

A Feminine Perspective:**Censorship is a dangerous thing**

Our obsession with being politically correct (PC) is sending us into what could be the next Victorian Era. It's a problem all over the country, but recently has hit close to home.

The Hamilton school district replaced Halloween with "Black and Orange Day." It seems that the holiday offends Wiccans because of our distorted perception of witches as being broom-riding hags. I've never met a Wiccan who's offended by Halloween.

We can't have Christmas parties: we hold "holiday parties" instead. While attending a Catholic grammar school, I learned of Christmas, Kwanzaa, the Winter Solstice and Hanukkah. But at the rate we're censoring everything now, we're creating an ignorant society that may not be tolerant of anything unfamiliar.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is trying to censor satellite radio. Since children don't have access to it unless their parents purchase it, who is getting hurt? Maybe if we stopped censoring everything, we would know what's really going on in the world.

When the Ten Commandments were displayed in court buildings nationwide, it wasn't an offensive action; it was to display our American heritage and, I'm sorry, but we were founded on some version of Christianity. The commandments were there to respect our founding fathers and religious heritage. This shouldn't be a problem since nearly one-third of the world currently practices some form of Christianity.

We can no longer speak of God in public

or pray in schools, yet we obsess about the morals behind nudity. Women can't show their nipples, but men can. The only difference is the fleshy breast of a female. Women's nipples breast-feed babies, so why can't we view them as a dairy product? We don't ban milk, yogurt and cheese — why nipples?

Europe doesn't have an obsession with nudity, and it seems to have a lower number of sexual crimes, too. Nudity doesn't bother them, but it is a moral issue to PC-obsessed Americans. Why does everyone forget that we're born naked?

Since parents are too busy to actually watch their children, we rely on computer chips to control what America's youth sees on television. Although it helps to ensure that young children aren't exposed to things they shouldn't see, it is the epitome of our population's laziness. It also helps to encourage children's curiosity about violence, sex and bad words. Parents need to stop complaining about what their children do if they are never around to raise their own children.

It's obvious that Americans love to find ridiculous things to censor. Just because we can't say things doesn't mean we aren't thinking them. We need to stop dwelling on political correctness because it isn't changing anything: It is only superficializing it.



Laura
Murphy

The Concerned Student:**Best seller lacking literary worth**

Between the first and second helpings of turkey, my family's Thanksgiving conversation turned to the Rosslyn Chapel in Scotland. My grandfather talked of the Chapel's significance to the family, and my grandmother mentioned its role in Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code*.

When I voiced my extreme dislike for this novel, my family launched an intense interrogation, not understanding how anyone could hate it, but I struggle to understand how anyone actually could enjoy the idiocy that is Dan Brown. Since everyone is eager to proclaim an ardent admiration for Brown, maybe we should stop and fully digest *The Da Vinci Code*.

As an avid reader and a logophile, I do have a right to dislike this book. Just because a book tops *The New York Times* Best seller List, it is not necessarily a worthy read.

Whenever this is mentioned in polite conversation, I am counterattacked with the "Have you read *Angels and Demons*?" argument. I have been given a summary of *Angels and Demons* explaining how it is exactly like its sequel, except that some characters have different names and accents. If I didn't like Brown's style in one book, why would I like it in another?

Indeed, I abhor his style. His method of foreshadowing ignores the conventional definition of the technique: blatantly telling the

reader what will happen is not foreshadowing. There are *Goosebumps* books that have better cliffhangers.

One of the least compelling defenses for *The Da Vinci Code* is that it has allowed intelligent discussion of the Catholic Church's state, and so on, ad nauseam. Maybe I'm just friends with the wrong English majors, but I've yet to be involved in such a discussion.

I am irked by Brown's blatant dismissal of Arthuriana, despite the fact that major events in the novel are set in England, and that the plot focuses on the Holy Grail. In the entire book, he devotes about two lines to the legendary quest.

This is the missed potential that I find to be most bothersome. I am an Arthuriana enthusiast, but I cannot comprehend how a story about the fate of the Grail can overlook such an element. And I shan't even touch his disappointing lack of history beyond the Templar Knights.

One day I will finally go to Rosslyn Chapel, but when I do it will only be for its history. In the meantime, if I want an exciting tale of a college professor seeking the Grail, I'll go watch *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade*.

Yet there is one locker in which nothing remains but the number 15. Neither Ruth nor Mantle have this honor; only the quiet Munson. I'd like to think that, while we can't preserve his dorm room, if we all try to keep a little bit of John's heart and humanity in mind, Rider will be a better place. Rest in peace, John. We'll miss you very much.



Maureen
Zahn

'JOHN' FROM PAGE 8

short, he was the kind of student we think of when we idealize college life.

In the home locker room at Yankee Stadium, space is at a premium. With so many players, coaches and personnel, this is hardly surprising.

**CLIPPINGS FROM RIDER HISTORY****UNWANTED GIFTS**

Dec. 2, 1966 — An intestinal virus epidemic has broken out on campus. Within three days, more than 150 cases were reported.

A RISE IN CAMPUS HOUSING

Dec. 3, 1965 — 2,200 students are accommodated in the dormitories. This is quite a change from seven years ago, when only 175 students lived on campus, and 400 homes located in downtown Trenton were approved for Rider students.

FLOAT OFF TO DREAMLAND

Dec. 3, 1971 — Twin-size water beds are on sale for \$22 on campus.

Letter to the Editor:**A right to bear arms**

I'm writing in response to your Nov. 18 editorial about campus safety.

I couldn't agree with you more that education and vigilance are necessary to ensure a safe environment.

I do disagree, however, with your stance that the Second Amendment is outdated and is a cause of gun violence in American society.

The amendment itself guarantees us the right to use firearms for legal purposes — such as self-protection and hunting, which is still needed to control wildlife populations — not to commit violent crimes against others. Repealing the Second Amendment and instituting further gun-control laws are not the answer.

Law enforcement agencies need to do a better job enforcing the gun control laws that are already on the books. I'm not familiar with all of the details surrounding the tragic 2003 shooting on campus, but I'd bet that the individuals with the pistol were not properly licensed to have it in their possession — and definitely not on campus.

Like drugs, firearms can always be obtained by those outside the law, unless law-enforcement agencies crack down on black market dealers.

Studies have shown that countries with severe and outright bans on firearms, such as the United Kingdom and Australia, have had dramatic increases in violent crime (especially those committed with firearms) after law-abiding citizens have turned in their guns.

Instead of promoting feel-good legislation calling for more bans on firearms, we must attack the societal causes of gun violence and enforce the rules already in place.

— Ed Mayer
Class of 2000

Rider News Executive Editor, 1998-2000

QUOTE OF THE WEEK

"The deep pain that is felt at the death of every friendly soul arises from the feeling that there is in every individual something which is inexpressible, peculiar to him alone, and is, therefore, absolutely and irretrievably lost."

— Arthur Schopenhauer