

## Contraception Commandment Cons

SUSANNA AIGA  
Staff Writer

Does the contraception mandate ultimately help or hurt businesses? The Supreme Court's decision to declare ObamaCare constitutional worried many, and some have even found it an intrusion on their beliefs, as is the case with Tom Monaghan, founder of Domino's Pizza. The new mandated healthcare plan covers contraception and some business owners do not believe that birth control is something that they should have to provide their employees with. Although suing the federal government is a little absurd, the option to supply workers with birth control should remain a business owner's decision.

Employers are not responsible for their employees' personal lives, and it is only right that the employers decide whether or not

to aid their workers in affairs outside of work. Some executives do not find it necessary to help workers with birth control, as it does not affect their company in the long run. Others want to keep their employees in good health and are fine with paying for contraception. Either way, it would be fair if the decision to provide contraception be left in the company's hands.

There are many people who do think that birth control should be supplied for women, as it may prevent health issues like ovarian cysts, in addition to preventing pregnancies. I understand these concerns, but there are already 26 states which require insurers and employers to cover the Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, California being one of them. However, 21 out of the 26 states also allow for exemptions from this cover-

age, mainly for religious reasons. This is fairer than the ObamaCare mandate, and seeing as there are state laws already in place for birth control insurance, it is not really necessary for the federal government to have an additional plan for contraception.

Also, as businesses struggle economically, it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to provide for their workers. Taxes on the healthcare industry—which help pay for the new benefits in the health law, such as birth control—simultaneously increase the costs of insurance. It seems unfair to pile the spiraling costs on top of the towering debt and other financial problems that plague many businesses. Most employers want to provide their workers with health care, but if the situation intensifies, the expenses may backfire on employees. More companies might start



trying to find loopholes in the law, such as firing more full-time workers in order to get under the 50-employee threshold, where businesses with more than 50 full-time employees will have to supply workers with affordable insurance or be fined, and employ more

part-time workers instead. Although Monaghan's lawsuit may seem extreme, his actions draw attention towards the mounting pressure on the private sector in general. In the end, contraception is just one more thing for CEOs to worry about.



JUST FOR THE HAL-  
Katherine Ong  
Opinions Editor  
GoDaddy-A-NoNo!

One of the highlights of the Super Bowl season is not only the game but also the special commercials created especially for the intervals between game coverage. They are the only ones I ever look forward to, as commercials are often the bane of my Sunday night "Once Upon a Time" airtime existence.

This year, however, GoDaddy—corporate company, domain registrar and web hosting superpower—decided to air a rather unconventional commercial in hopes of possibly rebuilding their customer fanbase that was lost after the Stop Online Piracy Act boycotts in 2012.

Within the commercial, GoDaddy claims that there are two sides to their company. Bar Raefeli, an Israeli supermodel, represents GoDaddy's "sexy side" and Walter, played by Jessie Heiman, represents the "smart side."

In order to visually portray its ability to be the perfect fusion of sexy and smart, GoDaddy presented a physical analogy and had both sides fuse *lips*. The camera then proceeded to lock onto the scene of mashing and sucking, complete with an amplified soundtrack of smacks, slurps and sucks, zooming in on the trading of spittle. The scene lasted approximately ten seconds, but felt more like a million—when sitting next to my dad.

After the excruciating commercial had ended, I had a chance to reevaluate my life. How in the world had I gone on so long without understanding just how perfect GoDaddy's services are for my website ventures?! Just kidding. Honestly, I got nothing from the commercial, except the deduction that GoDaddy has a strange idea of who's their target audience: people who associate the sound of saliva with commercial success.

If their goal was to make an impression, they certainly achieved it. Jay Leno himself has already done his version of a reenactment—albeit more hilarious than cringe-worthy. Good advertisements are hard to forget. GoDaddy is bound to have some intrigued reactions to their otherwise embarrassing marketing methods.

## MOOR vs. MOOR: Should amusement parks be held liable for injuries?



TINA CHEN  
Staff Writer

As every hair follicle on my skin rose from excitement to get onto a 100 mph beast that takes its riders up for a rush of adrenaline, I realized I was putting my life on the line. At that moment, I feared for my safety; what if the entire roller coaster malfunctioned and broke down?

Every year, approximately 300 million people spend their leisure times at amusement parks and thousands are reported injured; a fraction of those are fatal. Of those people, none of them wanted to get injured; all they wanted was a great time.

Obviously Disneyland's slogan of "Where Dreams Come True" didn't mean sending their customers to incapacitation or their deathbed, but fearing for safety after being put in high-risk situations suggests the violation of trust in a business transaction.

For a safe environment, maximum attention to the details is vital for limiting the chances for accidents. Rides are supposed to be built with safety in mind, and it becomes the fault of the amusement parks to allow riders to enter after paying for their ticket that their only obligation is not upheld.

In a recent California Supreme Court case where a woman was injured while being on bumper cars, I agree with the court's decision that liabilities are limited; however, the court made a valid point that amusement parks are "not to unreasonably increase the risk of injury." How would one even define unreasonably when any injuries are possible within amusement park premises? Though some tickets have disclaimers in fine print absolving amusement parks of any liability issues, disclaimers themselves are too vague that it is considered "patently unreasonable" in the courtroom.

In spite of the fact that some injuries occur because of consumer behaviors, serious injuries caused by mechanical mishaps and operation failures should make the amusement parks legally responsible for those injured.

### Tug My Finger!

DENISE TIEU  
Staff Writer

Accidents occur every day. If you watch "1000 Ways to Die," you'll understand how accidents lurk around every corner. A game of tug-of-war may seem harmless, yet this simple game caused two students to lose fingers recently at South El

Monte High School.

However, someone losing their appendages over a game of tug-of-war is not a one time incidence. In 1997, two men lost their arms and 40 others were hurt from a tug-of-war game in Taiwan involving over 1,600 people.

School officials should have considered how school activities can possibly affect the students. Further-

People from around the world flock to amusement parks to experience the thrills and excitement of heights and speed that would otherwise never be experienced. However, in the same way that people flock to these rides, it seems that inevitably, some of these visitors bring with them lawyers and unwarranted litigation.

Although amusement parks are responsible for maintaining and caring for their rides, the park-goers themselves must fully understand that, in the pursuit of adrenaline and thrill, the riders assume many risks and hazards that are inherent to the nature of the attractions they ride. Consequently, these individuals cannot expect amusement parks to compensate them for the injuries that might be sustained on amusement park rides.

In the same way that parks have an obligation to maintain and design the rides with safety in mind, those who visit the park have their own obligation to understand the limits of their physical bodies and to understand the risks associated with getting on the attractions that parks offer to them.

If a rider has even a slight history of heart issues, then they should probably think twice before hopping on the new rollercoaster with the flame-throwers and pretzel loops. Moreover, as ruled by a 6-1 California Supreme Court decision this past December, amusement parks cannot be held liable for injuries resulting from risks inherent to the nature of the rides.

However, the risk of injury is not limited to mega-coasters and frail senior citizens. In the aforementioned court case, a woman broke her wrist while riding the bumper cars. The court ruled against her simply because, whether a person chooses to engage in low-speed bumper car mayhem or a gravity-defying coaster, it is ultimately the rider, not the theme park, who makes the decision to assume the related risks.

more, the rope should have been examined, since a specific type of rope is needed to prevent any injuries, according to the International Tug-of-War Federation.

The students now have to suffer the consequences of the officials' oversight on the matter; the school district is currently planning to review policies on the appropriateness of tug-of-war on campus.



SEAN NGUYEN  
Staff Writer

Though school officials were at fault, they aren't entirely to blame. Students should've had the common sense to not wrap the rope around their hands. They should've acknowledged that they may have been in danger when their peers got too enthusiastic with their rope-pulling. For future safety liabilities, students should be wary of the activities they choose to engage in.