



## Movie Prices Over The Years

## Reclaim the Ronza for Kirksville



Connor Stangler

While everybody else has moved on, accepted reality and put things in perspective, I haven't. It still hurts. My friends tell me to turn my back, but as long I'm still breathing, I will never stop fighting for it. I will never forget the Ronza.

During May 2012, Kirksville's own Pagliai's celebrated the Ronza's 30th birthday. Two months later the meal died a symbolic death when a Nebraska-based company threatened to take Pagliai's to court for trademark infringement because its similar product, the "Runza," predated the "Ronza," according to the Kirksville Daily Express. While Pagliai's owner John Wichmann wisely backed down from the federal lawsuit, some of us have not yet surrendered. If a vowel is all that separates this city from reclaiming one of its proud traditions, then assemble the legal team. This time, Lady Justice marches with us.

I can't even sink my teeth into the gooey heart of the former Ronza without thinking that some faraway authority has deemed the cheese, sauce, meat and dough legally questionable. I'm an accomplice in a food felony, aiding and abetting the criminal pepperoni and the illicit sausage. I blame Runza National, the corporate giant who apparently felt a local Kirksville eatery threatened the integrity of their eighty locations. Since 1982, Pagliai's has minded its own business. Relying on intimate relationships with students and locals rather than mass-marketing ploys, the restaurant has kept its ambitions humble. Now it's the victim of corporate imperialism for, as far as I can tell, no good reason.

From the pictures on the Runza National website, the Ronza and the Runza are similar in structure but different in essence. The former is a pleasantly ovular bundle of heaven. Its creators lovingly tuck the ingredients into the shell and then pull the dough over the ends like a blanket over an infant. The latter looks more like a burrito wrapped in white bread and includes cabbage and ground beef, things thankfully missing from the Ronza.

In a quaint rural city, I've been deprived of the quaintness. Truman State students rarely find Kirksville exciting, so they instead resort to calling it "charming," a condescending euphemism that really says, "There's just not much here, so I guess it's kind of cute." The Ronza was one of those quintessential Kirksville traditions, one of the few bridges between me and the town. I could enjoy the meat and cheese coddled in dough while I exchanged a knowing nod with the letter-jacketed high school kids at the adjoining table, a silent tribute to the non-sandwich, the great equalizer of Northeast Missouri. It knew not class, age, gender, political orientation or city of origin. It knew only flavor.

The same product now markets with an imposter name, the Palonza. The extra syllable burdens the customer like an awkward T-shirt two sizes too big. Worst of all, the old name haunts the restaurant. The Ronza is the ex-girlfriend of Kirksville. Everywhere you turn, from the gaudy delivery trucks to the take-out boxes smeared with an ominous Sharpie streak across the former name, its memory stubbornly remains.

The controversy was thrust into the limelight when, according to the Daily Express, Missouri Senator Claire McCaskill offered her legal talent in support of the Ronza at a Kirksville campaign event during August. Our proud tradition has been offered an unequal ally in the form of a federal official, a colleague of the President and a brilliant attorney. Mr. Wichmann, the rest of the Pagliai's family and this community cannot pass up such an opportunity.

Truman students often lament the boredom Kirksville seems to breed. Perhaps this could be the fight we've been waiting for, the cause worth joining. Admittedly, the Ronza is not your conventional crusade, but like any song, story or memento it endures as part of a broader mythology. It's a symbol through which we interpret our community, an emblem meant to last longer than we do and a monument to a simple affection that cares not for profit or credit. Let's reclaim the Ronza.

Connor Stangler is a senior English and history major from Columbia, Mo.

## Going to movies is overrated



Garrett Kelsey

When was the last time you chose to go to the movies? For me, it was when "The Avengers" came out. I also saw "The Dark Knight Rises", but I only saw that because I needed a date idea before college started back up. It was either that or "The Watch." Gross. The reason I say all this is because it illustrates the pointlessness of cinemas during today's society.

For example, I am a poor college student — all my money goes to rent, bills and food. Rarely am I in a situation where I have a little extra money. When I am, I try to get the most for it. Why would I want to spend twenty dollars minimum to take my girlfriend

to see some overblown Hollywood blockbuster or pretentious art film. I would rather cook a nice dinner and watch something with her on Netflix. It's quieter and less crowded. But the biggest reason I hate the movies is the people in the audience.

Let's examine the five major types of people you might be unlucky enough to see a movie with. There's the good old standard, which is a nice person there to quietly enjoy a film.

Next, the gasper. Gasps usually are women who react to literally anything that happens, other than a character walking down the street. Then there is the always clever "say-what-I-see-guy," the person who feels the need to narrate the film in case someone decided to nod off. "Oh man! He's going into the room!" Thanks buddy, I was a little lost.

Then there's the couple — the people far too interested with each other to pay attention to the movie. The good news is if the movie is terrible, their constant smacking and incessant moans will give you something entertaining to watch.

The most common, unfortunately, is the talker, the moviegoer who talks during the entire film. I can't believe

people still do it. Everyone knows it's rude! Everyone hates it! As obnoxious as these people are, they aren't the worst. Oh no, not even close.

The worst are the phone users. Why did you come to the movie, if you wanted to talk on the phone? Why on earth are you actually talking on the phone, in a movie theatre? Not only are there users that talk, there are users who text the whole time. If you wanted to talk to your friends, why aren't you hanging out with them? I know you're trying to hide the backlight with your hand, but you know what? It's not working! I still have a glare on my peripheral vision and I can still hear the noises you didn't have the courtesy to turn down.

I'm just going to sit on my couch and watch a movie in the privacy of my apartment where nobody forces me listen to other people talking or kissing, where I don't have to wear dorky-looking 3D glasses to see some gimmicky effect, where no one has a phone I can hear and where the popcorn costs \$2.50 for six bags.

Garrett Kelsey is a sophomore linguistics major from O'Fallon, Mo.

## How should parents approach the debate regarding evolution and creationism?

"I think if they're proponents of creationism it should be taught at home and they should tell their children to weigh all theories and decide for themselves."

Carrie Weber Senior



"I think it's more on what the child believes. It should be a joint effort because the theory states things change and that is true. People should be tolerant."

Nicole Bowman Freshman



"Parents should remember even if their personal beliefs contradict the theory of evolution, they should teach their children to think critically and create their own opinions."

Matt Henry Junior



"Both should be fully addressed. The child should make the decision themselves after being equipped with the information on both."

Lara Redmond Senior



### AROUND THE QUAD

## Nye risks jeopardizing early science education



Robert Overmann

Dubbed "Bill Nye the Science Guy", the amiable, bowtie-sporting children's television host recently has caused quite a stir among parents who believe in the theory of a divine creator. In a clip uploaded August 23 to YouTube and titled "Creationism is Not Appropriate for Children", Nye argues that denying evolution to one's children is detrimental to their future. While nobody expected Nye to express any anti-evolutionist rhetoric, Nye's comments were rash and unnecessarily alienated parents of children who would otherwise

be starting their understanding of modern science. As the host of children's television programs seeking to educate as many youths as possible, Nye's well-intended statements do anything but advance this mission.

Nye is hardly different in the scientific community for his acceptance of the theory of evolution. The theory is well-supported and has been a basic concept in biology since the mid-19th century when the "Origin of Species" was published. However, regardless of acceptance among scientists, the theory is still hotly debated in the public arena.

Countless children of the 1990s were entertained by and received a significant head start in their understanding of the scientific world thanks to Nye's science show. Nye covered topics from plant physiology to plate tectonics. His show delved into geology, physics, chemistry and biology. Thanks to Nye's recent comments and the resulting outrage of parents who believe in a divine creator, Nye's show will be added by many parents to an already long list of media deemed "inappropriate" for their children.

Nye, of all people, should understand science does not exist in a vacuum — it operates with the cultural and political constraints of

its time period. Newton's laws of motion were criticized because they didn't include any reference to God. Galileo was punished by the Catholic Church for his advocacy of heliocentrism. Science has often, though not always, been at odds with Western religion. Nye seems to have knowingly walked directly into the career-killing crossfire of this centuries-old clash.

If Nye is looking to broaden his educational impact, he could attempt to reach a more adult audience. Sexually transmitted infections, for example, is one such pressing topic of which much of the adult population remains woefully ignorant. Nye has great skill at explaining complex topics in layman's terms. He could, if he so chose, address a topic few outside the scientific community comprehend, such as quantum mechanics. There are a plethora of less controversial topics Nye could have addressed.

Furthermore, Nye clearly understands how children learn and the importance of educating youth about scientific thought — but is he in a position to instruct parents about how to raise their children? Nye graduated from Cornell University with a mechanical engineering Bachelor of Science, hardly an education that

would give him insight into proper parenting techniques. Nye should stick to simply providing scientific information rather than giving advice.

Although attempts at damage control might be futile in the minds of parents who adhere to the theory of an intelligent design, Nye would do well to revise his position. Instead, Nye should advise parents to expose their children to both theories: intelligent design and evolution. Although Nye claims it is irresponsible to teach children creationism, isn't it equally, if not more, irresponsible to not expose children to each argument on an issue? In a way, isn't it more scientific to expose children to multiple hypotheses explaining a phenomenon?

Bill Nye is an asset to the education and scientific communities. People who cause a substantial uproar, however, are typically judged by that uproar rather than their other achievements. Nye's credibility and good name among parents are invaluable to advancing education and science. Compromising his standing among such a large group of viewers would be a blow to his life's work.

Robert Overmann is a junior English major from Cape Girardeau, Mo.