CENSORSHIP GENERATION

the millenial attack on free speech
EDITOR’S LETTER

The Saber is back for another semester of providing student-related content.

In this issue we focused on the topic of free speech – on campuses, in communities, and in the world at large. What does freedom of speech really mean for society and a growing generation of millennials?

You might find it surprising that millennials at times seek to limit free speech for themselves and others. For data on national poll results on this topic as well as survey information on what CSU students think about the problem, see the infographic on page 3. For an in depth look at the topic of free speech see the feature on pages 8 and 9.

Other exciting topics in store for you are our big features, including a column on what role sex has in a relationship, how nostalgia is affecting our generation, and how these days students are leaving college later and later.

We are currently looking for new writers, photographers and illustrators to take active roles in our staff. The Saber offers experience and compensation for those who are willing to learn the art of journalism, and the environment is great for making friends and working in a team-based job. Email me for an application at CSUSaberEditor@gmail.com; we are accepting applications until February 20th.

A big congratulations to next semester’s Editor-in-Chief Scott Berson, who will be taking over for me after I graduate this summer. He’s taking on a difficult job, but I know he will be an excellent leader and asset to the team and to the paper itself.

While this issue of The Saber might seem heavy to some of you, we have a fun Marvel and superhero themed issue coming out on February 10th. See you then!

Courtyard 2 Fire Update

How are the residents of O building?

In November resident students involved in the Courtyard 2 fire were relocated to the Holiday Inn on Manchester Expressway after O building was burned down because of a cooking fire.

Gina Sheeks, Ph.D., Vice President of Student Affairs, has confirmed that the students are no longer at the hotel and have all been relocated into dorms once more. As reported in the previous issue of The Saber, the fire displaced 25 students.

No visible repair is underway on O building by the university or Greenhill Apartments, who are currently renting Courtyard 2 to Columbus State University until July 1, 2016.
Free Speech Violations on College Campuses

Lindsay Marchello
Copy Editor
Infographic: Scott Berson

Yik Yak Nightmare: Thaddeus Pryor, a student at Colorado College, was suspended last November for making a joke on the Yik Yak app. Pryor had responded to a post on Yik Yak that read “#blackwomenmatter” with “They matter, they’re just not hot.” The university originally suspended Pryor for two years, but they have since reduced the sentence to 6 months after the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education argued that suspending him violated his First Amendment right to free speech.

Costume Debacle: Erika Christakis, a professor in early childhood education and her husband, Nicholas Christakis PhD, a physician and professor of sociology found themselves in hot water when they challenged an email sent by Yale’s Intercultural Affairs Committee regarding inappropriate Halloween costumes. The two professors were the subjects of student protests after they questioned the intent of the email that aimed to instruct students to avoid wearing culturally insensitive Halloween costumes.

Erika Christakis argued that telling students what costumes they could wear would be infringing on their right to free expression, and her husband came out in support of her statement. Yale students called for the two professors’ resignation for failing to create a safe space. Erika decided not to return to Yale this spring semester and Nicholas went on a sabbatical.

Curtains Called on School Play: Administrators at Saint Mary’s University of Minnesota fired a professor for writing a script for the school play “Medea: A Virgin’s Voice.” David Hillman, the professor in question, wrote a translated script of the Greek tragedy “Medea” that incorporated the use of phallic shaped props. Hillman’s goal was to remain as true to the historical integrity of the play; however, administrators felt that the props were too suggestive and terminated Hillman’s position at the campus after charges of sexual harassment were made. The details of the charges, including the source of the accusations, have not been made clear to Hillman.

A Celebration of Liberation

The Dream Lives Unity Commemoration
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In the early afternoon of Jan. 16, 2016, local corporations, high schools and Columbus State University student organizations gathered to commemorate and celebrate the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King by marching in the MLK: The Dream Lives Unity Commemoration, an event coordinated by Mayor Teresa Tomlinson’s Commission on Unity, Diversity, and Prosperity.

The event program boasted a special guest appearance from Shark Tank’s Daymond John, a 5k run and local talent in the form of high school bands, promising entertainment for all ages. However, the “highlight” of The Dream Lives event—according to the event webpage—was the Unity Processional.

At 12 p.m., all commemoration attendees began to march in solidarity toward the Liberty Theatre and Cultural District, chosen for its history as a “highly frequented cultural hub.” Among the participants were CSU’s student organizations the NAACP Youth and College Division and NPHC “Divine Nine” fraternities (Alpha Phi Alpha, Kappa Alpha Psi, Omega Psi Phi and Phi Beta Sigma) and sororities (Delta Sigma Theta and Alpha Kappa Alpha).

Social media commentary on the event has been overwhelmingly positive, with one local describing it as “bigger and better” each year. With every year drawing a bigger crowd, Mayor Tomlinson’s Commission takes a bigger step towards its goal to “create a community where every individual is valued and presented with equal access to opportunities.”

Should students who use racist, misogynistic or homophobic language be subject to formal discipline from school authorities?
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Are Students Addicted to College?

Are students channeling the idiom of "living in an ivory tower" by prolonging their college stay to avoid facing the real world, or are they simply facing external hardships that are keeping them from graduating on time? Why do some students stay in university for so long? Could it be that they're addicted to the college lifestyle?

The latest information from the U.S. Department of Education reveals that in 2013, 59 percent of first-time, full-time students who began seeking a bachelor’s degree at a 4-year institution in fall 2007 completed the degree at that institution by 2013. That’s six years between freshman fifteen and getting a diploma, and proof that the promise of graduation in four years is, increasingly, a myth. So who are these sticky people?

Spend enough time on campus and you’ll run into various culprits of longtime college occupancy. You can catch the grad who didn’t get enough punishment the first time around. You’ll find the eternal student, who avoids working for as long as possible by accumulating degrees. Sometimes you’ll see the occasional vagabond who just seems to hang around on campus for no reason long after their graduation.

A classic you’ll run into is the indomitable super senior – five or six years into their education and no end in sight. Or perhaps you’ve encountered the indecisive student who decided last week that after three years of political science, they would be better off changing their major to theatre. And if you look really hard, you’ll catch a glimpse of the elusive double-major, double minor, overachieving student as they rush off to study, coffee in hand.

But just as you’ll find all types who are remaining in academia, there are equally reasons as to how this happens. Sometimes the stories people tell are sad; educations have been interrupted by tragic events, and as a result students lose focus or need a break. Many students support themselves, with full-time jobs keeping them in a part-time education. People may have families that need attention more than classwork does. And college is the definition of financial hardship, so for many it is too expensive to continue full time. Students leave and come back. They take too few hours. They fail classes.

At age 27, Tom Ingram, an English literature and creative writing major, has had a long affair with the university experience. “I have been in and out of college since the spring of 2006. In fact, I left high school early for college. I expected to graduate in four to five years, but life has a way of imposing its own designs.”

When asked why he chose to keep coming back Ingram said, “I have stayed in and returned to school because I enjoy it, and that’s that. I could make a good living doing a few things that require no higher education whatsoever, but I prefer the work that does require the education.”

Lance Price, a graduate student who went straight to CSU’s MBA program after
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graduating with a degree in Management, said, “In the final semester of my undergrad degree I was still unsure of my professional direction in life...The reason I decided to stay in school is that at this point in my life I have both the time and opportunity to continue my education, and if I went straight into the workforce I may never have the opportunity or the motivation to go back to school again.”

Students alone are not to blame for extended educations, as many have been frozen by the educational system itself. For some, the inability to get into the right classes because they are offered infrequently or are overcrowded have pushed back graduation dates; inconvenient class rotation can add an extra year to the sentence.

A lack of proper career advising for high school students is blamed for indecision further on. And as for transfer students, the system can derail them if they lose their credits in the switch. Is it really that surprising that students can’t seem to leave on time?

But don’t assume it’s just students who are spending extra years in university. Patrick Jackson, PhD, of the English department, found meaning in this academic atmosphere and has not left it since he began his undergraduate degree at age 23. “The truth is that I fell in love with intellectual life and actively pursued it, often with many great obstacles impeding my way. Working a full-time job, finishing my degree, and trying to get into grad school certainly did not make for an easy path. At the same time, I suppose you could say I was (am?) addicted to the classroom.” Opposed to the ivory tower concept, “When I started taking classes, I felt like I was leaving a very fake and superficial world behind and joining the real world,” said Jackson.

But time is money, and university time is not cheap. The costs of surplus college years include extra tuition, foregone earnings and work experience, and a burden to taxpayers who are subsidizing education. “I think there are many reasons people might stick around campus: friends, timidity of starting a career, etc. Considering the costs of attending college, it’s a real concern. People can accrue a lot of debt before they decide it’s time to leave,” said Jackson.

Nevertheless, it’s not all bad news. “I have worked a number of different jobs, encountered people I would never have otherwise known, and am generally a more well-rounded person than I would be had I gone straight through,” said Ingram.

So the question remains, are students addicted to the safety of school, or are they just unlucky? For now, it seems that the answer is both.
Do you ever see something old and suddenly feel yourself wrapped in a feeling akin to the fuzziest, warmest, coziest embrace you’ve ever felt? Nostalgia is a powerful emotion; it creeps up on you and fills you with a happiness that can be hard to describe. It is defined by Merriam-Webster as “a wistful or excessively sentimental yearning for a return to or of some past period or irrevocable condition.”

With the arrival of cultural phenomena such as adult coloring books and the rising trend of reboots and remakes in entertainment, people tend to confuse nostalgia with Peter Pan Syndrome, a psychological condition in which individuals are resistant or afraid of “growing up”.

Cylina Velazquez, a marketing major in her senior year, believes that the two are not synonymous. “I believe there is a difference. I love nostalgia, but realistically, I want to mature and have a life in which I can share my nostalgia with my kids one day.”

Nostalgia can be both rewarding and bittersweet. John Stevens, a sophomore computer science major, feels that nostalgia enhances his appreciation of things, and that being older helps him “fully comprehend and break down what went into the things from his past.”

It also gives him a “newfound respect for them.” Senior theatre major Amanda Worthington, however, finds that while her nostalgia doesn’t “hold [her] back from appreciating new things,” sometimes the newer thing “just isn’t the same.”

Aside from what Stevens describes as the “fuzzy jolt you get when your brain recognizes something that you haven’t seen in a long time,” what is actually going on with our bodies when we feel nostalgic?

It turns out nostalgia has some surprising features. John Tierney, in his 2013 article for The New York Times, explains that while nostalgia used to be classified as a disorder, it actually has some important benefits.

“Nostalgia has been shown to counteract loneliness, boredom and anxiety. It makes people more generous to strangers and more tolerant of outsiders. Couples feel closer and look happier when they’re sharing nostalgic memories. On cold days, or in cold rooms, people use nostalgia to literally feel warmer.”
So what does nostalgia look like? It can manifest itself in various ways, from photographs to fashion, and from trinkets to entire collections. Velasquez says that she’s a huge Hello Kitty freak. “I own everything from Hello Kitty purses and clothes to huge stuffed animals half the size of me.”

Stevens is “hyped” about the resurrection of French Toast Crunch and finds that old television shows like Hey Arnold! and The Price is Right really bring him back.

Worthington can’t get enough of her favorite childhood video games such as Harvest Moon, Animal Crossing and Pikmin. She also finds that “pretty much every Disney movie, heck, even going to Disney World makes me feel nostalgic” and is “glad the Miyazaki movies [and] Pokemon” have stuck around.

Velasquez admits that sometimes it is hard to find friends who are as nostalgic as she is, and she is often asked “Aren’t you a bit too old for that?” to which “[her] answer has always been no.” And while it may seem to some that nostalgic people have some growing up to do, Worthington says that while nostalgia “can be childish in some cases…that doesn’t mean that we don’t want to grow up.”

“Adulthood can suck,” she acknowledged, “but these sentimental things allow us to appreciate how far we’ve come.”
By Scott Berson and Lindsay Marchello

Controversy erupted at the University of Missouri last November when students protested what they saw as a culture of racism at the school and the inaction of an apathetic administration. The university president, Tim Wolfe, eventually resigned from his position after the school’s football team refused to play any longer.

In the following weeks, similar protests against perceived social injustices flared up at dozens of schools, including Yale, Amherst College, Brandeis University and Claremont McKenna College.

It was not until video surfaced showing protesters at Mizzou physically blocking student journalists from covering the protest that some began to detect a current of unease beneath the passionate calls for justice.

In the video, protesters are seen physically forcing reporters away from the site. At one point, Melissa Click, an assistant professor in the university’s Department of Communication, requested some “muscle” to remove one photographer from the premise, despite his constitutional right to be in the public space.

The occurrences at Mizzou and other universities across the country sparked a larger discussion regarding the state of free speech on public campuses.

Free speech can be a confusing concept to define. Outlined in the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution, the right to freedom of speech guarantees the right to voice opinions openly without fear of governmental interference. This protection covers everyone, from journalists at the New York Times to the Westboro Baptist Church and the rallies of the Ku Klux Klan.

There are certain types of speech that are not covered; libel, slander and threats of violence are all forms of speech regulated by the government.

So where does that leave us at our universities? Colleges house people of many different backgrounds under one roof and the possibility of conflict can be high. But they are also, by definition, centers of learning and free inquiry which depend on an environment free of censorship.

In recent years, there has been a renewed call for limitations on the First Amendment, specifically in regulating offensive speech, or hate speech. Many universities, public and private, have published lists of rules (called “speech codes”) that regulate how, where and when students are allowed to speak. Perhaps ironically, it has mostly been the students themselves who have called for increased administrative regulation of speech. But well-intentioned as their efforts are (most of us could safely agree that racist and sexist language is atrocious), the very concept of speech codes raises some thorny issues.

Most speech codes have at their heart a goal of weeding out and punishing “offensive” speech. But what exactly does “offensive” mean? If someone tells a crude joke at a cafeteria table next to you, is that offensive and worthy of punishment? If a person wears a shirt with a homophobic Senator’s campaign slogan on it, is that offensive and is that student off to the dean’s office?

In America, our historical position has been that we willingly sacrifice some amount of comfort because we feel that the harm of authoritarian censorship outweighs the good of making people “feel” comfortable at all times.

The flip side of this is that anyone who speaks in an offensive way can be verbally challenged in return or simply ignored. What better way to prove someone wrong than making them look like an idiot in an argument? But this isn’t the way the millennial mindset is drifting.

A Yale study found that 51 percent of current students across the country support the use of restrictive speech codes which would punish those who use “offensive” speech. A separate Pew research study found that 40 percent of millennials (those between ages 18-34) favored allowing the government to prevent people from saying things which could be considered offensive to minority groups. Columbus State University’s numbers are even more extreme than the national polls.

Although 96 percent of students surveyed by
The Saber said that the concept of free speech was important or very important to them, over 76 percent said that students who used “racist, sexist, misogynistic or homophobic language” should be formally disciplined by school authorities.

Nearly half of students said that potentially controversial people, like the pro-life protesters of 2015, should not be allowed on campus. Another 24 percent of students said that these groups should only be allowed if they were placed in designated areas on the periphery of campus where people wouldn’t have to see them if they didn’t want to. These free speech “zones” are a common element in many schools that have speech codes (CSU does not).

This change has many instructors worried about the implications on learning. Mariko Izumi, PhD, an Associate Professor and rhetorician in the Communication department, says that there is danger in framing the discussion about offense and personal injury. “It is vital for CSU or any other academic institution to provide both physical and intellectual safety so that there is a genuine room for creative friction—frictions of ideas, opinions, where differences are not threatening to each other...[But when] we begin regulating each other for being ‘offensive’ in how we communicate, then most of us will not be able to speak anywhere, and communication [itself] becomes a danger. That’s a sad prospect.”

Universities, in other words, have an obligation to make the learning environment safe for living and for intellectual debate, but do not have any obligation (nor any real legal ability, at least not at public institutions) to police individual students’ speech for things that could be upsetting, derogatory or offensive to individuals or groups. As public institutions, they must also allow protesters, demonstrators, preachers or any other member of the public to come and speak their minds on campus, as long as it does not significantly affect the day-to-day operations of the University.

This is not at all to say that offensive speech is encouraged, or even okay. But banning it is a dangerously slippery slope, especially in an academic setting based on free exchange of knowledge—even from people with whom we may disagree. As more and more calls for censorship end with wins, students (and all of us) should be aware of what we stand to lose.
Censorship is a scary word. It often calls to mind images of Nazi Germany’s book burnings or Soviet Russia’s photo-altering habits. It holds a connection to brutal dictatorships’ unrelenting regimes. Thankfully, we have nothing like that in America. Right?

Recently, Scholastic recalled a children’s book called “A Birthday Cake for George Washington.” The book, written by Ramin Ganeshram, tells a story about George Washington’s slave chef, Hercules, and his daughter, Delia, as they happily make a cake. According to The New York Times, critics cried out that the book portrayed slavery in an “offensively sanitized” manner. Hercules and Delia are shown happy and smiling, and people were outraged.

Is this censorship? To censor is to remove something from the media due to graphic, offensive, immoral, or harmful nature. Whether or not Ganeshram’s book is offensive, it was removed from shelves due to the overwhelming opinion that it, as Scholastic stated, gave children “a false impression of the reality of the lives of slaves.” That sounds suspiciously similar to the above definition.

Backlash against topics seen as offensive or graphic is becoming dangerously commonplace. This overzealous desire to shelter people from the uncomfortable could cover up the complexities of important issues and render people ignorant and academically vulnerable. So ask yourself, how are people supposed to argue against bigotry if they’re blind to the reasoning behind it?

Cry Wolf

Is it really racist?

We see a situation involving a minority in a tough spot and we automatically cry wolf, calling the situation racist, but why? We have been conditioned by a society that is so terrified of being politically incorrect that we assume the worst.

This anti-racist hive mind has been exacerbated largely by the internet which generates things like fake images of KKK rallies which never happened on Missouri State’s campus, and then the misinformation spreads like wildfire. This trend is poisoning our minds and our ability to rationalize.

This past December, a Muslim couple attacked a holiday party and killed 14 people in San Bernardino. Later a neighbor stepped forward and admitted that he saw the couple and thought about calling the police but didn’t, even though he had seen them involved in suspicious abnormal activity. He hesitated because he was afraid of being called a racist by his neighbors and peers.

When we talk about racism we have to proceed with caution and make sure that we have all of the facts and have ruled out every possible alternative.

When we cry wolf there are many consequences. Rumors spread and cause riots, people become afraid of doing the right thing in fear of being socially exiled, and the public starts to give less clout to situations that are actually racist and need to be stopped. Just like in the children’s story, if we continue to cry that we’ve seen the “racist” wolves, we will be eaten alive by them. And then when we see something really racist, will people believe us, or will they just think we’re overreacting again?
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Censorship Conundrum
What it is and what it looks like
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Children’s book challenged for its portrayal of slave life

CHILDREN’S BOOK CHALLENGED FOR ITS PORTRAYAL OF SLAVE LIFE
The biggest blockbusters of the year used to be originals. Directors created amazing movies like “The Godfather,” “Star Wars,” “Independence Day” and “Mad Max.” Today, the biggest money-makers are a combination of reboots, sequels, spin-offs and revivals, not to mention the influx of box-office breaking comic book films.

Constant remakes, sequels and spin-offs of old films like “The Jungle Book,” “Peter Pan,” “Die Hard” and “The Fast and the Furious” show no sign of stopping. And there’s little reason they should, at least according to economics. The latest “Transformers” film, fourth in the series, grossed over $1.3 billion according to Box Office Mojo, a box office numbers tracking site. The latest Star Wars film shattered multiple records at the ticket office.

Television is following this same trend, with shows like “Pokémon” being reborn every few years, and the tremendous popularity of the return of “Doctor Who” in 2005 after a 16 year hiatus. Some television shows have also made their way to the silver screen, such as J.J. Abram’s “Star Trek,” a rebooted “Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles” and Michael Bay’s explosive “Transformers” series.

While there will always be a rose-tinted love of the old, the lack of new and original content leads to a feeling that the movie industry is simply afraid to make anything new. Thankfully, some filmmakers aren’t embracing the end of originality. Breakout new films like “Ex Machina” have shown that new and “out there” cinema can still sell - the industry just has to trust that people will come to watch.
Here’s a hypothetical for you: You’re in a relationship with a wonderful person. Everything is great between the two of you—you get along so well, you support each other, you talk all the time. Maybe you’re even in love. But suddenly, some rainy evening, something changes.

You realize that you don’t want to have sex again. There’s no clear reason—no secret lover, no sudden trauma. You just don’t think it’s for you anymore. Fair enough, right? And after some thought, you tell your partner that you still want to be with them, but you just don’t want to have sex from now on. And you wait. After a few tense days, your partner leaves you.

Now what does that say about them?

I asked several different people to imagine that this scenario had happened to them, and the answers I got were interesting. The overwhelming consensus was that the partner who left was a bad person. They didn’t care about the relationship at all. All they cared about was sex. Good riddance to bad rubbish and all that.

I don’t agree.

To explain, we’re going to have to get to the bottom of why we have sex in the first place, and it’s a trickier question than you think. So really, why do we have sex? What’s the point? Oh, sure, procreation and all that, but let’s not pretend that’s what we’re talking about here. Is it just because it feels good? I have doubts. If so, why don’t we just save time and do it ourselves? It’s quicker, easier and satisfaction is relatively guaranteed. Is it just biological impetus? If so, then why do we wrap it with so many trappings, so many strange emotions and rituals and meanings? Why don’t we just get on with it, if that’s what biology is telling us to do?

The answer is because it’s more than that. Sex is more than that, and you know it. Your boyfriend, your girlfriend, your fuck buddy, your spouse... beneath whatever shell of social construction we put up, whatever face you’re trying to show the world, you know that there’s more to it than carnal pleasure. And that extra little thing, buried beneath hookup culture, monogamy, online dating, prostitution, that little thing that is the core of human sexuality—that is why your partner is not a bad person for leaving you.

Because sex isn’t just about the feeling. It’s a good bonus, sure, and it gets things moving along, but sex, more than anything, is about being as close as you possibly can be with another person. As people, we don’t just crave contact, intimacy, affection, acceptance...we need it. We cannot survive without it. There’s your biology. There’s your humanity.

Having sex, especially with someone you truly care about, is about accepting everything about each other, good and bad. It’s about sharing experiences. It’s about making each other happy, and it’s about doing all of these things in the most basic, most powerful way that we know how.

“Ah,” but you say, “Speak for yourself. I have sex with a new person each week. It’s just how I am. No emotions for me.”

And you’re right, I can’t speak for you. I’ve never been into that kind of lifestyle, and that doesn’t at all mean it’s not valid—but neither does it prove me wrong. Beneath each carefree hookup that you have is the exact same set of motivations; closeness, acceptance, making each other happy. Even if only for a night.

Of course, for some people that isn’t true. Some people really don’t need sex. In our hypothetical story, you decide you don’t want it anymore, and that’s perfectly okay. But for billions of other people, sex is an incredibly important part of a relationship. Losing the opportunity to share that experience with your partner, to have them accept you, to be able to make each other happy—to lose that, to a lot of people, can be a deal-breaker. That doesn’t make them a bad person, it doesn’t even make them shallow, or a slut, or any other ridiculous label. It just means that they need that kind of closeness in their lives, like so many of us do. Even if only for a night.
What's the Point of Sex?
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Everyone knows hoverboards are the coolest mode of transportation on the planet,” said freshman shoemaking major Ima Dumas, “...and when I finally got one, they get banned from campus.”

Dumas is the president of the newly formed campus group “Hoverboarders United,” a collection of students who stand in support of hoverboarder rights. “I really wanted to glide down the sidewalk, forcing other people to slow down and move out of my way,” said Dumas.

“So what if I have to leave early for class because my board is slower than walking? I have to pick the board up if there are stairs, but that’s just a minor inconvenience.”

“I can even twerk on my board, and it has flashing lights!” exclaimed sophomore farming major Shea Burns. “A few boards explode because of cheap lithium batteries and everyone freaks out. That doesn’t mean my board is going to explode.”

Dumas stated that the banning of hoverboards on campuses across the nation is a kneejerk reaction to a solvable problem and that there have been less than a dozen incidents - not many if you take into consideration the number of boards sold.

“Right before Christmas, a board was sold every 12 seconds, so there are a lot of us students who got boards now we can’t even use them,” said Dumas. “If my board catches fire while I’m riding, I can just stop, drop and roll. It’s a risk I’m willing to take. They didn’t ban the car when people wrecked, and I have a friend who broke his leg rollerblading, but rollerblades aren’t banned. This is transportation discrimination and needs to stop.”

For more information on Hoverboarders United and how you can join, go to www.hotwheelz.com.
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