Dr. Joseph Sabia delivered this speech to members of the College Republicans on September 2, 2002. A transcript appears below:

As I begin my ninth year on Cornell’s campus, I am still searching for answers to a question that has frustrated me during all these years. Why won’t conservatives—particularly young conservatives—confidently, loudly, and defiantly defend themselves when slandered by Leftists? Each year I look for new pieces to the puzzle to explain why Republicans are content to play political badminton while the other side is dropping nukes. These are the explanations I have come up with: irrational fear, narcissism, and plain, old-fashioned sloth. Let me try to dissuade you from falling into these traps.

Many Republicans are scared that they will be called “insensitive” or “evil” if they speak up against political correctness. Look, people, trying to debate a liberal is like arguing with a ten-year-old. These people cannot form cogent arguments so they rattle off clichés, prattle on about irrelevant minutia, and call you names. You can’t be scared of these people; you have to challenge them. A few examples of this from on campus:

Last year, I debated the president of the Cornell Democrats on many of the pressing issues facing the university. An audience member asked us what our views on race-based dormitories were. I answered first and stated that I opposed race-based living centers and that our views on race-based dormitories suggest that racial minorities cannot meet the same objective standards as whites, it promotes a permanent victim-hood pathology, and so forth. Unbeknownst to us, a liberal in the crowd overheard our conversation. She turned to Ken—an American of Asian descent—and presented her side of the argument, saying: “You belong in the Ku Klux Klan.” Startled, Ken responded, “But I’m Asian. The Klan would kill me.” “Well,” she replied, “you with you were white.” And there you go. This is how the Left argues. I beg you, do not be scared of these people. Get in there and mix it up. If you don’t have a thick skin, get one. This nation was founded by men who were willing to risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for our liberty. The least we college kids can do is to speak out against Leftist drivel, even if it means that our professors, administrators, or fellow students will hate us for it. And honestly, if these people will really hate you for expressing your point of view, is their respect really worth having?

Just last week, a Leftist got angry with a chanting I did up on North Campus. There was a picture of the American flag along with President Bush’s famous quote, “You’re either with us or with the terrorists.” In response, she wrote a letter to the Dean of Students demanding that this organization be censored and that the
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Don’t want to sit near you, Joe? Wow, that really surprises me.”

That was his entire argument. I was a racist. That’s it. He said this in front of several hundred students and got big applause for it. I mean, what is that? Saying “you’re a racist” is not an argument. It’s unconditional surrender of any semblance of intellectual thought. Whenever someone calls me a racist, a little bell goes off in my head and I know I have won the argument.

Another example: When I was a sophomore, a gentleman by the name of Ken Lee—who was the editor of a campus conservative newspaper at the time and is a recent graduate of Harvard Law School—was standing with me on Ho Plaza during a pro-affirmative action rally. Ken and I began speaking about all of the reasons we opposed racial quotas—for instance, it is morally wrong to judge individuals based upon their skin color, it is dangerous to suggest that racial minorities cannot meet the same objective standards as whites, it promotes a permanent victim-hood pathology, and so forth. Unbeknownst to us, a liberal in the crowd overheard our conversation. She turned to Ken—an American of Asian descent—and presented her side of the argument, saying: “You belong in the Ku Klux Klan.”

Partner, Ken responded, “But I’m Asian. The Klan would kill me.”

“Yeah,” she replied, “you with you were white.”

And there you go. This is how the Left argues. I beg you, do not be scared of these people. Get in there and mix it up. If you don’t have a thick skin, get one. This nation was founded by men who were willing to risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for our liberty. The least we college kids can do is to speak out against Leftist drivel, even if it means that our professors, administrators, or fellow students will hate us for it. And honestly, if these people will really hate you for expressing your point of view, is their respect really worth having?

Just last week, a Leftist got angry with a chanting I did up on North Campus. There was a picture of the American flag along with President Bush’s famous quote, “You’re either with us or with the terrorists.” In response, she wrote a letter to the Dean of Students demanding that the organization be censored and that the...
Five Great Reasons Not to be a “Closet” Conservative
A Freshman’s Antidote to Fear

Class of 2012, welcome to Cornell! I’m certain that many of the conservatives among you have heard myriad horror stories about the monolithic liberal slant of the university’s student body and, indeed, the faculty. Most of them, I can assure you, are true to one extent or another. Liberal and “far-left” students outnumber conservatives by an unhealthy three-to-one margin, and the faculty ratio can only be guessed at (although one poll in an earlier Review article had it at about 26:1).

Statistics like these can be daunting, even terrifying to the incoming Cornell conservative. It’s not easy to speak up and truly embrace a right-wing ideology in such an environment, and at first it seems much easier to suppress the urge to speak out against some of the clearly outrageous things that you are certain to hear around campus or in the Cornell Daily Sun. While that may be a little less difficult, you really betray your personal ethos by remaining silent. I know that making your views heard and taken seriously might sound just this side of impossible, but it truly isn’t. Don’t believe me? Here are five great reasons to be an active campus conservative.

1. It teaches you to defend your arguments and ideas
In these surroundings, thick with people who disagree with you and will do anything to “enlighten” you to your supposed errors, if you make an attempt to be an active conservative, you’re going to catch some flak. Plain and simple. It might be disorienting at first, but in time, it will become your sort of “School of Hard Knocks” for ideological self-defense. Repeated (and often repetitive) criticisms will cause you to question your positions, and, if you take the time to really answer those questions, you will develop counter-arguments to these criticisms. Disconcerting as such an adjustment might be, it really winds up to everybody’s benefit. You learn how to defend yourself, you develop more nuanced stands on political issues, and you can, in turn, enrich campus political debate enormously by making a strong case on your position, be it pro-life, pro-gun, or pro-fiscal responsibility.

2. This is the year when you will see the biggest diversity in the conservative movement.
With the far right wing of the Republican party losing traction amongst moderate voters the door is wide open for other sects of the party to step up. The ballot sports a varied field of contenders with remarkably different ideas of where they want to go with their presidencies—Romney’s newfound social conservative niche, Giuliani’s steadfast fiscal conservatism, Ron Paul’s ardent and striking moderate stance, and Tancredo’s heavy border-security emphasis place us at a position from which we cannot know where the party will go. The internal debate within the Republican Party (and our small, but active Cornell contingent) promises to be some of the best since the 1980 elections, and can be a source of simultaneous education and entertainment for those who participate.


While liberal publications such as the Cornell Progressive (formerly and more infamously known as Turn Left), Black Perspectives, and the Cornell Daily Sun (certain opinions columns exempted) can be found in great quantities and with great diversity scattered across campus, the right-leaning equivalent might be slightly harder to find. However, between the aforementioned Daily Sun conservative opinions columns and Cornell’s only conservative opinions paper, the Cornell Review, the right side of the spectrum is hardly unspoken for. Also, while each of those papers covers only a limited scope of the extremely broad liberal ideology, the Review covers everything from fiscal to social, from election opinions pieces to criticism of the latest Ho Plaza protest. For Cornell’s Republican contingent, the Review is both an outlet for campus conservatives to vent and an enjoyable read for all—it’s quality over quantity here!

(Also, Iest I forget to mention it, the Review staff members have a far better sense of humor than many of our liberal counterparts.)

5. The Cornell College Republicans (CRs).
For the less writing-inclined aspiring active conservatives, the Cornell CRs may be the answer. Ever an important part of campus politics, the CRs add to campus dialogue both in their presence at school debates and in their actions throughout the Cornell community. Members of the CRs are always present at political functions on the campus and regional, and national levels—be it debates on topics from the Iraq war to stem cell research (in which we face off against the Cornell Democrats and Socialists), a Tompkins County gathering of area conservatives, or the annual Conservative Political Action Conference in Washington, D.C., you can always find a number of the Cornell Republicans there. Furthermore, we contribute to the campus and local communities both intellectually and otherwise—last year, Cornell’s conservative community hosted several speakers, including the National Review’s John Derbyshire and columnist Robert Novak, and found other ways to help others, such as collecting signatures for a letter of encouragement to a platoon of soldiers deployed in Iraq. We also make an impression on campus politics—CR President Ahmed Salem is a member of the Student Assembly and helped pass the Diversity of Thought Initiative to ensure conservatives feel comfortable expressing their views in class. Over the years, the CRs have been an incredibly active force in enriching our campus community, and will continue to do so over time.

Sure, conservatives on campus may be a minority, but we’re louder than our numbers would suggest. We do make a real impact on Cornell, but that alone isn’t why we’re active and proud conservatives—above all, we just have fun doing it. If you’re conservative, and wondering whether or not you want to be an active member of the community, take my advice and come to a meeting of the Review or the CRs. Odds are, you’ll find yourself relishing your conservative identity more than ever before. And you had heard there were only liberals here…

The Review welcomes and encourages letters to the editor. Please send questions, comments, and concerns to cornell.review@gmail.com.
Welcome Class of 2012!

The Cornell Review would like to take this opportunity to welcome you to Cornell University. We won’t spend any time telling you about how awesome Cornell is, and how the time you spend here will change you forever.

We won’t do that for two reasons; 1. You have been hearing it enough from various school officials and overly peppy RAs, and OLS etc. And 2. It just might not be true for you.

While Cornell is a great university, where almost all of the students, faculty and staff are all very talented, it is far from perfect.

You will very quickly realize that sunny days are few and far between (and oddly only occur when it’s Homecoming, Parents, or Pre-Frosh Weekends), the long walk to anywhere from North Campus gets old really quickly and driving in Ithaca’s hilly poorly maintained roads is a pain in the ass.

Before you think The Review is just crotchety bastards who will complain about anything we should point out that we acknowledge that all of these “problems” are merely inconveniences that are not worthy of spoiling the “best years of our lives”.

The point we’re making is: in all of the brochures about Cornell that were mailed to you the sun was shining brilliantly, students were walking to class smiling without a worry on their mind, and any of the pictures of Ithaca’s hills showed them in their majestic foliage…not of a frustrated college kid trying to parallel park their Yukon Denali on a 30 degree incline while cars are trying to get by in both directions.

Alas, none of these shortcomings can be solved. Therefore the Cornell Review focuses its efforts on something we can have a bit more success; Cornell’s lack of balance on the political spectrum.

As the articles in this issue of the Cornell Review (all of which are taken from previous issues) will show you, Cornell is a very liberal place. Whether it’s the Student Assembly’s unwillingness to consider allowing concealed carry of firearms on campus (page X), or the lack of care given to facilities that house Cornell’s Officer Training Programs (page Y) the Cornell community simply does not value things that are important to conservatives.

This liberal skew is prevalent at all levels of the community. You will undoubtedly see hundreds more Obama stickers, posters and shirts in the months leading up until the election (and regardless of the outcome you will continue to see the same stickers, posters and shirts because they demand their “voice be heard”).

Within a month of arriving at Cornell you will sit through a nice 45-minute rant by one of your professors about how much better this country will be once “King George” is out of office (but only if Obama wins). And do not be surprised if this occurs in a class that has absolutely nothing to do with government, history or any social science for that matter. Apparently Bush has been such a bad President that biology professors could do a better job.

Since you have been in Ithaca for about a week I’m sure you have already noticed how hippy of a town it is. Bumper stickers such as “1-20-09 Bush’s Last Day”, “Ithaca is not George’s” and “Bush Lied 1,000’s Died” are on about 2/3 of the cars in the city of Ithaca. There is nothing wrong with that because as any city in America they have a right to set up their own community, but when their overly liberal policies affect our lives you can count on the Cornell Review to go to bat for you.

Ithaca, while dependent on students for economic stability, continuously try to stick it to students any way they can. Tax rates are higher in the Collegetown neighborhood (where the residents are predominately Cornell students) than any other area in Ithaca. This is despite the fact that students do not utilize Ithaca’s public school system, or the vast array of social services programs that our tax dollars fund.

Even Cornell’s staff has fallen to this liberal epidemic. Its bureaucratic nature reeks of one of FDR’s New Deal government programs. There are codes to limit your free speech, hypocritical policies in regards to diversity, and an overall disdain for anything conservative.

Being a conservative in such a hostile environment can be a very beneficial experience. It teaches you how to defend yourself in hostile environment, and given the academic standards of Cornell you will be doing it against very bright people. Former Arkansas Governor and Presidential Candidate Mike Huckabee said when he visited our campus last year said he likes visiting a place like Cornell because “it’s easy for me to go to a place like (fundamentally Baptist) Liberty University and give a speech because most everyone there agrees with me… but if I want to hit a home run I have to get a fast enough pitch to hit out of the park, and that’s what I got coming to Cornell”.

Hopefully you will make Huckabee’s challenge your own, and not be afraid to speak up when you disagree with what someone is saying. Because if you are conservative and a Cornellian, it will happen.

-Eddie Herron, for the editors

The Cornell Review meets regularly on Mondays at 5:00 pm in GS 144. E-mail messages should be sent to cornell.review@gmail.com.
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A House of Horrors
How Historic Barton Hall Became Dilapidated, and What’s Being Done about It

JORDAN FABIAN
EDITOR-AT-LARGE

One of the most iconic buildings on Cornell’s campus, Barton Hall has stood strong for 94 years, serving as the home for ROTC’s program and hosting many campus athletic and cultural events. However, underneath Barton’s robust appearance lies a litany of structural issues that have existed for decades; the vast majority of which have gone unaddressed by the university until just a few months ago.

“There are structural issues at Barton Hall that have been identified for the last, at least seven years, that require immediate or high priority maintenance, and a scale of millions of dollars to repair,” explained Lieutenant Colonel Brian Page, tri-service chairman for Cornell’s ROTC. A 36-page report compiled by the structural engineering firm Ryan-Biggs Associates in October 2000 identified substantial problems with the roof over the main drill hall, the Northwest and Southeast towers, and the masonry on the exterior of the building.

In their report, Ryan-Biggs classified many repairs in either the Immediate or High priority, which meant that they should have been completed either without delay or six months to two years after the study’s completion, respectively. Over seven years later, none of these immediate or high priority projects have been completed. Then, the combined estimated cost of the immediate and high priority projects was over $1.8 million. However, as the problems have progressively worsened over time and prices have risen, the estimated cost has gone up as well.

The most troubling structural weakness of Barton Hall is the roof. When Ryan-Biggs evaluated the roof in 2000, they found that the troubles do not meet New York State Code, which requires that roofs be able to bear a minimum amount of dead weight. Ryan-Biggs recommended that the wood rafters be replaced on the roof immediately; however, this still has not been completed.

During the winter, the roof is not strong enough to bear snow loads and in order to prevent any problems; the heat is turned up to maximum temperature in order to melt the snow’s off the roof. Lt. Col. Page explained that the sustainability issues posed by this usage of the heating system were “laughable.”

The extent of the damage at Barton is stunning; massive cracks span the length and run through the thickness of the interior wall in the main staircase on the building’s west side. Also, on the exterior of the north and west sides of the building, extensive fractures can be seen in masonry and the parapets that have caused the structure to bow inward on the upper levels of the building. These cracks have caused the west wall of the building to partially shift out of place and in some locations; the wall appears to be leaning towards Statler Drive.

Masonry issues can be explained by water damage, deferred maintenance, and the pure aging of the building. However, Lt. Col. Page alluded to other exacerbating factors that have occurred more recently. Pipes from the Cornell Lake Source Cooling System installed under Statler Drive in 1999 and 2000 may have accelerated the cracking on the west side wall, however this claim is unconfirmed by university engineers and the Ryan-Biggs report.

The problems go beyond structural issues. Obviously Barton Hall contains a substantial amount of asbestos as do many older buildings; however, in some areas, the asbestos has become exposed. In the men’s bathroom on the first floor, asbestos insulated piping surrounds the room. A warning sign instructs people not to “create dust” indicating that asbestos could easily be spread through the air. Also, the warning label indicates that some asbestos in the room could be unmarked. A large pipe along the north wall in the main drill hall has a large piece of insulation hanging off which contains asbestos.

Another tragic victim of entropy and apathy

The areas that appear to be in the worst shape are the Northwest and Southeast towers, which have multiple cracks through the stone face, displaced stone, and broken joints. Decades of water leakage and aging has caused the masonry on the building’s façade to crumble. Some of the fractures are out in the open such as the ones on the staircases, but others can only be seen behind closed doors. From a balcony behind the Wortham Military Museum on the building’s third floor, the exterior sandstone on the corner of a parapet on the Northwest side can be seen very clearly.

Most of the damage on the exterior can be explained by water damage, deferred maintenance, and the pure age of the building. However, Lt. Col. Page noted that the structure to bow inward on the upper levels of the building. These cracks have caused the west wall of the building to partially shift out of place and in some locations; the wall appears to be leaning towards Statler Drive.

In the spaces where masonry is missing or damaged, more asbestos can be found. In the room under the Wortham Military Museum on the northwest corner of the roof, a large piece of insulation hanging off the wall contains asbestos. In the men’s bathroom on the first floor, asbestos insulated piping surrounds the room. A warning sign instructs people not to “create dust” indicating that asbestos could easily be spread through the air. Also, the warning label indicates that some asbestos in the room could be unmarked. A large pipe along the north wall in the main drill hall has a large piece of insulation hanging off which contains asbestos.

In any other non-structural problems, life would be difficult for the ROTC employees and students who use the office and classroom space in Barton on a daily basis. Obviously Barton Hall’s structural issues pose a serious ventilation problem and an outdated electrical system. For example, some of the original glass from 1915 remains in the windows and routinely leaks air into the building. A bulky air conditioning unit sits in Page’s office which’s loud noise makes it almost impossible to hold meetings in his office during the spring and summer. Additionally, the electrical wiring is crude and most of which does not meet the New York State Fire Code, says Lt. Col. Page.

The question of whether or not Barton Hall’s structural issues pose a safety threat to students, faculty, and staff has been a point of contention between Page and the administration. Page contests that many of the concerns, including the exposed asbestos in the main floors restroom and in the drill hall, loose stones on the exterior and general wear and tear put Barton Hall’s occupants in jeopardy. Lt. Col. Page recalled an incident that happened during the 2006-2007 winter break in which chunks of stone fell off the roof of the Northwest tower and landed in the Cornell Police parking lot. “That’s unsafe for anyone walking by,” said Page.

However, Vice Provost for Land Grant Affairs Ron Seebier, who has recently started to work with Page to resolve Barton’s issues, does not believe that the structural problems pose a safety risk. “No I don’t think it does [threaten health and safety]. Is it showing age? Yes. Is it crumbling? Yes. There’s no question about it. It needs structural rehabilitation… I would leave it to the facilities experts to judge whether it’s a health and safety problem,” commented Seebier.

Many facilities management officials and engineers who work for the university agree with Seebier and certify that the building is safe to use. However, the Ryan-Biggs assessment claims, “We observed several locations that should be addressed for safety reasons.”

According to Page, the university’s obligations to Barton go beyond simply providing a basic level of maintenance to the facility. Page noted that ROTC pays for more than $1.9 million in scholarship money while fulfilling the university’s “land grant mission” which calls for instruction in the agricultural arts, mechanical arts, and military tactics. Lt. Col. Page said, “We need [Cornell] to step up and meet [its] part of the military tactics land grant mission by providing us with resources that reflect Cornell as well as New York State, not substandard facilities.”

Seebier seemed to agree with Page about the condition of the facility. “There hasn’t been a significant structural investment to that building for a long time. There’s no question about it,” explained Seebier. Seebier added that Barton’s problems should be addressed because of the building’s egregious maintenance issues and its widespread use by many different types of students and academic departments, not just those in ROTC.

However, Seebier made it clear that Barton was not the only building with these types of problems on campus. Seebier cited Stocking Hall as an example that “is more of a wreck than Barton… Barton is clearly not the worst on campus by any means.”

This odd situation begs the question: why hasn’t anything been done about the problems at Barton? One major quandary that has faced Barton that both Page and Seebier cited was its lack of an “advocate” to the university and to the State of New York. Most buildings on campus fall under the supervision of one of the colleges on campus, which in turn have Deans to advocate for maintenance projects on their buildings. Barton is not owned by one of the colleges, thus leaving it without a formal advocate to work on its behalf.

Without an advocate, the findings of the Ryan-Biggs were never converted into a formal estimate for repair and renovation. Also, the building was never incorporated into the process to acquire state funding for a large structural investment. Thus, other projects on the state-owned portion of campus, such as Mann Library and the Fernel/Rice/Bruckner project were put ahead of Barton.

Now that steps are being taken to replace the roof, the probability may struggle to find financial support from the State University Construction Fund (SUCF), which...
Misguided
The Sustainability Farce

BRIAN GRAMBOW
CAMPUS EDITOR

Everywhere I turn, I see something on sustainability. Whole industries are based on this phenomenon. Cornell has an office of sustainability, with signs everywhere. The word sustainability appears everywhere I look: news papers to play bills to even my own Nestle. With so much attention and hype, sustainability rarely explained. What is sustainability? How much more does it cost? What are other net benefits that making a few liberal students feel good? And, even when one goes to find the answers to these common sense questions through different website through Cornell, blogger, or even on the back of bathroom doors, questions are still left unanswered.

The truth of the matter is not even supporters of the word can agree. Cornell’s own sustainability office offers this definition: “Meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” A quick Google search offers this: “Living and working in ways that do not jeopardize our current and future social, environmental and economic resources” and “The ongoing process of achieving development or redevelop that does not undermine its physical or social systems of support.” “The use of ecosystems and their resources in a manner that satisfies current needs without compromising the needs or options of future generations.”

To me, it seems interesting that a concept coined to protect eco systems has morphed into its own cult. Social systems of support; what the hell is that supposed to mean? It can mean many different things, just a quick look at the sustainable campus website home page highlights the Green Purchasing, Kyoto protocols, the lake cooling system, transportation management, increased recycling efforts and carbon neutrality. Some of these programs actually kinda make sense if you squint a little; recycling animal manure, dining hall food scraps, and office paper are easy solutions to minimize the financial impact on a waste disposal bill. Even the expensive lake cooling system will start to pay for itself in the next 125 years.

However, some things just don’t quite make sense when it comes to sustainability. With Cornell’s sustainability program just over 60% of the university’s paper needs are met by 30% and 100% post consumer product paper. Interestingly enough there is about a 20% price difference between post consumer paper products and virgin paper, with virgin paper being the least costly. 120,000 reams of paper are costing us, tuition payers. Net print is $0.09; $0.02 of that is to cover the cost of sustainability.

But paying too much for paper is just a small thing in comparison of the costs to maintain a climate neutral university. President, David J. Skorton said last February in his state of the University said, “Because there are no real cost-effective solutions to achieve climate neutrality today, a strong emphasis on education and research, coupled with the willingness to make the tough decisions now, will produce meaningful answers for tomorrow.”

I disagree. Let’s take low energy fluorescent light bulbs. They are more costly to install, yet they last longer, actually costing the user less in terms of utility costs. But let’s say that you break one of these fancy expensive lights and expose yourself to the mercury content inside. On average, to have a professional cleaning service clean the mess would set you back about $2,000. Or you could opt to clean up the mess yourself, risking significant mercury exposure proven. Either way, this nice little fluorescent light bulb cost you a lot more trouble than neglecting future generations through an old fashioned filament.

Even though sustainability and climate neutrality seem synonymous, climate neutrality raises interesting questions if we define sustainability as limiting the impacts of our generation’s decisions to just our generation, how will future generations update aging, complex systems, unless they sink many more millions of dollars into retro fits? Or even, what will future generations say about us if predictions of changing climate prove to be exaggerated? Will they praise us for spending billions of dollars worth of resources into an imaginary problem, without even combating the socio-economic issues facing our time. What will they say about our social responsibility? We drop millions of dollars into high technology to retrofit buildings to get 5% energy savings when we only have one day where we “enter the streets.”

Even the students are getting on board the sustainability band wagon.

A recent piece in the Cornell Daily Sun highlighted a freshman student, Christina Copeland, and her crew in a campaign to “educate” the Cornell community of the irresponsible impacts of bottled water consumption. Miss Copeland’s campaign highlights little factoids about the number of barrels used by plastics industry to make water bottles, and the number of trucks used per week throughout the world to transport the water is about 2% of the weekly commercial truck traffic in the United States. While, I commend her initiative, her campaign is another example of horribly misguided efforts in the war for sustainability.

It seems to be that our generation and our University have strayed away from the true spirit of sustainability: social responsibility. Generations before us have eradicated polio, stood for liberty in the face of totalitarianism, and provided for prosperity to posterity. What will our mark be? Heat efficient buildings and recycling programs? It is far more “sustainable” to tutor a child in reading, or to advocate the end of hunger in Tompkins County; but if sustainability is about zeroing carbon dioxide outputs and eliminating bottled water, count me out.

Brian Grambow is a sophomore in the School of Hotel Administration. He can be reached at big75@cornell.edu.

continued from page 4

provides planning, design, and construction funding for SUNY facilities. According to Sebeer, the SUCF periodically rates buildings on campus on a three point scale: good, fair, and poor. The fund constantly tries to rehabilitate poor buildings to good condition. Sebeer noted, “With their rating scheme, I don’t know if this building qualifies as poor. Believe it or not, you may think I was too busy to keep these statutory colleges that’s sort of how far behind we are in capital investment on the statutory campus.”

Sebeer explained that from Governor Mario Cuomo (D) and up through Governor George Pataki’s (R) term, there, “hasn’t been kind of a capitol. They just didn’t have the money to keep the buildings up to a good standard on the statutory side of the university.” He said for backup funding for construction projects on the statutory campus, the university requested $700 million from the SUCF, but “we expect to get $200 to $250 million funded from 2009 to 2013.” Aside from the lack of an advocate, Barton may receive limited state funding because it is used by the general university and not just the statutory colleges. Thus, Sebeer noted that a financial plan will need to be drafted to seek out additional funds.

Page agreed with Sebeer in that many of Barton’s problems stem from its undefined position within the School of Hotel Administration. University President, David J. Skorton said last February in his state of the University said, “Because there are no real cost-effective solutions to achieve climate neutrality today, a strong emphasis on education and research, coupled with the willingness to make the tough decisions now, will produce meaningful answers for tomorrow.”

I disagree. Let’s take low energy fluorescent light bulbs. They are more costly to install, yet they last longer, actually costing the user less in terms of utility costs. But let’s say that you break one of these fancy expensive lights and expose yourself to the mercury content inside. On average, to have a professional cleaning service clean the mess would set you back about $2,000. Or you could opt to clean up the mess yourself, risking significant mercury exposure proven. Either way, this nice little fluorescent light bulb cost you a lot more trouble than neglecting future generations through an old fashioned filament.

Even though sustainability and climate neutrality seem synonymous, climate neutrality raises interesting questions if we define sustainability as limiting the impacts of our generation’s decisions to just our generation, how will future generations update aging, complex systems, unless they sink many more millions of dollars into retro fits? Or even, what will future generations say about us if predictions of changing climate prove to be exaggerated? Will they praise us for spending billions of dollars worth of resources into an imaginary problem, without even combating the socio-economic issues facing our time. What will they say about our social responsibility? We drop millions of dollars into high technology to retrofit buildings to get 5% energy savings when we only have one day where we “enter the streets.”

Even the students are getting on board the sustainability band wagon.

A recent piece in the Cornell Daily Sun highlighted a freshman student, Christina Copeland, and her crew in a campaign to “educate” the Cornell community of the irresponsible impacts of bottled water consumption. Miss Copeland’s campaign highlights little factoids about the number of barrels used by plastics industry to make water bottles, and the number of trucks used per week throughout the world to transport the water is about 2% of the weekly commercial truck traffic in the United States. While, I commend her initiative, her campaign is another example of horribly misguided efforts in the war for sustainability.

It seems to be that our generation and our University have strayed away from the true spirit of sustainability: social responsibility. Generations before us have eradicated polio, stood for liberty in the face of totalitarianism, and provided for prosperity to posterity. What will our mark be? Heat efficient buildings and recycling programs? It is far more “sustainable” to tutor a child in reading, or to advocate the end of hunger in Tompkins County; but if sustainability is about zeroing carbon dioxide outputs and eliminating bottled water, count me out.

Brian Grambow is a sophomore in the School of Hotel Administration. He can be reached at big75@cornell.edu.
 Shame on Columbia!

KENT HAEGER
MANAGING EDITOR

“There is a difference between lies and
truh and truth... there is a difference
between good and evil. Today we
form a new resistance to Western self-
destruction.”

Thus were the brave words of a Jewish
leader protesting Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s
invitation to speak at Columbia University, and they hardly could
have been more apt. September 24th, 2007, marked a new low in
the odious history of moral relativism: an
invitation from an Ivy League
university to a genocidal despot
whose regime is currently waging
an undeclared war against the
United States.

Arguing that ideas needed to be
exchanged and debated, university
president Lee Bollinger extended
an invitation to the Iranian leader
to give a speech at Columbia. The
university claimed that Ahmadinejad
wouldn’t harm the microphones and
vigorous debate; I wouldn’t
know, since non-students weren’t
even allowed on campus.

It turned out that what Bollinger
had in mind was a brief verbal
excoriation of the man, calling him
a “cruel and petty dictator” before
letting him have the microphone
for almost an hour. Yes, Bollinger
did accuse him of criminal idiocy
for denying the Holocaust. Yes, he
did accuse him of criminal idiocy
for denying the Holocaust. But besides this curiously
loosely organized, the protestors
gathered on the four
entrances, and although it was
rational debate – or a barrage
of insults – can change the opinions
of Ahmadinejad and his irrational
ilk, but a universal condemnation
of his theories about
Freedom of speech is a wonderful
right, but only able to do so in very limited
venues – think, for example, of the
crazy street person who harasses
passerby with his theories about
the “Zionist-occupied government” or the conspiracy
crazies who hold
in other ways.

Ahmadinejad’s speech disgusted
most Americans, and rightfully so,
but we mustn’t forget that it was
broadcast to the world at large. Every
bit of it was carefully calculated to
make him look like a hero in the
eyes of the Iranian people, standing
up to the evil imperialist superpower
and its “Zionist” ally. For giving
dangerous man a platform upon
which he could appear legitimate,
moderate even, and for promising
rational confrontation but delivering
ineffective insults, Columbia
University’s leadership deserves
our scorn.

That Ahmadinejad is a madman
is not up for debate. He’s the oldest
breed of fundamentalist lunatic –
the type that desires to bring about
an apocalyptic war in order to
remake the world the way he thinks
it should be. In his case, he believes
that his policies of Islamizing the
world and obliterating Israel will
hasten the return of the Mahdi, the
Muslim messiah. History has never
wanted for cultists of this sort, but
Iran’s burgeoning nuclear program
would be the first of his ilk to the
means to pull off an
apocalyptic. His ravings against
Israel in particular and the Jewish
people as a whole are well-known,
and if any man in the modern era
could be called Adolf Hitler’s
spiritual successor, Ahmadinejad
would be a prime candidate.

Of course, Hitler analogies have
become a cliché, but in this case
I think it’s a well-deserved
comparison. Rabid anti-Semitism?
Check. Global ambitions? Check. Sheer irrationality? Well... we’ll
give it some time and see if the “debate” at Columbia swayed
Ahmadinejad’s heart. While we’re
doing that, of course, he’ll be
stoning rape victims and throwing
students in prison, but hey, we’re
at least trying to be civilized, right?

On the subject of der Fuhrer,
Columbia dean John Coatsworth
proclaimed that he would invite
anyone – even Adolf Hitler himself –
for a nice little academic debate.

Following public outcry over this
lunacy, he softened his stand just
a bit, clarifying that he was talking
about the pre-World War II
dictator who hadn’t yet begun the
holocaust. Ohhh, the cuddly, fuzzy
Hitler. The one who’d only had a hand in
the repressive Nuremberg Laws
and Kristallnacht, rather than having
graduated to all-out genocide. Glad
we got that cleared up.

This, then, is the crux of the
issue. Columbia’s top brass appear to
have fallen into the trap of assuming
that all ideas are valid enough to
be debated on an equal playing
field. But, as one protester’s sign
put it, some things are not up for
discussion. Killing Jews, I would
submit, is certainly one of those
things. I’d like to think that by now
most of us have moved beyond
having to question whether certain
groups of people are subhuman or
worthy of extermination. Likewise,
I think you’d find a general consensus
that forcing your beliefs on others
through terror and violence is
abominable. President Bollinger
would obviously disagree with me,
however, since he apparently
believes that debating these “issues”
with Ahmadinejad will aid the
education of his students. All I can
say is, thank God I went to Cornell
instead.

When questioned as to why they
would let this madman speak at their
university, Bollinger and Coatsworth
claim to be defending free speech
rights. Free speech rights. I don’t
even know where to begin with that.
This is the same university, of
course, that didn’t raise a finger to
stop anti-protest demonstrations.

For giving him an immeasurable
bit of it was carefully calculated to
but we mustn’t forget that it was
executed, in the tradition of the
Minutemen organization from a
gang of radicals who disrupted their
presentation and drove them off the
stage. But besides this curiously
narrow definition of free speech, the
argument itself is a fallacy. Freedom
of speech is a wonderful thing, of
course. It’s our right as Americans
to air our opinions, however unpopular they may be.

And yes, this freedom leads to
the occasional hatemonger spewing an
odious doctrine like anti-Semitism.
But this is where the fallacy comes
in. Most lunatics of this sort, while
free to preach their idiot beliefs, are
only able to do so in very limited
venues – think, for example, of the
crazy street person who harasses
passerby with his theories about
the “Zionist-occupied government” or
the conspiracy nuts who hold
in other ways.

We have ample evidence that Iran
has funded, trained, supported, and
provided weapons to at least some
of the terrorists who are currently
killing our men and women in Iraq.
In fact, we know that Iran has ties
to terrorist groups throughout the
Middle East, from Hezbollah to
Hamas, and in fact took an active
hand in transforming the former
from a political party into a terrorist
organization. There is no reason
– ever – to knowingly invite a terrorist
or the leader of a terrorist regime,
particularly not one who has shed
American blood – to speak on our
soil, with the possible exception of
luring him to America so he can be
arrested for crimes against
humanity.

So, let’s recap. Here we have
ea tyrant who has threatened
to remake the world the way he thinks
it should be, and who may soon have the means
to make good on his threat), and
whose hands are stained with the
blood of America’s heroic armed
forces. This man is the despotic ruler
of a hostile nation with whom we are
already in a low-level undeclared
war. Inviting him to spew his venom
at an allegedly prestigious university
has given him an immeasurable
propaganda victory and granted
a false legitimacy to his depraved
regime.

Columbia’s invitation of
Ahmadinejad has given “aid and
comfort to our enemies and is thus
an act of treason.”

So it was that your correspondent
attended the protest outside
Columbia’s walls. A sizeable
group had gathered on the four
street corners near the university’s
entrance, and although it was
loosely organized, the protestors
did draw considerable media
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group of environmental lunatics decided to chain themselves in the University Department of Agriculture to prevent the creation of this lovely paved paradise. When that didn’t work, they proceeded to live in the woods to prevent construction from beginning. Their living conditions in the Redbud Woods looked like the Swiss Family Robinson on acid. Some of them had actually written notes to the trees. Yes, they spoke to the trees. In the end, the hippies were thrown out of their tree houses; unfortunately, none of them were hurt. Better luck next time.

The Limousine Liberal

The limousine liberal and the hippy may have both voted for Kerry in 2004 but the limousine liberal would never be seen with someone who looks like that. Often the offspring of a wealthy family of professionals in the New York metropolitan area, the limousine liberal’s politics are derived from his or her superiority complex. Conservatives, you see, are ignorant, Bible-thumping, moron rednecks. Liberals, however, are enlightened, intelligent, classy, and generous—with other people’s money. Limousine liberals come to Cornell already comfortable in their families’ wealth and therefore have no problem supporting raising other people’s taxes and hindering them from enjoying that same prosperity. If too many other people get rich, who will be left to patronize? Limousine liberals are some of the most frustratingly hypocritical politicians at Cornell. They are so quick to empathize with the sufferings of minorities but likely live in a gated community where the only black face is on the lawn jockey. They are the products of their families’ affluence but want to prevent others from achieving that same status by having the government steal half of their paychecks.

It’s the limousine liberals that use the privilege granted to them by their parents’ money to get a good education, go to law school, enter politics, and then hasten the socialization of America. So be nice to these rich liberals; one day they will be deciding your income tax rate.

The Angry Minority

Before MTV’s The Real World became soft-core porn and there were actually real people on the show, every season would have at least one sassy minority. Cornell has more than its fair share of these folks. Of course, let me be up front and say that there are plenty of kind, intelligent, and fun minority students at this University. Some of them I consider to be friends and acquaintances of mine (my “Diversity Rainbow” as I call them). That being said, it’s impossible to ignore the nasty, ignorant, and bitter members of the minority community who constantly whine about the brutal oppression they suffer at the hands of whitey. Apparently, part of this oppression involves their admittance to an Ivy League institution, likely as a recipient of affirmative action and scholarships. If that’s what oppression is, I’d like to get myself a piece of that.

These repeaters of racial rage seclude themselves inside their ethnic ghettos (be it Ujamaa, Latino Living Center, or Akwekon) and then complain about their supposed exclusion from the rest of the Cornell community. While there’s nothing morally wrong about preferring to associate with people like you (whether you define “like you” as similar-looking, similar-thinking, or whatever), if you choose to isolate yourself from the greater community you should cede your right to complain if you think the greater community is largely ignoring you. Some groups grasp this concept. You don’t ever see the Dungeons & Dragons players rallying on Ho Plaza to protest the lack of understanding on campus towards pasty white kids who enjoy playing board games on Friday night. D&D players never launched an armed takeover of Willard Straight Hall as a group of black students did in 1969. Unfortunately, angry minorities have become a celebrated part of Cornell’s legacy as the WSH Takeover is memorialized each April. One of the darkest blemishes on our University’s history is commemorated every year, probably to placate the violent radicals and stave off another takeover.

The Conservative Activist

In my completely objective opinion, the bravest, most-intelligent, and best-looking group of people on campus are the conservatives—the Cornell Republicans, to be exact. Unlike the unwashed leftist masses, conservatives enjoy showering and general cleanliness. The absence of multi-colored hair, repulsive tattoos, and grotesque piercings also contribute to the clean look and feel of the movement. But not all right-wingers are created equal. Some weak-kneed conservatives at Cornell constantly seek to “dialogue” with the left and try to find common ground. Their ultimate goal in life is to be liked by liberals, to be invited to their cocktail parties, to be declared a “respectable” conservative. The Cornell Republicans, on the other hand, stands for a muscular conservatism that will not only take the heat from the left but give them hell right back. Cowards need not apply. There are other publications where you would be more than welcome.

There are many other breeds of political hacks at Cornell and plenty of other walking stereotypes that populate campus, but these descriptions should give you a good head start on your Cornell enculturation. So welcome, freshmen, to the three-ring circus that is Cornell University. You can find the bearded lady over in the Women’s Studies department, the two-headed llama over at the vet school, and the dog and pony show in the administration building. Keep your hands and arms inside the vehicle at all times, but above all else, enjoy the ride.

– Eric Shive is the former Editor-in-Chief of the Cornell American, from 2004 to 2006. He can be reached at ems65@cornell.edu
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attention. Our signs ranged from displays of Ahmadinejad’s terrorist credentials (including memorable quotes about Israel’s impending destruction) to declarations of shame from Columbia students and alumni to declarations of the United States’ solidarity with Israel. One particularly poignant poster showed the image of a young Israeli woman who had been killed by a Hamas bus bombing, along with evidence for Israel’s involvement. Several prominent individuals, including New York Congressmen, spoke over a megaphone, though this reporter was unable to get close enough to hear them. A refrain of “Shame on Columbia!” echoed from the crowd almost constantly, summing up our feelings after the event.

The majority of the protest was composed of Jewish groups, some displaying Israeli flags, yarmulkes, and other Jewish symbols. I felt ashamed that there were so few non-Jewish protesters; as in the 1930s, it seems that the rest of the civilized world is idly standing by while obvious warning signs flash from despotic regimes. “Never again” doesn’t have much meaning if the Jewish people can’t count on getting any sort of help from their supposed allies. When a man sees a group threatened with extermination, even if he doesn’t identify with that group, can’t he stand up for them?! Too few of us did on Monday.

As always, there was a small but belligerent counter-protest, wielding signs admonishing us not to attack Iran. The usual anti-Bush fanatics were there, carrying a charming banner claiming “Ahmadinejad is bad… Bush is worse.” One woman, clearly out of her gourd, carried a sign welcoming Ahmadinejad, who she called a “seeker of truth.” Worse than the blatant lunacy of these statements was the active evil of a small group of counter-protestors, three or four bearded men holding signs calling for the elimination of the “Jewish entity” and the liberation of Palestine from the “Zionist pigs” or even asking Iran to monitor its nuclear program more closely “before [sic] it is too late!” The protesters and counter-protestors got into a few shouting matches, but for the most part retained civility… with the exception of a heart-wrenching spectacle in which a man whose father had been murdered by the Iranian regime was reduced to tears by leftist counter-protestors who insisted that Ahmadinejad was right and that he was a victim.

I left the protest knowing full well who won on September 24th. Columbia University’s foolish, cowardly invitation of a hostile despots was a wonderful propaganda victory for the hateful fundamentalists who control so much of the Middle East, and for all our righteous indignation, the hundreds of protestors couldn’t damp that victory. Like it or not, Ahmadinejad’s regime’s support of terrorist groups in Iraq was a silent—and apparently unnoticed—declaration of war against the United States and all we hold dear. In a just world, the streets of New York City would have been blocked with throngs of protesters demonstrating against our foe. America would have taken a decisive stand against Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and his depravity.

But not in our world. We welcome dictators with open arms and seek a civilized reconciliation. And when we’re doing that, “their” people suffer, and the world draws closer to a nightmare of nuclear proportions. Shame on Columbia. Shame on us.

Kent Haeger is a junior in the College of Arts and Sciences. He
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author of the chalking being reprimanded in some way. What would you do in such a situation? How would you explain yourself? Would you schedule a meeting with the Dean and the Leftist and try to smooth things over? Would you try to come to some middle ground? Or would you do what Ryan Horn, [former Editor-in-Chief of The Cornell American] and I did and assert our First Amendment rights and refuse to meet with anyone? Sure it’s hard, sure it’s a bad position to be in, and “mean,” but too bad. We were right. We speak the truth as we know it and don’t water our opinions down so as to be “sensitive” to anyone. It’s a shame nobody seems to want to do it. You’re easy to espouse Republican principles when you’re sitting around at dinner with a few friends or when you’re sitting down in a group of like-minded folks. But what if you are in a crowd of 100 black nationalists at Ujamaa Residential College who are arguing for slavery reparations? What if your professor stands up in front of you and says: “The New Deal saved this country from the Great Depression?” What if you are in the middle of a mandatory diversity workshop and a facilitator intimates that the only way to avoid incurring the wrath of your professor is to adopt a certain color of your skin is irrelevant. It’s your race-based program houses, yada, yada, yada.” Then it was my turn. I said: “Professor, I don’t know as much as you do about rural sociology. I’m not sure, I think you might be right, but if I speak out the way you do, I won’t have the guts to do the same thing when your turn comes? If you are afraid of being called a racist, a Righty, or a conservative, you are bucking the grain of history. You are not that important to have your voice heard.” At this point the class was completely silenced with the protesters and was content to stomp on the First Amendment rights of conservatives. Fortunately, members of the press like John Leo and I assert our First Amendment rights and reading Ayn Rand’s novels. Still others may look to Milton Friedman, Friedrich Hayek, and Walter Williams. Whatever you choose, you must have some idea of what you are talking about. I assure you—most ideas that pop into our heads are not original. They have been thought of before and have been written about extensively. Why not learn about these ideas from their founders to better understand them? I have a Ph.D. in economics from Cornell University. I work as an assistant professor at the University of Georgia. He can be contacted through his website at www.joesabia.com.
Concealed Carry Heats Up

EDDIE HERRON  BRIAN GRAMBOW
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF  CAMPUS EDITOR

The Student Assembly saw one of its largest audiences of the year last Thursday, at its weekly public meeting. No, the unusually large audience was not there to see the Cheerleading squad, or Alternative Breaks Program appeal their SAFC funding (or lack thereof). It took the controversial Resolution 17 to get students who would otherwise be apathetic (ourselves included) to come see student-run bureaucracy at its finest.

Resolution 17, which called for “(The) assembly (to) strongly urge the administration to take whatever action is necessary to allow for concealed carry on campus,” was soundly defeated by the Student Assembly last Wednesday, March 6th by a vote of 3-14-1. The resolution was sponsored by Student Assembly Vice-Chair and Class of 2008 President-at-Large and Chairman of the College Republicans Ahmed Salem ’08, Director of Elections and cowboy hat maven Mark Coombs ’08, as well as Rachel Quigley ’09 and Carol Glen ’08, both of them College Republicans.

The debate about the right to “concealed carry” has been growing in the aftermath of the attacks at Northern Illinois University this past month and Virginia Tech almost a year ago. Over three dozen college students lost their lives in attacks that Salem et al. believe could have been mitigated by the possibility of armed bystanders. As it stands now, people who do abide by the law are not allowed to have firearms on any campus outside of the state of Utah. Combine that with the fact that 99.9% of all criminals prefer unarmned victims and, as the co-sponsors argued, you have a huge potential for future attacks on campuses across the country.

Members both of the College Republicans and Cornell Democrats brought signs showing their support or opposition to the resolution. Both groups behaved rather predictably. The Democrats lined the left half of the Willard Straight Hall Memorial Room with cutely decorated colored signs attacking the resolution and its sponsors such as “Mark Coombs is a fiend, don’t pass 17!” and “You don’t trust Republicans with your government but you trust them with a gun?”

On the right side of the room the Republicans had draft signs consisting of white poster board and black marker but carrying a fundamental messages such as “Yes to 17!” and “Gun free zones do not work!” The Republican’s signs spoke as loud as the seemingly withering attacks displayed by the Democrats (they could not go longer than 15 seconds without giggling like school girls after their fearless leader gave them their signs).

Coombs started the proposal of the Resolution by reading a letter from an anonymous Cornell Police officer. The letter was in favor of the resolution and above all stated that if people think there are not any guns on campus then they are mistaken. This is very important to keep in mind because one of the biggest misconceptions of the Resolution has been that it intends to flood Cornell’s campus with guns. This is not the case; it is not even a reasonable argument of Coombs was to provide a way for citizens who want to follow the rules at Cornell to have a concealed weapon. The biggest arguments against the benefits of concealed carry but arguably the most illogical was by Rammi Salem ’10, minority representative. After Rachel Quigley postulated about an attack in PSYCH 101, which, with 1,200 students is one of the largest classes in the country, Salem stated in a very cavalier manner “I am a TA in PSYCH 101, see what I do if someone brings in a gun.”

Although courageous and respectable to offer oneself in sacrifice, there are some reservations about how effective this “see what I do” argument can be. Salem could not be reached for comment about what he would be able to do to thwart the attack if he had 5 bullet holes in his chest.

Some of the more reasonable arguments for concealed carry were raised by audience members, most of whom were members of the Cornell Democrats. Possibilities such as accidental firings, people’s psychological fear of guns, and the presence of handguns in emotional arguments were all brought up by concerned undergraduate students.

The possibility of a frat party turning into the OK Correl was also a concern brought up many times. This danger was unequivocally proven by a math equation in a sign held by a Cornell Democrat which stated “Guns + Frat Party = Bad.”

These arguments were made by individuals who did not seem to fully understand the core proposal of Resolution 17. The resolution is to permit students to defend themselves. Instead of arguing why Cornell in particular should be a gun free zone they were focusing generally on why guns are bad.

Also the Resolution merely asked for Cornell to follow New York State’s gun laws which are pretty fair and straightforward. In New York State, a person requesting permission to maintain a concealed weapon must; be 21 years of age (that fake ID you use to get into Johnny O’s will not work in this case), be of good moral character, have not committed any felony or serious offense, mentally healthy, and never had a pistol license revoked. Additionally, New York law requires that the permit carrier have good cause for the permit.

Additionally, a permit carrier may never intentionally brandish the weapon or discharge it. You may never discharge the weapon in public areas without good cause, nor may he intentionally aim the weapon, even without malice, at another person. If any of the above terms are violated it is a Class A misdemeanor, which would be punishable with up to a year in prison. Therefore, any permit carrier who is convicted of any above crime will have the concealed carry license permanently revoked.

Coombs pointed out that these restrictions, as well as other gun laws in New York, makes New York the safest state for concealed carry according to the Brady Campaign. Conversely that would make them the 44th best state for gun laws if you ask the NRA.

The resolution was originally submitted a week earlier and drew immediate criticism from members of the SA. Then, in an unexpected move, The SA voted to move the controversial resolution from new business to amending “business of the day,” in what could have been an attempt to prevent improperly planned debate and organization of support for the resolution. Eventually, Coombs and Salem were able to convince the assembly that the issue of concealment of firearms must not be brushed aside, allowing the Cornell Police and students an opportunity to express their respective opinions more thoughtfully.

All parties involved returned to the SA meeting a week later. They were supposed to come prepared with arguments, responses from the representatives’ constituencies, and a clear head to objectively analyze the situation. Two out of three ain’t bad I guess. After the meeting Quigley lamented on the lack of objectivity on the part of the SA, stating that they “were even more disrespectful than our liberal counterparts in the audience, taking while we were talking, and leaving the room” Quigley was also unhappy with the lack of opportunities for rebuttal by resolution sponsors to statements made by assembly members and the fact that the SA can call for an issue to be voted on before the sponsors of any resolution are done making their argument. Salem also expressed his disappointment with some of the assembly members saying “When I brought the resolution forward I knew it was going to be an uphill battle. I had hoped that many of the assembly members thought the second amendment would vote for this as it is a clear extension of it” This strife came to a head in Salem’s interaction with Rebecca Stein ‘10, who is the transfer student representative. Stein, who has been an active member in the College Republicans for the entire year, was very scathing in her opposition to the resolution.

Salem claimed it is irrelevant time for the Assembly, and that she is embarrassed to be a member of the College Republicans as a result. In a e-mail, Salem said that Stein is no longer a member of the College Republicans because she is disputed by stating that according to group constitution anyone who attends just one meeting is a member for the entire year. Official member of the College Republicans or not, her membership has been compromised for voicing her opinion on an issue so controversial that it is not bound to traditional party lines of conservative or liberal.

It was not just the Student Assembly who showed a lack of respect for the College Republicans’ concerns. Resolution 17 also drew such a controversial reaction from the Cornell Daily Sun. Throughout the week leading up to the decision on Resolution 17, the Sun ran articles ranging from community comments about students to a lack of opportunities for students to amend Resolution 17 to include concealment of squirt guns. It is obvious that few opponents of Resolution 17 actually read the resolution or understand New York’s laws concerning fire arms. Tony Manfred of the Cornell Daily Sun wrote that the passage of the resolution would of essentially turn the college administration into an “armed and paranoid and ready” force looking to “pump nutty grad students full of lead in the name of Justice.” The Sun’s Charley Niesenbaum requested that the SA allow the resolution to be brushed aside, to include water pistols, a frightening trivialization of the right to defend one’s self with firearms.

Eddie Herron is a senior in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations. He can be reached at eh25@cornell.edu
Brian Grambow is a sophomore in the School of Hotel Administration. He can be reached at bg75@cornell.edu
Threat of Two-Headed Terrorists?

Muslim inbreeding in Europe may be linked to transatlantic flight clampdown

RAZA HODA
ONLINE EDITOR

Early last week, President George W. Bush urged twenty-seven European governments to tighten security and heighten awareness on flights outbound to the United States. He called for the increased presence of armed U.S. air marshals on these flights and detailed reports on the families of travelers. This was met with protest from the Belgian government, which urged other EU nations not to allow themselves to be bullied by the Americans. Last time I checked, 3,000 Belgians didn’t die when airliners loaded with jet fuel were hijacked and flown into skyscrapers — they don’t exactly have a right to complain. Our strong and steadfast president used a hard tone with the Europeans, stating that countries who do not comply with the clampdown may see requirements for visas to visit America in the near future—a requirement already in place for countries such as Pakistan, Afghanistan, and all the other -stans, as well as North Korea and Iran. If they want to tempt the fates and defy the United States, they can plot themselves on the Axis of Visas along with those other degenerate rogue states.

One of the main issues the Belgian government has with the new policies is privacy. Identity theft and protection of digital information were some of the big concerns. As if America really cares if Jean l’Homme is having an affair and has cancer. America has bigger fish to fry like Abu al-Qaeda and Nawaf bin Taliban. Like Belgium, the Association of European Airlines, or AEA, which is composed of thirty-one airlines, including Germany-based Lufthansa and Air France-KLM, cried out against the demands. “[There is] no international legal foundation,” they argued. Right, and which of the thirty-one airlines have had their pilots stabbed with box cutters and planes crashed into government buildings? How much did their airlines suffer after that fateful day in September? Perhaps if British Airways had filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy, they would be a little more sensitive. Regardless of the reactions from the EU, steps are being taken by the Department of Homeland Security to ensure America remains terrorist-free. Europeans will soon have to ask for permission online before planning a trip to the United States.

But why did President Bush urgently call for immediate action? Why now? Early last week, about the same time the president made the demands, British environmental minister Phil Woolas warned Muslims against their common practice of inbreeding. Muslim families have a tendency to arrange marriages with first cousins. This sickening trailer-park tradition is not against British law—but bloody well should be. Even though these unions are responsible for only three percent of births in the United Kingdom, their children make up one-third of the population afflicted by genetic disorders. Recent studies have also shown that political ideology is genetically linked.

What does this mean for America and the War on Terrorism? It means that an arranged marriage between families of radical Islamists who hate everything about freedom and democracy results in offspring who hate twice as much; that this twisted family tree of Taliban-esque beliefs gets compounded until it produces a two-headed, double-bearded megaterrorist. We already have enough on our plate battling one-headed jihadists. Britain needs to not only prevent these rampant incestuous relations, but also prosecute those guilty of fornication with family members. For the sake of Americans, of our national security, and most of all of common decency. It means that the Europeans must be more active in complying with the rules and regulations of the United States, whether or not the Belgian waffles approve. It means we should be grateful to have a great and glorious leader like President Bush, who sees the danger before it becomes a danger, to protect us from mutant Muslims out to get us and our freedom.

Raza Hoda is a sophomore in the College of Arts and Sciences. He can be reached at rsh94@cornell.edu.
Obama’s Secrets to Success

How has a political neophyte with unpalatably far-left views risen from obscurity to capture the hearts, minds, and bumper sticker space of millions of impressionable voters? In addition to his vague, sweeping statements of “hope” and “change” which show an uncanny ability to whip crowds into a frenzy, his campaign has utilized some more... er, unorthodox tactics.

- Hypnotizing the masses with mysterious “Mark of Hope” on his forehead
- Tearing off Hillary’s facemask during a debate, revealing the compound eyes and tentacles beneath
- Capturing the dentist vote with perfectly brushed smile
- Wearing Necktie of +4 Charisma
- Renaming welfare rolls the “Department of Change,” thus attracting both lower-class voters and irony fetishists
- Promising key Democratic “super-delegates” that Cthulhu would eat them last
- Personally performing 47 partial-birth abortions upon the altar of Beelzebub
- Vowing to personally inflate every American’s tires to improve gas mileage and end the energy crisis
- Buttocks undulate in suave, sexuality-challenging manner during television close-ups

Read the Cornell Review Online
www.thecornellreview.com
The most fundamental fact about the ideas of the political left is that they do not work. Therefore we should not be surprised to find the left concentrated in institutions where ideas do not have to work in order to survive.

~Thomas Sowell

I have never wavered from my intention to advance the cause of diversity in new and more effective ways

~Jeb Bush

Democracy is the art of running the circus from the monkey cage.

~H.L. Mencken

Those who govern, having much business on their hands, do not generally like to take the trouble of considering and carrying into execution new projects. The best public measures are therefore seldom adopted from previous wisdom, but orced by the occasion.

~Benjamin Franklin

Amidst all the clutter, beyond all the obstacles, aside from all the static, are the goals set. Put your head down, do the best job possible, let the flak pass, and work towards those goals.

~Donald Rumsfeld

Arms discourage and keep the invader and plunderer in awe, and preserve order in the world as well as property... Horrid mischief would ensue were the law-abiding deprived of the use of them.

~Thomas Paine

It is better to be violent, if there is violence in our hearts, than to put on the cloak of nonviolence to cover impotence.

~Mohandas Gandhi

Liberty is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end.

~Lord Acton

In politics it is necessary either to betray one’s country or the electorate. I prefer to betray the electorate.

~Charles de Gaulle

Public opinion, I am sorry to say, will bear a great deal of nonsense. There is scarcely any absurdity so gross, whether in religion, politics, science or manners, which it will not bear.

~Ralph Waldo Emerson

Democracy forever teases us with the contrast between its ideals and its realities, between its heroic possibilities and its sorry achievements.

~Agnes Repplier

Democracy does not guarantee equality of conditions - it only guarantees equality of opportunity.

~Irving Kristol

Democracy means not “I am as good as you are” but “You are as good as I am.

~Theodore Parker

America’s support for human rights and democracy is our noblest export to the world.

~William J. Bennett

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

~Martin Luther King, Jr.

I personally call the type of government which can be removed without violence ‘democracy,’ and the other, ‘tyranny.’

~Karl Popper
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