

## Editorial:

### Student equals broke

It is a fact as constant as death or taxes; a college student is broke, plain and simple. For a resident, college is a very strange environment to be in as far as money and spending are concerned. Basic needs are pretty much provided for. A resident has shelter, food and a bed, the bare essentials. So, whatever money that a resident has is devoted to extras, things like snacks, entertainment, and, for many, alcohol.

At the beginning of a semester there is a tendency to feel almost wealthy as far as college students are concerned. Most of us have money from working over a break, others get a bit from their parents before returning to school. So we go to movies, go to places we normally wouldn't go to like Wal-Mart and even Home Depot and just buy stuff.

Then a month goes by and the ATM tells you that your balance is around \$1.75 and your Bronc bucks are a distant memory. The money goes and it goes fast. Trying to scrape together cash and borrowing from friends for the rest of the semester is not a wonderful experience and it has a tendency to make friends into enemies. And we all want to avoid those excruciating calls home begging for a few dollars.

The student financial burden is no lighter on the shoulders of commuters. Most commuters have a job, and have to pay for gas, car maintenance and a bevy of things that residents don't have to worry about.

There are alternatives, of course, and they should be examined in an effort to help all of us who are strapped for cash better our situation. There's always the possibility of an on-campus job but there aren't very many of them and the majority don't pay very much. However, the convenience of a job with flexible hours that a resident can walk to is a very valuable thing.

Then there is always the option of a job in the real world, off-campus, but that can often cause more complications since one must mold one's school life around one's work schedule. That means the weekends are usually sacrificed to the holy pursuit of a paycheck, a sacrifice that not all are willing to make.

Whatever type of job one has, it will still add to the general stress level of your life. So however you earn your money, you have to remember to stretch it as far as it will go. Try to watch those 3 a.m. Cluck-U orders, the \$5 packs of cigarettes, the Blockbuster rentals and the PS2 games. Still, we have to enjoy ourselves, right? Supposedly these are the best years of our lives.

This is college. We have the rest of our lives to worry about bills and paychecks. There's only one thing we can do to avoid the pressure of being flat broke. If we are wise with our funds, we won't be forced to lock ourselves into the vicious consumer cycle of earn and spend, just yet anyway.

*This weekly editorial expresses the majority opinion of The Rider News editorial board and is written by the Opinion section editor.*

**Letters to the Editor:** *The Rider News* welcomes letters on all subjects of interest to the campus community. Letters must be typed and include the name, address, phone number and signature of the author for verification. Send to *The Rider News* via e-mail (ridernews@rider.edu), campus mail, or hand deliver to Centennial House. All letters must be received by midnight Monday preceding publication. *The Rider News* reserves the right to edit all letters for space and clarity.

### QUOTE OF THE WEEK

**"Education... has produced a vast population able to read but unable to distinguish what is worth reading."**

— G.M. Trevelyan

### THIS WEEK IN HISTORY ...

#### Oct. 9, 1940

This day is John Lennon's birthday. He was born in Liverpool, England and went on to gain fame in the rock band The Beatles. In the midst of his profound solo career he was killed by an assassin's bullet.

#### Oct. 9, 1000

Supposedly on this date explorer Leif Erikson and his party landed on the North American coast near present day Newfoundland.

#### Oct. 12, 1492

Christopher Columbus arrived in the Bahamas on this day.



### Letters to the Editor:

#### Parking peeve

I admit I'm a freshman, and am new to everything here, but quite honestly, I think that the tickets issued here are RIDICULOUS! God forbid that some of us leave our cars in front of our dorms for five minutes so we can unload the heavy stuff we have to bring to our rooms, we get \$80 tickets thrown in our faces.

And the price that the tickets start at, I see no need for it. My dad was a cop for

27 years and even he was shocked at the prices of some of the tickets they issue to us students.

I'd LOVE to hear security's excuse for such hefty fines, cause quite frankly, I think it's a rip-off!

Kelly Chenker  
Freshman

#### Soccer victory overlooked

I was disappointed to see in Sept. 27 issue of *The Rider News* such minimal coverage of the men's soccer team's 3-2, double-overtime win over Princeton on Sept. 25.

The Broncs' victory was capped by Sean O'Hare's goal off a feed from freshman Sandro DeCristofaro 5:55 into the second overtime. It was their first victory over Princeton since 1997 and only their third win in 18 meetings with the Tigers. The other goals for Rider came from seniors Jake Trainor and Brett Aefsky, who tied the game at 2-2 with 3:26 left in regulation.

The game recap was featured on the front page of *The Trenton Times*' sports section on Sept. 26 and the game itself

also was carried by CN8, which televised it at least twice.

With the attention the game received from the external media outlets, I feel the story probably should have been more than a one-paragraph mention in the campus newspaper.

This was truly a special victory for the Rider men's soccer team and should have received the coverage it deserved in the pages of *The Rider News*.

Brian J. Kelley  
Rider Web Coordinator  
Class of 1997

### The Rider News EDITORIAL STAFF

**EXECUTIVE EDITOR**  
Laura Sass

**MANAGING EDITOR**  
Dana Lynn Flatekval

**NEWS EDITOR**  
Dave Barry

**ASSISTANT NEWS EDITOR**  
Michael D. Lovullo

**FEATURES EDITOR**  
Vincent Civitillo

**OPINION EDITOR**  
David Maccar

**SPORTS EDITOR**  
Jared Vichko

**WEB EDITOR**  
Vincent Civitillo

**PHOTOGRAPHY EDITOR**  
Jennifer Kuhn

**BUSINESS MANAGER**  
Jaclyn Oceanak

**ADVERTISING MANAGERS**  
Haley Ross  
Shea Nelson

**HEAD COPY EDITOR**  
Terri Swan

**DELIVERY MANAGER**  
Joe Kilman

**CO-ADVISERS**  
Dr. E. Graham McKinley  
Dr. Thomas Simonet

**Innuendos:****Is it just a game?**

In the English language there are many sports terms which are also used as slang to describe sex. This makes me wonder if sex is really just a sport.

If sex is a game, it must have rules. These rules are learned from experience and constantly change. As social norms change, so do the rules.

Men were once the winning team, but more recently, women haven't been too far behind. The reason for this is that the new rules have allowed women to even the score.

No longer does a woman have to be at a disadvantage to the more sexually aggressive man. Women have developed their own plays over the years, which make the sport all the more interesting.

Like many other sports, there are intramural leagues as well. Men compete against other men and women compete with other women. I feel that these "leagues" are meant for the pure purpose of validation. It can boost an individual's personal score, or as you might call it, his or her ego. The male players would then be able to brag



**Tim Green**

about their game-winning homerun while the female players tell their teammates about the male's handicaps.

If sex is a sport, it is not without spectators. We are witnesses to the game everyday. We watch our friends play the game and sometimes we root for them and sometimes we don't. We also engage in sports talk everyday. We gossip about who hooked up with who and who cheated on who. It is as if society is a sports talk radio station that is on 24/7. On this station we all play the roles of commentator, expert and listener.

As the sport of sex continues, we will keep our eyes and ears open in the hopes of seeing the next Hail Mary pass, hearing about the next amazing sex story, and possibly even scoring ourselves. There is only one more question to answer: who's winning?

**A Citizen's Voice:  
Irate about Iraq**

What a mess this Iraqi situation is!

On one side, we have angry Republicans proclaiming that by not removing Saddam Hussein from power we leave ourselves open to another attack, one that could rival Sept. 11. And they may be right. Could we live with ourselves if another attack occurred, one that we could have prevented?

On the other side, however, equally angry Democrats argue that we have absolutely no proof that Hussein is building weapons of mass destruction (WMD), let alone that he is willing to use them on America. And, as they point out, do we really have the right to declare war based on mere suspicion?

For over a decade there has been conflict between the United States and Iraq. It all began with the Gulf War in the 90s. By the end of that war, it was discovered that Hussein was only about six months away from the completion of a powerful nuclear device. It was never completed, but it came very close. Sanctions were directed at Iraq, aiming to lessen the amount of raw material Hussein would have access to in order to limit his opportunities to build weapons of mass destruction. The years following the Gulf War consisted of the United Nations trying constantly to get weapon inspectors into Iraq to make sure the sanctions were working but rarely succeeding. Hussein rejected them time and time again, leaving the world unsure as to what kind of power Iraq possessed.

The United States and Britain had been increasing their bombing of Iraq over no-fly zone disputes until the events of Sept. 11 put everything else on hold. Since then America, with Great Britain firmly behind her, has been extending the "axis of evil" scope to include Iraq. In August, Iraq invited UN weapon inspectors to resume talks about continuing inspections, a move Tony Blair of England calls a "game." He considers it a delaying tactic.

So our history with Iraq has been one filled with deception, violence and fear. That cannot be changed now. But we can still determine our future relations.

Bush and Blair are for using an iron fist, giving Iraq an ultimatum with the threat of war. The policy they want implemented is that Iraq has seven days to agree to a complete inspection and 23 days for this to begin. If the Iraqi government raises any objections, the U.S. and England will attack. Hussein will be removed from power and part of the Middle East would be under U.S. and British control. In short, invasion.

There seems to be no concrete evidence that Iraq possesses WMD, although there is certainly no doubt that Hussein has continued trying to build them. The argument for going to war seems to be so we can "get" Iraq before they "get" us, yet we do not know what, if anything, Hussein is planning.

A war means death. There is absolutely no way around that. American citizens will die if this continues. Many more may die if Iraq does attack us, but some certainly will die if we go to war.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, a very dangerous precedent will be set. Any country that wants to invade another country can attempt to justify it with the excuse of pre-emption. How can America then step in and say that others are not allowed to follow a practice we ourselves started?

There are many reasons not to go to war, but it cannot be forgotten that our most important priority is protecting this country and her citizens. If there is a chance that an attack on America could happen again, we have no choice but to do everything in our power to stop it. After Sept. 11 Americans criticized the government for not doing something about the threat we knew existed. This time they are doing something, and trying to do it early enough so that many less people get hurt.

War is never a good option, but sometimes it is the only option. If going to war may prevent an Iraqi attack, or scare other countries into peace, it will have been worth it.

It is a very complicated problem with no clear path for the United States and her allies to follow. Either way leads into a slippery slope in which one wrong move can cost thousands of lives, both American and foreign. It is obvious that a choice has to be made, but how to determine which is the right one? Must it simply be the lesser of two evils? I hope not, for the lesser of two evils is still evil.



**Laura Sass**

**Political Perspective:****Absolutely nothing good about war**

With America's failure to capture Osama Bin Laden, it appears President Bush is beginning to lose support for his new war on terrorism. With Bush's ratings dropping, what better way to gain support and take the eyes of the citizens off our struggling economy than to go to war? Since President Bush and his team of hawks have no international support except from Great Britain for attacking Iraq, we are told we must go at it alone.

First, let me say that Saddam Hussein is a murderous thug and a monster but let's remember that he was the same monster back in the 80s when he was our ally and trading partner. In fact, he was our ally until he invaded Kuwait in what Noam Chomsky has said was simply "stepping on the wrong toes." The United States fully supported Hussein, even when he committed atrocities against the Kurds.

Although the talk of Iraq having

weapons of mass destruction (WMD) may indeed be true, there is still no clear evidence that would justify military action, especially since the U.S. destroyed nearly all of Iraq's weaponry after the Gulf War. Ex-Marine and former weapons Inspector Scott Ritter has even said that Iraq presents "absolutely nothing" of a military threat, and with continued U.S. bombings there is no way Hussein has the capabilities to use his *dirty* weapons against the United States.

It is also important to mention that there are dozens of countries besides Iraq, including the United States, who possess WMD. Are we going to attack all of them? Will Iran or North Korea be next? When will it end?

Let's also remember reports of Iraq having these kinds of weapons are nothing new. Reports of Hussein trying to obtain WMD go back to the 80s; how-

ever, it was the U.S. State Department who defended Hussein claiming he was not a threat. A pre-emptive strike would not only violate international law but it would also endanger the entire world, sending the message that any country can attack another that poses a threat.

That kind of mentality would leave the U.S. open to attack considering we have the most WMDs, and are clearly not afraid to use them. Let's be realistic. Our government has absolutely no concern for liberating the people of Iraq. All the U.S. cares about is replacing a corrupt regime with another corrupt regime; however, this time the regime will know how to follow orders, especially when it comes to matters of oil trade.

Finally, an attack on Iraq would be devastating to our struggling economy.

Senator Joseph Biden, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign

Relations, estimates that with no allies, a U.S. led war on Iraq could cost up to \$100 billion.

If Senator Biden's calculations are correct, attacking Iraq would cost tax payers in N.J. alone close to \$4 billion. Let's stop this war before it goes any further. Write or call your local and state representatives and tell them hands off Iraq!



**Joe Rotkowitz**