

www.pervert.com

The 'male pig' stems from the adolescent perversion of Internet pornography

Once again, American males have proved what sick and perverted creatures they are.

Last week, a columnist in *The Boston Globe* chronicled the not-so-top 10 most searched words on the Internet.



APRIL TOWERLY
opinion editor

Among these words were, in order, XXX, layboy,

and porno and porn. Additionally, only four human beings appear in the Top 100. They are Pamela Anderson (No. 12), Jenny McCarthy (31), Cindy Crawford (36) and Madonna (74).

OK, guys, get off the computer and get a life. I don't expect 21-year-old males to not have sexual curiosity, but looking at dirty pictures doesn't quench the curiosity. It only fuels the fire.

On the "Friendsnet" site, more than 1,300 repulsive sexual profiles are listed. The explicit language and pictures warn Web surfers not to go further unless they are 18 years old or older.

Well, no one's going to know how many high school students or even younger males are making a few peeks on their home computers.

And it's everywhere. I was researching the cure for impotence and found a site that invited Internet surfers with the slogan, "After you see these pictures, you won't need Viagra."

Women aren't looking at selective nude photos of male models every chance they get. The Internet sites that offer pornographic material are very much female-dominated.

It is so sad that men have become so obsessed with sex they have to look at dirty pictures on the Internet and read about "Pervan Kitty" and her fantasies to get a thrill.

Pornography also is the starting point for much more serious issues.

Almost every human has some sort of sexual desire or curiosity. This is normal. What is not normal is to trivialize and de-sanitize something that was created to be a beautiful expression of love between men and women, specifically husbands and wives.

OK, easier said than done. Many students struggle with lust and sexual desires. These things cause internal destruction. And becoming involved in pornography adds to the downward spiral.

Serial killer Ted Bundy had a sick mind and perverse desire to kill beautiful women. In interviews before his death, he attributed much of his mental illness to his early obsession with pornography.

True, not everyone who looks

at a few Playboys becomes a serial killer. However, the men who spend their spare time entertaining pornography do have less respect for women and thus the "typical male," the disgusting, insensitive and perverted pig, is born.

If men would stop looking at pornography, they would stop seeing women as sex objects.

True, some women act like sex objects. It could be argued some women deserve to be treated like sex objects.

I disagree. Women are humans. They may act or dress a certain way because of insecurity, their upbringing or another reason. However, even Persian Kitty has feelings that can be hurt. And treating someone like a prostitute is unacceptable in any case.

Men who entertain pornography treat women this way without even thinking about it. It has become socially acceptable.

The old saying "garbage in, garbage out" rings true in this situation. If people put filthy trash in their minds all the time, it reflects in their words and actions.

However, the men who spend their spare time entertaining pornography do have less respect for women and thus the "typical male," the disgusting, insensitive and perverted pig, is born.

It's just like watching a horror movie. The pictures and images remain in the viewer's mind long after the movie has ended. It causes nightmares.

Similarly, pornography causes its viewers to constantly entertain the images in their minds. It affects their views toward women and sex in general. It trivializes an act that should be very special.

The Bible states the message best. Those who utilize their thoughts for good will find peace of mind.

"Whatever things are true, whatever things are noble, whatever things are just, whatever things are pure, whatever things are lovely, whatever things are of good report, if there is any virtue and if there is anything praiseworthy, meditate on these things . . . and the peace of God will be with you." — *Philippians 4:8*

April Towery is a senior journalism major.



GRAPHIC BY BRAD GRAEBER/THE BATTALION

Playboys and prisoners do not mix

The recent 4th of July holiday offered a stirring reminder of the strengths of our great land. Indeed, this is the freest country in the world.



JOHN LEMONS
columnist

But if one has kept up with the news during the past several weeks, one cannot help but notice that the United States is a bit mixed up at times. Recent headlines show the list of inalienable rights Americans claim as their own is changing.

Unfortunately, the revised list of American rights do not mark progress nor do they make citizens more free. On the contrary, the new American rights are signposts marking this country's journey along the road to becoming a modern-day Sodom and Gomorrah.

Consider the court case resolved last Thursday in which the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled convicts have a right to pornography. That is right, along with leg irons, lock downs and license plate making, Playboy and Hustler are now officially part of the prison experience.

The suit was prompted by a 1993 ban on nude pinups imposed at Arizona's Maricopa County Jail. The county said that inmates harassed female guards by waving pictures from sexually explicit magazines at them. The court, however, ruled that banning nude pictures could go too far.

"We question whether all materials depicting nudity are reasonably likely to be the cause of violence

or a tool of harassment," Judge Betty Fletcher said in an Associated Press report.

The court feared that a ban on nude pictures could apply to more socially acceptable images like classical art or National Geographic photos.

What is truly reprehensible about this case is how the court has undermined the Maricopa County sheriff's ability to maintain discipline in his jail. Here is a situation where it was prudent to ban nude pictures. Female guards, who were just trying to do their job, were being sexually harassed. Surely, those guards are entitled to work in a harassment-free environment.

Moreover, allowing inmates to have pornography seems to be an ineffective way to run a prison. After all, the purpose of prison is to punish and rehabilitate criminals. But allowing prisoners to pin-up nude pictures is no punishment, nor does it aid in prisoner rehabilitation. No, if anything, pornography is a destructive force. It is thought by many psychologists to be addictive.

Indeed, one wonders if pornography was what the framers of the Constitution had in mind when they were laying out the Bill of Rights. Apparently, the core of American rights is life, liberty and the pursuit of adult magazines.

The Maricopa county jail case, however, is not the only disheartening story to appear in the news during the past few weeks. Although Americans can have pornography while serving time in jail, they cannot have prayer while spending time in public school. Just ask Mildred Rosario.

Rosario was fired last month from her teaching job in a Bronx, N.Y. middle school after leading her sixth-grade class in a prayer. On June 8, a student

in Rosario's class asked if a schoolmate who had drowned had gone to heaven. Rosario led the class in a religious discussion that ended with a prayer. During the prayer, Rosario placed her hand on each student's head.

After a parent complained, the Bronx school board fired Rosario.

Rosario's case offers another example of rights being distorted. This time, Rosario's right to express herself has been trampled. Here is a woman, who in good faith, attempted to console her students' grief over the death of a peer.

Although public school classrooms are not the place for teachers to proselytize their religious beliefs, Rosario deserved better treatment than being terminated.

Rosario caused no harm. She left no scars on her students. If anything, she comforted them. Surely, a warning or temporary suspension would have been more appropriate than firing Rosario.

But these days, Americans have so twisted their rights that they want to be free of what is helpful, i.e., prayer, and want to embrace what is harmful, i.e., pornography.

The country is in a frightening state when cons can have porn, but kids cannot have prayer. At least this cloud has a small silver lining — the courts have not yet ruled that kids can have pornography or that convicts cannot pray. Maybe there still is hope.

John Lemons is a graduate student in electrical engineering.

National interests fuel the U.S.' foreign policy

For many people, foreign policy is like another universe — as far beyond their perception as it is from their daily concern. However, President Clinton's recent state visit to China incited a fire storm of controversy as many questioned the real objective of United States foreign policy.



STEVEN GYESZLY
columnist

Even before the official announcement was made, an entire chorus of protest was raised against the visit. The reasons for objecting were as varied as the organizations that made them.

Members of the religious right charged that the United States should not communicate with any country that violates an undefined, yet oft repeated "moral code," while human rights activists pointed towards China's record of suppressing democracy and individual rights.

On their own, in a domestic setting, these are valid complaints. Yet in the field of foreign relations, these views are woefully naive in their focus.

Diplomats are envoys, not missionaries. American foreign policy has never been about creating a global utopia; it is, to paraphrase Daniel Vare, the art of letting another country do what we want. Issues of morality and questions of human rights do have their place in American international diplomacy, but they never interfere with what our country is truly after.

Most Americans use terms ranging from moral outrage to mortal sin in describing the Chinese procedure of the forced organ harvesting of prisoners. As gruesome as this procedure is, we have historically maintained, and even cultivated, relations with other countries guilty of inhumane acts as long as they did not interfere with American interests.

Ironically, if foreign relations were determined strictly on the basis of morality, countries such as France, Germany and Great Britain would cut off all diplomatic ties with us because the United

States maintains the death penalty while all of the European Union nations have abolished it.

Clinton's state visit to China also brought to light the U.S.' relationship with countries that deny their citizens basic human rights.

China is not a democracy and does not pretend to be one. Yet the absence of democracy has never interfered with the U.S.' diplomatic ties with foreign countries.

After all, look at the U.S.' two closest allies in the Gulf: Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. In terms of freedom, about the only difference between communism and a monarchy is that in a monarchy, the secret police have better-looking uniforms.

This nation's history is evidence of the reality of foreign policy. One of the best illustrations is to look back at the events of late 1956. Despite our government's vow to "roll back" communism, the United States refused to help as Soviet tanks invaded Hungary, crushing a Hungarian revolt against the communist regime. Yet at the very same time, the U.S. is willing to start a war in an effort to pro-

tect shipping interests at the Suez Canal.

The U.S.' foreign policy is fueled by domestic needs. We practice international diplomacy because we want something from the other country. Whether it is better access to a foreign marketplace, continued cooperation in regional political affairs or a pledge to send peacekeeping troops, the U.S. gets what it is after, and only then begin discussion on a Joint Declaration of Human Rights.

Some argue that the best foreign policy is one that keeps the U.S. away from most countries. Yet the government practices international diplomacy for one reason — to advance national interests. It is because of our idea of foreign policy — getting what the government really want from other countries while paying lip service to morality and human rights that we have preserved those rights where it counts most: here at home.

Steven Gyeszly is a junior finance major.