

# Who is responsible for America anyway?

Walt Disney Pictures edited a scene from their new release "The Program" in which school football team members drunkenly lay on lane division lines amidst oncoming traffic as an exercise in team spirit. This scene has recently been at the center of controversy concerning teenagers that have imitated the stunt, resulting in several injuries and one death.

In recent music history, Time Warner records pulled the song "Cop Killer" from the maiden album of recording artist Ice T's rock band "Body Count", because it may have encouraged hostile or even lethal behavior towards law enforcement officers.

These are just two high profile cases in the ongoing trend of shielding impressionable American youth from creative wrongdoing - wrongdoing that never would have occurred if not for the negligent inspiration of the entertainment industry. *The Review Journal's* Sunday comic section brandished an advertisement put out by the American Family Asso-

ciation, a member of the Evangelical Council For Financial Accountability. The advertisement

thrusts the blame on TV and its advertisers as "the single most significant factor contributing to violence in America".

Exactly how responsible for the welfare of America's children is the entertainment industry? How responsible should they be?

The answer is simple. The entertainment industry - television, music, film, video, etc. is being held accountable for the lemming-like imitative, irrational behavior of our youth. It should not be that way.

What happened to parenting? No one ever points the finger at good old-fashioned upbringing. Are parents absolved from the responsibility of the children they choose to bring into the world?

Of course parents cannot control everything—sometimes kids see what isn't intended for them.

In addition, the entertainment industry should exercise some decorum - called, hmm...ethics. Ex-

cessive decadence in our entertainment venues should not be condoned.

Ah...but what is the official definition of "excessive"? Its all relative, my friends. Another primary concern is that of creative license and the right to free speech.

Messy, messy.

However - why do you suppose these sex, violence, and thrill-seeking laden abominations exist? We, the American public, watch it. Avidly. We want it, we crave it, we demand it. If we didn't, it wouldn't exist. The entertainment industry, just like any other, is out to make the biggest buck possible. They supply what is in demand. To do otherwise would just be bad business.

Let's assume, for argument's sake, that all of us are the minority.

In this case, there are several things to be done. Do not allow your children to see or rent R-rated movies. Do not get cable. If you work, do not allow your child to visit friends until you are home, or trust a responsible adult at the friend's house. Call to make sure your child is where they are supposed to be. If you do not trust your child alone with the VCR, lock it up, and keep the key on your person. In the evenings, only watch PBS. Screen all music coming into your home. Do not allow your child to have a walkman...

The list could go on forever. The point is, as American citizens, we have choices. Whether or not we choose to utilize these options is our own responsibility, no one else's.

Good judgment, good values, and morality are purely subjective. Suggesting that the entertainment industry, the media, or even the government sets the standard, or that they should, is preposterous. We are the people; we set the standard.

"school football team members drunkenly lay on lane division lines amidst oncoming traffic"

We hate sex, violence, and abject stupidity. We never watch MTV, and wish "Beavis and Butthead" would drop dead. We don't want our children to turn into ouzi-toting sex perverts.

## Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor,

In response to James Yohe's column concerning sexual harassment in the Oct. 28, edition of *The Rebel Yell*, I found myself confused and rather annoyed by his commentary. He writes, "The whole sexual harassment movement is merely an attempt by the government to expand its power by politicizing sensitivity." (Just when you thought every conspiracy theory had been tapped...) But even more unnerving, he writes, "When an employer decides to hire a woman, he/she has to worry about her being harassed and the consequences if she is harassed." Once again, blame is placed upon the individual that deserves no such attention. Why didn't you write Mr. Yohe, "When an employer decides to hire a man, they have to first worry about him harassing and the consequences of this harassment." A ridiculous, offensive statement. Just because an individual has the chromosomal makeup of XY, does not inherently mean they will harass others. Why does this logic not extend to women? (By the way, women have been known to harass men. It could happen.) Sexual harassment is not about sex any more that rape is about sex. It is about control and domination. I suppose, ladies, we should carry around an entire suitcase of clothing with us everyday, since different men find different styles provocative. We should not smile because we all know that smiling is a form of flirting, and flirting is an invitation to have our bodies bent backward over a pool table. We should not get a job because we are not man's equal. We should take no responsibility for any aspect of our life or our place in collective society, because we are asking to be harassed, raped, assaulted, as-

sassinated. That is the way of the world, and we have no right to change and shape the tenets of society.

Mr. Yohe, here is a news flash. Despairingly hurtful remarks disguised as sexual innuendo is not a new beast recently sprung full grown from the government's brain. Anita Hill did not create it. It is an attitude so deeply woven into the fabric of society we imagine ourselves naked if it is stripped away. It is the same attitude that feeds the gas fires of rape and assault. It is the same attitude that creates films like *Basic Instinct*, where a woman who is in touch with her sexuality is viewed as inherently dangerous to men. We must start educating all of our children. Now. The answer does not lie in male bashing or in perpetuating rape myths. (The number one rape myth being, "She asked for it.") The answer lies in mutual respect for the other sexes' intelligence and spirit. Sadly, I don't see the dawn of that day anywhere near the horizon.

Sincerely,

Nicole Thomas

2nd year Graduate Student

Playwrighting

Dear Editor,

This truly comes from the heart: Jay Sapovits you are a grade A, class 1, complete BOZO. Didn't your mother ever teach you to think before speaking (or writing as the case may be). Sometimes I choose not to read your column because it is usually uninformed; and if four-year-olds could read, it would even be insulting to their intelligence, but when I do read it, it reaffirms my entertainment of others. Well, that's enough for the insults (I need to vent sometimes). I'm writing in response to "The Sap" column of Oct. 28, "Students Should Manage Alcohol—Not Administrators."

Jay says, "the main concern of Student Affairs director should be allowing students to manage themselves." I agree (for a change). Unfortunately, the brawl at the Silver Bowl clearly says that under certain conditions students don't manage themselves, and they cause undue grief to have the responsibility to ask themselves, "What are the conditions under which students don't control themselves?" They ask themselves this because they are paid to serve the students, and in their response to the brawl they serve the students by protecting the reputation of our institution, and by preserving the public's safety.

My next concern with Jay's article evolves in the question, "What's wrong with a hand stamp?" The stamp is an effort to comply with the laws that state no one under the age of 21 is allowed to consume alcohol. Everyone over 21 needs to get stamped so that there is no question of who is legal to drink and who is not. (Jay, if you wash with soap you can get that bothersome stamp off with the first rinse.)

Sincerely,

Rover J. Williams

English Major

Senior

Dear Editor,

I was a little upset with your Oct. 21, 1993 issue of *The Rebel Yell*. I am referring to the Buddy Rich photo on page nine.

Many Jazz historians do consider Rich the greatest drummer of all time. I did not approve of your writer's headline declaring Buddy Rich the world's greatest jazz drummer.

These are touchy words to Gene Krupa fans like myself. I feel that Krupa was a much better drummer than Rich, but in a headline I would never declare Krupa the best because I have great respect for all the Buddy Rich, Max Roach, and Chick Webb fans who stand behind their choices of all-time greatest drummer.

I love Gene Krupa because he had such an energetic and relentless approach to his drumming. He was a few years older than Rich and was the first big-name jazz drummer with an almost Elvis-like following. Gene Krupa was also a member of the world-famous Benny Goodman Quartet consisting of Krupa, Goodman, Lionel Hampton and Teddy Wilson.

Jazz historians declare Rich the king because he only recently passed away. Krupa died 14 years before Rich and I feel that Gene was forgotten by many fans and historians. By writing this letter, I wanted to stir the memories of a true jazz legend and that legend is named Gene Krupa.

Curtis Reynolds