

# The Stanford Review

Volume XXXI, Number 5

Established 1987 : [www.stanfordreview.org](http://www.stanfordreview.org)

November 13, 2003

## Character and the American Presidency

by Aliyya Haque  
News Staff Writer

American presidents have often faced political, economic, social and even cultural moments of crises during their terms in office. However, it is the way in which they have dealt with these crises that separates the truly great presidents from the rest. On October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2003 in front of a packed house in Kresge Auditorium, historians David Kennedy and Michael Beschloss joined moderator Michael Krasny, KQED radio personality and "Forum" host, to discuss the effect certain crises had on several presidents. They concentrated specifically on how a president's character dictated his actions during these specific crises, which in turn clearly defined his presidency.

Both David Kennedy and Michael Beschloss have extensive background experience concerning the American presidency. Professor Kennedy is the Donald J. McLachlan Professor of History here at Stanford and won the Pulitzer Prize for history in 2000. Mr. Beschloss is an award winning historian and expert on the American presidency.

Both Professor Kennedy and Mr. Beschloss emphasized the fact that a president's character was one of the most important elements that influenced his actions during a moment of crisis. On presidential character, Professor Kennedy explained, "the most important ingredient in a president's character is clarity." He divided this clarity into three parts: clarity of conviction representing a president's beliefs and who he really is, clarity of vision describing the historical situation and background of the president, and clarity of communication or a president's relationship with his electorate.

However, to the public it is often only in looking back on the past that a president's character and the motive for his actions are truly revealed, sometimes twenty to thirty years after the fact. Mr. Beschloss stated, "Often with current presidencies, we lack a lot of information that would clue us in to the reasons behind a certain president's

actions. We only hear what's said in public speeches." He continued, "It's only in hindsight, when diaries and other private papers are released many years later, that we can fully understand the character of a president."

At times, presidents would hide their actions from the public for fear of negative reaction and intense criticism. Mr. Beschloss cites the example of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt to illustrate this point. In a time of American isolationism and neutrality, Roosevelt had to face the danger of both Hitler and the Japanese, thus going against popular opinion, he followed his convictions and secretly conducted negotiations with the allies. "In retrospect, historians will cut

done the popular thing and stayed isolationist, but if you had asked FDR what his decision was, he would have said that the defense of the country was more important than his re-election." Both historians also mentioned the example of former President John F. Kennedy and the civil rights bill he supported soon before his death, which led to a drop in his approval ratings particularly in the Southern states, and the danger of losing the next election. "There is no doubt he [Kennedy] did the right thing," Mr. Beschloss commented.

However, not all presidents have acted in this morally strong manner. In fact, a few actually lacked much clarity in their character, including

tions against war that occurred after his election were especially bitter."

Both historians also commented on the difficulty of obtaining presidential data that would shed light on current presidents' characters for a variety of reasons. Although now a vast amount of presidential information is available, finding reliable and pertinent data, in particular concerning controversial presidential actions, is a formidable undertaking. "Even though the bulk of information is greater, the quality is lessened," said Prof. Kennedy. Kennedy and Beschloss also both lamented on the lack of personal data as "presidents now write less and try to keep as little of a paper trail as possible for the information could alternatively be

leaked to a newspaper or subpoenaed in court." Remarked Mr. Beschloss, "We may now have to write history from press releases."

Professor Kennedy and Mr. Beschloss concluded their discussion with a projection on the actions and characters of both presidents in the recent Clinton and George W. Bush administrations. Although both historians stressed the need for hindsight when discussing these matters, of Clinton they noted, "His presidency can be considered a great squandering. Although he was a great politician and had clear communication skills, Clinton never had the opportunity to fully realize his vision."

On George W. Bush, both historians noticed that rudiments of a narrative are emerging about the Bush presidency, and they predicted that 9/11 would be considered the turning point of his presidency. Whether the risks Bush

has taken are justifiable and will pay off in the end will not be decided until the end of the War on terrorism, thus again the focus on hindsight. "Bush might bring peace and democracy to the Middle East and might stop other dictators, such as in North Korea, but we will see in twenty-thirty years whether this occurs or not," said Professor Kennedy.

Remarked Mr. Beschloss, "Some comfort can be taken when we view great events to see which presidents measure up or not. It's where we see what democracy is really all about."



Michael Beschloss (Left), Michael Krasny (Middle), and David Kennedy (Right) discussed the impact of character on American presidential leadership during times of crisis.

FDR some slack, even if he lied to the American people and perhaps broke the law, because his actions were for a good cause and for the benefit of the country," says Mr. Beschloss.

Often, presidents are faced with crises that could harm their popularity ratings and possibly jeopardize their chances of re-election. However, Mr. Beschloss remarked, "most people would want a president who believes that the issues themselves are more important than popularity or re-election." He also stated, "If FDR had any desire for re-election, he would have

former President Richard Nixon. Concerning Nixon's presidency, Professor Kennedy stated, "Nixon failed all three categories of clarity, especially in communication because he was lousy in convincing the American public about his policies." This weakness in character was readily apparent in the election of 1968, in which the Vietnam War was the most pressing issue. "Nixon was elected under false pretenses," Mr. Beschloss remarked, "He allowed people to think he was dovish and would immediately get the US out of the war. Because of this, demonstra-

Democracy in Baghdad?  
NYU Law Professor Speaks on  
Iraq's Future Government

Page 2



Cyberlibertarianism  
The Political Philosophy  
of Silicon Valley?

Page 4



# Forming an Islamic Democracy in Iraq

by Ryan Wisnesky  
News Staff Writer

On Tuesday, November 4, 2003, sponsored by the ASSU Speaker's Bureau and the Society for International Affairs at Stanford, NYU law professor Noah Feldman spoke about the United States role in establishing an Iraqi democracy and how Iraq must combine both the principles of democracy and Islamic law in forming its constitution.

"The United States must support an Iraqi model of government that is both a legitimate democracy and is committed to Islamic values," Noah Feldman told a large audience in Kresge Auditorium.

Mr. Feldman, a Rhodes scholar, is an advisor to the Iraqi constitutional process and is acting as an independent consultant to its reconstruction. He is also the author of the recent book *After Jihad: America and the Struggle for Islamic Democracy*. A graduate of Harvard University and Yale Law School, Mr. Feldman has thoroughly studied Middle Eastern affairs and is an expert on Islamic thought, especially concerning law.

"Islam is the key to peace in the Middle East," said Mr. Feldman. He also noted that the basics of democracy, such as equality and freedom of speech, are all complementary to Islamic law. The emergence of democratic voices in the Middle East, however, gets no media coverage. Mr. Feldman explained, "This is in part due to the coverage of Muslims and the Middle East in relation to the 9/11 attacks. For most Americans, their first meeting with Islam was in a violent manner with attackers claiming to represent Islam. Thus, the media focused on the 'why do they hate us?' question, assuming divisions and hateful attitudes in these countries."

Mr. Feldman stated that the United States government needed to take steps

towards democracy in the Middle East by changing its foreign policy and strengthening positive developments in those countries. He said, "The question arises of the best way to bring about democracy in a region where it is not the most common form of government. And the best way to promote democracy is to support positive developments in Iraq."

Mr. Feldman also criticized American foreign policy, tracing its origins of its origins back to the Cold War, during which America gave support to countries that openly opposed Communism while turning a blind eye to the civil and human rights violations that occurred within these countries. "Though this policy was somewhat justifiable in the Cold war, it is unacceptable in this era," Mr. Feldman remarked. He linked the suppression of democratic voices in many Middle Eastern countries to the dictatorships, previously supported by the United States and its policy, within these countries. "The United States should instead reinforce positive developments such as democratic reform in Bahrain and not reward recalcitrant countries," he said.

The many reasons for the United States invasion of Iraq were also discussed such as the weapons of mass destruction, the goal of democratizing Iraq, and the liberation of Iraq from Saddam Hussein, a man who orchestrated a mass genocide of hundreds of

thousands of Iraqis on a world class scale. However, Mr. Feldman did not believe that these reasons alone were justification for invading Iraq, but instead the reason for invasion was a need for a United States response, on a worldwide scale, to the attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup>. "But once the United States did invade Iraq, it was committed to establishing a democracy there, for both pragmatic and moral reasons," Mr. Feldman said.

Pragmatically, the United States was bound by oil. "If the United States walks away, it creates the possibility of a civil war in Iraq, concerning the oil found there," Mr. Feldman remarked,

"Also, it would drive up the price of oil in the United States, and the government is not about to allow that to happen."

According to Mr. Feldman, the United States has an even stronger moral commitment for remaining in Iraq. "The United States has a ethical obligation to stay in Iraq and to restore a government which is better than a dictatorship, that would leave the Iraqis with a serious chance of governing themselves," he remarked.

Mr. Feldman also added that while no one in Iraq asked the United States to invade, the majority were happy to see Saddam gone, and though the United States had supported Saddam for a while during his regime, they must now clean up after the mess created by the war and "realistically facilitate the transfer of authority over to the Iraqi

people."

Concerning the actual Iraqi constitution, Mr. Feldman said that the Iraqis themselves must decide what they want in the constitution. He also noted that the overwhelming majority of Iraqis are committed to a democracy and that they want Islam to play an official role in the state.

According to Mr. Feldman a major barrier in the constitution process, however, is the increasingly dangerous security situation in Iraq. "If security continues to deteriorate, without law and order the constitutional process won't happen or will happen as a charade," cautioned Mr. Feldman. He also said that the overwhelming majority of attacks against Americans and the majority of Iraqis come from other Iraqis, most likely members of the old regime. "Though the threat is always there, there is no firm evidence to suggest that the attacks come from foreign terrorist powers, but instead from those closely associated with Saddam," Mr. Feldman commented.

The goal of these oppositional forces is to kill enough Americans so that they would leave Iraq and the old regime could reclaim power. "The old regime knows that they will get cut no breaks by the new Iraqi government, so they are trying to de-stabilize the situation in an effort to regain power," said Mr. Feldman.

He also remarked that coalition forces were not enough to beat the opposition but that the Iraqis themselves must join together to fight them.

Mr. Feldman concluded his lecture with a prediction of Iraq's future in which he envisioned more violence and a stronger push for the United States to leave Iraq. However, he extolled the need for the United States to finish what it had started and "to give the Iraqi people the chance to decide for themselves where and how they want to live."



NYU Law Professor Noah Feldman spoke at Kresge on Tuesday night.

Sweden Norway Costa Rica Scotland Ghana  
Thailand Spain Japan Denmark Czech Republic  
Ghana Italy New Zealand Chile Thailand S  
zech Republic Australia Ireland France Ma  
Costa Rica Scotland Ghana Italy New Zeala  
Spain Japan Denmark Czech Republic Austr  
aly New Zealand Chile Thailand Spain Ja

## Learning

has never taken you this far...

University Studies Abroad Consortium

Where will it take you? Through USAC, a consortium of U.S. universities, you can choose from 31 programs in 21 countries. With 20 years of experience, you can be sure that you have someone to turn to throughout your educational adventures.

- Month, summer, semester & year-long programs
- Wide range of academic courses
- Internships
- Field trips & tours
- Language classes at all levels
- Small classes
- University credit
- Scholarships
- Housing

USAC

HTTP://USAC.UNR.EDU • 775-784-6569

Your Gateway to the World

## So, you want to get involved?

The Stanford Review needs partners like you to keep Stanford's conservative voice strong!

### 1. Write for the Review.

Student writers and artists needed! Gain valuable journalism experience, develop connections with the Hoover Institution and local business leaders, and GET PAID! Send an email to [editor@stanfordreview.org](mailto:editor@stanfordreview.org) to find out how you can get involved.

### 2. Subscribe to the Review.

Stay informed of Stanford's political scene while helping The Stanford Review continue its fifteen-year tradition of delivering copies to students on campus free of charge. See the back page for details.

### 3. Visit our website online.

Check out our website that's kept up to date with the latest in news relevant to you, yourself, and Irene. <http://www.stanfordreview.org>





THE STANFORD  
REVIEW

An Independent Student Publication  
Established 1987

Editor-in-chief  
Business Manager  
Managing Editor  
Opinions Editor  
News Events Editor  
Investigative News Editor  
Associate Editor  
Distribution Manager  
Photography Editor  
Public Relations Manager  
Web Designer

Gary J. Raichart '05  
Mark Zavislak '05  
Christopher Baer '05  
Stephen A. Cohen '05  
Harrison Y. Osaki '05  
Michael T. Hasper '05  
Joseph A. Fairbanks '05  
Ben Guthrie '06  
Ron Gutmark '05  
Stephen A. Cohen '05  
Joel Gedalius '05

The Stanford Review is an independently run student newspaper published by a voluntary student organization at Stanford University. The Review uses the common space provided to all publications by the ASSU Publications Board. The Stanford Review is published and distributed without charge to the Stanford community on a weekly basis during the academic year. Opinions expressed herein are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the Stanford Review.

The Stanford Review welcomes letters from its readers on any topic. Submission constitutes testimony to the accuracy and originality of the work. The Stanford Review reserves the right to edit letters for space and clarity. Please include your name, address, and Stanford affiliation. Letters can be e-mailed to [editor@stanfordreview.org](mailto:editor@stanfordreview.org) or delivered to room 205 of the Storke Publications Building.

Editorial: (650) 723-8221  
[www.stanfordreview.org](http://www.stanfordreview.org)

Founded MCMLXXXVII  
Norm Book & Peter Thiel

Editor-in-Chief: [editor@stanfordreview.org](mailto:editor@stanfordreview.org)  
Business Manager: [business@stanfordreview.org](mailto:business@stanfordreview.org)

The News in Brief

by Harrison Y. Osaki  
News Events Editor  
and Shawn M. Sims  
News Staff Writer

Pre-Paid Tuition Plan Approved

The Board of Trustees has approved a new tuition plan that would allow students and their families to pay a percentage of their tuition before the students apply to Stanford. The tuition scheme, known as the Independent 529 Plan, would allow prospective students to purchase a certificate prior to applying to Stanford that would give them at least a 0.5% discount on tuition. The families would then make payments on the plan over a period of time. 529 Plan's administrators have warned families that the certificates will not affect chances of acceptance at the colleges that they purchase the certificate from; however, the certificates will be transferable to other participating colleges. The plan places the money collected from the certificates, from all of the colleges participating in the plan, in the hands of a finance company that manages the money and invests it. The universities that participate in this program choose to forfeit all of the difference in tuition between the amount that currently exists at that time and the tuition as was paid at the time of the certificate's purchase. Universities will receive money from the trust as students enroll; the schools will receive the net investment value of the money from the students' certificate. The plan is only for tuition, and not for other outside expenses.

Stanford Researchers Construct Larger DNA Molecule

Stanford researchers under Professor Eric Kool have recently created a DNA called xDNA molecule with a larger double helix than any other molecule found in nature. DNA, which is shaped in a pair of twisted spirals known as the double helix, is composed of four bases, each of which

matches only to another one: adenine (A) matches to thymine (T) while guanine (G) matches to cytosine.

Dr. Kool's group added benzene, which is a geometrically flat molecule composed of carbon, into the A-T base pairs in a strand of normal DNA. This resulted in bases that were about one-third larger than normal A and T bases, and then constructed a molecule based on the oversized bases. The enlarged A and T bases were then matched up with their smaller counterparts (an expanded A to a normal T, and expanded T to a normal A), creating a stretched double helix.

The researchers theorized that the new base pairs in the molecule could, if they met other normal base pairs in standard DNA or RNA, possibly change intensity of color and would thus be useful for processes that require typing or identification of cells.

The molecule is both more resistant to heat and degradation as well as being fluorescent (emitting light in the darkness). The researchers have stated that they will continue exploring the molecule and whether or not it is capable of reproduction.

Eastern music legend visits Stanford with daughter

Sitar legend Pandit Ravi Shankar, born in 1920, and his daughter, Anoushka Shankar, performed for a sold out and enthusiastic crowd on Saturday night, October 25th. Pandit is a term that describes a lifelong scholar in both sitar music and a personal quest for spiritual wisdom. After studying with his guru, Ustad Allauidin Khan, Ravi's journey brought him in the 1960's from his native India to the United States. Here he became one of the first musicians to truly meld Eastern and Western styles of making music. The beauty and improvisational nature of sitar music appealed to the "hippie" generation, and he performed at both the Monterey Pop Festival and at Woodstock. George Harrison studied under Shankar's guidance, and this collaboration, in particular, helped the United States to appreciate world music. He also composed a concerto

for sitar and orchestra, and has worked with many modern composers including Philip Glass. Both Ravi and his daughter have been involved in charities and human rights efforts throughout their lives.

Indian melody is cyclical, technically complex, and laden with spiritual significance. Araga is roughly analogous to a Western scale and is specific to time of day and mood; Ravi played two in the first half, on slower, the second an evening raga.

In the second half, Ravi played a conglomeration of tunes in different ragas, an example of how he has made Eastern music accessible to a larger audience. Anoushka had a wounded hand and did not play as much in quantity as her father, but she showed with her skill and grace that she truly is a student of her father. It is rare and quite an honor for Stanford to see such an exciting performance by the "Godfather of World Music."

Cultural Historian from Yale speaks on British racism

Hazel Carby, Professor of African American Studies and American Studies at Yale since 1989, appeared Monday night at the Law School and delivered the first Presidential Lecture in the Humanities and Arts. "Child of the Empire" titles both her talk and the book she is writing about growing up as a multiracial child in Great Britain. Her mother was of Welsh descent, and her father a Jamaican immigrant, which made Carby an outcast to her peers and her society. The terror of World War II, in which both of her parents served, gave most British citizens a distinct national identity that Professor Carby was not permitted to share in. Societal distaste for their marriage pressured her parents to live in separate apartments for part of her youth until they bought a house. Friends were often confused about her place in Britain and even questioned her right to be there. Carby pointed out that her situation was quite different from that of the African-American struggling for civil rights, since there were so few dark skinned people of any background living on the island.

A well-known Marxist feminist, Carby seeks to expose the hidden forms of racial exclusion in the global economy that are often forgotten amidst showy, "fashionable" racial acceptance. She received her Ph.D. from University of Birmingham, U.K., taught in high schools and assisted labor relations in London, and moved to the U.S. to teach at Wesleyan University for seven years. Her books include *Reconstructing Womanhood*, *Race Men*, and *Cultures in Babylon*, a collection of essays.

TWISB-BISS COLLEGE FOOTBALL POLL		
Rnk.	Team	Record
1.	Oklahoma	10-0
2.	TCU	9-0
3.	Ohio State	9-1
4.	USC	8-1
5.	LSU	8-1
6.	Michigan	8-2
7.	Purdue	8-2
8.	Texas	8-2
9.	Georgia	7-2
10.	Virginia Tech	7-2
11.	Tennessee	7-2
12.	Miami	7-2
13.	Minnesota	9-2
14.	Wash. State	8-2
15.	Florida State	8-2
16.	Nebraska	8-2
17.	Boise State	8-1
18.	N. Illinois	9-1
19.	Miami (OH)	8-1
20.	Pittsburgh	7-2
21.	Bowling Green	7-2
22.	Mississippi	8-2
23.	Florida	7-3
24.	Iowa	7-3
25.	Michigan State	7-3
Honorable Mention: Utah, Kansas State, NC State, Okla. State, Maryland, Arkansas, Oregon St., Texas Tech, Louisville, Missouri		

# Cyberlibertarianism in the Silicon Valley

by Dave Myszewski  
News Staff Writer

"If there is a default ideology in cyberspace, it is libertarianism."

This statement, made by Salon.com's Gary Kamiya in 1997, still largely rings true today. The philosophy of libertarianism, which was largely encouraged by the expectations that were fueled by the tremendous success of the Internet in the mid-1990's, is defended by many in the Silicon Valley—an unlikely place for the adoption of a largely right-wing ideology.

In a 1997 paper, Langdon Winner was one of the first people to publish a paper using the term "cyberlibertarianism," which he called "a collection of ideas that link ecstatic enthusiasm for electronically mediated forms of living with radical, right wing libertarian ideas about the proper definition of freedom, social life, economics, and politics in the years to come."

Cyberlibertarians dream of a utopian world in which the Internet allows free market to thrive without any government intervention, communities are bound by common beliefs and values rather than geographical location, and the government holds little—if any—power over the people.

## The Californian Ideology

Richard Barbrook and Andy Cameron, of the Hypermedia Research Centre at the University of Westminster in London, UK, wrote about the changes many in cyberspace were anticipating, in a widely discussed 1995 essay, *The Californian Ideology*.

"Information technologies, so the argument goes, empower the individual, enhance personal freedom, and radically reduce the power of the nation-state. Existing social, political and legal power structures will wither away to be replaced by unfettered interactions between autonomous individuals and their software."

Security and encryption technology provides the key to this reduction of power because it enables individuals to interact with each other without the possibility of others discovering anything about their communication beyond the simple fact that it occurred. Cyberlibertarians idealize this technology as the capability that allows individuals to break free from government control.

In an October 31 talk for the Ethics and Society Program entitled *Cyberlibertarianism in the Wake of the Dot-Com Collapse*, computer science professor Eric Roberts said that in recent years there has been a shift in the focus of the Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility. Originally created soon after the election of Ronald Reagan, the Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility was founded to examine the social and ethical issues surrounding the cold war, such as the role of computers in military and nuclear technology. In the last seven or eight years, said Professor Roberts, the organization has become

increasingly involved in security and encryption issues. Encryption has become the new rallying cry for the cyberlibertarians.

The ability to keep government out of the Internet is not necessarily a good thing, according to critics of cyberlibertarian thought. Lawrence Lessig, now a law professor at Stanford University, wrote an influential book, *Code*, that discussed the critical importance of governmental involvement in the Internet. "Liberty in cyberspace," he wrote, "will not come from the absence of the state. Liberty there, as anywhere, will come from a state of a certain kind. We build a world where freedom can flourish not by removing from society any self-conscious control; we build a world where freedom can flourish by setting it in a place where a particular kind of self-conscious control survives."

## Government and the free market

Several critics have said that the rejection of any governmental role in the Internet is fundamentally flawed. However, the government has a great historical significance in the creation of the Internet. The ARPANET, the predecessor to the Internet that enabled the creation of technology now taken for granted, was a project funded by the Department of Defense. The universities who have produced some of the most intelligent individuals in the computing community, such as Stanford and Berkeley, rely on the government for research grants. The government has funded much of the technology that drives the Internet both directly or indirectly, and a significant portion of that has come from military-related expenditures.

The government has played such a pivotal role in the development of the Internet that Barbrook and Cameron quipped, "For those not blinded by 'free market' dogmas, it was obvious that the Americans have always had state planning: only they call it the defense budget."

Yet the immensely important historical role the government has played in the development of computing has not been completely overlooked by the cyberlibertarians. In fact, some argue that the government's involvement slowed economic development.

Louis Rossetto, one of the founders of *Wired* magazine, which many linked to Newt Gingrich believe is the voice of cyberlibertarian thought, makes this point emphatically.

"Far from building the Digital Revolution, the US Defense Department sucked up 6 to 7 percent of US GNP for 40 years and utilized up to 40 percent of all engineering talent, channeling these resources not into technological growth, but into tanks, bombs, and military adventurism. In point of fact, it was the cutback in American defense spending following the Vietnam War and the subsequent firing of thousands of California engineers which resulted in the creation of Silicon Valley and the personal computer revolution."

The government did not allow the Internet to be used for any commer-

cial purposes, and it was only when commercial use of the Internet was allowed in the 1990's that the technology exploded. Cyberlibertarians argue that unbridled competition within a completely free market would be certain to contribute even more to the economy. Several critics declare that the combination of rejecting any governmental control and embracing all aspects of an unbridled free market system is not likely to produce good economic results.

In his October talk, Eric Roberts argued that one of the flaws of cyberlibertarian thought is the attachment to a philosophy "without an understanding of the nuance of their arguments."

"Markets don't always work. They often work really, really well...but to say that government can never do anything right, and markets can never do anything wrong sets yourself up for failure."

## The Magna Carta

The Progress and Freedom Foundation published the document that is perhaps most central to cyberlibertarian thought, "Cyberspace and the American Dream: A Magna Carta for the Knowledge Age."

Their ideal is a world in which communities are not tied to political organization or geographic location, but by common interests that transcend conventional barriers. Due to the Internet, everyone can find acceptance in a community. Others are quick to point out that even if this ideal were realized, the creation of several fragmented, homogeneous communities would be antithetical to some of the fundamental benefits of a community, which provides the opportunity for people of a variety of backgrounds learn from each other and join in pursuit of common goals.

Richard Moore responded to the publication of this document in *Cyberspace Inc* and the *Robber Baron Age*, and analysis of PFF's 'Magna Carta.' One criticism points out the irony in the fact that the Magna Carta granted "powers and privileges exclusively to an elite aristocracy" and argued that this is precisely what could happen in the Internet: several of the communal goals are dependent upon everyone being able to use the Internet.

Several have argued that this ideal has not yet been realized, and will not for a time to come, because of a "Digital Divide"—a rift between families of different races of income levels.

Two reports from the National Center for Educational Statistics released in October 2003 confirm that a Digital Divide exists today, though the gap between races and income levels is closing.

According to one of the reports, "Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms: 1994-2002," 99% of schools have Internet access, compared to 35% in 1994. At the home, however, it is different. The other report, "Computer and Internet Use by Children and Adolescents in 2001," found that 45.3% of blacks and 37.2% of

Hispanics use the Internet, compared to 66.7% and 64.6% for whites and Asians, respectively.

The differences stem primarily from economic and geographic factors—those in the inner city and those whose families made less than \$35,000 a year were less likely to have computers or use the Internet than those who live in other areas or make more money.

The ubiquity of Internet access is one of the necessary conditions for creating the world that cyberlibertarians describe, but that condition has not yet come to pass.

## Why does cyberlibertarianism thrive in the Silicon Valley?

Perhaps one of the most perplexing issues to those who write about cyberlibertarianism is understanding how such libertarian ideals developed in the Bay Area that is largely dominated by the left.

Paulina Borsook was surprised at the juxtaposition of strongly liberal and conservative values. She described her experience in the Silicon Valley in *Cyberselfish*, saying that "the technologists I encountered there were the liberals on social issues I would have expected (pro-choice, as far as abortion; pro-diversity, as far as domestic partner benefits; inclined to sanction the occasional use of recreational drugs), they were violently lacking in compassion, ravingly anti-government, and tremendously opposed to regulation."

Barbrook and Cameron believe that the anti-government stance is fundamental to reconciling these differences.

"By mixing New Left and New Right, the Californian Ideology provides a mystical resolution of the contradictory attitudes held by members of the 'virtual class'. Crucially, anti-statism provides the means to reconcile radical and reactionary ideas about technological progress."

## Against corporations

In addition to the anti-government stance, many individuals—especially college students—rally against large corporations such as Microsoft or the music industry. They exercise this belief by using programs to illegally download music, movies, and software.

Eric Roberts also believes that the cause of this is in part due to students taking cultural relativism too far, to the extent of ethical relativism.

The Business Software Alliance confirms the prevalence of these activities among college students. "Only 24 percent of 1,000 college and university students surveyed consider it wrong to make unauthorized copies of software." However, 93% said that "people who develop software deserve to be rewarded for their efforts," and 89% said that they had illegally downloaded software without paying for it.

The BSA also found that software piracy cost \$2 billion in 2002 and—perhaps most importantly to college graduates—cost 105,000 people their jobs because of the large financial losses.



# The Moral Incompetence of Disarmed Society

by Alec Rawls  
News Staff Writer

Consider the following advice from Thomas Jefferson to his 15-year-old nephew:

A strong body makes the mind strong. As to the species of exercise, I advise the gun. While this gives a moderate exercise to the body, it gives boldness, enterprise, and independence to the mind. Games played with the ball, and others of that nature, are too violent for the body, and stamp no character on the mind. Let your gun therefore be the constant companion of your walks.<sup>1</sup>

A little unfair to games with the ball perhaps, but dead on about arms giving boldness to the mind. Armed with a gun, one can move toward circumstances of possible conflict with the prospect of being able to be of help, should help be needed. And what is more on the mind a fifteen year old boy, out on a walk in rural Virginia, than the situations he might encounter, especially dangerous situations, where bravery and fast comportment might be called for? Armed, he can think of how to proceed.

Gunfire sounds nearby. Jefferson's nephew runs up to the bend in the road and sees a wagon ahead. Another thunderous report and a man on the near-side of the wagon tumbles backwards. A young woman screams. Two men run up from the other side of the road and muffle her. One of the highwaymen is cut through the heart with the boy's first shot. Ducking back behind cover, he reloads. Thanks to much practice, he can do it in about thirty seconds if he uses pre-patched balls and doesn't swab the bore, which he has found he can get away with once.

"Let the woman go" the boy bellows with his newly deep voice, "and we won't kill you." No reply. He darts up through the trees alongside the road to get to cover in front of the bend. From there he sees the villain running back into the woods on the other side of the road... alone. A horse whinnys and gallops off. Running up to help, the boy finds that the waylaid man, the age of his own father, is alert. The author of the scream is the man's very shaken, very grateful and very beautiful 14 year old daughter...

Kids.

But a gun is not all fun and games. A gun, one learns the first time one pulls a trigger, is a very serious thing. Any mistake in its use will haunt the rest of one's days. At the same time, a gun can also save whole lifetimes, including one's own. Thus hard questions are thrust onto the imagination.

What to do if you come upon a violent scene and do not know who is the assailant and who is the victim, or whether neither is blameless? If one combatant begs for mercy and the other will not grant it, you can insist. But at what point is deadly force justified, and when must it be withheld, even at risk to oneself? A gun prompts its possessor to consider lifetimes of value, and come

to grips with the weighing of such quantities against each other. Whether to drop a highwayman molesting a girl is a trivially easy question. The person who walks with a gun is prompted to ponder infinitely more difficult questions than that.

A stamp on the mind indeed. Now consider how the disarmed condition stamps the mind.

Many years ago in Harvard Square I saw a dirty young man attack another street person who was standing in a doorway, slicing him again and again with a knife. The sharp blade made an awful sound as it laid open the man's face and palms. No one could do anything but seek for the police, who were nowhere to be found.

After the attacker had had his fill, no one met his eye as he slithered off. None followed as he looked back over his shoulder.

Against a knife, every passerby was defenseless. Recoil was the only possible course, as it always is for the disarmed person. To go through life disarmed is to ever contemplate timidity, instinctively shrinking from every serious threat. Where the armed condition stamps the mind with powers of moral engagement, the disarmed person is stamped with flight from moral engagement.

This is a very serious lack of moral scope to have in a democracy, where fight or flight is ultimately for the electorate to decide. Western civilization is currently witnessing a most remarkable phenomenon. Majorities across

most of Western Europe and across large swaths of the United States are mortified that the United States is waging war on those who plot the mass murder of Americans, a rather obvious imperative, one would think, in the wake of 9/11. Is it coincidence that citizens of European countries are almost all disarmed, and that in America, anti-war views and anti-gun views are highly correlated? Anti-gunners presumably eschew gun ownership, which would explain why they share with disarmed Europeans a seeming unfamiliarity with the moral use of force.

Thank God for the Bush Administration. At least our present government is not a lamb for the slaughter, right? Don't be so sure. Joel Mowbray, in his book *Dangerous Diplomacy*, documents how the State Department is

ruled by the exact moral incompetence that the disarmed condition creates: recoil from forceful engagement. State opposes every use of American power on the grounds that even forceful demands, never mind actual uses of force, pose a threat to diplomatic ties, which constitute State's preferred avenue for promoting America's interests.

That preference may be ideological, stemming from pacifist/anti-gun type incompetence regarding the moral use of force, or it might be a manifestation of the principle-agent problem, where State sees its own power as operating through diplomatic ties and, like a miser, does not want to spend its own power on national objectives. Either way, eschewing the use of power has the effect of rendering State, and The United States, powerless. State often ends up acting as if it is doing its best

to throw the contest to the Islamist enemy, shielding them from American power wherever possible.

Diplomacy is a mouthpiece for will. You can't get rid of the will and still have a moral mouthpiece. A similarly immoral institution is the U.N., designed from the outset to prioritize diplomacy over force, and even to strip nations of their sovereign power to employ force: a kind of gun-control on the nation-state level. Here too the coincidence between moral incompetence and the disarmed condition obtains. U.N. aficionados are the anti-gunners from Europe and America.

To believe in liberty is to be willing to pay a price for it.

With gun rights, both reason and evidence indicate that gun rights make us safer. The logic is simple: public safety comes from tipping the advantage in favor of would-be defenders and away from would-be attackers. Disarming criminals tips the advantage towards defenders, a plus. Disarming law-abiding citizens tips the advantage towards attackers, a negative. We should disarm convicts, but not law abiding citizens.

In addition, an armed citizenry gains advantage from concealment. Not knowing who is armed, the criminals are deterred from attacking anyone. Thus even those who want nothing to do with guns are safer when the right of law abiding citizens to keep and bear arms is protected.

The evidence is just as conclusive. Over the last fifteen years, thirty four

states have passed "shall issue" gun carry laws, stripping sheriffs of the power to deny law-abiding citizens their right to bear arms. All applicants who are not disqualified by history of crime or mental illness must be issued a gun carry permit. The results of this massive experiment can be stated concisely: More Guns Less Crime, as University of Chicago economist John Lott titled his comprehensive analysis of the data.<sup>2</sup>

Thus the anti-gun position is revealed to be what one might call a pure illiberalism. Instead of being willing to pay a price for liberty, anti-gunners are willing to pay a high price in public safety in order to get rid of gun rights, in violation of the priority of liberty. This is beyond the pale.

Adherents of the moral philosophy of John Rawls should note that the priority of liberty is the very core of the "overlapping consensus" that Rawls thought all reasonable people must accept. His candidate for this reasonable consensus was his two principles of justice, with the first principle—the priority of liberty—taking lexical (or absolute) priority.

Rawls did not hit every nail square on the head, but this conclusion is unshakable: those who do not accept the priority of liberty—those who are willing to pay a price in human life and prosperity in order to diminish liberty—are the unreasonable of the polity of liberty, and hence outside of the reasonable consensus upon which legitimate government can and must be based.

Our anti-gun, anti-war Democrats offer a living, breathing, example of unreasonableness gone haywire. Ignorant of the lessons that guns teach, they only know to shrink from force. They don't care if gun rights make us safer, they still don't want people to be allowed to carry guns. They think that the liberty to keep and bear arms is uncivilized. They think that civilized people don't fight back. They can't even defend America. Having been suckled on flight from moral engagement, their moral comprehension is non-existent.

The morally incompetent will always be with us. The great imperative is to expel these people from every level of government and from every position of public trust.

Alec Rawls is a Contributing Editor to the Stanford Review. He is currently writing a book on republicanism. Contact [alec@rawls.org](mailto:alec@rawls.org) or visit [www.rawls.org](http://www.rawls.org).

Further information:

<sup>1</sup> To Peter Carr, Paris, August 19, 1785. Complete letter available at Yale Law School's Avalon Project: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/jefflett/let31.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> John Lott, *More Guns Less Crime*, second edition, University of Chicago Press, 1998/2000.



Rawls echoes Jefferson: the gun "gives a moderate exercise to the body, it gives boldness, enterprise, and independence to the mind."



# America's New Moral Battleground

by Gary J. Raichart  
Editor in Chief

America is currently engaged in a battle for its future. No, I'm not talking about the war on terrorism. I'm talking about the spiritual war for the heart and soul of our great country.

This war, however, isn't being fought on traditional battlegrounds. It's not being fought in Boston Harbor, the hills of Gettysburg, or even the streets of New York. No, it's not even being fought among elected officials on Capitol Hill. This war is being fought in the courtroom.

You might call it ridiculous that mere "ideological differences" are depicted in such a ghastly manner as a war. Where are the guns, you might ask? Where are the soldiers? Where are the battle lines? One must only look at a map of the 2000 Presidential election results and note which states are red vs. blue.

Where are the casualties? Over 35 million unborn dead and counting.

Over the last forty years, liberals have won battle after battle in the war on religion, almost all in the courts. Beginning in 1962 with the ban on prayer in public schools to the pledge ban case today, liberals have used the court system to circumvent the democratic process and further their political agendas. Conservatives have in large part been consigned to forced acceptance since there is no real check on the judicial branch of the government other than Constitutional Amendments. Moreover, conservatives are in general reluctant to pursue such a path of because of their belief in the greatness of the document and perception that the Justice system already takes liberties in misinterpreting what the Constitution actually says. In other words, conservatives view various amendments as simply restating what is already explicated sufficiently in the Constitution.

While abortion is the most important issue in this war, it is merely one of many facets in the war of ideologies. Gay marriage is another such hot discussion topic. With the Supreme Court once again deciding to legislate instead of adjudicate, it overturned the Texas sodomy law this past summer on grounds of "privacy." While all in society revel in having their own private lives, the Constitution offers no such remediation. Rather, it was first invented in 1965 as a means of outlawing state laws against contraceptives and became infamous for its use as justification for the Roe v. Wade decision. Yet as a result, this decision has far-reaching implications, including the classic "slippery-slope." What are the limitations of privacy? Incest? Bestiality? Self-Mutilation? Suicide? Euthanasia? Privacy henceforth becomes infinitely regressive and dangerously constrictive.

Some may claim that homosexuality falls outside of this debate. Why shouldn't two people of the same sex

who love each other be able to marry? Isn't this denial of equal rights? I ask this. There are some people who love their pets more than they love any other human. Should they be able to marry their pet? Is it the same? Not at all. But would it be the next step after gay marriage? Perhaps.

The fact is that the majority of the nation opposes gay marriage. Most Americans believe marriage to be a sacred institution uniting a man and a woman. It is the ultimate expression of love, the symbol of the sacrifice of the self for the other, the uniting of two people into one. Yet, marriage is more than that. Marriage is the core institution upon which our entire society was

“Marriage is the core institution upon which our entire society was founded.”

founded. Marriage is the center of the family unit, which is responsible for the raising of the next generation and instructing children concerning religion and morality.

While a vast majority of the population is tolerant of homosexuality today, there's still a large portion of the population who believe homosexuality is a sin. We are all predisposed to certain actions through heredity and environment, but nevertheless, we still, as humans, have the ability to make choices in life. Hence, while certain people may be predisposed towards homosexual tendencies, they have the choice on whether or not to act on those tendencies. Just as many Americans are drawn to alcoholism through societal, cultural, environmental, and hereditary influences, drunkenness is still considered a sin by many Christians. Hence, having hereditary desires to be homosexual is not a sin. Attraction to members of the same sex is not a sin. Only giving into these temptations by committing homosexual acts is a sin.

Yet, homosexuality is just one of many sins. Why does it elicit so much derision from the religious right? The first and most unfortunate answer is that of hypocrisy. While everyone sins, and Christians will often be the first to point this out to anyone, homosexuality is a sin that few believers succumb to. While many Christians fail through such sins as adultery, pornography, and lust, most do not commit homosexuality. Hence, not being plagued by that particular sin, it becomes one easily attacked by the right as primarily an exterior problem.

Yet, there is a much greater reason to oppose homosexuality so fervently, which is the preservation of the traditional family unit. The religious right believes that God is more important than anything else. Second to God is

family. They believe marriage to be a sacrament, an act before God which solidifies for all time the union between a man and a woman. Sex is seen as a consummation of this everlasting commitment, an intimate expression of one's devotion to one's spouse and only one's spouse for all time.

Childrearing is not simply the raising of a child to become an active member of society. Rather, raising children is a solemn task of which instruction in religious and spiritual matters is considered of the utmost import. Christianity is seen as the one and only way to God, and therefore raising a child in any other way would be exposing them to the possibility of eternal dam-

nation.

Yet, this is where so many fail. Parents cannot choose Jesus for their children. Rather, choosing to follow Christ is something each and everyone has the opportunity to do or not do. Giving children every opportunity to make that choice is fine. Trying to force that choice upon them can do nothing but spark rebellion. Following Jesus is a choice, just as not following Him is also a choice.

The preservation of this family unit, therefore, is of the utmost import for the religious right. Gay marriage would not only be an affront to their religious beliefs, but also an attack upon the very existence of the traditional family. As statistics prove, the traditional family is far and away the best environment in which to raise a child. Children in single-parent households are far more likely to live in poverty and to turn to a life of crime. Thus, preservation of the traditional family unit would not only seem to be in the best interests of morality, but also in the best interests for the next generation of our society.

But a gay marriage has nothing to do with a single-parent household, you might argue. In fact, gay marriage is the commitment of two people to be together and not single, and therefore through adoption might provide a two "parent" household for a child as opposed to a single parent household.

Obviously, there is little data to support the argument either way on this issue as the presence of gay marriage in America is very small and short-lived, since only Vermont has legalized some form of it. However, the answer lies at the very core of the heart of the overall war. The answer is morality.

While a homosexual couple may love each other, and may even serve as good parents, it ultimately comes down to the fact that homosexuality is immoral. Does that mean the government should

go around arresting gays? Absolutely not. There should not be any national law outlawing homosexuality. Indeed, anti-sodomy laws existed only in a handful of states before the Supreme Court decision, and in none were the laws actually enforced more than on rare occasions. But gay marriage is something entirely different than anti-sodomy laws. Legalizing gay marriage is equivalent to the government sanctioning homosexuality. There is a vast difference between the government allowing homosexual behavior and the government endorsing it through legalizing marriage.

Does government have the right to legislate morality? Of course. It does so all the time. Murder, tax fraud, theft, fraud, and so on are all examples of immoral acts. But these acts all harm others, you say, whereas homosexuality is a private matter.

This is an essential difference between libertarian and conservative ideology. Libertarians believe that what one does in the privacy of their own home should be totally up to them because it doesn't affect anyone else. Conservatives, on the other hand, realize that no one lives in a bubble and that everything you do affects those around you. Homosexuality today is such a hot topic because what people do in private does extend into the public; that's the entire point of "coming out of the closet." Exposing others to the fact that homosexuality exists and that many people engage in it is fine. But when the government takes the step of marriage, then those who believe homosexuality is a sin will find it all the harder to preserve the traditional family unit for which they are so desperately fighting.

Gay marriage is just one of the issues in this war for the heart of America's soul. While America has become tolerant of homosexual behavior, the heartland has definitely not accepted it as a proper means of forming a family, whereas the coasts have. If the right is to win this battle, the leaders of the movement for the preservation of Judeo-Christian values need to stop denouncing homosexuals, and only denounce homosexuality.

All humans sin. Denouncing a sinner or discriminating against a segment of society just because they have given into a sin is the antithesis of what Jesus taught us. Rather than endorsing the stoning of the adulteress, Jesus forgave her sins and encouraged her to move on with her life, showing her that there was a better way.

Similarly, Christians, while never waivering from the stance that homosexuality is a sin, need to reach out to homosexuals and show the love and grace of God to the world.

While the fight for family values and morality in America is vital to our nation's future, what are we fighting for if we cannot even love our neighbor?

We must remember that winning the battle on homosexuality means nothing if we lose the war.

# Why Conservatives Should Support Gay Marriage

by Bob McGrew  
Editor Emeritus

Across the United States, gay marriage has become a defining issue in state politics: California has enacted a ban on gay marriage, while Vermont has enshrined it as civil unions. Gay marriage is replacing abortion as social conservatives' most defining issue. Yet, by rights, gay marriage should be the least objectionable part of the so-called 'gay agenda.' Anti-discrimination laws impinge on the freedom of religious believers to choose who teaches their children, who leads their Boy Scout troop, whom they associate with. Hate crimes laws ask for special treatment for special victims. In contrast, gay marriage imposes no special obligation on heterosexuals and no special privileges for gays that straight people do not already enjoy. As Jon Stewart joked on the Daily Show, it's not like gay marriage will be mandatory.

Now, there's no constitutional right to gay marriage, as some of its proponents hope to argue. But that doesn't stop gay marriage from being a good idea – and for some very conservative reasons. Unlike the other gay issues, social conservatives oppose gay

marriage not because it offers special treatment for gays but because they fear that it will destroy the institution of heterosexual marriage. But, in fact, exactly the opposite is true. It's the alternatives to gay marriage that pose the most threat to heterosexual marriage – and that threat is not hypothetical but there today.

So what is the greatest threat to marriage today? Not gay marriage, but cohabitation. Cohabiting couples increased by 54% as a percentage of households in the '90s, compared with a 7% decline for married couples. Living together is increasingly being defined not as a trial period before marriage but as an alternative to marriage itself. Most large companies offer benefits to unmarried couples just as they do to married couples, and almost all do so for opposite-sex partners as well as same-sex partners. Cities like San Francisco and Los Angeles have long had domestic partner registration for both gay and straight partners, and Gray Davis just signed AB 205 to extend that to all of California. Live-in boyfriends and girlfriends are often invited to Thanksgiving dinner and treated as part of the family. For people of a certain age, cohabitation is now normal – and if you can get all the benefits of marriage just from shacking up, what's the point of actually getting married? In Sweden today, registered domestic partnerships are more numerous than marriages and rarely lead to them.

Domestic partnerships are so popular among cities and corporations only because they are the way to offer gays benefits and recognition short of marriage. But they are almost never restricted only to same-sex couples. For corporations, it would be a gender discrimination issue and a lawsuit magnet to restrict partner benefits to same-sex couples. For states and municipalities that created domestic partnerships, making them open to heterosexuals and homosexuals alike blunts the criticism that they are offering special treatment to gays.

Some social conservatives might want to resolve this problem by just getting rid of domestic partner benefits and laws entirely, either through laws or through boycotts of offending companies. But this is not even remotely possible as a matter of practical politics. If resisting gay marriage is a fight, imagine trying to take away benefits already granted to gay couples. And this is only going to get more difficult over the years in a society where Will and Grace is a top-rated show and Queer Eye for the Straight Guy is the talk of the town.

Yet there is one way to get rid of domestic partnerships with a single stroke, saving marriage from its single greatest competitor. That

way is making gay marriage legal.

In 2000, after the passage of Vermont's civil union law, the University of Vermont decided to withdraw its long-standing domestic partner benefits for same-sex couples, requiring civil union for gays and marriage for straights in order for partners to obtain benefits. Corporations, like universities, have a strong fiscal incentive to drop their domestic partner benefits if gay marriage is allowed. By restricting benefits to marriage, they will still be able to attract gay employees without losing straight employees. Domestic partner legislation would wither on the vine after losing its most important constituency. Marriage for heterosexual couples would even get a publicity boost from the stories about gay people getting happily married.

Moreover, such a change wouldn't impact religious marriage. Civil marriage doesn't imply religious recognition just as a religious marriage does not imply a civil one. Gay marriage is even now practiced by several Christian denominations in the United States, but this in no way forces civil marriage to include gays.

To conservatives, marriage is one of the most important social institutions, and the arguments for it go far beyond providing for the care of children. Most conservatives would argue that marriage should be the ideal even for people that don't want to or can't have children. Married people live longer,

“... there is one way to get rid of domestic partnerships... That way is making gay marriage legal”

# Review Censored



This editorial is the opinion of the Review's Editorial Board, which consists of the Editor-in-Chief, Opinions Editor, News Events Editor, Investigative News Editor, and Associate Editor.

An assault on student freedom is beginning. Two years ago a policy banning door-to-door distribution of publications was formed at the behest of Residential Education. At the time of its conception, this policy faced little organized resistance for a simple reason: no one enforced it. Now this policy is being awakened from its two year hibernation by a small group of offended students who wish to silence the voices of dissent.

Let there be no misunderstandings. The main reason that this policy may become enforceable is because of the “controversy” the Review stirred up publishing an investigative piece on MEChA. An un-enforced law is not a law at all. It doesn't matter if this policy was put on the books two years ago or two hundred years ago; this policy of censorship effectively didn't exist until a few weeks ago. So let us not skirt around this issue by pretending the debate is centered upon issues of excess publications outside people's doors or any other meager excuse meant to deceive. The effect of this policy is censorship and the cause undeniably came from the Review.

So what exactly did the Review do to warrant such a strong response? The Review published an article condemning racist statements that MEChA put forth years ago. It made a plea for them to distance themselves further from racist literature they still link to on their website.

The current distribution problem began when Roble Hall banned door-to-door distribution as a direct result of the MEChA pieces in the Review. After distribution of our next issue, university officials held a meeting concerning door-to-door distribution of the Review as a result of several complaints they had received, after which all university publications were informed that door-to-door distribution was not allowed in the dormitories without the posted consent of each Resident Fellow. While many Resident Fellows have granted publications the right to distribute door-to-door in their respective dorms, a majority have simply not yet made a policy, meaning door-to-door is still banned in most dorms.

While the Review has complied with the newly enforced policy, the Progressive, a liberal student publication, chose to defy ResEd and distributed their most recent issue door-to-door. However, university officials have said that the violation will only have ramifications if someone lodges a complaint. As of yet, no one has filed a complaint against the Progressive, whereas there were several filed against the Review the last time we distributed door-to-door. What does that say about the tolerance of liberals vs. the tolerance of conservatives?

Stanford University boasts perhaps the most diverse campus in the world in terms of student programs, cultures, ethnicities, thoughts, and ideas. We have community centers for many cultural groups, houses with themes ranging from Hippie to Native American to HumBio, and a diversity of student opinion which makes Stanford a cultural epicenter to the entire world. Diversity is one of the guiding visions used to shape our community. Starting freshmen year we are taught the many virtues of accepting those with which we disagree rather than dismissing them.

Yet many of those who claim to treasure diversity are the same people who are now actively working to quash what was already one of Stanford's most marginalized student groups, the Review, even at the expense of other publications.

Whether you enjoy reading the Review or not, one statement everyone can agree on is the Review always has something unique to add to the current campus debate. Is accepting differing opinions not at core of the ideals of tolerance and acceptance?

The Review was founded in 1987 because many frustrated students felt their voice wasn't being represented. The Review's presence is a testament to just how tolerant our community is to a wide range of ideas. Our recent articles are no different than what we have published for years. They are no more inflaming or provocative. So what grievous crime have we committed now that justifies cutting down our primary means to reach our to the student body?

If you don't like the Review throw it away. If you find it under your door and you don't want to read it, make it into a paper airplane or a sailor's cap. But whatever you do, do not quash the expression of ideas it represents simply because you don't agree with them.

The Review has no weapons. The Review holds no protests. The only thing the Review does is print words. When printing words becomes so dangerous it warrants censorship, we, as a community, must ask ourselves “How tolerant have we become?”

stay healthier, and lead happier lives. They do so because true happiness is found, not in short-term promiscuous relationships to satisfy one's sexual needs, but in a deep, loving, committed relationship to another person. For now, marriage is still the ideal to which heterosexuals aspire. Allowing gay marriage can make that long-term, loving commitment the ideal for gay people as well. Surely the benefits to gay people of long-term committed relationships should be laid on the bal-

ance scale of public policy. After all, consideration for the interests of gay people is part of the love for the sinner that Christianity enjoins.

Instead of making opposition to same-sex marriage an integral part of their platform, conservatives and Republicans should support it. It will help gays aspire to long-term relationships just as straights do – and it will save opposite-sex marriage from becoming that old-fashioned thing your parents did.



# Liberals Just Say No - To Reality, Tolerance

## Students Attempt to Censor OneTruth.org Advertisment in Stanford Daily

by Joe Lonsdale  
Editor Emeritus

We are all aware that the left is the dominant voice in today's universities, and that they hate loud, clearly articulated points of view that provide an alternate way of thinking about the world. (If you are liberal and do not believe this, picture someone well-intentioned setting out to do an objective study on the mental and physical distinctions among the races, using methods he's thought over to ensure unbiased results. Ooo, makes you angry. How dare he? Don't you hate that person? That "racist"! Don't worry, your friends chased him out of Stanford.) The liberals' response, whenever there is no logical way to reconcile their views with a more nuanced reality, is anger and censorship. Any viewpoints, or even statistics, that would refute the pretty-picture-reality that liberals have painted in their heads are despised. If it doesn't support the party line, it has no need to exist.

A similar situation persists in Arab countries, except blown even more out of proportion. The culture of lies that exists in these places has frustrated and confounded even tried-and-true American liberals like Bill Clinton as evidenced by his failed attempts to deal with Arafat. In these countries, other viewpoints aren't tolerated, period. In places like Syria and Lebanon, they take it a step further than Stanford – publicly accusing someone of being pro-Israel in an Arab land is truly the equivalent of calling for their death, and anyone who loudly cries out against those in power is quickly killed. Arafat and his henchmen kill far more Arabs than Jews as they move to silence their dissenters and thus brainwash their youth. Only a single point of view is allowed in schools, mosques, and in any public discussion of Jews – hate. "Who do we hate?" asks a teacher in a typical PLO classroom, on a video you'd never see in the liberal American press. "The Jews!" responds the class. "Who will we kill?" "The Jews!"

Not all Arabs are brainwashed; that would be an impossible task, with all the diverse and intelligent individuals in the Middle East...but this is the official curriculum and public "truth" handed down from those in charge. It's a horrible reality, and it's breeding murderers, children and young adults who celebrate death. But note the word, "reality". Perhaps you have heard of the Iraqi Information Minister who openly proclaimed that there were no Americans anywhere near Baghdad as tanks rolled through the city in the background? There is no objective reality in a world defined by autocrats, only the party line, whatever it may be. Fortunately, Stanford is not this bad. Not yet.

ing in the streets, cheering with their hate. Why do I support these ads?

To quote someone from the Stanford community, "After World War II the slogan of the Jewish people was 'Never Again.' Who would have thought that almost 60 years after the Holocaust it can happen again! The ad is a wake up call! Just listen to the prime minister of Malaysia, Mahatir Mohamad, who in a speech to the 57 member Organization of the Islamic Conference October 16, 2003, delivered to the world a 'toxic statement of hatred of Jews.' Receiving unanimous standing ovation and applause, he declared that 'the Jews run the world by proxy.' 'They get others to fight and die for them.' Muslims are 'up against a people who think.'"

which we all adhere as members of the Stanford community. These ads were an attack on the personal honor of a specific group of people with no agenda other than to smear their image and dehumanize them. They promote the idea that it is acceptable to make blanket statements regarding an entire people and display an alarming degree of intolerance towards them. This is especially harmful..."

Despite their history of being passionately anti-Israel and misrepresenting the facts of the Middle East conflict, I applaud the Daily for their dedication to free speech in the face of this attempted censorship, and I hope it continues. Others, however, clearly felt that this "intolerant" ad should not be allowed on a college campus.

At Michigan, "a mass effort was organized to stop these racist advertisements. These ads were in fact against the State News' advertising policy because they incriminated an ethnicity."

At the University of Arizona, the ad provoked violence: according to pro-Israel student Noah Friend, "...As I tried to talk to [an Arab who came up to our pro-Israel table] in a peaceful manner, he resorted to name calling, using anti-Semitic slurs, including 'f---ing Jew'. He also threatened to kick me below the belt, and before he was pulled away by his friend, he assaulted me by pushing me..." I have also been approached and threatened at Stanford by a screaming anti-Israeli student.

According to the Daily Illini, visiting sociology professor Carl Estabrook said he wasn't pleased with the idea of running paid ads expressing "despicable speech."

Said the editor at the University of Chicago, Pete Beatty, "To me, it's clearly hate speech and a misuse of facts. It's lying."

Yes, Pete. A misuse of facts. How dare they use these facts. How dare we "lie" by using facts to portray reality. Welcome to the modern American University, where reality is in the eye of the liberal beholder, and others just need to learn to be more tolerant.

Reality + liberal-mindset  
= does not compute  
=> censorship.

What is the truth? It's what's actually happening, outside of the solipsistic picture you paint in your head. A recent poll jointly conducted by The Public Opinion Research of Israel and The Palestinian Center for Public Opinion showed 59% of Palestinians believe that Hamas and Islamic Jihad should continue armed struggle against Israel even if Israel leaves all of the West Bank and Gaza, including East Jerusalem, and a Palestinian state is created.

OneTruth has created ads to illustrate the basic difference, the basic truth about this conflict. On one side, there is hate and a lack of reality, and on the other there is attempted normalcy in the face of insanity. An ad showed Israeli children looking up to athletes as role models on one side, and Palestinian children admiring suicide bombers on the other. Israelis mourning 9/11 and the Palestinians celebrating

There is a clear and dangerous difference between the two sides in the Middle East conflict, and it is "intolerant" to express this reality. The idea of a people being brainwashed simply doesn't fit with the liberal viewpoint of the world...you can't have that kind of truth because it would create way too much intolerance, so it must not be true. Reality + liberal-mindset = does not compute, => censorship.

Whether or not you support the ad, the response of many students on campuses around the nation is telling. Many of those responding with censorship and violence are the people who grew up in these countries where truth is subjective and the other side is not tolerated, and they're right at home in our environment.

Read a Stanford petition:  
"We find these ads to be distasteful ... simply out of keeping with the spirit of the fundamental standards to


### Support Stanford's Conservative Voice

Contributions from individual Stanford alumni and friends keep The Stanford Review on the presses.

Donations are tax-deductible. For a gift of \$75 or more, you will receive one year of The Stanford Review. Please make checks payable to "The Stanford Review" and mail to: The Stanford Review, P.O. Box 20222, Stanford, CA, 94309.

Donations can also be made online at [www.stanfordreview.org](http://www.stanfordreview.org).

☐ \$75      ☐ \$250  
☐ \$100      ☐ \_\_\_\_\_



Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

The Stanford Review  
P.O. Box 20222  
Stanford, CA 94309

First Class Prst.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Permit No. 5283  
San Jose, CA

The Stanford Review is written by a voluntary student organization of the Associated Students of Stanford University, 205 Tresidder Memorial Union, Stanford, CA 94305.