

## Model minority need not be inscrutable

Veteran LPGA pro Jan Stephenson's recent comments about female Asian golfers on the tour hurting the image of the game, and her statement about their "lack of emotion and inapproachability," as quoted widely by the sports media was very interesting to me, as an Asian-American male who never ever tried the game of golf, much less ever wanted to. Stephenson later apologized profusely for making such a "racial comment" against several top Asian golfers. Korean-born players Grace Park and Se Ri Park just happen to be at the top of the standings, just as Tiger Woods has dominated his male counterparts on the PGA.

What bothers me more is the lack of understanding in this country among many non-Asians about whom Asian-Americans really are. After all, it's not like all Asian-Americans are alike. We could be Japanese, Okinawan, Korean, Filipino, Singaporean, Chinese, Burmese, Cambodian, Vietnamese or we might be a racially-mixed Hapa, an Asian one of whose parents is Asian. Or we might be, like me, a Chinese-American immigrant who lived most of his youth in the Mississippi Delta area made famous by playwright Tennessee Williams. Also, depending on how long we have lived in the United States, or where we lived, we might indeed have become "unemotional and unapproachable" for reasons as legitimate as our lack of fluency in the English lan-



**Chat Sue**  
Guest Commentary

just arrived in America only several years ago, and if we were older than 14 years old, our spoken English might not be as good as that of a native-born person. And finally, even if some of us cannot among ourselves figure out which one of us is from what Asian country, that's OK too.

In my freshman diversity class, I have had my students review a humorous Web site, aptly called [www.alllookslike.com](http://www.alllookslike.com), which allows the viewer to determine what country of origin some pictured

guage like most natives, or because we might be just plain shy, or both. We might be third generation Americans, like Ronald Takaki, the University of California Berkeley scholar and Asian-American historian-one of my heroes - whose grandparents emigrated from Japan to Hawaii more than 100 years ago. And yet, he is still asked by strangers what foreign country he is from.

Or we might have just arrived in America only several years ago, and if we were older than 14 years old, our spoken English might not be as good as that of a native-born person. And finally, even if some of us cannot among ourselves figure out which one of us is from what Asian country, that's OK too.

In my freshman diversity class, I have had my students review a humorous Web site, aptly called [www.alllookslike.com](http://www.alllookslike.com), which allows the viewer to determine what country of origin some pictured

Asians hail from.

Unfortunately, my score was pretty bad when I tried to guess by using my so-called "Asian" power of intuition, ending up being as bad as any 18-year-old Caucasian student in my class. You might want to try this yourself, and once you see your scores, you will see what I mean.

Asian-Americans have a sense of humor, regardless of our country of origin, or where our parents came from, or how old we are. What many of us are beginning to find disheartening are such things as the unwillingness of some Americans to really get to know us as individuals apart from our country of origin. How many times has anyone asked an Asian what country they are from?

But mostly, we do not like being referred to by the American mass media and some political and social commentators as the "model minority."

This is what is considered a positive stereotype, but it's a vast oversimplification about our cultures, our personal histories and about us as individuals.

Don't lump Asian-Americans together, because we are each uniquely different. And heaven forbid, don't use this false image as a sledge-hammer to tell black Americans how they too should be more like us. That's not fair to the different histories that African-Americans have in the United States, as well as Asian-Americans.

## Video games do more harm than good

**Robert D. Leitch**  
Contributing Writer

It is entirely absurd to believe that one can engage in many of today's vicious video games and be unaffected by them.

This controversial topic has gained renewed interest in light of recent discussions concerning the Columbine shootings. Consider the following ideas:

Many would argue that violent video games harm children by making them more aggressive and destroying their natural concern for their fellow man. For example,



a recent narrative on National Public Radio explained that some games are derivatives of programs developed by the military for new recruits. They are designed to condition troops to kill people, and are used to help them overcome the inhibition to take human life. Therefore, how can one even suggest that children can play these games for hours each day and not be affected?

Moreover, this multibillion-dollar industry is bringing millions into governmental coffers, and the government appears to be content. Retailers claim the games are not to blame for school shootings, and that they should not be responsible for controlling who purchases them.

Furthermore, merchants maintain it is the parents' duty to know what their children are doing. These arguments are faulty for a few reasons. First, these peripheral arguments have nothing to do with the real issue of whether or not the games should be permitted on store shelves. After all, adults continue to play them, and it has recently been reported that the DC snipers trained using the video game "Halo" in order to desensitize themselves to killing.

Second, does parental knowledge make it any less dangerous? We are not currently using this same silly logic when it comes to drugs. Does one postulate that drugs should be available on store shelves, and we will leave it up to parents to watch what their kids are doing? Unquestionably no!

Last, if retailers do not have to account for who purchases the games, maybe we should just eliminate the drinking age and leave it up to parents to ensure their children refrain from alcohol consumption.

If merchants are not going to enforce the age limits on aggressive video games, why should we be concerned with enforcing the drinking age?

On balance, if one disagrees that these games cause teens to commit murder, maybe one should consider that alcohol may not be the cause of a car accident involving a drunken teenager.

It may just be that the phone or a radio distracted the individual. Violent games are very suspect, but the government continues to allow them to be sold while research is done.

If a food item were suspected of causing some physical harm, the government would immediately prevent public access while research was performed.

Additionally, if one was suspected of committing murder, he would be quickly apprehended until it was determined if he were guilty. Nevertheless, suspect video games continue to be sold in spite of realistic concerns and viable arguments.

## Censorship and lack of sense limit free speech

**Travis Huisken**  
Staff Writer

Our recent history shows a great number of people — from Ludacris and Snoop Dogg to Rush Limbaugh and Michael Savage — getting pulled out of the spotlight for presenting a message that some people group or other has found overwhelmingly offensive. What should the limits be on our "free speech?"

Even our own presidents have apparently had differing opinions on this matter. B.J. Lossing in his book "Lives of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence," wrote that a foreigner visited Thomas Jefferson's White House to inquire as to how America's unprecedented form of government operated so successfully. Picking up a newspaper libeling the third president from the president's very desk, the visitor asked, "Why do you not hang the man?" An amused Jefferson answered, "Put the paper in your pocket, and on your return to your country, if anyone doubts the freedom of our press, show it to him, and tell

him where you found it."

President Franklin Roosevelt evidently had a different take on the First Amendment. Agitated by the damage one of his critics was doing to his public image, FDR angrily suggested to a magazine editor that John T. Flynn "should be barred hereafter from the columns of any presentable daily paper, monthly magazine or national quarterly."

Today, Michael Savage boldly goes where few men dare to go, insisting that illegal immigration from Mexico has all but utterly destroyed California, and that the leftist elite are perverting our culture with their insatiable lust for forcing moral relativism down the throats of our children. Many consider his angry rants to be nothing short of "hate speech," yet his talk show is the fastest growing show on your radio dial.

Wanting to capitalize on his overwhelming success, MSNBC hired Savage to do a weekly television show. After about two months of staying in character, his so-called "hate speech" got him fired.

He didn't get fired because he lost

his audience, thereby losing the market for his program. No, he was fired because he offended a minority of people who use lobbying and legal strong-arming to work as activists in shutting down people who don't speak within politically correct parameters (see the definition of fascism).

As we see, to Jefferson, free speech is a principle that must not be undermined for anyone's personal interests, unless and until an actual injury is at stake.

In his only full-length book, "Notes on the State of Virginia," he writes, "it does me no injury for my neighbor to say there are twenty gods, or no god. It neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg."

The Voyager recently printed an article which proclaimed Savage's fans must be, among other things, "ignorant." To this I respond: then dispel that ignorance. Take Savage's audience away from him, not his podium. The answer to Savage's "hate speech" is not suppression, but more speech.

Explain why he is wrong, and his audience will have no interest in listening anymore.

When he loses his audience — and only when he loses his audience — he will fade into obscurity. Incidentally, his is still the fastest growing radio show in the country.

When we censor someone by removing their podium instead of removing their audience, the logical end is terrifying. If Savage can be punished for hating a people group, you can then be punished for hating an ideology. We soon find ourselves being fined or punished for merely having ideas that do not conform to those of whoever holds the fascist power of censorship.

The answer to hate speech is more speech. Not censorship. What happened to Michael Savage would probably be agreeable to leaders like President FDR and Josef Stalin (whom FDR affectionately referred to as "Uncle Joe"), but it would have our founding fathers rolling in their graves. Americans are supposed to have free speech.

Speech is not free when it must conform to the narrow definitions of today's cultural fascists who have appointed themselves as modern

## No one needs beauty tips from a cereal box

**Jennifer Smith**  
Contributing Writer

Can I eat my cereal without having to be preached to about how I need to be beautiful? I bought some cereal the other day. It's called Smart Start. It's advertised as sweet crunchy flakes, rice and oat clusters cereal. Sounds a lot like Nut-N-Honey I thought, and it's on sale. This is a winning combination any day.

The next morning, when I sit down to breakfast, I open the box and start eating. It's cereal, nothing good, nothing bad, but then I look at the side of the box and see "Feel beautiful inside and out." I dropped my spoon and read closer.

Where most cereals advertise toys and cartoons, it was advertising women's beauty products beneath an ad that said, "Beauty is more than the mirror reflects.

It's also how you feel on the inside. So, wake up to a healthier, more beautiful you with Kellogg's Healthy Beginnings, a line of cereals that provides nutrition women need. Then, look as beautiful as you feel with these leading beauty care products. Give every day a beautiful start, inside and out."

When I turn on the television, I see ads for make-up, clothes and underwear all telling me that I need to be skinny and pretty to get noticed. When I turn on the radio, I hear that I need a tan to make me beautiful. Who cares that it also is a leading suspect for skin cancer. Billboards for the Psychedelic Shack tell me that "tattoos are hot," and countless others tell me that their products will highlight my eyes. I've never even met a man who cared about my eyes. All that they care about is my torso.

Stop preaching. I'm already converted. I buy thongs, and I use expensive skin lotion. My make up costs more than the national budgets of some small

countries, and my closet is brimming with clothes. Just leave me alone. I'm one of you.

I go to the tanning salon. My lipstick is expensive and supposedly makes me beautiful. I even take my dog to be trimmed at the salon. How ridiculous is that? I get professional haircuts for my dog!

Something is wrong with me. Something is wrong with all of it. The media blitz from all sides has so discombobulated my brain that even this ad on the side of my Smart Start cereal is starting to make me want some Crest Night Effects teeth whitener.

"Whiten your smile while you sleep. It's two times better than the leading daytime paint-on whitener!" Two times! Two times! That deserves to be said twice! Wake up America. Eat your cereal, and let your breakfast convince you to be more beautiful because you never are until you have spent a lot of money.

## Letters to the Editor

This letter is in response to the liberal staff writer, Terese M. Jordan, published in the Oct. 22 edition of The Voyager.

I have a minor in psychology, and everyday I look through the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders for the heading, "Bleeding Heart Liberals!" Where do these people come from? The derogatory article written by Terese M. Jordan about the "right wing's

message of hate" is a great example of a case study. Jordon thinks Rush Limbaugh and Michael Savage lie to the American public about the social climate in this country, but maybe if you left-wing loonies would open your "pierced" ears for a moment you might actually learn something that you frankly do not want to hear. The social situation in this country is crap, and it all started with what Rush Limbaugh called the "feminist-Nazi" movement.

Everywhere we look today, there are people hiding in the proverbial "corner" with a dunce hat on because they said something naughty or INSENSITIVE about an oppressed people. But you know what? Everybody is in that corner for misbehavior. Why do we continue to allow people to be so individualistic and encourage them to do whatever they want to do? Don't you people get it? All Limbaugh and Savage are trying to point out is the obvious, and

that is WE NEED A MORAL FOUNDATION IN COUNTRY !!

People need a platform of ethics, and that is what this country has had until recently. But in today's society anything goes, right? If your child likes to watch Jerry Springer, it's OK. If

your child is "born" bi-sexual, maybe he'll have sex with mom and dad, right? If your boy likes to dress like a woman, he's just trying to express himself, true? Basically what I am trying to say is that you people have a problem with authority. Everyone wants to do whatever they want to and do away with tradition in our society. I don't know about you, but I think there is a certain positive aspect to being close-minded. Change is not always a

good thing. Look around us people!!! We have people wanting to take "God" out of the pledge. We have people taking down the Ten Commandments in judicial buildings. We are allowing same sex marriages. We accept people sleeping and living together out of wedlock! And we have the nerve to wonder why our society is being destroyed! Get a clue. Have some self-control.

**Sean Riffenburg,**  
**Gulf Breeze**

## VOYAGER

The Voyager is produced weekly by students of the University of West Florida and is partially funded by Student Activities and Services fees with assistance from the Office of Student Affairs. This public document was promulgated by the president of the University at an annual cost of \$,275 per copy. Opinions expressed do not necessarily represent the views of UWF, the Voyager or its staff.

Advertiser and advertising agency will indemnify and hold harmless The Voyager, and its staff, for all contents supplied to publisher, including text, representation and illustrations of advertisements printed, and for any claims arising from contents including, but not limited to defamation, invasion of privacy, copyright infringement, plagiarism, and in the case of a pre-printed insert, deficient postage.

The Voyager is printed by the Press Gazette, in accordance with Florida Law. The above information is presented in compliance Section 283.27 of Florida Statutes. All contents © 2003 Voyager.

### FALL 2003 STAFF

**EDITOR IN CHIEF**  
Carmen Reynolds

**NEWS EDITOR**  
Kris Thoma

**FEATURES EDITOR**  
Jessica Leigh Jones

**ASSISTANT FEATURES EDITOR**  
Christina Tilton

**SPORTS EDITOR**  
Andrew Kilgo

**PHOTO EDITOR**  
Ron Besser

**STAFF PHOTOGRAPHERS**  
Jeff Meffert  
Greg Miller  
Mark Lane

**COMMENTARY EDITOR**  
William Bolen

**COPY EDITOR**  
Katherine Goldsberry

**PRODUCTION**  
Tammy Leytham

**STAFF**  
Merit Claire  
Melissa Cook  
Travis Huisken  
Josephine Rios  
Amber Gay  
Mae Humiston  
Mara McDermott  
Rebecca Warren  
Chris Louie  
Bethanne Sevcech  
Geoff Watts  
Ted King  
Megan Youngblood  
Megan Martinez  
Luis Ferreiro  
Christina Tilton  
Robert Pennebaker



Shanna Hawkins  
Peter Chase  
Maurice Moulton/FWB Campus  
Bryan Meyers  
Terese Jordan  
Richard Berger  
Justin Pizza  
Kathleen Ortiz

**BUSINESS MANAGER**  
Beverly Kelly

**ADVERTISING MANAGER**  
Randy Schilling

**CIRCULATION MANAGER**  
Reynaldo Soares

**FACULTY ADVISOR**  
Gary Ghioto

**ONLINE EDITION**  
Marcus Ditty-Webmaster  
Dan Kettinger  
Phyllis Wells

## POLICY

Letters to the Editor must be signed and include the author's address and telephone number for verification purposes. Letters must be less than 250 words and are published as space allows. Letters to the editor do not necessarily represent the views of the Voyager staff. The Editor reserves the right to edit letters or to refuse to publish letters. Deadline for letters is noon Friday before the date of publication. Guest commentary is also welcome and follows the same guidelines.

**YOU CAN E-MAIL ALL LETTERS TO THE EDITOR AT**  
**voyager@uwf.edu**  
**ATTN: EDITORIAL**  
**or drop them by Bldg. 36,**  
**Room 120**