheless left participants crazed with filthy, lustful thoughts.

Don Goldman is not a “philosopher-king”, as the article in question claimed.

The OC regrets the egregious mistakes and can only beg forgiveness from the thousands of members of the campus community who look for pinpoint accuracy in our hard-hitting news stories concerning three-hundred pound anthropomorphic, zombie mugs of beer.

It should also be noted that Sudsy is merely the construct of the OC. 

Or is he?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Number of people crushed by an angry motorist at the popular Eugene bar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of patrons accusing EPD of racial profiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncountable</td>
<td>Number of frat boy patrons who hook up with diseases with boobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Take one coke-addicted stuffed bear. Add a half-kilo of stolen Columbian nostril candy. Introduce the cartel leader, who’s not terribly pleased that his last score before retirement has already been scored.

What’s the inevitable outcome?

You get one hell of a mess.

A public service announcement brought to you by the **OREGON COMMENTATOR**

---

**THE OC ASKS:**

**What Has the First Amendment Done for You Lately?**

- **Robocop**
  - I can finally publish my Thundercats erotic fan fiction online.

- **Bobby Knight**
  - It didn’t help me when I called the referee a cocksucker, I can tell you that.

- **Aaron Shakra**
  - Bullshit! The OREGON COMMENTATOR went after me for years and all I got were these lucrative endorsement deals.

- **Roy Cohn**
  - Thundercats is copyrighted. Cease and desist, you filthy commie!

- **Joseph Welch**
  - If there is a God in Heaven, your attack on Thunderra’s quivering thighs and pouty, feline lips will do you no good. Have you no decency, sir?

---

**Jan. 27, 2005**
In 1983, Hustler Magazine published an ad parody featuring the above quote, attributed to televangelist Jerry Falwell. In progressively more disturbing language, the fictionalized version of the popular pulp jockey described an incestuous sexual experience with his mother in an outhouse. The cartoon was intended to resemble a Campari liquor ad, whose ad campaign at the time played on the double-entendre-laden notion of “first times”.

Falwell was not pleased. Despite the addition of a disclaimer at the bottom of the page that stated that the ad was intended as satire, Falwell sued Flynt in district court for libel, intentional infliction of emotional distress and invasion of privacy. The invasion of privacy charge was an odd addition to the litany of complaints, unless Falwell was admitting that there was a modicum of truth to the incest claim. Nonetheless, the jury found for Falwell on the intentional infliction of distress claim, awarding him $100,000 in compensatory damage and $50,000 in punitive damages for each petitioner.

The jury in this case made a disastrous decision: By ruling in favor of Falwell, based on the spurious and subjective argument that the fake ad had caused emotional distress, it was opening the floodgates for similar lawsuits filed by oft-mocked public figures. The decision cast serious doubt on the future validity of satire as a serious art form. Would political cartoonists be free to ply their trade under such legal scrutiny? Would Saturday Night Live feel free to needle celebrities and politicians? Would hack stand-up comics still have the balls to impersonate the likes of Herve Villechaize or Gary Coleman? And although the Hustler parody was essentially a protracted “your mom” joke, with nary an intelligent insight contained within, it was satire nevertheless.

The months leading up to the Supreme Court trial were filled with anxiety for many journalists and First Amendment watchdogs. Larry Flynt was not a sympathetic character. He wasn’t the type of guy journalists wanted in their court, defending issues of incredible importance. He was a peddler of gynecological curiosities, a dirty pornographer, and a purveyor of filth and misogynistic degradation of women. At least that’s what his critics would lead you to believe. He was, in essence, the face of smut.

Was anyone else as well known for disseminating crudity? Not Hugh
Hefner, who, though a trailblazer in the field of “men’s magazines”, was too poncey and literate to be perceived as a threat to the masses. Not Bob Guccione of Penthouse, whose magazine had not yet ascended to the storied realm of Hustler-esque hardcore debauchery it attempts now. And not the New York-based publisher of Screw Magazine, Al Goldstein, who, despite being a man so lacking in human decency that he once received oral gratification from Linda Lovelace during an interview, would not become widely known throughout the rest of the country until referenced by the Beastie Boys. No, Larry Flynt was the it pornographer -- the first man to give this sex-starved country the “pink” shots it so eagerly sought. A man who once screamed, “fuck this court!” during another libel trial and then referred to the justices as “eight assholes and a token cunt.” Yet there he was at the Supreme Court, lawyer in tow, defending the virtues of free speech. No wonder the journalists were anxious.

But we all know that Flynt’s legal battle ended happily. We’ve seen the movie. In a unanimous decision, the justices overturned the lower court’s ruling. The Supreme Court found that public figures, such as Falwell, could not recover damages for intentional infliction of emotional distress without proving a knowing or reckless disregard for the statement’s falsity. In the written opinion of the court, Chief Justice Rehnquist stated:

“[The] [r]espondent would have us find that a State’s interest in protecting public figures from emotional distress is sufficient to deny First Amendment protection to speech that is patently offensive and is intended to inflict emotional injury, even when that speech could not reasonably have been interpreted as stating actual facts about the public figure involved. This we decline to do.”

The justices understood that in order to prevent a chilling effect on speech, the government and its agents must remain neutral in the Marketplace of Ideas. The offensiveness of the satire must not play a role in the decision of whether said satire is protected by the First Amendment, because that would create a subjective value statement based solely on questions of content. Such questions can only be ameliorated by refusing to take them into account, thus giving satirists free rein to bedevil public figures as ruthlessly as they see fit. “[O]ne of the prerogatives of American citizenship is the right to criticize public men and measure,” said Justice Frankfurter in 1944. And the words remain true to this day.

---

**A Very Brief History of Satire in America**

W ill Rogers. Nathaniel West. Ben Hecht. James Thurber. The list could go on -- satirical geniuses all, whose wry, often cynical outlook would stand the test of time. Although satire is not a uniquely American form of expression, like jazz or – shudder – line dancing, it has played a major role in defining the cultural Zeitgeist.

The early revolutionary and post revolutionary days were full with satire. Popular songs mocked the British and local politicians, while newspapers – which were generally affiliated with a political party or politician – used their pages to take jabs at their enemies.

Thus, satire was prevalent during the early days of our nation, but it didn’t hit its stride until a national calamity – the Civil War.

During the Civil War, satirical publications flourished. Of publications with Northern sympathies there was *Vanity Fair* (1860-65), *Funniest of the Phun* (1864-56), and *Yankee Notions* (1852-75). Southern sympathies were dominated by the widely distributed British magazine *Punch*, which existed from 1841 to 2002, though its take on race relations undoubtedly evolved over the those 160 years. It was joined by another pro-south British publication, the cleverly titled *Fun*.

These publications were the equivalent to the *National Lampoon* or the *Onion* today. They were filled with satirical stories and early political cartoons, which brimmed over with contempt for politicians and political infrastructures. They were also some of the most intellectually stimulating and literary publications of the time. The publishers, editors and cartoonists of these publications clearly understood that the conscience of the people could not not be won with reason alone; their rival’s absurdity, both political and moral, must be exaggerated using humor.

The foremost political satirist of his generation was Thomas Nast, a political cartoonist for *Harper’s*. In 1873, Nast won notoriety for his satirical campaign against New York City’s Tweed Ring -- a corrupt consortium of political cogs – run by political boss William Maeger Tweed. The infamous cartoon of Boss Tweed and his associates made to look like vultures remains one of the most famous political cartoons of all time.

Naturally, Tweed found little to laugh at. He is purported to have said: “Stop them damned pictures! I don’t care what the papers
write about me. My constituents can’t read. But damn it, they can see picture.” However, it’s uncertain whether Tweed actually made this less than aldermanic plea, though one can assume that he probably made similar proclamations, using only the choicest 19th century vulgarities.

As a result of Nast’s cartoons, Tweed was sent to prison on corruption charges. After serving only one year, he was released from prison. However, he would soon find himself back in the slammer, this time for accumulating debts in excess of $6 million. He died in prison in 1876, a befitting end to a political criminal of brobdingnagian proportions.

But lest you think that satire only has the power to destroy political lives and send individuals into downward spirals of ruination, remember Mark Twain, who pointed out the faults of American culture. Remember a myriad other American humorists and satirists whose witty take on the absurdities of the times are still remembered as powerful and pertinent.

In the 20th century, new issues arose to become targets of the satirist’s lancing pen. Notably, much of this satire was directed at the antebellum south. For example, H.L. Mencken wrote a scorching portrayal of the Scopes Monkey Trial in 1925. Mencken is considered to be one of the first modern writers to depict southerners as red-faced, finger wagging, corpulent hillbillies. He was far ahead of his time, as his work clearly helped inspire the Blue Collar Comedy Tour.

“[William Jennings Bryan] descended to demagoguery so dreadful that his very associates at the trial table blushed,” wrote Mencken, describing the Scopes Trial. “His one yearning was to keep his yokels heated up - to lead his forlorn mob of imbeciles against the foe.”

The Scopes Trial was fodder for numerous satirists and professional mockers. Thus, the stereotypical image of the bible-thumping dogmatist would become the most pervasive image of the new south -- it was primarily due to Northern writers like Mencken who viewed the hyperbolically titled “Trial of the Century” with bemusement. This white trash tableau, this visage of atavism incarnate, inculcated itself. For better or worse, Mencken’s barbed, mocking tone worked far better than a measured voice of reason would have. Perhaps it worked too well, as his words further propagated the notion of the imbecile southerner. Though the propagation of ideas is the ambition of any polemicist.

As the century progressed, more and more authors found satire to be incredibly useful. There was Joseph Heller’s antiwar novel, *Catch-22*. There was Kurt Vonnegut’s anti-war novel *Slaughterhouse-Five*. There was Richard Hooker’s antiwar novel, *MASH* (this was something of a theme). And, more recently, there was Robert Clark Young’s book, *One of The Guys*, ostensibly about the U.S. Navy’s complicity in child prostitution. This book, published in 1999, was so offensive to members of the American Family Association that they attempted to get it banned. The organization called the book “garbage” and “horror art”.

In fact, most of America’s best-known authors have written satirical works, including John Updike, Thomas Pynchon and David Foster Wallace. *A Confederacy of Dunces* is rich in satire, as is the post-modern *White Noise*. What do all these works have in common? Nothing really. Except that they mock, ridicule or reveal a group of people, an institution or a facet of society as being absurd. Of course, treating certain issues with bemusement is not always appreciated by the majority (Example: child prostitution/molestation doesn’t strike everyone as a knee-slapper).

**You Can’t Spell Hate Without HA!**

It’s difficult to be satirical without offending someone. People tend to read what they want to read, while glossing over the intentions. If a person is already prone to victimization syndrome – wherein he or she interprets even the most innocuous phrase as somehow offensive – then this person will find something to yelp about.

Some satire is, on the surface, offensive. But the offensive-ness of the work belies the true meaning, which is often worthwhile. An example of this is evident in one of my favorite P.J. O’Rourke pieces from the National lampoon – back when that magazine was actually good, not to mention an actual magazine.

The piece, titled “Foreigners Around the World”, ruthlessly rips on every major ethnicity and nationality.

About Australians, O’Rourke writes:

“Violently loud alcoholic roughnecks whose idea of fun is to throw up on your car. The national sport is breaking furniture and the average daily consumption of beer in Sydney is ten and three quarters Imperial gallons for children under the age of nine.”

Political incorrectness in all its ‘70s glory. Throughout the remainder of the piece O’Rourke mocks the Brits, the Irish, the French, etc. The point of the piece, aside from having fun saying things that one cannot generally say in polite company, is that
stereotypes are funny. They’re not funny because they are true, they’re funny because they aver from the truth so drastically. Satire of this nature must be contextualized -- people must ask, What is it trying to say?. This shouldn’t be too hard to do. Most educated people have been taught to contextualize literature. But it seems as if people have a real problem contextualizing modern satire.

The racial language in Huck Finn is permissible (well, not to everyone); it was, as Abe Simpson would say, the fashion of the time. Whereas the over-the-top language of Quentin Tarantino movie is distasteful. This is a double standard that greatly affects satire.

Because satire targets an individual or a group, it becomes easy to accuse certain satirical works of perpetuating hate, especially if the target happens -- by mere coincidence -- to belong to a “subjugated” minority group. In the real world, these accusations can be annoying -- or costly if lawsuits enter the equation, a la Falwell’s case against Hustler -- but at the University level, where students and administrators are cowed by political correctness, it can be much more insidious.

**PCU -- The Chilling of Satire at the University**

Recent incidents involving college students have bolstered concerns that universities are becoming too politically correct.

In 2004, Patrick Higgins, a student at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, was embroiled in a bitter race for the student presidency. During his campaign, he voiced his opposition to a student set-aside program that would have guaranteed a minority student group, ALANA, seats in student government. Members of ALANA quickly seized on the opportunity to call Higgins a racist without mentioning that the set-aside program had already been deemed unconstitutional.

After the election, Higgins and a group of friends threw a party. At the party, a friend of Higgins drew a caricature of him dressed as a Klu Klux Klan Wizard clutching a burning cross. Clearly the purpose of the caricature was to satirize the slanderous claims that Higgins was a racist.

Photographs of the caricature leaked to the student body and the administration, setting off an uproar. Many students were outraged and demanded sanctions against the partygoers. UMass Vice Chancellor Michael Gargano kow-towed and declared, “I have the authority to remove these people from student government office … I have a variety of sanctions at my disposal; I’m not ruling out dismissal.”

Ouch. The cartoon certainly was not on par with the work of Thomas Nast -- in terms of quality, that is -- but it was a work of political satire, in spite of the UMass administration’s inability to read it as such.

That incident is one of many. Here at the University of Oregon, these incidents have not been as common. The administration understands that in the court of public opinion -- not to mention the court of law -- taking draconian steps to stifle unpopular or misunderstood satire would spell disaster.

Currently, this publication has come under scrutiny for the satirical content it has printed. The PFC and assorted campus activists have called for the magazine’s de-funding, despite the fact that nothing this magazine has printed has been unprotected by the first amendment.

Thus, the University and its agents -- student government included -- are walking a very fine line. The University of Oregon is a public institution, which means that the University cannot prohibit speech that would be found acceptable by the First Amendment or the State Constitution. This is not true in every state. Private universities in California, for example, cannot suppress speech at a greater degree than their public counterparts. However, in Oregon, as is the case with most states, there is a distinction between the amount of speech that can be stifled at a public institution and the amount that can be stifled at a private institution. Thus, if this were a private university, Willamette for example, the situation would be different, as that school is not affiliated with the state and can make its response to offensive speech more stringent.

The satirical speech that this publication prints is firmly protected by the First Amendment. Hell, the satirical speech that the Student Insurgent prints is also protected. Many of us remember when the Insurgent printed the names and addresses of science professors who experimented on animals on one page, while the opposite page contained detailed instructions on how to commit terrorist acts against such people. This was ostensibly a joke, done in poor taste, and it was much more offensive and potentially dangerous than anything this publication has ever printed, but the Insurgent survived with only a slap on the wrist.

Perhaps the scariest thing about being a student journalist at a public institution is the way publications are funded. The existence of the publications on this campus are tied to the whims of a few students who act on behalf of the state. They are not lawyers, nor do they have any law training (with the exception of the few law students who perform the job briefly before stepping down), yet they have the power to control whether or not your ideas are disseminated. If they are the ones who have been mocked in a student publication, can we expect them to act impartially, without a shred of bias? Of course not.

They are the government. And it is scary as hell for student journalists to work within a system that requires the government’s approval -- by way of its “cultural and physical” advancement of students requisite -- to get funding.

The administration and student leaders should understand the important history of satire in the United States. Only by understanding the importance of satire, and the legal protection it has, can they make the right decision.

Otherwise they will continue being the butts of jokes.

Tyler Graf, who has finally admitted that there’s nothing funny about your mom’s pancreatic cancer, is editor-in-chief of the Oregon Commentator
Public college campuses face a unique situation: the diversity of students sharing a campus is a potential fire starter for violent disagreement. This scares the hell out of administrators; so, as it is illegal to discriminatingly admit individual students based on gender, sex, race, religion, or background, the historical solution seems to be to restrict speech deemed “offensive” to diffuse any potential problems between groups. However, this is in direct violation of the entire philosophy of free speech: a forum including all ideas as equally valid, with no administrator or institution directing particular opinions or forms of expression as right or wrong. This is the situation we, the students, live in daily.

Free Speech: 101

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) is a national organization devoted to defending individual rights, student faculty and staff, in higher education. They advocate for issues such as due process, freedom of speech and conscience, and religious liberty. Of particular interest is FIRE’s advocacy for the freedom of speech on campus. According to the FIRE’s website <www.thefire.org>, “When administrators at your school advance a rationale to punish a student for his or her speech, a student newspaper for an article, or a student group for a parody or satire, chances are they are recycling the reasoning of the censors of America’s past.” Further, it states, “Liberty cannot exist in a society in which people are forced to conform their thoughts and expression to an official viewpoint.” Are we, the students of the University of Oregon, having the wool pulled over our eyes and the gags stuffed in our mouths?

Based on the philosophy of John Stuart Mill, the idea of free speech is protected in the First Amendment of the Constitution. This philosophy proposes that no state official should be allowed to determine what speech is appropriate and that all opinions and forms of speech should be protected. A commonly used description -- the free marketplace of ideas -- is used to sum up the ideal of American speech rights. Historically, majority groups of power have at least attempted to censor minority groups expressing dissent or alternative ideas. The disagreement between abolitionists and pro-slavery advocates, the perceived threat of communism after the major world wars are just two of many examples of infringements upon free speech in American history. The 1960’s, perhaps the greatest era of First Amendment growth, deemed previously disallowed obscenities, alternative forms of expression, and indecent material to be protected as free speech.

Your Rights: To Speak

Repeat after me: There are no laws in the state of Oregon defining “hate speech”. Chris Loschiavo, Director of Student Judicial Affairs, explained that “Most campuses strive for an environment of free speech... people have a tendency to ignore things they don’t agree with, but may not know why they don’t agree with it until they listen.” Indeed, this is the sort of environment the University of Oregon strives to facilitate. In an academic utopia, ideas and opinions from individuals of all backgrounds are exchanged freely, respectfully, and without too much hostility. However, we know this to be an imperfect world, and there is much disharmony, much hostility, and much offending that occurs when ideas are disseminated freely.

The University of Oregon, like any public university, walks a shaky line between ensuring the safety of its students while allowing free speech. Loschiavo related this problem succinctly: “It’s a difficult line of balance, especially on a college campus, to create both a forum for free speech and a safe, supportive academic environment.”

According to Loschiavo, the UO wants student to feel “like the UO is a safe place, for both identity minorities as well as opinion and viewpoint minorities on campus.” The Student Code of conduct defines punishable harassment as physical contact or “specifically insulting another person in his or her immediate presence with abusive words or gestures.”

The university has also never had a “free speech zone.” Thus, a question arises: is our Free Speech Amphitheatre a “free speech zone”? The answer: no. Free speech zones are designated places on campus available only during certain hours; they allow expression of all viewpoints, but make it punishable to demonstrate outside that zone. Our Free Speech Amphitheatre at the
In the area of university sponsored speech...universities must remain viewpoint neutral when funding student organizations. Viewpoint neutrality means that public universities, in making their decisions about funding, may not take into consideration what position or opinion a student or group of students stands for or advocates.

EMU is more of a congregation point, and although it is certainly a place where individuals like Bible Jim or the Raving Angry Old Man may voice their concerns, they are also free to voice those concerns in other conspicuous places on campus.

Still, while the entirety of campus may be available as a forum for demonstration or speech, there are general safety rules that must be followed, to ensure the physical safety of those fellow students who share the campus. For example, any activity which disturbs classes or impedes the access of emergency vehicles can be asked to disperse and can result in a reprimanding from the Student Judicial Affairs office. These are not in violation of anyone’s First Amendment rights: they are simply safety issues.

Your Rights: On Campus

The FIRE’s Guide to Free Speech on Campus states, concerning political affiliations, “The obligation to profess a governmental creed—political, religious, or ideological—involves perhaps the most sacred of our constitutional and moral rights: freedom of belief and conscience.” The First Amendment protects both your right to believe what you want and speak on it without fear of censorship, as well protecting the individual from being forced by those individuals in power to believe something (or claim they believe something) against their will. The FIRE’s Guide explains these as, “officially approved beliefs or orthodoxies that citizens are compelled to believe or say they believe.” Would claiming that the University of Oregon is a liberal/progressive campus fall into this category?

The opinion varies depending on whom you ask. For more politically conservative students, like the College Republicans, the University of Oregon campus may feel like a place where politically conservative tendencies are best hidden. Chris Loschiavo and journalism Professor Tom Bivins both affirmed the commonly held belief that the political climate at University of Oregon is, without a doubt, tilted left. However, this university has no official political affiliation. The University of Oregon mission statement clearly states that “the acceptance of the challenge of an evolving social, political, and technological environment” is paramount to all other commitments to this university, its students and its faculty/staff. The next time you find yourself sitting in a class where the instructor claims that the UO is a “liberal” institution, politely remind them of the above information and their responsibility to adhere to it.

Your Rights: Student Publications

The FIRE’s Guide to Free Speech on Campus very clearly states, “In the area of university sponsored speech...universities must remain viewpoint neutral when funding student organizations. Viewpoint neutrality means that public universities, in making their decisions about funding, may not take into consideration what position or opinion a student or group of students stands for or advocates.” This means that the PFC may not reject student groups based on their usage of the words “left-wing orthodoxy” or their supposed “lack of minority viewpoints.”

“I believe in responsible journalism,” explained Bivins, emphasizing that publications that print material in “bad taste” should explain their reasoning for printing the material; they may even go so far as to clear up their intentions in later printings.

He also said that student journalists may “do tasteless things” but “have every right to do them.”

Drawing on personal experience, Bivins acknowledged that in his 20 years with the University of Oregon, the number of publications that run counter to the prevailing campus orientation has impressed him.

Within a democracy, especially one based on utilitarian principles, the majority wins, and the minority is left unhappy. In this situation, there will always be a group that isn’t getting what it wants.

“I don’t think the majority opinion has any right to cut off the minority opinion,” said Bivins.

Although no consequences can legally be brought against someone for offensive speech, they may need to explain the reasoning for their commentary. Both Loschiavo and Bivins encourage dialogue and respectful communication when one individual or group has been offended by another’s opinion. Bivins stressed the responsibility of student publications to acknowledge complaints and, if need be, publish an apology. He encourages individuals who have objections to a publication’s content to write the editor, or otherwise contact someone in a respectful manner. This idea bears repeating: in a respectful manner.

Melissa Hanks, whose turn ons include whiskey, kittens and explosives, can be reached at #6669787
Did You Know?

Fun Facts About Free Speech

- Did you know? You can wear a jacket that says “FUCK THE DRAFT” inside a courthouse. When the bailiff asks you to remove it, just shout “Cohen v. California” over and over again. So long as you don’t cross the line into the realm of conduct, you should be in the clear.

- Did you know? First Amendment doctrine doesn’t like those essayists you have to read in WR 121 any more than you do. In American Booksellers Association v. Hudnut, Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit ruled that an Indianapolis anti-pornography ordinance drafted by Catherine MacKinnon and Andrea Dworkin amounted to “THOUGHT CONTROL.” It “leaves the government in control of all the institutions of culture, the great censor and director of which thoughts are good for us.”

- Did you know? The ASUO PROGRAMS FINANCE COMMITTEE is also interested in acting as “the great censor and director of which thoughts are good for us.” Let them know how you feel about this at pfc@gladstone.uoregon.edu.

- Did you know? The words “shit, piss, fuck, cunt, cocksucker, motherfucker, and tits” will “curve your spine {and} grow hair on your hands” according to George Carlin. As such, they are “not entitled to absolute constitutional protection under all circumstances” by the rule of FCC v. Pacifica. HOWEVER, they are entitled to absolute constitutional protection in this circumstance. So let’s run them again: “shit, piss, fuck, cunt, cocksucker, motherfucker, and tits.” Because we can. Because we care.

- Did you know? The Supreme Court has ROUNDLY REJECTED prior restraint. We learned this from The Big Lebowski, but we didn’t really feel it until we read Near v. Minnesota.

- Did you know? PFC member Mason Quiroz has said things to the effect that his TORTURED READING of the ASUO Green Tape Notebook trumps federal constitutional doctrine.

- Did you know? Citations to the Green Tape Notebook during a 42 U.S.C. s. 1983 proceeding would NOT IMPRESS a federal judge.

- Did you know? The Constitution protects your right to sound like a racist backwoods idiot. In Brandenburg v. Ohio, the Supreme Court upheld as protected speech the rantings of a KKK member who ACTUALLY BELIEVED that “revengeance” and “revengeant” were words.

- Did you know? Fully nude dancing, including LAP DANCES, is considered protected artistic expression under the Oregon constitution. Sex in the champagne room, however, was deemed conduct rather than speech, and hence unprotected, in State v. Boynton.

- Did you know? We were kidding about State v. Boynton. Still: there is no sex in the champagne room. And if a stripper tells you that there is, that’s MISLEADING commercial speech and it enjoys no First Amendment protection. Sue her.
On Nov. 20 Congress passed House Resolution 4818, an appropriations act which dictates the funding structure of hundreds of agencies and projects, including education. The bill updates the income tax formula with which federal financial aid is calculated. It will also cap the upper limit of Pell Grants for the third time in as many years.

The formula in question is much like the federal income tax, allowing for an amount of state tax payments to be deducted from federal tax payments. Last year that amount was cut, leaving more money in the hands of working families.

An opponent of the bill, Sen. Jon Corzine, D-N.J, believes the bill will keep students out of the higher education system, and many say that millions of students will be forced to shoulder more of cost of their educations.

Elizabeth Bickford, director the University Financial Aid office, said the update was a good thing because the tax information used to calculate the old formula was collected in 1988 and is no longer current.

“We would always like to be using current information in our calculations,” said Bickford. She also pointed out that the formula change represents an alteration to only one of the many tables on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid form.

Bickford said the change would mean that some of the universities 12,000 financial aid students will probably lose their aid, but an equal number would probably become eligible as a result. Bickford also pointed out that the neediest students often come from families that pay little in state taxes so it is unlikely that their aid is going to change as a result.

The students Bickford said would lose their funding are those receiving the smallest amount of aid. These are generally students from families that make just enough money to make them ineligible for large federal aid disbursements but often make too little to be able to effectively pay for college on their own.

Currently, it is not known what will happen to these students should they lose their federal aid, although Bickford says there are programs in place that can help them stay in school, usually by increasing loans or work study hours. Bickford said that it is hard to predict what students will do in a given year, but history suggests that the University will not lose many students over this funding change.

“Somehow they make up for it,” said Bickford.

As for Pell Grants, the exact consequences are difficult to predict, but it would appear that more than one million students nationwide will receive smaller payments and as many as 84,000 will lose the grant altogether.

Bickford said that of the 4,100 students at the university receiving Pell Grant money, approximately 100 of them would likely lose their funds. Students who lose money are likely to be at the low end of the Pell Grant, receiving $400 annually.

There has been an effort at the federal level to raise the Pell Grant.

On Jan. 14 President Bush proposed a plan that would raise the Pell Grant by $100 a year for the next five years, raising the maximum grant to $4,550 by 2010. This move has brought some praise, the level of the grant has remained static at $4,050 for three years in the face of rising tuition costs nationwide.

Rising tuition costs in Oregon have lead to a new proposal by Governor Kulongoski, the Access Scholarship for Education Trust (ASET). According to a press release the purpose of the legislation is to create a trust fund that would provide needy students with the money necessary to get an undergraduate education.

Not only does this help individuals reach their own personal goals, it helps keep talented and bright people in our state,” said Kulongoski.

The Access and Affordability workgroup will be meeting on Jan. 21 to further discuss the ASET program but at present nothing has been finalized.

Bickford said she is hopeful that ASET will provide more money for students.

“Any increase we can get in grants for students is a good thing,” Bickford said. “The financial aid community will always advocate for more grants.

Ben Brown, a senior majoring in journalism, is a staff writer for the OREGON COMMENTATOR.
In 1972, President Richard Nixon signed Title IX of the Educational Amendments. While the motives behind the measure were just, it has since its enactment cost universities around the country untold amounts of money, and is contrary to the spirit of freedom and personal effort that higher education has come to stand for.

The actual text of the measure states that any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance cannot discriminate on the basis of sex. In my understanding, this seems redundant after the passage of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs or activities that receive federal funds. What Title IX is translated into, though, is that universities are required to offer an equal number of scholarships to women as are offered to men. This in itself is noble, but when the University offers a full ride scholarship to a male wide receiver, for instance, they in turn receive a huge return in the form of the crowds the athlete draws to his games. For a female athlete, it may be beneficial for her and give her an opportunity to further her education -- an education she wouldn’t receive otherwise. From a pragmatic outlook though, the University gets no return on its investment. In reality, Title IX is a weak attempt by another small group of whiners to screw the University system out of more money.

The aim of Title IX, equality in higher education, is clearly a noble one. However, this act has cost the University a great deal of money, which students feel in their wallets. It is an unfortunate fact that women’s sports do not make the University -- or more precisely the Athletic Department -- money. Men’s sports are just more popular, and draw much larger crowds.

The issue, however, is not one of gender equality, but rather one of funds and NCAA regulations. Currently, these regulations require that a university must have around 10 sports to qualify as a division I school. Title IX regulations indirectly require that there are the same number of women’s and men’s sports. This puts the University in quite a pickle, in that as an institution we can not afford to have 10 major sports for both genders. To solve this problem, we can either (1) relinquish our status as a division I sports...
The first item that discounts the gender inequity argument is that another assistant coach, Mark Stream, was also laid off as a result of the consolidation. Stream, however, had been coaching at the University for 26 years, much longer than Harmon’s 18.

If the Title IX/division I funding debacle isn’t enough, Sally Harmon, the former University of Oregon women’s track coach, is suing the University for over one million dollars for pain and suffering after being fired following the consolidation of the women’s and men’s track teams. Harmon, who coached javelin, discus, shot put, and the hammer throw, spent 18 years coaching for the University before being laid off. Harmon and assistant coach Mark Stream were replaced by Lance Deal, a four-time Olympian and silver medalist. The suit references that Harmon’s throwing program has placed in the top ten in the nation each of her last five years with the University, and that Harmon was the first female individual national champion in Oregon history when she won the javelin competition in 1981. Harmon’s suit also claims that Deal, who has no prior paid experience coaching division I athletics, is less qualified for the position than Harmon. The former women’s coach is using the ambiguities of Title IX to her advantage by claiming its terms were violated when she was fired. While Title IX does prohibit discrimination on the basis of gender in any educational institution receiving federal financial aid, this is a relatively new approach to Title IX, and could possibly translate into even greater monetary losses for the University.

At first glance, this case may smell of gender inequity and illegitimate hiring practices. However, when all of the facts are taken into account, Harmon’s lawsuit is clearly frivolous and ill-founded. The first item that discounts the gender inequity argument is that another assistant coach, Mark Stream, was also laid off as a result of the consolidation. Stream, however, had been coaching at the University for 26 years, much longer than Harmon’s 18. Also, Deal, who was hired to replace Harmon and Stream, was a four-time Olympic athlete, and 1996 silver medalist in the hammer throw. Unless they award Olympic medals for whining, Harmon has none to speak of. The new coach is also a nine-time outdoor and 12-time indoor national throwing champion. Clearly, the latter’s qualifications vastly outshine those of Harmon. As a side, Deal stands at 6 feet, 2 inches and weighs 255 pounds, and if it came to a cage match between the two to decide the outcome, Deal would most definitely smack his bitch up.

Harmon claims that her career was irreparably damaged by her dismissal. The last that I heard, Harmon didn’t have a career anymore, so she needn’t worry. Also, the plaintiff claims in her case that she suffered emotionally and physically, which is usually what happens when one is canned. From the University Athletic Department’s standpoint, taking into account the tight financial situation, they are buying a better qualified candidate for less money. Perhaps the irony lies in the fact that because of Title IX, the athletic department is very tight financially, and must make adjustments in their programs. Because of this, Harmon was laid off and is suing the University on the grounds of Title IX, when Title IX is ultimately responsible for her present situation.

Ben Hartley, a freshman majoring in biology, is a staff writer for the Oregon Commentator.
The bodies of suicidal students are piling up like cord wood in October, and the stench has reached all the way to Johnson Hall.

The University of Oregon is in the process of finally drafting a “mandatory leave” policy for students with suicidal tendencies, a response to the growing rate of suicidal students. Anne Leavitt, Vice President of Student Affairs, claims that this is for the good of the entire student body as suicidal students are a threat to the community at large.

In fact, Leavitt has likened suicidal students to hostage takers. How apt. In fact, I would go farther and compare them to terrorists. I can’t remember a night when I didn’t wake up in a cold sweat wondering if some poor kid in Bean was going to behead himself.

So we couldn’t agree more with Leavitt and the other administrators. Something needs to be done to protect the University from lawsuits. Wait, that’s not right … Something needs to be done to protect University students from suicidal freaks. If we don’t do something now, right this second, then we will give the impression that these students can continue their brutal string of suicidings unabated. That’s not a world I’d like to live in.

But sadly, it’s a world we already live in.

How many times have you faced this scenario: You come home to your dorm room, beat as usual. But instead of being able to plop down on your bed, as you would have been able to do normally, you’re confronted by your roommate’s bloated corpse hanging from a dirty pair of underwear, an orange stuffed in his mouth. Naturally, you’re aghast. “Not again,” is all you can say while slapping your forehead in frustration.

Clearly, something needs to be done. But what? What can you do? Is kicking students out of school good enough? We don’t think so. There’s got to be a better way to cure this social scourge. And that’s why we are here, to help. Allow us to present a few ways the administration could help suicidal students and the campus community at large.

Keep in mind that this is not an extensive list. We can’t pretend that we have all the answers. The administration -- and the lawmakers in Salem -- may have their own ideas, and that’s fine. We simply think that the administration needs to think outside the box. Creativity in the face of nooses, pills and carbon monoxide poisoning is the only way to stem the tide of this terrible problem.
Promote students to exercise more. Regular exercise is a great way to release endorphins into the body and relieve stress. If students exercise for only four hours a week during the long, cold, dismal winter months they will dramatically impact their state of mind, not to mention their waistlines. Though it won’t help the ugly ones get rid of those unsightly pockmarks.

Get more students involved in student government. Nothing helps a sour mood like surrounding yourself with people who are worse off than you.

Forget about dispensing condoms. Instead, the Health Center should dispense sanitized straight razors. Only the bleeding can release the suicidal from the soul-crushing ennui of their pathetic, insignificant lives.

Require all incoming freshmen to read the inspiring works of self-help guru Harold Robbins.

Immediately fire the administrator who confused Harold Robbins with Tony Robbins.

Send all depressed and possibly suicidal students pictures of cute puppies. Attach a note informing said students that they have exactly 48 hours to cheer up or the next dish served at Carson will be “puppy pate”.

Blame all suicides on Ozzy Osbourne’s “Suicide Solution”. Bring Tipper Gore to campus to speak out on the outrageous lyrics of today’s so called “pop music”.

Patiently explain to suicidal students that suicide will only make people mock them more.

Send students on a field trip to Branson, MO to catch a show at Yakov Smirnoff’s theater. The suicidal feelings will swiftly be displaced by bloodlust.

Make it illegal again.


Send students an informal questionnaire: Do you ♥ yourself? Yes. No. Maybe.

Immediately fire the administrator who confused Tom Robbins with Tony Robbins

Remove works of Hemingway, Plath, etc. from library. Remove Rick Moody too, because it’s only a matter of time.

Convince freshmen girls that the only path to true happiness is rampant promiscuity.

Ask students, “What would Jesus do?” They will inevitably think, “Walk on water.” When they attempt this, they will sink to the bottom. Technically, this isn’t suicide, it’s accidental death.

When administrators start confusing Robin Givens with Tony Robbins, that’s when you know you have a problem. Shit can ‘em all.

Trick suicidal students into believing that they have won a contest. When they come to claim their prize, chloroform them. Fly them to a deserted island where they will be forced to hunt the most dangerous prey of all – each other. When there is only one student left standing, expel them.
Accountability took a back seat to political security this past month, when the group of stoned alcoholics we call the ASUO promised to take steps to atone for their student-financed October orgy of drugs and alcohol. The ASUO has promised to compensate the ill-used funds in a way befitting a bunch of self-described “cocky, smooth, motherfuckers”. The ASUO’s initial proposition was to raise enough funds to cover the incidental fees they’d drunkenly pissed away. ASUO Public Relations Director Nathan Strauss - think about that for a moment - told the Oregon Daily Emerald that they were “definitely on our way to getting this resolved.” Mr. Strauss could not have been more wrong.

It turns out, two months later, that the ASUO has no intention of paying the $3,200 of misappropriated funds back. Their reason being that it is simply too difficult to raise that much cash. (Unless, of course, you’ve got a real job instead of a student-funded cakewalk.) Additionally, “some” of the ASUO felt that repaying the funds “sends the message that the purpose of this retreat was not fulfilled,” according to Strauss. Apparently the purpose of the trip was to get blind-drunk and write obscenities in guestbooks.

The real problems, of course, have nothing to do with the pot smoking, the drinking, or even the retreat in the first place. There’s nothing wrong with dabbling in pot or drinking yourself into a stupor. To be honest, it’s refreshing to see that ASUO members are human beings too. And retreats? They can be quite beneficial for leaders of an organization. No, the gross misuse of student funds, the rejection of individual (and group) accountability, and the pitiful, self-imposed “solutions” are where the real problems lie.

Is a “luxurious” location necessary for a retreat whose purpose is to discuss responsible financing? Am I the only one who sees the irony in this? It may have come as a surprise to the “cocky, smooth, motherfuckers” on the ASUO finance committee that the $3,200 they spent didn’t come out of thin air… hopefully their fruitless search for alternative funds in the past two months proved that.

Is a “luxurious” location necessary for a retreat whose purpose is to discuss responsible financing? Am I the only one who sees the irony in this? --Ian Spencer

The ASUO’s trouble raising the misspent funds is accentuated by the fact that they collectively decided not to hold individuals accountable. Our bold student government leaders are preparing, it seems, for a future in the groupthink-heaven called the U.S. Congress. Oh, imagine the raucous retreats to Chappaquiddick and Crawford they’ll have!

But before our beloved “cocky, smooth, motherfuckers” can take their next steps up the bureaucratic food chain they’ll have to master the art of pretending they’re sorry. The ASUO, it seems, isn’t very good at this important political ability yet. Perhaps the worst part of this whole situation has been the pitifully inadequate solutions proposed by the ASUO. They are a slap-in-the-face of every tuition-paying student here at the University of Oregon.

--A Do’s and Don’t’s video? That begs the question of how
lavish and expensive the production costs will be for the “Don’t’s” portion. And who will be paying for it? The ASUO members who can’t even raise a few grand in two months? The only purpose a video would serve would be to remind future ASUO members of the money at their disposal and the inherent absence of accountability in their positions. Remember those anti-alcohol and anti-sex videos they showed you in school? How well did those work?

--A new meeting committee? What in the hell? Since when did expanding a bureaucracy help make it cheaper and more accountable? And when the members of the retreat committee first meet up, won’t they have to go on a retreat to get to know one another?

--Mena Ravassipour has told the Oregon Daily Emerald that

the primary purpose of the ASUO’s measures will be prevention of future incidents, not disciplining the guilty parties. This sets a bad precedent. How can you expect student politicians to follow rules if they know they will not be punished for the violation of said rules?

--If I may, I’d like to offer a solution for the “cocky, smooth, motherfuckers.” Hold those who broke the rules responsible as individuals. Offer each of these individuals a choice: either raise their share of the $3,200 that was spent or be kicked off of the ASUO, never to come back. This would serve the dual purpose of holding those who were responsible accountable and delivering a warning to future would-be rule breakers.

Ian Spencer, who does all his partying at Vail -- the damn snob, is a staff writer for the Oregon Commentator
ON VISIONARIES

As the progressive movement searches for a renewing vision, it would be well served by turning some attention toward the poetic visionaries.

--Brad Hachten in the ODE. Charles Bukowski wouldn’t be a bad place to start.

When I write “visionary,” I mean one who confronts human nature and, imaginatively and ecstatically, envisions a greater society.

--Hachten clarifies his point.

By delving deeper than the context of the political-rational, progressives can break out of a reactive mode that can be so emotionally exhausting. By taking an emotional-social approach, the progressive movement can be reinvigorated by a spiritually sustaining vision.

--Hard-nosed political operative Hachten, one more time. Perhaps Bob Shrum wasn’t the worst choice Kerry could have made, after all.

ON HIPUBLICANS:

Conservative students today will be wearing the same T-shirts, sneakers and jeans that you find on most 19-year-old college kids.

--Sarah Longwell, of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, quoted in the Wall Street Journal

The young conservatives, again like typical college kids, also play their iPods night and day, listening less to Bach and Beethoven than to alt-rock, country-and-western and hip-hop.

--Same WSJ piece. Do they really? Well I never.
ON GENITAL MUTILATION

Because I never step in anywhere and say, “Hey, [killing people] is all wrong,” people get upset. That’s outrageous to me! Who’s going to say that serial killing is wrong?! Isn’t that a given? There’s no need to say that.

- Author Bret Easton Ellis, interviewed by the Onion, on his perpetually controversial American Psycho.

[The Commentator suggested] that trans people ought to be dealt with through the violent removal of their genitalia, and that to do so with a gun would somehow be better...

- From a grievance filed against the OC by a student senator who shall remain nameless. What the hell? Of course we didn’t.

ON DIVERSITY

On campus, people are quick to know if you’re black, you’re an athlete, and you’re OK.

--Freshman football player Kwame Agyeman, in the ODE. It’s preferable to having the Klan on campus, but this still isn’t quite the “diversity” message we’re looking for...

On Tsunami Relief

Let me tell you something. There’s nothing better in the world than a Thai whore.

--Prominent former member of the College Republicans to the OC’s editor-in-chief.

Oh, Bill Bennett, where art thou?
Ian Crosswhite  
Forward | #11 | Junior  
Height: Variable  
Weight: 250

Scouting Report

A native of Australia. Got his start playing for the Australian Institute of Sport (AIS). Made a name for himself as one of the best low post scorers in either nation.

He has the potential to become an NBA player, or failing that UN Ambassador ... has been referred to as the most beloved athlete since Chris “The Dane” Christofferson.

Often sports “man-beard” to strike fear into the hearts of his testosteronally challenged opponents ... His height has fluctuated an incredible amount from season to season and from game to game ... shot blocking subpar unless playing at heights of eleven feet or above.

Crosswhite is “Australian for Rebounding”!

Stats

Points (avg): 9.3  
Rebounds (avg): 5.8  
Blocks (tot): 11  
Steals (tot): 13  
Facial Hair: Several  
Convictions: 0  
Real-Life Amputations: 0  
Magic-Realist Conceits: 3  
Anagrams: Care shit wins; Sancho wires it; Race within S.O.S; A richness I tow