
THE
PRINCETON TORY

February-March 2002

www.princetontory.com

205

The
PRINCETON TORY
- A Proud Tradition -

**Coming
Out of the
Closet**

THE PRINCETON TORY

February-March 2002
Volume XIX - Number 1

Publisher *Editor in Chief*
Pete Hegseth '03 Brad Simmons '03

Managing Editors
Jennifer Carter '03 Nitesh Paryani '05

Layout Editor *Content Editor*
Amy Burghardt '05 Nat Hoopes '03

Web Manager *Financial Manager*
Brian Beck '05 Ryan Feeney '03

Staff Writers
Nathaniel Norman '03 Matt O'Brien '03
Carlos Mrosovsky '04 Pete Sutherland '04
Arvin Bahl '05 John Brunger '05
Jonathan Bydlak '05 Dan Larach '05
J. R. Johnson GS

Board of Trustees
Peter Heinecke '87 Mark Banovich '92
David Daniels '89 Brian Tvenstrup '95
Kim Daniels '90 Wickham Schmidt '99
Timothy Webster '99

The Princeton Tory is a journal of conservative political thought written, edited and produced by Princeton University students and delivered free of charge to all Princeton students and faculty. *The Princeton Tory* is a publication of The Princeton Tory, Inc. The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the editors, trustees, Princeton University, or the Princeton Tory, Inc.

The Princeton Tory accepts letters to the editor. Direct correspondence to: P.O. Box 1499, Princeton, NJ 08542; or by e-mail: tory@Princeton.edu.

Advertisement rates for *The Princeton Tory* are: \$75 for a quarter page, \$110 for a half page, \$200 for a full page, and \$300 for the back cover.

Donations to *The Princeton Tory* are fully tax-deductible. Please mail donations to: P.O. Box 1499, Princeton, NJ 08542.

The Princeton Tory is a member of the Collegiate Network. *The Princeton Tory* gives special thanks to the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, Princeton Alumni Viewpoints, The Wilbur Foundation, and the Publishers Guild.

The Princeton Tory, Inc. is a non-profit corporation registered in New Jersey. No part of this publication should be construed to promote any pending legislation or to support any candidate for office. No part of this publication may be reproduced without express written consent of the Publisher.

Copyright © 2001, The Princeton Tory, Inc.

Notes from the Publisher



Princeton University is, in its most profound sense, an institution dedicated to the education and cultivation of tomorrow's leaders. And in pursuit of a well-rounded liberal arts education, Princetonians are constantly involved in the timeless exchange of ideas. From the moment we arrive on campus, a wide range of ideologies are thrown in our direction. From the Marxists to the atheist Religion Professors to the Secular Humanists, Princeton's got 'em all.

However, underneath all the liberal noise, there is a traditional core to the Princeton experience. It is that core which *The Princeton Tory* seeks to rediscover. The *Tory* original Statement of Principles, written in 1984, sums up our mission well: "Our objective is to legitimate conservatism as a philosophy and as an approach for those reformers who seek to ameliorate our social and political problems. We present our views as a challenge to those who would build their new world by destroying many of those very qualities which we value in our civilization."

As conservatives it is our duty to present the other side of the story—the right side. We will try our damndest to provide the Princeton community, and our faithful subscribers, with news and opinion that unabashedly relay the conservative message—the truth, as we know it. While we do not expect any mass conversions, we do hope to facilitate a campus discussion. The ideas we accrue on campus soon become the ideas that shape this country and the world; and as conservatives we want all Americans and Princetonians to remember that ideas have consequences.

I would like to personally invite you to become a part of this discussion. Contact me if you'd like to submit a letter-to-the-editor, or if you'd simply like to discuss a difference of opinion. And of course, an occasional comment of support is always welcome. I am honored to be the newest Publisher of the *Tory* and look forward to the task.

Pete Hegseth '03
phegseth@princeton.edu

- The 2002 *Tory* Editorial Staff -



THE RANT

The *Tory* comments on:

- obesity
- binge drinking
- angry grad students
- homophobia on the 'Street'
- French cowardice and more...

ON CAMPUS

6 Diversity, Shmiversity

The University's superficial definition of diversity assumes Princetonians have the intellect of pre-pubescent teens.

Jenn Carter '03

8 SVC on the Rocks

One part service and two parts liberal demagoguery. Stir well.

Brad Simmons '03

UNITED STATES

12 Axis of Foolishness


Three impressionable American youths fall prey to militant Islam. A sign of things to come?

Pete Hegseth '03

14 Nix on the Creationism

Why science and religion belong in different classrooms.

Brian Beck '05



COVER STORY

Coming to Terms with One's Ideology

A Princeton student finally makes peace with his conservative nature and comes out with the news to his family and friends.

By Nitesh Paryani '05

PAGE 10

INTERNATIONAL

15 Problems on the Peninsula

A first-hand perspective on the growing unrest in the Arabian peninsula.

J. R. Johnson GS

THE LAST WORD

19 The Vagina Monologues

Raunchy ad campaign deserves condemnation, despite weak "defense" by campus lefty.

Ryan Feeney '03

THE RANT

- U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher spoke to Princeton students on February 7th, detailing the newest health reports concerning the rising danger of obesity. Satcher warned that, over the next fifteen years, obesity will replace tobacco as the leading cause of preventable deaths in the United States. Not surprisingly, the audience at Satcher's address was unwilling to recognize obesity as a serious public health problem without significant qualifications. Those present seemed intent on understanding the institutional, cultural, genetic, and familial factors related to overeating. Satcher stuck to his guns, calmly recognizing the partial validity of such remarks but insisting that additional exercise and a low-calorie diet were the most important elements of any solution. Conservatives have always recognized the role individual responsibility ought to play in alleviating social crises and Satcher, though not a *Tory* favorite, deserves praises for withstanding an intellectually hostile crowd. Allow us to put into words what Satcher ought to have said to his student critics: if you want to lose weight, try eating less.
- The campaign against binge drinking always heats up after bicker week, but the hypocrisy of efforts to reduce alcohol consumption is particularly apparent this year. Several months ago, USG members and high-level administrators urged students to protest the town's ordinance permitting greater enforcement of underage drinking statutes, decrying the possibility of law enforcement officials intruding on "private" property. The beginnings of ideological inconsistency were already present then, for it is precisely the antithesis of that principle – that the eating clubs are *not* strictly private – that gave courts the authority to mandate their inclusion of women. The uncomfortable truth is that, for many, drinking is *fun*. And, yes, binge drinking can be fun. That's why most students opposed the local alcohol ordinance, that's why most students get hammered at the clubs every week, and that's why the "imperative" to reduce binge drinking ought to be reconsidered. Administrators and USG elites consider drinking six or more beers to be unhealthy, and they certainly have the right to explain their position. After that, it's the responsibility and privilege of students to decide how to spend their extracurricular time.
- Searching for a purpose, Students for Progressive Education and Action (SPEAC) recently lambasted Princeton for its continuing contracts with companies whose practices are inconsistent with appropriate standards of "fair labor." SPEAC cited just one example in its letter to the editor published February 11th issue of the 'Prince': the conduct of New Era Cap Company. Trouble is, as SPEACsters later learned, Princeton's contract with New Era was terminated last year. Oops.
- Beware of angry grad students searching desperately for a cause. In the February 18th issue of the Prince, graduate student Nick Guyatt wrote an editorial declaring "Black Hawk Down"—a recent blockbuster hit and personal favorite of the *Tory*—a racist movie. Guyatt summarizes the movie as "143 minutes of white guys killing black people." Well, we'd like to point out that the actual skirmish took place over the course of fifteen hours—but Guyatt is correct, it was fifteen hours of white American GI's killing hostile black Somalis. Guyatt calls the movie a "fallacious rendering of history," when in fact the American-made movie merely depicts what actually happened. The fact is that we

had the highly trained soldiers and the toys to back them up—did you see those machine guns? Wow. We lost 18 men, they lost close to 1,000. Should the movie have highlighted every Somali casualty as Guyatt seems to suggest? That might actually have required 15 hours of film. Regardless, the courage of America's soldiers in a time of great distress is what is to be commended. The commander's plan was poor and the chips were stacked against them—but as always, American GI's won in the end, as they always do.

- So, *Homophobia on the Street*. The sign sparked our curiosity, so we attended with noble intentions. We have never witnessed any sort of homophobic act at the Street, but the sign indicated that such events do occur. And so we went, and we heard some of the unfortunate stories of gay students being physically or verbally harassed while partying at the Street. The students who relayed these acts to the audience should be commended for their bravery, and we at the *Tory* sincerely hope that other students on campus recognize that any harassment of a homosexual based solely on his/her sexual choice is unjust. Unfortunately, according to the panelists, the lack of harassment that they face at Princeton is the greater, and more serious, issue. Panelists lamented the fact that other students don't violently confront them on a daily basis. One student actually stated that he wished people would approach him and scream demeaning slurs at him. Others described their concern that, for the most part, they live completely normal lives, and that, outside of infrequent confrontations, no one bothers them about their sexuality. Wow, that sounds pretty rough. You mean they aren't harassed on a daily basis? Can you believe that people are actually cordial and nice when they speak to them? Well, pardon us for not bringing out our handkerchiefs and crying a river. Isn't it funny that those who once bemoaned their differential treatment have changed their tune and now clamor for it? Instead of making the meeting a productive session where problems were announced and solutions discussed, the panelists whined about how bad their Princeton University lives are. We only have question: With so many different groups sponsoring the event, why wasn't the *Tory* contacted to be a co-sponsor?

- Recently the Foreign Minister of France, Mr. Hubert Vedrine, openly criticized the United States' approach to terrorism as "simplistic." The only question is—who cares? Based on the modern military history of both countries, it seems odd that the French are even attempting to critique United States military policy. In fact, hasn't France already formally surrendered to terrorism?

- Is Martin Luther King Really More Important than Lincoln? The University has certainly answered this question. While Martin Luther King's birthday (MLK Day) was celebrated with a large service in the University Chapel, Lincoln's birthday (February 12th) passed without mention. Also, it was very unfortunate to see President's Day (that was February 18th for all our fellow patriots) come and go without any formal recognition. Frankly, we find it absurd that the University spends so much time celebrating the life of Dr. King without even mentioning the original champion of minority rights, Abraham Lincoln. Martin Luther King deserves extensive study and praise, but only alongside Lincoln. Without Lincoln, the ugly face of slavery might still be evident today. Without Lincoln, there would never have been a Martin Luther King to protest peacefully. While Dr. King won civil rights for black Americans, Lincoln won them basic HUMAN RIGHTS. In fact, Lincoln was willing to fight the bloodiest war ever on American soil in order to maintain the Union, free from slavery; in doing this, Lincoln kept intact the ultimate integrity of our Constitutional ideals. Martin Luther King was a great man as well—winning blacks their due civil rights while staying true to American ideals. But do Dr. King's actions deserve more praise than those of Lincoln? We think not. The *Tory* salutes Lincoln and his eternal contributions to the greatest, and most diverse, country the world has ever known

- Can we please go to Iraq already? We've established that Saddam is evil and that he has biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction at his fingertips. What further evidence is needed? Lets take him out, and his crazy son with him.

—Compiled by the *Tory* Editors

DIVERSITY, SHMIVERSITY

Race and the Humanities at Princeton University

by Jennifer Carter '03

Just before course cards were due for the spring term, a booklet entitled *Race, Ethnicity, and Cross-Cultural Encounter: A Guide to Undergraduate Courses* appeared in every student mailbox on campus.

Published by the office of the Dean of the College, the booklet is the product of a 1995 task force on diversity. It offers a description of "courses in the curriculum that explore racial,

ethnic, and cultural diversity" and claims to be "illustrative rather than exhaustive." Four pages of explanatory text are followed, however, by a nine-page listing of hundreds of courses that would indeed appear to be very exhaustive.

The annual publication of this booklet is troubling both on practical and philosophical levels. Surely the thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours of faculty time involved could have been better spent elsewhere. As a tool for students, the booklet is wholly arbitrary and unhelpful. It serves only its self-proclaimed

**As a tool
for students,
the booklet
is wholly ar-
bitrary and
unhelpful.**

"illustrative" purpose, testifying to the supposed progressiveness of Princeton's curriculum and attempting to vindicate the existence of the Diversity Committee.

Worse still, it reaffirms the University's limited and divisive conceptions of diversity.

Race, Ethnicity, and Cross-Cultural Encounter lists 83 courses for Spring 2002 (in addition to 80 for Fall 2001 and 64 not offered this year) from 25 departments and programs.

One immediately wonders at the subjectivity of such long lists. For example:

- Four Spanish-language courses and one French course qualify as "cross-cultural," but no courses in any of the other 16 languages taught at Princeton.

- AMS 307 (BeBop: Triumph of the Avant-Garde in Pop Culture) is listed, but ECS 321 (Cultural Explosion: Avant-Garde and Dictatorship in the Soviet Union) is not.

- POL 316 (Civil Liberties) is listed, but POL 318 (Law and Society) is not.

- ANT 330 (Ethnographic Perspectives on States in Transnational Contexts) is listed, but ANT 230 (Ethnographic Perspectives on Everyday Lives in

Contexts of Dramatic Political Change) is not.

- HUM 232/3 (Literatures of the World) are missing from the list, as is the rest of the program in Humanistic Studies.

The overwhelming arbitrariness of the courses listed in *Race, Ethnicity, and Cross-Cultural Encounter* underscores the insulting irrelevance of such a

**Attempts to
foster diver-
sity have
only served
to reinforce
the racial
status quo.**

publication. One wonders whether anyone actually chose their courses based on the contents of this booklet. Furthermore, we should be troubled and offended by the implication that students receiving a liberal arts

education at Princeton are unable to choose a diverse and mind-opening curriculum on their own.

What we have here, at least in part, is a backlash against the conservative "great books" curricula that have reappeared in many of the nation's universities. Princeton's version is the humanities sequence HUM 216-219, devoted to the

canon of Western culture. Along with the rest of the Humanities Council offerings, these apparently close-minded courses fail to meet the University's standards for diversity.

Race, Ethnicity, and Cross-Cultural Encounter is a symptom of a larger problem plaguing the University: a glaring misunderstanding of what diversity means. "Understanding diversity is central, not peripheral, to our academic objectives," insists the Task Force on

Diversity in the introduction to the booklet. But apparently, understanding diversity means simply engaging in "critical analysis of cultural, ethnic, [and] racial differences." This call for superficial analysis based on skin color and nationality is just one of many examples of the rhetoric of difference so prevalent on this campus.

True diversity sees no skin color or nationality, but only ideas—good and bad, old and new, conservative and liberal alike.

When freshmen of color arrive on campus, Minority Affairs Advisors are there to remind them that they are different. History and Heritage Months (Black, Latino, and Asian-Pacific, but not

American) are heavily funded and promoted by the University. The Third World Center suggests to ethnic-minority students that they need their own separate space on campus. Surveys and USG reports attempt to reveal, over and over


USG Focus on Minorities report, "minorities need to sign-in and bicker. Period." Meanwhile, the University's present attempts to foster diversity have only served to reinforce the racial status quo, affirming differences and erecting ethnic barriers.

The Third World Center's pending name change is a step in the right direction, reflecting a desire to deconstruct the racial barriers that divide this campus. Yet not until the University stops bombarding minority students with the message "you're a minority, you're a minority" will diversity begin to encompass more than just superficial outward characteristics.

Instead of encouraging a truly liberal and humanistic education, the University's booklet on diversity destructively fixates upon race and ethnicity — mere superficialities compared to the diversity of ideas, beliefs and worldviews found on the Princeton

University campus. As George Moore wrote, "after all there is but one race — humanity."

Therefore, our studies and our lives here should, above all, constructively explore and reflect the wonderful richness of the human race.



again, that there are serious racial divides on this campus, socially and otherwise.

It appears that Princeton students recognize these problems and have a good sense for what is required to overcome them. "If the 'Street' is to become more diverse," wrote a minority student in the

SVC ON THE ROCKS

A 'NONPARTISAN' GROUP?

by Brad Simmons '03

Progressive, diversity, “the administration” – all words I have come to interpret as codewords for dogmatic leftism on campus. Add to this burgeoning list “nonpartisan,” a label that student groups without official political ties or leanings use to cover up fairly obvious political agendas.

It happens all the time among national advocacy groups. The liberal National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL) is technically nonpartisan, for instance, because its endorsements are issue- rather than party-driven. If a Republican supports pro-choice legislation more vigorously than her Democratic opponent, NARAL gives her the nod. Same goes (but in the reverse direction) for the NRA.

Because organizations whose constituents are found almost exclusively at the extremes of the political spectrum still take advantage of the “nonpartisan” credibility boost, we would do well to ignore the label altogether. When the NAACP, American Conservative Union, Citizens for Tax Justice, Federalist Society, and *The New York Times* can be uttered in the same breath as “nonpartisan,” we’ve got problems.

Which somehow brings me to Princeton’s Student Volunteers Council (SVC). The role SVC plays on campus is a vital one, inculcating in on-balance privileged students the value of service with and for the needy. I participated in the program formerly known as Urban Action my freshman year and truly enjoyed it, though I confess my delinquency in volunteering since.

According to official SVC material, the organization’s mission is to “promote an ethic of community involvement,” all the while developing “partnerships within our community.” The stuff of decency and

goodwill, I’d say. Why, then, the organization insists on joining the political causes célèbres of the day – and without fail supporting the corresponding liberal

Those funds are meant to assist the entire membership, rather than soothe the guilty consciences of its elites.

take on each of those issues – is beyond me.

Consider the recently assembled coalition of student groups opposed to the Justice Department’s move to gather information from universities in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. Arguing that such efforts target students of Arab descent and *ipso facto* constitute unconscionable acts of “racial profiling,” these groups asked Princeton officials to “consider a position of non-compliance” with the investigations. Sit on that one for a second. The groups asked Princeton to *obstruct* federal investigations into terrorist activity: to disobey the law.

Let’s go on a tangent for a moment, for the politically charged nature of this petition can only be fully grasped with a bit of explanation. First, polls consistently

show that nine out of ten Americans back the war on terrorism as it is being conducted. Large majorities favor harsh treatment in the prosecution of terrorists, including the possibility of conducting trials by way of military tribunals. I shouldn’t have to point out that the Justice Department’s possible requests for information are leagues away from these measures. I have come to expect non-mainstream thinking at Princeton, but objecting to the government’s investigatory efforts may take the cake.

Second, “racial profiling,” a term coined by activists concerned with police stops along the New Jersey Turnpike in the early 1990s, is an insidious misnomer in this context. Profiling on the basis of race is typically laden with speculation, as it presumes that a person’s race alone is sufficient to suspect criminal behavior on his/her part. It has little or nothing to do with a specific, ongoing criminal investigation employing a multifaceted profile. As the Center for Equality Opportunity’s Roger Clegg surmises, the 9/11 perpetrators and masterminds are almost certainly young or middle-aged Arab males, of Muslim faith, and almost universally (in the case of the architects) recipients of higher education. They also have a penchant for learning how to operate large vehicles. That’s a pretty specific profile, certainly more damning than that devastating “middle-aged white male” description used routinely in law enforcement, over which no one seems to throw tantrums.

We can all pretend that an illiterate old Swedish woman is just as likely to be connected to Al-Qaida as an Iraqi-born physics major at an elite university. I’d prefer to play “pretend” on some other day, though – maybe when a transnational terrorist organization hasn’t made explicit

its intention to obliterate Israel and the West writ large. Point being, *nationality-conscious* profiling in a criminal investigation is not an open-and-shut case of ethical misconduct. Even if it were wrong, making the case against it requires several contentious political judgments, most of which happen to be decidedly left-of-center.

Back to the Student Volunteers Council. According to the Princeton Peace Network's web site, the anti-profiling movement was a "joint project with the Student Volunteers Council and other groups," including the Democratic Left, Princeton Greens, and SPEAC. Not exactly the most mainstream bunch. Former SVC board member Laura Kaplan concedes that SVC resources were used to promote this movement, and PPN project head Lee Worden notes that "they (SVC) definitely have been involved in the campaign since the beginning."

When an anti-profiling petition was submitted as a letter to the editor in the 'Prince,' however, the list of student groups endorsing it neglected to mention SVC, let alone its apparent role as co-coordinator. I suppose it's conceivable that this omission was the result of sloppy editing or space constraints. Conceivable, but doubtful. Worden confirmed my suspicions about SVC's role in the letter-writing, allowing that board members helped in "drafting and delivering that letter," as well as the corresponding public forum about the Justice Department's post-9/11 efforts.

It is comforting to know that SVC leaders would prefer not to be known as behind-the-scenes helpers with movements whose character is undeniably slanted and political. It would be even more comforting if that help ceased.

Now, I have nothing wrong with partisanship; I'm writing for the *Tory*, for God's sake. It's when politically neutral organizations issue decrees – when the opinions of their members are clearly not monolithic – that I get frustrated. If the

SVC simply made known its liberal leanings or perhaps made public the organization's positions on a range of public policy issues (if they aren't neatly aligned with contemporary liberalism), then this issue would be moot.

But again and again, the SVC uses its nonpartisan credibility to back clearly partisan issues. While scouring the archives of official SVC statements for exculpatory evidence, I came upon a defiant 'Prince' op-ed collectively written by the SVC student board. Penned during the heyday of sweatshop protests, the board expressed its disgust with the presence of sweatshops, simultaneously reasserting SVC's status as a "non-partisan, apolitical service organization."



Would an apolitical group cry foul when a student proposed coordinating an urban-focused community service project with a local Boy Scouts chapter? (The Boy Scouts is a bigoted organization, for forgetful readers.)

Would the former head of such a nonpartisan, apolitical group confess to a reporter her sorrow at Princeton's disconnect from the sort of activism seen at Brown and Berkeley?

Would it object to an investigation into terrorist activity on the grounds that law enforcement authorities cannot consider a person's geographic background? I'm curious: under this flexible definition of "apolitical" community service, what precisely would the SVC *not* be permitted to do, aside from knocking down the doors to the Oval Office and diving for Cheney's defibrillator?

Relevant SVC authorities tell me that a distinction ought to be drawn between endorsements issued by the board and

those from the organization at large. This strikes me as particularly disingenuous. Imagine Princeton's Board of Trustees acting in unison to support a political crusade, but admonishing those who paid attention to its connection with the university. I can see the headlines now: "Princeton Board Objects to Investigation, Yells at Onlookers for Noticing Princeton Affiliation."

Surely SVC board members realize that their influence stems overwhelmingly from the broader organization's presumed status as a genuinely objective authority on local affairs. If its institutional weight were irrelevant to the anti-profiling campaign, then why bother deploying the letters "S-V-C" in the first place?

What's more, the "board vs. organization" distinction fails to legitimize the use of SVC funds, building space, and distribution resources in political movements like the one seen recently. Those funds have been given to and are meant to assist the entire membership,

rather than soothe the guilty consciences of its elites.

There must be some reason SVC leaders feel compelled to add the heft of their *organization* to these causes, instead of merely signing on their own names as individuals. Perhaps it's the widespread name recognition, the far-reaching e-mail list, the financial resources, or some combination thereof. These are precisely the reasons that self-proclaimed "apolitical" organizations have a duty to *refrain* from titular association with controversial bouts of activism. To do otherwise inserts an element of ideological rancor into a group whose message ought to be untainted and inclusive of all students' perspectives.

If only to reclaim the integrity of an otherwise upstanding organization, the Student Volunteers Council should restore meaning to its status as a nonpartisan entity or do away with that pretense entirely.

OUT OF THE CLOSET....

by Nitesh Paryani '05

So I did it. I came clean. After years of denying it to everyone – even to myself – I finally just went out and said it.

I'm a conservative.

That's right. A conservative. An honest-to-God, free market-loving, affirmative action-opposed, non-egalitarian conservative. I know society may not accept me for what I am. But I can't stand living my life denying my true identity. I had to come clean. I had to embrace my conservatism – despite the consequences that it may bring. I know I will be discriminated against, that people will look down on me, and that people will draw all sorts of assumptions about me – just because I label myself “a conservative.”


They don't even know me...but they'll judge me anyway.

For example, a lot of the kids in my dorm here know that I'm a conservative. They treat me differently because of it; it's pretty easy to see that they are

uncomfortable with my conservatism. They do their best to avoid any discussions about politics. And when these discussions do come up, it's obvious my hall-mates are embarrassed to discuss the issue with me: they turn all red, they

home. What was I to say? How could I break the news without hurting them? I decided the best way would just be to come out and say it. No fluffing it up or beating around the bush; I just needed to say: “I'm conservative and I'm PROUD!”

I had to tell my high school girlfriend. I mean, she deserved to know. I had deceived her for so long; she was a good friend to me and I owed it to her to tell the truth. She was devastated. She kept asking, “Was it me? Did I make you turn conservative? Was it something I did?” I told her that it wasn't her fault. I told her I was a conservative well before we started dating; I assured her that I had just tried to ignore that fact while we're dating. She wouldn't believe



fidget, and they avoid making eye contact with me. It's obvious that they have a problem with my being conservative.

While it may have been hard to come clean to my friends here at Princeton, it was even harder to tell everyone back

it. She was convinced it was her fault. She even said she would stop dating; the fact that she turned a man into a conservative absolutely devastated her.

Then I had to tell my friends. This wasn't easy. We had spent all our time

...AND *PROUD!*

making fun of conservatives. We'd see a guy who we knew was conservative (you know how people always say they just know that someone is conservative), wearing his J. Crew sweater-vest and his penny-loafers, and we'd taunt him. We'd chase conservatives down the street, threatening to beat them up if we caught them. Telling them that I had become a conservative...I just didn't know how they would react. They'd probably stop talking to me. They'd probably beat me up the next time they saw me.


Surprisingly, my friends were all pretty cool about it. I guess college had opened up their minds – they had become more accepting of diverse lifestyles and realized that conservatives weren't "evil." This was a major relief. I used the positive support that I got from my friends to muster up the strength to tell my brother.

My brother too was surprisingly more supportive than I thought he would be. But I attributed this also to the fact that he had gone to college not too long ago.

"Besides," he said, "I'm your brother and you know I will always support you, even if you're a...con...con...even if you're not a liberal." What about telling Mom and Dad, I asked? He just wished me good luck.

on Princeton, saying that this "crazy elitist school had turned me into a conservative." He would definitely stop helping me pay for tuition, that's for sure. He would probably disown me. I can't tell him. He just wouldn't understand.

And my mom. Oh boy my mom. She would say something like: "How can you be conservative? Indians are not conservative!" She would be so ashamed. What would all her friends say if they found out? What would the neighbors say? And what if I wanted to bring conservative friends home with me? Well that would definitely be out of the question. No. I can't tell mom and dad



I couldn't bring myself to tell them. I mean...how would they react? I know how they'd react. They would go crazy. My dad would be in total shock. How could his own son reject liberalism? It would destroy him. He would probably blame it

now. But maybe in time. After graduation. When I'm on my own. When I don't have to go back and live in their house.

But I'm glad I came clean. I couldn't live the lie any longer. I'm conservative, and I'm proud!

AXIS OF FOOLISHNESS

by Pete Hegseth '03

The events of September 11th brought the best qualities of the American people to the forefront: courage, patriotism, resilience, compassion, religiosity, sacrifice, and selfless service. America's citizens, and her leaders, have truly come to embody the timeless creed of "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

However, the resurgence of America's best qualities has led to the uncovering of some of her worst. From the ACLU's attempts to protect the judicial "rights" of avowed, anti-American terrorists to the knee-jerk peace rallies held by ill-informed protestors, the forces of anti-American spirit are well at work. However, while the ACLU and campus peace-mongers may have good intentions, an "axis" of individual conspirators has surfaced since 9/11—and the scary part is—they are only the beginning of a larger threat.

In his State of the Union Address on January 29th, President Bush referred to Iraq, Iran and North Korea as an "axis of evil," and in keeping with his theme, I will describe John Walker Lindh, Hiram Torres, and Charles Bishop as an "axis of foolishness."

John Walker Lindh, as I'm sure you're well aware, is the American citizen (or can we please say "ex-American citizen") who moved to Afghanistan to fight for the radical Taliban and is now on trial in America for aiding terrorists. He supported

the Taliban's militant regime and even trained at one of Osama bin Laden's terrorist camps; where, among other things, he learned how to detonate bombs and look discreet in an airport.

In 1994, Hiram Torres was a freshman at Yale University; however, he quit less than a month after arriving in New Haven.



Armed with a "disgust for American culture" and dreams of becoming a "revolutionary," Torres set off for Bangladesh. He then moved on to Pakistan, and finally to Afghanistan, where his mother last heard from him in 1998. Torres told his mother that he was "studying" in Afghanistan, but, in December 2001, a New York Times reporter in Kabul found his personal information on different sort of list. He was not listed amongst other students of Islam, but rather was found on a recruiting list belonging to pro-Taliban Pakistani

militants with ties to Al-Qaeda. While there are no confirmed reports of his association with either the Taliban, Al-Qaeda or their stated missions, he is certainly no friend of the United States.

Charles Bishop, the last member of the "axis," never made it to Afghanistan, but shared the same radical views as the

nineteen killers of 9/11. This "fool" ended his 15-year life when he flew a Cessna into a skyscraper in an apparent copycat mission. In a note he left behind, Bishop intelligently declared that, "Osama bin Laden is absolutely justified in the terror he has caused on 9/11" and "God blesses him and the others who helped make September 11th happen." While Bishop claimed to

have ties to Al-Qaeda, authorities have found no such link. Bishop's family is saddened by "his obvious loss of touch with reality," but apparently, they didn't see it coming.

The above examples merit serious inquiry: Why didn't anyone stop John Walker from interrupting his high school years to go to Yemen, a breeding place for militant radicals? Why didn't someone smack young John upside the head when he justified the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole (and death of 17 American boys) by saying that when the U.S. docked its ship there, it

had committed an act of war? Why didn't anyone confront young Torres when they saw a flag from "The Iron Guard," a fascist, anti-Semitic secret society flying in his room? Did it ever strike anyone as odd that Charles Bishop's reading list included such books as "Assassins: Assignment: Jerusalem" and "Antichrist and Deseccration: Antichrist Takes the Throne?"

The fact is that these kids and their moral wanderings may not be isolated incidents, but rather the beginning of a growing American threat. It is not surprising that none of the "axis of foolishness" had a father figure in their lives. Walker dropped his father's name and cut off all communications with him, while Bishop's father left shortly after he was born. For his part, Torres hasn't spoken to his father for over a decade. The absence of a male disciplinary figure helps explain the lack of moral rectitude shown by the "axis." While mothers often do play the role of family disciplinarian, no phrase has been more responsible for keeping American kids awake at night than "wait until your father gets home." However, regardless of the source of parental discipline, strong discipline is needed. First in the form of spankings, moving next to soap-in-the-mouth, then grounding, and

finally curfews—parents have traditionally been unafraid of disciplining their children, and rightfully so.

Unfortunately, a new phenomenon pervades American society and western culture in general. Some call it "post-modernism," but I prefer the label of "moral relativism." Some parents no longer think it is their place to "impose" their beliefs on their children, but instead would rather have their kids "discover" their own belief system. Isn't that a liberating idea? At a time when most teens just want clear skin and a locker next to the prom queen, some parents now expect their kids to build a belief system from scratch. Where, then, do the majority of America's youth go for advice? The internet is a great place to start. The great expanse known as the World Wide Web provides a moral quagmire: kids can skillfully go from the official site of the Klu Klux Klan to one representing Neo-Nazis with the click of a mouse.

If not the internet, then why not public schools? More and more parents are ushering their kids to public schools at the tender age of three or four, expecting them to not only learn arithmetic, but also right from wrong. Unfortunately, atheist public schools, long stripped of any redemptive *moral* value, have outlawed



God and related discussions of moral absolutes. Don't expect your local teacher to train up a moral child, because they are obligated to encourage any and every lifestyle your child embraces...even those of little Johnny, the Al-Qaeda sympathizer.

But the internet and public schools are not the only place where America's searching teens get bad advice. Without parental guidance, children can also find moral subversion on the back of the bus, in the lobby of the bowling alley, in the back-row of the movie theatre, in the locker room, and at the local chapter of Young Communists. Take your pick. And if you're a true moral relativist, no worries, they're all the same anyway—opportunities for "free expression."

I don't know exactly where the aforementioned "axis of foolishness" gained its desire for radical knowledge, nor exactly when their affinity for militant Islam began, but I can tell you one thing, it wasn't around the dinner table. Parents are not experts in morality, but can at least provide their kids with a basic structure for deciphering right (i.e. not killing innocent people) from wrong (i.e. killing innocent people). Impressionable teens today are taught that every loony idea and every earthly impulse they've ever had is valid. Such ideas are ludicrous, and until parents firmly reassume their position as moral guardians, the "axis of foolishness" will continue to expand.



Bad Science, Wrong Priorities

Where does
creationism belong?

by *Brian Beck*'05

Now that the left has foolishly claimed that the American government is no better than those who would drop walls on homosexuals, destroy ancient artifacts, and stone women who show more than their eyes in public, it's time for the right to make fools of themselves again. Unlike those at the *Tory*, some national conservatives seem entirely to ignore the need for facts, science, data, or logic in their writing.

One recent example is now appearing in my home state of Ohio, possibly the only state with more mistakes in education policy than California.

Ohio, of course, isn't merely content to have some horrible public schools. (East Cleveland city schools could barely get 3% of their 12th grade class to pass a 9th grade proficiency test with questions like, "Which of these is the American flag?") The solution, according to the liberals on the Ohio Supreme Court, was to have more equitable funding, because we have supposedly failed to pump enough money into inner-city schools yet. The right, correctly, decided to call for higher standards.

However, silly Ohio Republicans, working hard to beat Kansas's image as the most backwards state in science education, have started protesting the lack of diversity in the standard biology curriculum; in plain English, they're annoyed about a lack of teaching of creationism in the science standards.

Prominent national Republicans like Phyllis Schlafly couldn't help but attack the Ohio Board of Education. In her syndicated column on February 6, she complained in her syndicated column that in science that no theory should be censored from the classroom, saying, "The truth and accuracy of science should be determined by scientific evidence and open debate, not silencing dissent." This part is certainly true, as is her next statement: "By definition, if a theory is scientific, it should be demonstrated by evidence and replicable experiments, and testable against alternate hypotheses."

This leads her to the misguided conclusion that all theories, no matter how harebrained, should be taught in science class as long as they haven't been proven false. In the meantime, the "separation of church and state" groups have started jumping on the right-wingers for pushing



a religious message in schools. As is typical in fierce debates between the loony left and the radical right, neither have it fully correct.

Science is about testing falsifiable hypotheses. Scientists develop theories that can be tested by experiment, and more importantly can be proved false through science. This is why the question of whether or not God exists is not scientific—there is no physical way to prove or disprove the existence of God, and no data to look at.

For those who would use the lack of evidence to disprove God's existence, remember that absence of evidence is not

evidence of absence. Intelligent design theory (the newest form of creationism) generally claims that while evolution happens, it is not random.

However, there is no way to test this hypothesis—while it is easy to show a lack of an obvious pattern in a sequence, the randomness or lack thereof of evolution is not a testable hypothesis. For example, take the common example of pi—take a string in the middle of it, and it will probably look very random. In a certain sense, it is random—but there is a pattern to the digits, as we know from the fact that we can calculate them with a repeating formula.

The question of God's intervention into scientific inquiry is a question we should reserve for philosophers and religion scholars, rather than high school biology classes.

It's also a very interesting question, one that the faculty of Princeton possibly should look into—or if they already have, should look into teaching a class on the subject.

Most importantly, it should be removed from the political sphere—because the only thing worse than misunderstanding of science is when that misunderstanding becomes official state policy.

Problems on the Peninsula

by Jameson R. Johnson GS

The American and European news media has created a storm over the apparent upheaval in the Arabian Peninsula. The media would have us believe that the present war and the ongoing presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia are the origins of this new unrest, perhaps even the reason behind the September 11th attack. Like with many key issues facing the world today, the news media only operates with half of the information, and usually less than half of the truth.

I spent a good deal of time in the Persian Gulf in the past year. I toured the entire region, interviewing U.S. State Department and military personnel. I also spoke with many outside observers. It became quite clear to me that this region is headed for even more unrest, trouble and upheaval. It is not coming from another Iraqi invasion or from Iran closing off the Gulf, not even from social conflicts with Islam, but from problems within.

There are many areas of future conflict for all the Gulf States should they not take steps to alleviate them. First is a population explosion that could foster a massive unemployment problem; secondly, the depletion of oil reserves; and thirdly, a fresh water crisis.

Their importance seems diminished at a time of war. However, when combined, these three problems actually fuel the religious radicals' campaigns (like Al

Qaida) against the present Gulf leadership. Taking care of these issues will help to reduce the attraction of these extremist groups.

It is quite clear to me that this entire region is headed for even more unrest, trouble and upheaval.

First is the problem of population explosion and future unemployment. Modern health care and improvements in diet have created a double-edged sword for the Gulf States. There has been an increase in the life expectancy of most of the population, and a reduced infant mortality rate. These, combined with government and religious programs encouraging large families lasting into the

1980s, have resulted in a population explosion.

At present, the Gulf has the highest percentage of its population under the age of 25, per capita, in the world. Saudi Arabia has 75% of its population under the age of thirty and that population is only getting larger. While this may not seem like a large problem, one must consider the impact of the current job/welfare program in most Gulf countries. The method these Kings and Princes have used to maintain order is to promise universal employment, benefits, and subsidies for all citizens based on oil revenues. Typically, these jobs are bureaucratic and have no real performance requirements associated with them. Citizens are pleased because they have high-paying jobs with benefits, and little or no real work. It has created a bureaucratic empire and turned the Arab population into a welfare workforce that is ineffectual and unskilled.

These leaders have staked their future on their ability to keep the native population at near 100% employment with zero-substance jobs. A perfect example is the 93% state employment in Kuwait. As we begin this new century, the largest portion of the population is still in school. Soon, they are going hit the job market and demand jobs equal to those of their fathers and grandfathers.

Unfortunately, the universities have not moved to accommodate the future glut



of citizens. Instead of pushing petroleum technology or engineering, many still focus on Islamic Studies, which causes other problems with radicalism. In addition, many Arab students in the United States and England only study English. This will not bring new business leaders to the forefront.

Each Gulf state has begun a program to encourage future employment training of its citizenry. The States hail the entrance of native Arab artisans, engineers, salesmen, and local businessmen and the exit of expatriate (non-Arab) workers. The result is some natives do go into jobs formerly held by third country nationals (TCNs). More often it is a strong-arm maneuver by the governments to force Western companies to hire Arab “engineers” and “managers” who typically demand high salaries but perform few tasks. They are the private sector equivalent to their bureaucrat countrymen.

Secondly, there is the coming oil crisis. The mention of an oil crisis with a barrel of oil still near the \$30 range seems ridiculous. Yet, a crisis is coming for the Gulf – not the world – over oil. The combination of dwindling oil reserves within the Gulf, an increase of oil

discoveries in Africa, Central Asia and the ocean, and the beginning of a move away from gluttonous oil consumption in the West means the prospects for a continued boom to the Gulf economies has a poor forecast.

A backlash to oil in some progressive economies has begun. The restrictions of the Kyoto Treaty are evidence of that fact. Auto companies have started to put electric cars into production. Alternative energy sources are being explored and used throughout the world. Larger economies have begun towards move to natural gas and hydroelectric power to fuel their industrial production. While these moves don’t signal the end of the oil heyday, they do signal the autumn of the oil-based economies.

These countries know the end is coming; they just don’t know what to do about it. The Saudi

Arabian Oil Minister Ali Na’imi appeared on BBC in April 2000 and admitted that that present spike in oil prices was the last hurrah of the dying market. The Kuwaitis and Saudis still have oil, but at the present production levels, they could run out as early as 2025 according to some analysts. Given those figures, UAE, Qatar, Bahrain, and Oman will all run out much earlier. Unless the Gulf nations can come up with some other industry to put the population into the workforce, they face the bankruptcy of their economies and the disintegration of their infrastructure as the TCNs abandon a sinking ship.

Lastly, there is an absolute crisis over water. Prior to the Arab nations of the Gulf running out of oil, they will have run out of all natural sources of water and will be completely dependent upon outside nations for their water needs.

Presently, Gulf nations have no water policy. They import large portions of their drinking water already, and what aquifers they do have they are depleting far faster than can naturally be replenished. At this point, many are using desalination plants powered by natural gas. While that may help in the short term, the present demands of water in most Gulf States threaten to

overwhelm the already stressed desalination capabilities.

And worst still, most of the water is being wasted. Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait are draining their aquifers, importing large amounts of water or desalinating water to pour on palm trees lining the highways and wash cars. Most Gulf States don’t even charge their citizens for water use; it is free!

Many have said that the next war won’t be fought over oil, but over water. The sides are already being drawn for that war. The Turks are already using dams to limit water reaching Iraq and Syria. Now they are going to sell water by the tanker load to the highest bidder. They’ve already made lucrative deals with Jordan and Israel to supplement these nations’ existing water supplies.

Much sooner
than the Arab
nations of the
Gulf run out of
oil, they will run
out of all natural
sources of water.

Israel and Syria cannot agree over the sovereignty of the Golan Heights for many reasons. One major reason is the spring network that feeds the Jordan River. Israel currently has all of that fresh water piped back into Israel. Thus, returning the Golan Heights would greatly reduce the fresh water supply for Israel. Israel uses that water for vast irrigation projects in the valley below the Golan.

Iran talks of deals with Kuwait, Bahrain, and Qatar to sell them water via a pipeline from their mountainous region. It would be not only a moneymaker for the Iranians once these three nations are dependent upon Iranian water supplies,

but Iran will have broken the power of the Gulf Cooperation Council. Iran could threaten to cut off the water supply to its dry customers if its leaders did not like a policy decision.

At this point, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have begun pumping some recycled water into their aquifers. While it helps, they also need to dump most of their desalinated water back in just to save them. Further, they need to increase efforts to trap and use wastewater created through carelessness. Few people know that Kuwait City and Riyadh sit on underground lakes of unusable wastewater lost from poor plumbing, lawn care, street cleaning, and palm watering.

Unless the Gulf States break their foolish uses of water, begin to use a recycling process for their waste, and attempt to save the aquifers, they will be completely dependent upon the goodwill of their non-Arab neighbors and the West for their water supplies. This crisis threatens to peak just about the same time the oil reserves run out, leaving them without the oil revenues to buy water.

The Persian Gulf is again the center of a crisis. The present war has many of its roots in the Arabian Peninsula. The next phase of this war may indeed be back on the Peninsula.

However, in the future, instead of invading armies or outside political upheaval, the unrest may come from what is going on right now in these Gulf countries. If these states do not take steps to better educate and move their population into the workforce, develop other means of national income, and reform their water-usage practices, they face catastrophic consequences both

economically and politically. This type of upheaval is exactly what the religious radicals need to gain a foothold for their causes.

It is not the presence of American troops in Saudi Arabia that will bring about this upheaval. It will be a failure to act by the indigenous leaders and Kings rather than U.S. policy. The consequences of their failure include a broken economy dependent on a dwindling product, with demand and price falling, a workforce of managers unable to lead, and even the fall of the monarchies in some of the more conservative nations.

***The Princeton Tory* accepts letters to the editor.**

Please direct correspondence to:

P.O. Box 1499, Princeton, NJ 08540;

E-mail: tory@princeton.edu or

phegseth@princeton.edu

WE NEED YOUR HELP! We cannot continue to spread the conservative message without your financial support. We typically receive **no funding from the University**, so we rely on you.

Why support the *Tory*? Because we were the *only* publication to:

- **expose censorship** by liberal editors at *The Daily Princetonian*;
- **uncover liberal** voting records and campaign contributions by Princeton professors;
- **cover Princeton Pro-Life's** march on Washington;
- **to expose sacrilege** in the University chapel;
- **and to stand against Peter Singer**, the professor who preaches euthanasia and infanticide.

Remember, a gift of \$25 or more gets you a year's subscription to *The Princeton Tory*, and a gift of \$500 or more gets you a lifetime subscription. *Thank you!*

YES! I want to help the *Princeton Tory* keep conservatism alive at Princeton. I am enclosing my contribution for:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$10	<input type="checkbox"/> \$250
<input type="checkbox"/> \$20	<input type="checkbox"/> \$500
<input type="checkbox"/> \$50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100	<input type="checkbox"/> \$_____

Name: _____

Address: _____


City _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Email: _____

Mail to: P.O. Box 1499; Princeton, NJ 08542

The Vagina Monologues

A Lesson in How Not to 'Spread' the Word



Recent advertisements for *The Vagina Monologues* posted around campus contained several vulgar phrases. Members of the Tory criticized these ads in an editorial in the *Prince* and put up signs of our own to make people take a second look at the indecency of the bright pink Monologues' ads. A scathing response was printed in the *Prince* the following day.

So, we did it. Yes, a few Tory members did attend a showing of *The Vagina Monologues*. Our response? Well, we'll get to that in a minute. But first, now that all of the responses to our campaign are in, we've got a few more things to say.

Where to start? Well, we should probably begin with the initial response to our ad campaign from a certain Mr. Dan Wachtell. According to Dan, we represent the future of so-called bigotry and misogyny in the Republican Party. That's good Dan. At least you paid attention to the article and made some legitimate criticisms... You see, Dan watches MTV and uses it to formulate his standards as to what is acceptable for public consumption. We do not believe that our world has changed so dramatically that different standards of common decency now exist. Something that was indecent yesterday is not suddenly less so, despite MTV's attempts to convince people like Dan otherwise.

Now, let's clear something up while we're on the subject. The editorial published in the *Prince* criticized the indecency of the advertisements of the show, but not the show itself. The proceeds of the show go to help victims of sexual violence, definitely a most worthy cause. And we would never call for, as one critic put it, "the

silencing of the feminine voice," if that is really what *The Vagina Monologues* represents.

But, for the way in which they portrayed the show, the ads did make it seem like pornography. The show may not be not pornographic (although that is open for debate), but the ads only used the show's most graphic material to promote the performance.

Consider, Mr. Wachtell, your emotions had you walked down Prospect with your mother in the days leading up to the performance. How would you feel? We would be disgusted. But maybe Wachtell and his mother feel comfortable talking about each other's...well, you get the picture.

The language in the show is raunchy, but as art aficionados, we understand its role in relaying the message of the show itself, however misguided its role may be. We think this language belongs within the show's arena, and not posted around campus for all to see. And it is not, as Mr. Wachtell seems to think, because we have lived sheltered lives and never heard the words on the ads before.

In fact, we have heard those words before. We've also heard many curse words before, but would it be justifiable to post signs around campus with the f-word on them? We think not.

Some people think that we contradicted our intended message by putting up vulgar signs of our own. Sadly, the signs were a necessary part of our message. We had to show something vulgar in order to make people realize the indecencies of the *Monologues*' ads. Would this matter have grown as big as it has become if we had merely written a piece in the *Prince*? Probably not. The signs were important because they made people step back. They are just as disgusting as those posted by the *Monologues*.

Our purpose was to inspire people to consider the issue, whether it is out of support, or out of disdain. We wanted to get the campus to think about what have

become of our moral standards and the indecency that currently exists all over our campus. The number of responses that we've received, positive and negative, serve as evidence that we've accomplished our goal.

Having seen the show, we would acknowledge a few things that the show does well, but we do have some criticisms. Our newfound friend Peter Wicks at the *Nassau Weekly* has already expressed them quite well. Now, we are sorry that some people, like Dan Wachtell, like to think of

us as representatives of bigotry in the world.

They are flatly wrong in their assumptions. For our part, we think that Wachtell's ideas are what is wrong with the world today.

We cannot continue to accept the indecency and vulgarities that have eroded the moral standards in this country, even though people like Wachtell would have us do so.

Let the Vagina Monologues be shown, but advertise it in a wholesome

way. The show should have enough credibility and renown to attract people to come without the use of vulgar words on bright pink signs.

If all of the ads had been like the chalk marks on campus walks, we never would have written what we did. But the advertisers crossed the line with their disrespectful indecency, and we had the guts to call them on it. Maybe moral relativists like Wachtell should take a second to re-examine their values...if they have any.

THE PRINCETON TORY

Online

smart. original.

creative.

and just a little bit sexy.

www.princetontory.com

for ISI ad