

# The Wilson Society

2004, Issue 2 ♦ News and Comment from Around SPE ♦

## Politics...Only Politics

by David Frisk

**W**ith the election over, punditry refocuses on future elections and upcoming legislative battles. In both cases, few predictions beyond the obvious ones suggest themselves. But one question, whose answer will shape both elections and policy, is especially compelling: Will the Democratic Party change?

This year's narrow defeat obscures the issue for the Democrats. The fact that John Kerry won 48 percent of the vote, despite a clearly improved economy, against an incumbent president whom the public liked better personally and trusted more on national security, is evidence of a strong Democratic Party – not a weak one. Democrats who don't wish to change, and that means most of those in positions of power, have a ready excuse.

Republicans are understandably thrilled that, whatever the margins involved, their president survived a withering two-year onslaught from the left and increased his majority in the Senate. But a worrisome truth for the GOP is that the anti-Bush propaganda nearly worked, despite its thin factual support and despite the mounting evidence of irrationality and extremism at the highest levels, let alone other levels, of the Democratic Party.

Additionally, the Republicans in 2008 will probably see a painful nomination battle in which differences on social issues, papered over since Mr. Bush was nominated four years ago, will reassert themselves. Hillary Clinton has already signaled interest in pretending to move rightward

(Continued on page 2)

## In This This Issue

- ♦ "Politics...Only Politics" by David Frisk—p. 1-2, 5
- ♦ "Smoke..." by Gerard Pacificar—p. 1, 5-6
- ♦ "Green (With Envy)" by John Phillips—p. 2, 6
- ♦ "A Little Give-and-Take" by Elisabeth Piper Davidson—p. 3, 6-7
- ♦ "Women in Islam" by Abdel-fattah Mady—p. 4, 7
- ♦ "Thoughts from the Editor" by Pamela L. Foerstel—p. 8-9

## Smoke: A Brief Meditation on the Neurosis Known as Political Science

by Gerard Pacificar

**A**n economist friend of mine a few weeks past observed that political science students are often the ones seen lighting up around school. It's pretty obvious given that smoking trios bantering on *The Federalist* and Game Theory can be seen lighting up at all hours of the day. Typically there is the lonesome smoker drifting about before a class begins. After all, smokers cannot be counted to meet on time. Their pace is the leisurely pace, albeit one of the most scheming passive-aggression. Then there is the midpoint break with the smokers, now united, feverishly dragging down their tobacco that they may have time to get a cup of coffee, a candy bar, possibly a Cobb salad, and make it back to the designated smoking area in time to light one more before class resumes. Then there is the bittersweet group smoke at the end of class. Politics students huddle together dragging down their fourth and fifth cigarettes lit within the past three hours. It will be another day or week until next they meet. Shakespeare's words that "parting is such sweet sorrow" can be heard in the mixture of rustling yellow leaves and the whistling of the Harper evergreens. The whole experience is sublime. It is a testament to the destructive forces against which political science ostensibly rails.

So, what in the name of metaphysics is driving these folks to the pipe? Americans in general have come to see smoking as a social bad. It took a couple of decades and here we are. Tobacco is no longer an acceptable way to medicate yourself against anxiety which is the great threat of the modern world. Consider it, more people die from anxiety related illness every year than from weapons of mass destruction. Responding to this development, concerned policy jocks would tax cigarettes right out of Middle America given the

(Continued on page 5)

(Continued from page 1)

on immigration, another issue that threatens to split the party – or, more accurately, to split the Republican base from the Republican power structure. In short, the Democrats might enter 2008 as the favorites.

But while Kerry's 48 percent and his good showing in the Electoral College may argue against a genuine "electability problem" for the Democrats, it is clear that their failure to win this year owed much to the leftist character of the party and its candidate – a character that moderate voters didn't fully grasp in a factual sense, but that nonetheless seeped into their inarticulate consciousness.

The Democrats need only move a short distance, about 2 million voters, to the right. Can they? Conventional judgment says: "of course." I'm not so sure.

The beginning of wisdom about this party whether one supports it or not, is to recognize the Democrats' profound sense of entitlement to power. Most Democrats in leadership positions of any kind believe Republican proposals are not just wrong, but violate a quasi-constitutional order that Democratic presidents and Congresses, assisted by liberal courts, imposed between the 1930s and the 1970s and have continued to augment since.

Until a Republican president and a Republican Congress coincided, the threats to this order were either marginal or rhetorical. The Democrats screamed at every sign of real opposition, but they always had a backstop, either the White House, the House of Representatives or the Senate. Now, at last, they really are on uncharted ground. (For the last two years there has been a nominal, one-seat Republican majority in the Senate, but a five-seat majority will be more significant.) The alarmed Democratic talk about "complete Republican control" of the federal government is a gross oversimplification, as all political-science students should understand. But the Republicans may have a better opportunity than ever before in modern, post-1933 American history to shape public policy, however limited that opportunity is. What upsets the Democrats is not so much the specific things that are most likely (or least unlikely) to happen, but the fact that the Republicans now must be taken more seriously than ever.

(Continued on page 5)

## Green (With Envy)

by John Phillips

Breaking from their steady diet of blaming the Jews for everything from athlete's foot to the weather, lily-livered Europeans are now taking up the cause of blaming Americans for...you guessed it; the weather! According the Reuters news agency, a study of a 2003 heat wave in Europe is giving environmentalists new ammunition for legal cases blaming the United States for global warming. These lawsuits serve as a striking blow to the world-wide epidemic of anti-Semitism: getting Europeans to acknowledge that there are people out there with deeper pockets than the Jews is definitely progress.

The study, published in the *Journal of Nature*, says that human activity, especially emissions of heat trapping gasses from fossil fuels have at least doubled the risks of heat waves, like the one that claimed more than 20,000 lives in Europe last year. Wasteful, selfish Americans would have done silly things like turn on their air-conditioners. The more environmentally conscious Europeans took the moral high ground and let their poor, sick and aged die in the sweltering inferno. (The most commonly overheard phrase at swanky French eateries that summer: "Let them bake like a cake.")

The study's authors believe that claims linked to climate change could dwarf-billion dollar awards against tobacco companies if the rising temperatures, catastrophic storms, higher sea levels and droughts ever materialize. Luckily for the Euros, I hear John Edwards has some free time on his hands. Come to think of it, all of us should be lucky that John Edwards has free time on his hands.

Steve Sawyer, the climate policy director at Greenpeace believes, "One study is not going to create an entire new area of jurisprudence, but this is an important step." If successful, these lawsuits could also affect joke punch lines for years to come. "What do you call a million lawyers at the bottom of the ocean?" will no longer be answered with "a good start." It will become "a good start and a climate altering eco-hazard." (Although, if a million lawyers are thrown to the bottom of the ocean and no one is around to hear them whine, do they make a sound?)

If it weren't for groups like Greenpeace

(Continued on page 6)

## A Little Give-and-Take

by Elisabeth Piper Davidson

Given the raucousness of the public debate over past few years on issues ranging from international security and American military actions to the 2004 presidential election and media bias, it is certainly worth turning away from discussing ideas of dissension and reflecting for a moment instead upon the nature of cooperation. There is abundant evidence showing the presence of cooperative patterns among humans either forced by biological characteristics or facilitated by cultural evolution. For example, a series of studies on unrelated women and girls who live or work together for extended periods of time have each observed menstrual synchronization caused by female pheromone secretion; and it seems that male pheromones affect female fertility by shortening cycle length (McClintock and Stern 1998; McClintock 1971). Both of these instances are unconscious, biological occurrences forming part of the social glue that greatly influences how people interact, mate and reproduce. In other words, it's a singular event of cooperation stimulated by biological causes, rather than by active thought. Despite such patterns, spontaneous, unforced cooperation by rational actors is still thought a puzzle.

Contrary to strict game theory, experimental evidence reports significant cooperation, even in one-shot non-cooperation games (Camerer 2003). Clues explaining the presence of sustained cooperation are provided by cultural and biological evolutionary models. In cultural models human nature is malleable and it is accepted that culture and biology have reciprocal effects upon one another (Degler 1991). Human behavior is not malleable in biological models, where culture and biology are two distinct processes, but it is recognized that cultural universals (e.g. aesthetics, affection, status, taking turns) can be produced by rare cross-effects (Degler 1991). A common approach portrays cooperation as a product of cultural evolution correcting for non-optimal, biological outcomes. In these models, cooperation fluctuates within society because cultural evolution selects complete altruism (unselfishness) in order to correct for biological evolution selected selfishness (e.g. limited altruism or kin-selection, small group reciprocal altruism, cheap talk for acquaintances, complete egoism with strangers) (Jencks 1991). An example is Frank's (1988) com-

mitment model where given is a mix of cheaters and honest brokers in society and the habits of reciprocal altruism, cheap talk and punitive sentiments. To ensure they are with their own kind, honest brokers must pay to play. Overtime both cultural conditioning for moral sentiments and the natural selection pressures of bargaining bring the two groups to a stable equilibrium mix of cheaters and honest brokers, where both groups are earning the same average payoff and hence equally likely to survive (essentially game theory's evolutionary stable strategy where the percentage of each group depends upon the cost-benefit ratio of each strategy. In the culturally-dominated efficient altruism (Rubin 2002), aid is transferred only to those who could return to the group as a productive member—a judgment of fitness that is a cultural selection of preferences. Efficient altruism is a group selection theory meaning that a limited form of group selection could arise from the reinforcing effects of cultural and natural selection—something usually considered improbable due to free riding—so that as groups enforce social norms of cooperation, the survival of altruists is not only ensured, but also groups with altruists will be more successful and grow faster.

There is a similar correction effect at work between genetic variety and genetic sameness. Natural selection produces uniqueness in individuals while sexual selection produces a universal preference for species-impairing “choosiness” (Ridley 1993). This contradiction is the essence of Darwinian Theory: in genetic selection, each success pits the winner against a better opponent in the next game every single time—the pressure to get better and better never abates—just like a “within-species arms race.” The race is the theory of the Red Queen where evolutionary progress is relative. Genes do not have a single winning strategy against parasitic diseases; they are forced to play mixed strategies to keep the parasites guessing. Similarly, the faster one runs, the more the world keeps pace and the less progress one makes in real terms. Unable to truly vanquish ones' enemies with a final winning blow, the Red Queen forces cooperators and noncooperators to stay together and keep abreast of the other's progress in order to survive. The Red Queen is at work within cultural evolution, too. The key point in Thorstein Veblen's (1934) theory of cultural lag was society's domination by a constant struggle between its industrial base versus its laws and customs. Society's fittest institutions and beliefs were always contingent because the instant they became the norm, given that they had evolved from the cultural past, they were

*(Continued on page 6)*

# Women in Islam

by Abdel-fattah Mady

In the aftermath of the terrible events of September 11, 2001, Islam has come under unprecedented scrutiny in the West. A woman, it is argued, is inferior to a man in Islam. The reality is quite different. This article is a brief assessment of the status of women in Islam. Yet, it should be mentioned at the outset of this article that a basic distinction needs to be made between Islam as a religion and all the historical traditions that have accumulated around it over the years as well as the state of affairs of the so-called “Muslim countries,” which are ruled either by secular elites or by those who wrapped themselves in the mantle of religion and manipulated Islamic values and principles in order to conceal their despotic rule and achieve their own interests.

In many parts of the world, prior to the adoption of Islam, women were regarded by their parents as a threat to family honor and hence worthy of burial alive at infancy. As an adult, she was a sex object of men. In contrary, Islam announced women’s liberation in the 7<sup>th</sup> century.

(1) *Spiritually*, the Qur’an provides clear-cut evidence that the rights of women are equal to those of men but they are not necessarily identical with them. This difference is because a man and a woman are not identical, in their physiological and psychological make-up. Islam removed some of the false notions about women, such as the idea that Eve tempted Adam to disobey God, and thus caused his downfall. In terms of religious obligations, such as the Daily Prayers, Fasting, Zakah or Poor-due charity, and Pilgrimage, a woman is no different from a man. In some cases indeed, a woman has certain advantages over a man. For instance, a woman is exempted from daily prayers and from fasting during forty days after childbirth. She is also exempted from fasting during her pregnancy and when she is nursing her baby if there is any threat to her health or her baby’s health.

(2) *Socially*, in the 7<sup>th</sup> century, Islam raised women to a position of influence and prestige in family and society. Islam gave women, as it did to all other classes and groups, their legitimate place in life. In some cases, as a mother, for instance, Islam gave women precedence over man. Thus, when a man came to the Prophet Muhammad, and expressed his desire to join the military to defend Islam, the Prophet asked him if he had a mother. When he replied that he had, the Prophet advised him, “Stay with her, for Paradise is at her feet,” meaning that taking care of mothers is more

important than joining the army to defend Islam. In addition, seeking knowledge is a mandatory duty for every Muslim (male and female), and women have the basic freedom of choice and expression based on recognition of her individual personality. A Muslim woman chooses her husband and keeps her name after marriage. Moreover, the respect for the chastity of women is one of the main aspects of Islamic human rights that is a woman’s chastity must be respected and protected regardless of her race, religion, or language. And only marriage is designed to fulfill companionship and sexual needs for both women and men. All pre-marriage sexual relationships are forbidden in Islam. Islam advocates heavy punishments for the crime of adultery and violation of the chastity of women.

(3) *Politically*, a woman is entitled to freedom of expression as much as a man is. Her sound opinions cannot be disregarded just because she happens to belong to the female sex. The right to vote in political affairs (or the right to make *Bay’a* in Islamic terms) was given to women 14 centuries ago along with freedom of opinion and the right to political participation. Historical records show that women participated in public life with the early Muslims, and got political positions. In 641, there was a woman—Ash-Shefa’ bint Abdullah bint Abdshmas—in charge of “Accountability Markets, and Commerce Affairs” in the Islamic state under the second Caliphate, Omar Ibn El-Khtab. In contrast to the Western understanding, women were not shut behind iron bars or considered worthless creatures. In addition, unlike other ancient civilizations, women’s testimony is valid in legal disputes, and on topics in which women are more familiar, their evidence is conclusive and superior to those of men.

(4) *Economically*, a Muslim woman has the equal right to own property, to enter into legal contracts, to inherit from her relatives, and to manage all of her assets, and no one has any right to her earnings including her husband. Her life, her property, her honor are as sacred as those of man. And regardless of any wealth that she may have, guardianship and financial responsibility are given to men, meaning that they must provide women with not only monetary support but also physical protection and kind and respectful treatment.

*In sum*, Islam revealed women’s liberation in the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Islam made women

(Continued on page 7)

*(David Frisk, continued from page 2)*

The Democratic response to Republican ideas in Washington, and the Democratic self-presentation to the voters, will not be dictated by calm estimates of practical merit, of political popularity, or of what the Republicans can and cannot feasibly accomplish. They will be dictated by outrage at the formal Republican threat to a policy order that the Democrats have come to view in constitutional, and thus more-than-political, terms. As the Founders might put it: Pride will take precedence over Reason.

The party's insistence on forcing Ohio to recount its ballots, despite the stubborn fact that Kerry lost there by 119,000 votes, is farcical by any pragmatic standard. It makes sense only as a rather sterile kind of pride. My guess is that this demand offers a clue to Democratic conduct during President Bush's second term – and so, perhaps, to Democratic electoral chances two and four years from now.

*David Frisk is a doctoral candidate in American politics and political philosophy.*

*(Gerard Pacificar, continued from page 1)*

chance. Who needs cigarettes when there is a host of psychotropic alternatives, legal and otherwise, from which to choose? For what it's worth, it's hard for me to imagine picking up on a woman while rolling a Xanax between my teeth.

For now, I'll leave judgments between good and bad to the moralists. They always seem to be shopping for a cause. However, in seeking some satisfactory answer for why political scientists smoke as much as they do, I think it helpful to say that I tend to err on the side of non-judgment. The choice to smoke is simply not best framed as either right and/or wrong. Nothing stops discourse, discussion, and inquiry like a fire and brimstone speech. This is a very difficult position for political scientists to take. Politics is most comfortable with a strong mandate and conviction within the mandate. Relativism weakens this connection. It reframes operational statements from "we have to do something about this or that" to "I choose to do something about this or that." The latter sounds a little less forceful to me at least.

Somewhere deep down, political scientists have some intuitive sense that it is not so

much that truth is relative, but that the world in which truth is conceived is so. Nature makes no judgment really. At the least there are consequences to actions but even these are uncertain. There is an event then another event. The observer supplies the connection.

This can be a distressing way of looking at the world. It ends up as impermanent as we. Maybe belief in God can offer some reprieve from the anxiety of impermanence, but even in this, religious faith is often too tightly wrapped. Religion isn't something to connect us to the here and now. It is but one among mechanisms that keeps us from having to face the threat of a Hobbesian world.

Truth is constrained, defined and narrowed by our language and the limitations of our perceptions. This sentiment is practically commonplace now, although I don't think people really believe this. Perhaps they recognize the idea but it fails to resonate deep within the chest, that efficient barometer of personal and transcendental truth. There is an exception though. Political activists in my experience tend not to fret too much about metaphysical problems. The force of their conviction usually drives them with such gusto that I don't mean to speak poorly of activists. They do some wonderful things but they're terribly intense sometimes and it's a bit more than my nerves can take. Plus they never listen to me when I talk unless I happen to mention something tangential to their passion. It so happens that's pretty much everything. Tough crowd.

Nature is relative, therefore truth is relative. Maybe you don't believe it. I sure didn't want to believe it. I railed against relativism. I thought it would be the death of us all. Allan Bloom, channeling Strauss, and one of his cohort flunkies an old philosophy professor of mine (can't remember his name but he was a dead-ringer for Michael Chiklis), pounded me to pulp with the perils of relativism. Plus it was kind of mean-nasty-cool to feel superior to those poor saps buying into relativism. The fools! The fools! It was like a shot of schadenfreude straight out of the German enlightenment or something like that.

I've come to accept relativism in nature. It seems right. The truth about nature, about cats and dogs, birds and bees, Democrats and Republicans, Fascists and Nihilists, is that nature will do what nature will. They are all necessary cognates of the same system. Of course this can make the world terribly frustrating. And I guess the tough part is

*(Continued on next page)*

*(Gerard Pacificar, continued from page 5)*

that no matter how much we in politics try to shape the world to our ideals, it continues to frustrate us. Right when you think you've got the world pegged it changes up just enough to drive your political model back to the starting gate.

With that, we come full circle to that nervous trio smoking away like mad speed-freaks on home-grown Rialto glass. There they are, frustrated and slightly neurotic, struggling to bring their personal version of good or bad into the world. Politics is not for the faint of heart. It can be an express ticket to the great beyond. Politics is but another means to understand and control (or manage) human behavior. It achieves its ends by amplifying discord to some critical point at which the phase of the din shifts just right that the noise cancels out. Political scientists smoke because to them, the world vibrates at a terrible frequency. This they see as clear as day like a specter stalking them and their every decision. Smoking is one response to the perception of an anxiety provoking universe where good never completely trumps evil. It is illustrative of the occasional failure to find a less anxious way to perceive an otherwise diffident world.

*Gerard Pacificar is a Ph.D. student of Politics and Policy.*

*(John Phillips, continued from page 2)*

one could get the false impression that things like drought, floods and rising temperatures happened before Americans started driving Chevy Silverados. For all their blaming and contempt for modern conveniences you'd think that environmentalist groups like Greenpeace consist of subsistence farmers who eat what they grow and grow what they eat. In reality, these groups consist of more rich white liberals than most drug and alcohol rehab facilities in Santa Monica -- With just as many 'B-List' celebrities!

Here are the facts, as described by Cato Institute fellow Patrick J. Michaels and NASA scientist James Hansen: scientists know "quite precisely" how much the planet will warm in the foreseeable future -- a modest three-quarters of a degree Celsius, plus or minus a quarter of a degree. This warming rate (aka the real rate) is about four times less than the figure widely circulated by those masters of efficiency at the United Nations and endlessly repeated by the press. According to the duo, these numbers will hold whether or not we wreck our economy by signing the Kyoto Treaty,

get sued by bloodsucking parasites (and their clients too) or ride to work on a bicycle. Just think of it like the Kennedy kids getting in trouble with the law -- it's an inevitable fact of life.

We are not going to get sued because we are responsible for single-handedly destroying the earth's climate. We are going to get sued because we are rich, successful and powerful -- and the rest of the world is jealous. Instead of blaming their problems on failed socialist policies, they blame us. They aren't being green, just green with envy.

*John Phillips is Master of Arts candidate in American Politics.*

*(Elisabeth Piper, continued from page 3)*

already outmoded and lagging too far behind constantly changing social circumstances.

Regarding public goods provision and cooperation, experiments and field-testing have illustrated that social dilemmas reach cooperative solutions via endogenous institution-building and can achieve results that are "better than rational" by building conditions such that social norms which support cooperation are promoted (Ostrom 1998). Variability in strategies can be explained primarily by the transfer of social norms and importance placed upon them as well as the use of punishment strategies to increase cooperation. Even though reciprocity is thought to be most important norm to facilitate cooperation, whatever constitutes reciprocity norms will not be universal within a population because each one is culture/situation specific, therefore, people within the same population rationally expect one another to operate with a diverse set of norms and strategies, including playing "reciprocity/cooperate." Regarding punishment to maintain norms, because we know cheaters will always exist, the optimal strategy is a measured reaction that maintains the original commitment, e.g. graduated sanctions.

Camerer (2003) points out that whenever a Prisoner's Dilemma is likely to be repeated, evokes emotion, or has enough synergy or excludability, it is really a stag-hunt game with two equilibria (payoff dominant and a risk dominant). The distinction matters because the risk dominant payoff creates a weak link in a

*(Continued on next page)*

*(Elisabeth Piper, continued from page 6)*

group's overall payoff, i.e. player interaction matters to the overall outcome since achieving the efficient payoff depends on the degree of assurance that others will play efficiently. Thus the game played as theory uses best response strategies and adaptation to achieve the efficient payoff. However, for actual groups, miscommunication between neighbors spreads inefficiency (group disorganization and uncooperativeness), and therefore, the more repetitions and the longer the time horizon, the more accurate communication is needed as a corrective. The reality is that stag-hunt needs communication—or rather a shared understanding, i.e. norms—to overcome information manipulation by cheaters and the resulting default to the lesser risk dominant equilibrium payoff.

Observations of neurological activity during bargaining also provides clues explaining the presence of sustained cooperation. A funny depiction of human neural systems describes individuals as mini-conglomerates that lack an integrated communications system among its different divisions, so that the local offices often act without much supervision from the home office (Kopcke et al. 2004). To be fair, neuroscience also describes brains as prediction machines, where the difference between the outcome and its prediction guides adaptive behavior. This portrayal allows for evolution to shape preferences but leaves undetermined, and thus revealed through learning, how to achieve one's desires (Kopcke et al. 2004). Neuroscientific studies have delivered compatible findings to those from evolutionary and social dilemma models. MRI scans have shown that fair and unfair offers in the ultimatum game activate different parts of the brain; the more activity in the insular cortex, where unfair offers register, the more likely the player is to reject the offer (Adler 2003). Camerer argues that this outcome is indicative of emotions and thought acting together, i.e. the brain does not necessarily have executive control so that oftentimes self-awareness is limited, actual motivations are lost in the fog and people are forced (unwittingly) to rationalize their behavior (Kopcke et al. 2004). A study on monkeys isolated the neurons that fire in response to their expectation of getting a drink of BerryBerry fruit juice; by manipulating the odds of getting a drink and the size of that drink, the results showed that the rate at which these neurons fire is proportionate to the expected utility of the juice payoff. This outcome indicates that the utility function concept is "literally hard-wired into the primate brain" (Adler 2003). The reciprocal influence of culture and biology upon one another, however, cannot be ignored. A recently published study on maternal care

in rats has revealed how a mother's style of care can cause life-altering changes in her offspring's DNA. A rat pup's brain either does or does not release stress hormones depending upon the number of stress receptors it has; the number of the latter is greatly influenced by the mother's licking and grooming, i.e. more attention equals more stress receptors, less stress hormones released, and a happier, calmer rat. These effects also held for "adopted" rat pups (Begley 2004).

This short review of cooperation does highlight the consensus among various different disciplines that culture and biology develop in relation to reciprocal pressures from the other, so that not only is culture often correcting for genetic selection, but also that cooperation promotion is the mode it uses to do so. It also indicates that short-run issues aside, the give-and-take between biological and cultural factors over the long-run tend to promote the dominance of cooperation over defection in the world's societies.

*Elisabeth Piper Davidson is a doctoral candidate in American Politics and Public Policy.*

*(Abdel-fattah Mady, continued from page 4)*

equally accountable to God in worshipping Him and established a woman's equality in her humanity with men. The last historic speech delivered by the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, asked Men to treat women well, he said: "it is true that you have certain rights with regard to your women, but they also have rights over you...do treat your women well and be kind to them for they are your partners..."\*\*

*Abdel-fattah Mady is a doctoral candidate in Comparative Politics and Empirical Political Theory.*

\*\* For more details on this issue, see:

- Jamal A. Badawi, *The Status of Woman in Islam*, available online at: <<http://www.islamland.org/books1/swoman.htm>>

- *Women In Islam*: <<http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/humanrelations/womeninislam/>>

# Thoughts from the Editor

by Pamela L. Foerstel

## Double Standards

Why is the group that proclaims to be “tolerant” only tolerant to views they agree with? This is a question I have wondered about for so long now. I don’t actually think there is an answer to the question, except for the obvious “double standard” rule. However, it is the perfect question to begin my column with, considering what is happening in the SPE community right now. As you know, I have been the Editor of the Wilson Society Newsletter since the fall of 2003 when I took the reigns from April Barkley. Because I believe wholeheartedly in the freedom of speech, because we are all adults, and all part of the SPE community, I feel the need to share some things with all of you. It seems the Wilson, or rather I am under attack for its so-called bias, and therefore, this needs to be addressed. In order to clarify the procedures I use as Editor of the Wilson Society Newsletter, I have decided to put it in writing. Before I took over the Wilson (and at the beginning of the takeover), the contribution rate was dismal, although it is not by any means optimal now, it is at least “better” than it was. A couple of contributors are given the privilege of seniority and their works are generally displayed first (i.e. David Frisk, John Phillips). The other “executive” decision I make is to put the most attention grabbing articles first, or if there is a student writing for the first time, I give them the “rookie” honor (i.e. Elisabeth Piper, Gerry Pacificar). Contrary to the belief of some, the Wilson, under my editorship, has never been a purely conservative newsletter; I go out of my way, to grab students that I know have different and unique perspectives (i.e. Abdel-fattah Mady, Gerry Pacificar, and Elisabeth Piper). However, what I will not do is write articles for you! If you are concerned with the ideological leanings of the Wilson, I encourage you to SUBMIT.

I cannot be held to the standards of the *Los Angeles Times* (if such standards exist) for a departmental newsletter, it’s insane and frankly the pay isn’t that good. I don’t have the luxury of hiring writers from all points of view to display a more “balanced” newsletter. The contributors of the Wilson are solely volunteers, they receive no compensation, and I am grateful for their work, as should the entire SPE community. The fate of the Wilson at this point is unknown. It was brought to my attention that the writings are too conservative and the placement is seen as biased by one or more individuals within the department. I CAN ONLY PUBLISH

WHAT I RECEIVE! So, to the individual(s) with concerns, Edward George Bulwer Lytton so eloquently said “the pen is mightier than the sword”, and I would guarantee you a spot in the front. I have never denied any contribution, so I find these complaints to be unfounded. I send out numerous emails to the SPE community encouraging ALL to submit (I do not secretly withhold these emails from liberals), and I have personally sought out the works of several students, and now the Wilson is enjoying higher contribution rates (and I think greater diversity) than ever before.

To a more important point, if the Wilson is predominately conservative, I say “*So what?*”? As I stated before, I have no control over whom contributes or what is contributed, I can only publish what I receive. This is a good segue back to the question I asked at the beginning of the column. Maybe the views of the SPE community are more conservative, or maybe the conservatives feel more of an obligation to submit, whatever the case may be, it is what it is.

I was asked about my political leanings in regard to the controversy that has emerged. “*Is she a Republican?*” The answer is a resounding “Yes”. Yes, I am a Republican and unlike the editors, reporters, and anchors of the mainstream media, I will admit to that even before my retirement. I recently read an article by Maureen Daud (an admitted liberal) and I echo her sentiments (although in the opposite direction). She recently wrote that after spending Thanksgiving with her family, she realized she was the only liberal, and also the only person who disagreed with the election of President Bush. I can relate. I grew up in a household of Democrats, my grandparents, my mother, my uncle, etc... all Democrats. Although they all disagree with me wholeheartedly they do tolerate my differing opinions, and more importantly they support my endeavors whatever they may be. I always say that I was a Democrat (mainly because I was and am a feminist) until I saw the light. The light in my case was the Clinton scandal with Lewinsky. I never understood why so-called women’s organizations could defend a man that had displayed such misogynistic behavior, and then I realized the National Organization for Women (NOW) is not about women and their rights, but rather their own agendas, and political leanings. If Clinton had been a Republican—he would have hung for his behavior. Again... the double standard.

I am always asked “*How could you be a Republican?*” I think I am asked this because I am known as a feminist (in the true sense of the word,

(Continued on next page)

*(Pamela L. Foerstel, continued from page 8)*

because unfortunately the liberal women organizations have destroyed the true meaning of feminism) and society tells us that Republicans are only white, rich men. Well, I am neither male nor rich, but yet, I am a Republican. I saw my Mother struggle while she raised me, and I am so thankful she gave me all she had while accepting less. It was in her that I saw the true meaning of feminism and Republicanism. Republicanism to me is the belief in the American Dream. A life of struggles, complications but always personal accountability and self-dependency, a lifting up of one's boot straps. My Mother never asked for handouts, never complained about how hard and how much she had to work, instead she did whatever it took and I experienced a great childhood as a result of her determination. As an undergraduate student, I constantly faced liberal bias. This was mainly seen through various professors I had who could never accept conservative notions in their class. One such professor actually penalized me for my beliefs, and so I had to fight, I had to go through the Department Chair, the Dean of Student Affairs, and all the way to the President of the University. This happened other times as well, and I had to make a decision, either I would fight each and every battle or just appease them and give them what they want. Maybe it was because of my intention to succeed and not make enemies at the University, maybe it was because I was much more naïve, or maybe it was just too tiring to fight each and every battle, but I decided to choose the latter option. I have always regretted that decision and vowed never to hide my beliefs again. It's sad that in a nation built on liberty, freedom, diversity, deliberation, and tolerance that I (and others like me) have been stifled. Although I have experienced a similar type of situation only once at CGU (and voiced my concern in the student evaluation), it appears that it is occurring once again.

The Wilson can only be what the students and faculty who contribute make it. I am aware that the last issue of the Wilson was most definitely Pro-Bush, but if Pro-Kerry or Anti-Bush perspectives aren't contributed... they are not published. I have decided that I will not be stifled, and neither should any conservative who contributes, so I have vowed to fight. Ultimately, I have no control over the fate of the Wilson, but I will not let it or I go quietly. I thought this was a country based on different opinions, and I know even if it doesn't seem like it, that I should be free to express my beliefs in the world of academia as well. After all I am paying for the right!

Where is this country going? When a 5<sup>th</sup> grade history teacher in California has been banned from allowing his students to read the Declaration of Independence because of its reference to the "Creator", when women and minorities who do not hold typical liberal beliefs are deemed "sellouts" and when a poor, female, Republican doctoral student and Editor of a department newsletter is forced to pander for liberal leaning articles? In a sea of liberalism (also known as Claremont) we should encourage and even demand the conservative perspective to be heard. You own higher education, you own most of the media, and you own the community of Claremont, and because I am truly tolerant, I invite you to have a share of the Wilson newsletter as well. Rather than trying to stifle me and the other contributors of the Wilson because you disagree with our beliefs, fight us on our own battlefield, contribute your own perspectives, in the end this will promote discussion and benefit not only the department and the University, but the nation as a whole.

*Pamela L. Foerstel is a doctoral candidate in American Politics and Public Policy.*

**Dane-geld**  
(A.D. 980-1016)  
by Rudyard Kipling

IT IS always a temptation to an armed and agile nation,  
To call upon a neighbour and to say:—  
"We invaded you last night—we are quite prepared to fight,  
Unless you pay us cash to go away."  
And that is called asking for Dane-geld,  
And the people who ask it explain  
That you've only to pay 'em the Dane-geld  
And then you'll get rid of the Dane!  
It is always a temptation to a rich and lazy nation,  
To puff and look important and to say:—  
"Though we know we should defeat you, we have not the time  
to meet you.  
We will therefore pay you cash to go away."  
And that is called paying the Dane-geld;  
But we've proved it again and again,  
That if once you have paid him the Dane-geld  
You never get rid of the Dane.  
It is wrong to put temptation in the path of any nation,  
For fear they should succumb and go astray,  
So when you are requested to pay up or be molested,  
You will find it better policy to say:—  
"We never pay any one Dane-geld,  
No matter how trifling the cost,  
For the end of that game is oppression and shame,  
And the nation that plays it is lost!"

Submitted by Elisabeth Piper Davidson

## Quote of the Day

**“LEARN AS IF YOU WERE GOING TO LIVE FOREVER. LIVE AS IF YOU WERE GOING TO DIE TOMORROW.”**

—Mahatma Gandhi

## Word of the Day

ludic • \LOO-dik\ • adjective  
: of, relating to, or characterized by play : playful

Example sentence:

Three-year-old Rachel was delighted with her present, a ludic and lively pop-up book about the celebration of Hanukkah.

Did you know?

Here's a serious word, just for fun. That is to say, it means "fun," but it was created in all seriousness around 1940 by psychologists. They wanted a term to describe what children do, and they came up with "ludic activity." That may seem ludicrous—why not just call it "playing"?—but the word "ludic" caught on, and it's not all child's play anymore. It can refer to architecture that is playful, narrative that is humorous and even satirical, and literature that is light. "Ludic" is ultimately from the Latin noun "ludus," which refers to a whole range of fun things—stage shows, games, sports, even jokes. The more familiar word "ludicrous" also traces back to the same source.

## Events around the Claremont Colleges...

The following events are taking place at the Richard Nixon library and birthplace. For more information call: (714) 993-5075.

### [The Nixon Library Offers Holiday Delights](#)

Enjoy Miniature White House, East Room and Seasonal Concerts  
November 19 through the New Year

### [Needlework Exhibit](#)

Over 48 Intricate Pieces of Colorful Needlework on Display  
November 6, 2004 through January 9, 2005

### [Meet Ambassador L. Paul Bremer](#)

Presidential Envoy to Iraq and Administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority.  
February 2, 2005

### [Meet Ari Fleischer](#)

Former White House Press Secretary  
March 17, 2005

Contributions to this issue of The Wilson Society Newsletter were made by **David Frisk, Gerard Pacificar, John Phillips, Elisabeth Piper Davidson, Abdelfattah Mady, and Pamela L. Foerstel**. The Wilson is edited by Pamela L. Foerstel .

Opinions expressed in The Wilson are not necessarily those of the Editor or of the Claremont Graduate University. All submissions are treated as editorials and checked for grammar, not for the veracity of the statements made. Submissions to The Wilson are strongly encouraged. Please send submissions, comments, and suggestions to Pamela L. Foerstel at [pamela.foerstel@cgu.edu](mailto:pamela.foerstel@cgu.edu).