



Changing your expectations

Janica Kaneshiro



Gay marriage and The Bible

Julia Halpin

Don't get let down by the American dream



Branden Labarowski

COLUMNS

Republican candidates are lackluster options

Ian Howard | Staff Writer



Thomas Jefferson, Jimmy Carter, John Adams and John Quincy Adams were all great men, however, none of them were great presidents. Jefferson's entrance into sainthood in modern politics today poses a terrible

threat to America's stability and democratic tradition. Jefferson may have written the Declaration of Independence, but that is not to say that his practices as a president were completely airtight. He made humongous cuts in the military that left America unprepared at the outbreak of the War of 1812, and in 1808 his Embargo Act was an economic catastrophe. This deceives many about the lackluster excellence of Jefferson's actions, as opposed to his flamboyant craft as a wordsmith. Jefferson's sainthood has brought extremist fiscal conservatives a north star that is unlikely to line up with true north. A strict interpretation of the Constitution manifests itself today in libertarianism.

Libertarianism is a movement seen as a compromise between the social programs of the left and the financial programs of the right, but in practice it cannot work in modern industrialized nations. Ron Paul and other candidates that hold onto this false promise should not win the Republican nomination. Under Paul's presidency, or an analogous policy of fiscal conservatism, corporations would literally rule America on top of the rampant lobbying that happens in Congress currently. Remember child labor laws, the working weekend and the Clean Air Act? Those were regulations made lovingly by a congress that was aiming to help its constituency. Imagine what it would be like for us, as Americans, if our president no longer saw it as his or her right to make these fundamental changes that have stopped the uncontrollable onslaught of corporations? Yes, corporations create jobs. No, that does not mean that they will always be acting in the best interests of people.

The problem extrapolates beyond the domain of the idealistically government-hating Ron Paul, to the general postulate of corporate championship in conservatism. The recession is proof of the negative energies in deregulation. Despite what many would like to believe, the recession was not caused by over-regulation, it was caused by capitalism-sanctioned greed. Irresponsible home-loan practices to make money in the short-term, and deregulated insurance firms that became too big to actually be monitored, led to this crisis. Meanwhile, ill-informed fiscal conservatives ask why government should be given any more power when everything that has operated has failed. As a Democrat I will probably vote for Obama in the 2012 election, but as an American I feel disturbed at the prospect of an election without two sound candidates.



Rating system goes too far

Thom Carter | Staff Writer

From as long as I can remember, I've battled the toils of the Parental Advisory sticker, banned book list and M for Mature rating. I was constantly nagged by my elders not to buy a record because it "contained an F-bomb" or to choose a book that was "more suitable for my audience." As a result, I was stuck buying clean albums

from Wal-Mart and reading "A Series of Unfortunate Events" until I wanted to burn the books for their frustratingly morose tone and catastrophically dull characters.

Amidst the bleeps and often laughable replacements for curse words on cable, I began to realize what I was missing. Granted, I wasn't actually aware of what I was realizing, but something seemed to click when I saw my first R movie. On a flight from London to Cincinnati, the in-flight entertainment was the then-new "Bridget Jones's Diary."

Admittedly, it's not the most proud choice for a first restricted movie, but I emulated my peers who regularly watched harder R's like "Nightmare on Elm Street" and "Friday the 13th" (in retrospect, not so impressive), emerging from them without an ensuing barrage of nightmares. I needed some credibility, and judging by how stringent I once thought my parents were, Renee Zellweger in a naughty British rom-com was my only chance.

Reminiscing about that flight, I realize now how utterly useless a ratings system is. As it may provide sufficient warning for helicopter parents, it only fulfills social taboos that impede our ability to view what needs to be seen. The MPAA, an association that rates the movies we know and love, is a heinous gathering of individuals who slap bold letters onto films formulated to make audiences "aware" of what they're about to see. The ratings, climaxing with the infamous NC-17, would be better defined as public deterrents. An egregious number of films have been assigned the virtual death-sentence that is the NC-17 rating, forcing directors and producers to either accept it along with the lack of revenue that results, or bring the axe to scenes that warrant such a rating. I don't want the axe. I don't want a rating. I judge things not for the public and what their reaction might be. I judge them for myself.

Regulations, however, will never be entirely abolished. There's simply a natural order to things. No child should be able to freely stroll into "The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo" despite the title's innumerable merits. What children see is at the discretion of parents, not the MPAA. Shielding the eyes of offspring is a protective impulse—they don't need daunting font to tell them how to draw an opinion.

Abolishing the ratings system wouldn't create a crisis, only increased awareness and, in effect, better parenting. Besides, word of mouth regarding suggestive movies quickly spreads and pervades into the minds of overbearing guardians. Ratings only instill an immediacy of illogical judgment, thus diminishing hopes of not only film, but all levels of modern art and entertainment. As an audience, we're suffering.

WHAT YOU THINK

In terms of safety--will the prevalence of campus crime affect your college decision?

compiled by Branden Labarowski

"The prevalence of crime in college campuses will not affect my choice because I'm not going to a bad college – no one should go to a bad college – and if there's a good college and it has a crime rate, a significant one, I'm going to go there anyway because it's a good college."
Jared Miller, freshman

"Oh, yeah, definitely. I want to go to UC but it scares me because it's an inner-city and I hear a lot about the crime there, so it makes small-town colleges more appealing."
Andrea Seggerman, senior

"Probably. I mean, if there's going to be a lot of crime I'm probably not going to go. I just want to feel safe where I'm going."
Sarah Cedrone, Junior

"Yes, [prevelance of crime] will affect my decision because I don't want to get robbed or stabbed."
Sarah Matthews, senior

"Not really, because I don't really think that would be that much big of a deal because it's a college so a lot of big stuff's going to go down."
Ethan Salsbury, sophomore

"I think it would because I think if people were more aware of how dangerous places could be, they wouldn't want to go because then they would have a bigger risk of being injured or assaulted, so they would probably choose a safer place that's like closer to home where if something bad happens they can get help from their parents easily."
Almithra Daroga, freshman