



Associated Collegiate Press /  
National Scholastic Press Association  
All American  
1984 1985 1986  
1987 1988 1989  
1990 1991 1992  
Regional Pacemaker  
1988  
Journalism Association  
of Community Colleges  
First in General Excellence,  
Northern California  
Fall 1994  
General Excellence  
Fall 2000  
General Excellence  
Fall 2004

**Editor in chief:** Sean G. Crawford  
**News editor:** Aman Mehrzai  
**Opinion editor:** Olivia Speranza  
**Features editor:** Alisha Francisco  
**Sports editor:** Steven Chavez  
**Photo editor:** Shari Wargo  
**Layout editor:** Tony C. Yang  
**Cartoonist:** Aden Scott  
**Staff writers:** Frankie Addiego, Britney Bindel, Clifton M. DerBing, James Hendra, Meenu Kaushal, Tahsin Khan, Wendy Lao, Jessica Losee, Marc McCord, Roun Tamaki, Tau Wang, Randal Woo, Nick Zambrano  
**Photographers:** Inez Black, Lawrence Gerrero, Daniel Kwan, Charlie Hebison, Melody Marquez, Shari Wargo, David Mohammadi  
**Ad manager:** Corie Howell  
**Adviser:** Bill Parks  
**Printer:** F-P Press



Offices are located in Room 5310 on campus, 43600 Mission Blvd., Fremont 94539-5884. Call (510) 659-6075. Fax: (510) 659-6076. E-mail: monitor@ohlone.cc.ca.us

Opinions expressed in the *MONITOR* are those of the respective authors and are not necessarily those of the staff, the college or the Associated Students of Ohlone College. Unsigned editorials reflect the majority view of staff members. Advertising material is printed herein for informational purposes and is not to be construed as an expression of endorsement or verification of such commercial ventures by the staff or college.

The *MONITOR* is funded by the district, by the Associated Students of Ohlone College, and through advertising revenue.

The *MONITOR* is a member of the Associated Collegiate Press, Journalism Association of Community Colleges, Community College Journalism Association, California Newspaper Publishers Association, College Media Advisers and Society of Newspaper Design.

OPINION

# Give me my freedom of speech or give me death.

By **JESSICA LOSEE**  
Staff writer

An article in *USA Today* stated that a poll of 112,003 high school students found that 36 percent of the students feel that the government should approve newspaper stories before being published.

Just to refresh your memory, the first amendment states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the

people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

It amazes me that people are willing to have the government revert back to oppressive standards, which were felt by our ancestors when the British were still in control of our colonies.

The call for more control over what people can say and do has been recently renewed since the events of September 11. These freedoms, which were previously considered natural, have been withered under reforming bills passed

by congress. Including the infamous Patriot Act, and the Patriot Act II. Something is obviously wrong when a nation is so paranoid of terrorism that airlines must search passengers' shoes for potential weapons, including plastic knives and one-inch-long Swiss Army blades.

Yet, even with the threat of other terrorist attacks, there is no reason for people to ask for the universal freedom of speech to be discarded. If some do, they are denying the foundation on which our fair nation was built. And

frankly, I won't stand for it. I'd rather move to a deserted island and have a volleyball as my only friend.

There is no doubt that most of the nation doesn't understand the rights they inherit as citizens of this nation and if it were up to them, all published works would be threatened.

Without freedom of speech, I would not be able to write the preceding statements, nor any other considerably analytical or confrontational sentiments. Yet newspapers would only be the

beginning. Before anyone realized it, the government would have controversial books, such as Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn*, burned for its portrayal of *Huckleberry's* friend Jim, who is also a slave.

In the end, asking for limitations on our freedom of speech would ultimately result in the complete downfall of our relatively free society as a whole. Not only would we lack the freedom of speech, but also all of our basic freedoms as listed in the Constitution.

# Newsflash: attacking Bush doesn't matter anymore

By **FRANKIE ADDIEGO**  
Staff writer

On Monday morning, I woke up to read that a tape had surfaced with President George W. Bush admitting that he used illegal substances as a lad. Eeek! Horrors! Drugs are a vile thing to be abhorred by society, and people who believe in them don't believe in themselves. But we all know what's coming.

They're all going to talk about

how horrible it is that our president was a "drug addict" (whether or not he was ever "addicted") and that someone so morally defunct leading our country is just awful.

For what it's worth, and that may not be much, I'm here to just ask the Left if it's really necessary. I mean, he's in his second term, so it's not like he can lose another election. If Bush gets impeached, the only person in the universe that the Left hates more than Bush is Dick Cheney,, who will then become the Presi-

dent. Ultimately, really, is there any point in going out of your way to hate someone? More importantly, is it really the "liberal" thing to do?

First, isn't one of the Left's deepest beliefs that a man can change? It used to be the case. After all, isn't that why so many on the left oppose the death penalty? By all accounts, Bush has dramatically changed his ways.

Secondly, don't liberals often complain about how we're losing all of our privacy? Many a liberal professor has complained

before his or her class about the intrusive nature of cameras at traffic lights, the use of the Internet to pirate credit card numbers, and the fact that our government can now find out what library books we've checked out. Yet, here's a man whose friend (by the name of Wead, by the way) tape recorded him and went on to use it to some book about him. Do I really need to explain the problem there? Now some liberals, right or wrong, feel that Bush is personally responsible for some of our supposed loss of privacy. That's a

topic for another time, but even if you have come to that conclusion, do two wrongs make a right? In other words, shouldn't the privacy police be up in arms over this?

This controversy does actually seem to have petered out within a short period of time. However, there are still those who think that what Bush did was utterly inexcusable. I implore them to ask themselves what they would do if it was somebody they didn't hate inherently.

CAMPUS COMMENT >>>

# Should newspapers be allowed to be published without government approval?



**MICHAEL STEFFECK**  
Chemistry

"Sure, why not? I believe in no government censorship."



**GABRIELE QUILLMAN**  
Undecided

"Yes."



**RACHEL SHERMAN**  
English Instructor

"Yes, people should have freedom of speech."



**MARJAN PRIZADA**  
Pre-law

"I think it should be controlled to a degree, alot of information is coming out that isn't accurate anymore."



**KAMRAN ARABI**  
Theater

"No, newspapers could bring up conflicts with the government."