



THE PRINCETON TORY

SEPTEMBER 2008

Freshman Issue

INSIDE:

HOW TO FIND YOUR CONSERVATIVE VOICE
ON CAMPUS

WHY FRESHMAN ORIENTATION DOESN'T
WORK

THE PRINCETON TORY

September 2008
Volume XXV - Issue III

Publisher
Joel Alicea '10

Editor-in-Chief
Leon Furchtgott '09

Managing Editors
Brandon McGinley '10
Andrew Saraf '11

Copy Editor
Robert Day '10
Katie Fletcher '10

Production Manager
Robert Day '10

Financial Manager
Brendan Lyons '09

Production Advisor
Jonathan Giuffrida '10

Publisher Emeritus
Matthew J. Schmitz '08

Operations Manager
Johnny Love '09

Editor-in-Chief Emeritus
Sherif Girgis '08

Staff Writers

Clint Montague '09
Emely Peña '09
Kyle Smith '09
Katie Fletcher '10

Amy Osterman '10
Christine Bokman '11
Bobby Marsland '11
Aaron Smargon '11
Emma Yates '11

Board of Trustees

Peter Heinecke '87
Anna Bray Duff '92
Brian Tvenstrup '95

Wickham Schmidt '99
Timothy Webster '99
Peter Hegseth '03
Ira Leeds '06

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

The Princeton Tory accepts letters to the editor. Direct correspondence to: P.O. Box 1499, Princeton, NJ 08542; or by e-mail: tory@princeton.edu. Advertisement rates for *The Princeton Tory* can be found on the magazine's website at www.princetontory.com. Donations to *The Princeton Tory* are fully tax-deductible. Please mail donations to: P.O. Box 1499, Princeton, NJ 08542.

The Princeton Tory is a member of the Collegiate Network. *The Princeton Tory* gives special thanks to the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, Princeton Alumni Viewpoints, and The Bachman Foundation. *The Princeton Tory, Inc.* is a non-profit corporation registered in New Jersey. No part of this publication should be construed to promote any pending legislation or to support any candidate for office. No part of this publication may be reproduced without express written consent of the Publisher.

Copyright © 2008 *The Princeton Tory*

Letter from the Publisher

Welcome Freshmen!

At this point, it is likely that your head is still swirling with the whirlwind of Orientation Week. I certainly remember that it took me a few weeks to settle into the flow of things here at Princeton, and it was a full year before I felt I truly knew where I was going on campus. Even now I continue to learn about new things at Princeton I had no idea existed, though I am sure you will find your way better than I was able to.



Yes, there are indeed many things to do and see in your first few weeks at Princeton. Hundreds of different student organizations will be jockeying to sign you up and you will soon find that there is virtually no limit to the interests you can pursue through these various clubs. Here at the *Tory* we welcome you to Princeton confident that you will make a great addition to the campus and that some of you may become the next leaders of the vibrant and thriving conservative intellectual movement at this university. I am sure many of you are shocked that a conservative publication such as the *Tory* even exists on an Ivy League campus or that there are a good number of students just like you who hold vastly different views on vital issues compared to the rest of the campus. Rest assured that you are not alone and that at the *Tory* you will find a ready group of friends and a home for your intellectual growth and expression as a conservative.

Whether you are an ardent social conservative who wishes to stand up to the culture of casual sex on campus or a true believer in libertarianism who preaches economic and other liberties, all brands of conservatism are warmly embraced at the *Tory*. I hope that you will take the time to look through this issue at some of the major articles that appeared in last year's publications along with a few that we wrote specially for this occasion. I also hope to see you at the Activities Fair this Friday, September 12 from noon until 3:00 PM so we can talk more about your future involvement with the *Tory*. We are tremendously proud of all that you have accomplished to get to this point and have the firmest belief in your future success on this campus. I speak for all of the *Tory* when I proudly say: welcome to Princeton!

Best,
Joel Alicea '10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 4 - **Conservatism on Campus** by Brandon McGinley '10
Where to Look, and Why There's Cause for Optimism
- 6 - **Freshman Week and the Limits of Liberalism** by Leon Furchtgott '09
Why Princeton Struggles With Self-Segregation
- 8 - **"Queering" the LGBT Line** by Rob Day '10
Internal Hypocrisy Within the LGBT Center
- 11 - **McCoshed** by Matthew Schmitz '08
*A Clinic Plagued by Ethic Lapses, Incompetence
Leaves Students at Risk from STDs*
- 14 - **The Student Bill of Rights** by Emma Yates '11
Why the USG Must Keep It Relevant

Correction:

The article about the Woodrow Wilson School in the May edition incorrectly stated that Professor Stanley Katz was away from the University for the first third of the Spring semester. Professor Katz was in fact at Princeton for the entire semester. The Tory apologizes for the error.

CONSERVATISM ON CAMPUS



WHERE TO LOOK, AND WHY THERE'S CAUSE FOR OPTIMISM

Brandon McGinley '10

This summer, at an intimate fundraiser I was able to attend with some prominent Pittsburgh conservatives, I spoke about how now is a great time for conservatism at Princeton University. The group was pleased but just a bit incredulous. Yes, I know Princeton is an Ivy League school. I know it's run by liberals. And I know we have Peter Singer, Cornel West, and Lee Silver on the faculty. But the reality on the ground is that Princeton has a thriving, multi-faceted conservative community faced with a historic opportunity to shape the social and political debate not only in academia, but nationwide.

Conservatism at Princeton is, happily, an exercise in intellectualism rather than shrill argument. I hope you will find that borne out in these pages. This condition is fundamentally linked, although it's unclear whether it's a cause or an effect, to a strong focus on social issues both on campus and in the wider community. One is considerably more likely to overhear a heated debate about the moral implications

of premarital sex (no, this is not a matter of universal agreement, as pop culture or the "progressive" establishment would have you believe) than the merits of Social Security privatization. On a college campus, issues such as the former touch upon more immediate concerns and more deeply-held beliefs, as well as provide a greater chance for true change, as these social issues are fluid matters of University policy. They provide the most dynamic opportunity for grassroots activism and, hopefully, change.

counterculture that rejects the glorified failures of the "sexual revolution," standing, in the words of the late William F. Buckley, "athwart history, yelling 'Stop!'" Although not all in the conservative community may agree with every plank in Anscombe's platform, the group is an important and dynamic part not just of Princeton politics, but of the wider, dare I use the phrase, "culture war."

Not to be forgotten is the College Republicans, another important player in the university's political scene. The group bucks the trend toward social and cultural issues, representing the issues important to traditional conservative Princetonians, from defending students' academic rights

Conservatism at Princeton is, happily, an exercise in intellectualism rather than shrill argument.

This social focus manifests itself most strongly in two of the most vibrant activist organizations on campus: Princeton Pro-Life and, in particular, the Anscombe Society, for which I serve as public relations director. Roughly speaking, these two organizations take care of the pro-life and pro-family halves of social conservatism at Princeton. Anscombe is a first-of-its-kind student group representing a 21st century

to championing free markets, but generally avoiding the melee of emotionally-charged campus social issues. Most of that unfortunate shrillness emanates from progressive "offense" taken at some of the eminently reasonable (even if you disagree) principles espoused by Princeton conservatives. I can say with pride and confidence that Pro-Life, Anscombe, et al are fundamentally intellectual organizations that marshal ideas and

evidence rather than vitriol.

In order to combat this tendency toward piercing rhetoric rather than thoughtfulness, several students from across the political spectrum came together last spring and founded *Cornerstone* magazine, for which I am happy to say I serve as editor-in-chief. Although certainly a nonpartisan journal, *Cornerstone* is an important part of the conservative ecosystem on campus, allowing an unbiased forum for our ideas to compete in the intellectual marketplace. Please consider reading our inaugural issue this September and perhaps contributing in the future.

And of course, there's the *Tory*. Princeton's conservative journal of record has been published continuously for nearly 30 years and does its best to represent the cacophony of voices within the conservative political tent. In many ways, the *Tory* is that tent on this campus; it is the place where the Rockefeller Republicans meet the passionate social crusaders, where the secular political theorists meet the prayerful evangelical leaders. In these pages we discover our mutual understandings and celebrate the differences that make conservatism at Princeton, and this magazine, so dynamic. And we do so in good humor, often at the expense of professors, administrators, and liberals more generally.

As important as these various organizations and publications are, their vitality depends on the quality of the people who comprise and inspire them. Princeton has been and continues to be blessed influential, inspirational, and brilliant conservative leaders among students and faculty. The names are too numerous to mention and I'd be sure to omit some worthy friends and colleagues, but perhaps the most re-

markable fact is that the previous two editors-in-chief of this magazine—Christian Sahner '07 and Sherif Girgis '08—have been honored as Rhodes Scholars.

One of the primary reasons for the resurgence of campus conservatism at Princeton is strong faculty support, most notably that of Professor Robert George. Professor George is simultaneously one of the most eminent conservative scholars in the world and a fixture in campus politics, lending his thoughts and words to conservative causes on a regular basis. Even more importantly, Professor George, both by himself and through the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions which he heads, provides intellectual and personal support to students passionate about political and social issues and their ramifications.

After the fundraiser, one of the guests with whom I was speaking told me that Princeton University is on the "front lines" of not just academic debate, but of the national and international cultural disputes of our time. Universities have the ability to shape national conversations about society and culture not just because they are centers of intellectualism, but because they shape the minds of the youth who will define that conversation in the years to come. And so not only is conservatism strong at Princeton, it is eminently exciting, as we are engaging not merely in academic exercises, but we are bearing arms at the front lines of the fundamental cultural debates of our and future generations.

Secularism versus religiosity. Relativism versus moral universality. Robert George versus Peter Singer. Respect versus disregard for the dignity of human life. These are just a few of the intellectual

battles that wage every day at this university in precept discussions and newspaper editorials. Princeton, as one of America's elite universities, is uniquely situated as a bellwether for the current and future orientation of these discussions. But we also have a vibrant and growing conservative community rejecting the assumptions and presumptions of the self-righteously liberal elite and the self-consciously progressive youth that fill these gothic halls.

Welcome to Princeton. 

Brandon McGinley is a junior majoring in Politics. He is a Managing Editor for the *Tory*.



Angry? Frustrated?

Tell us what you're thinking...

Send the *Tory* an e-mail at tory@princeton.edu for a chance to have your letter published unaltered in the next issue.

FRESHMAN WEEK AND THE LIMITS OF LIBERALISM

WHY PRINCETON STRUGGLES WITH SELF-SEGREGATION

Leon Furchtgott '09

During my freshman week, the great Princeton sages, from President Tilghman to Anthony Appiah to Jeff Nunokowa, lectured my class on the value of diversity and the importance of cross-cultural interactions. By the end of my senior year, diversity will have an entirely different meaning. The class of 2009 will—in the name of diversity—hold an array of graduation ceremonies, from a Lavender Graduation for LGBT students to a Pan-African Graduation to a Latino Gradu-

ation. These self-segregated graduations present a troubling example of diversity in practice. When students are given the opportunity to decide for themselves how they want to graduate, many students want to have ceremonies as part of separate groups, not merely as part of the whole university. In spite of the University's most stringent efforts, many students *prefer* to socialize primarily in religious, ethnic, and other small communities.

The University's promotion of cross-cultural interactions, it seems, is no match for the strong forces of self-segregation. For all the eloquence of the freshman week lectures, Princeton is really powerless in the face of students' social choices. Paradoxically, Princeton's troubles with self-segregation stem from the inherent limitations of liberalism, one of its core ideals: the University believes in giving students maximal social freedom, but it is bewildered when they make the "wrong" decisions. The more aggressively the University promotes diversity and fights self-segregation, the more it infringes on students' freedoms and strays from being a liberal institution.

Princeton sees the ideal of diversity as cross-cultural interactions, not self-segregation, as a central part of a Princeton education. As President Tilghman told the class of 2009 in our Opening Exercises, "never again will you live with a group of peers that was expressly assembled to expand your horizons and open your eyes to the fascinating richness of the human condition. The reason [Dean Rapelye] took such care in selecting all of you ... was to increase the likelihood that your entire educational experience, inside and outside the classroom, is as mind-expanding as possible." According to the University, a defin-

limits itself to the selection process to create this society. Once students have been admitted, they are basically free from any interference, academic or social. In her address to my class, Tilghman merely *invited* freshmen to take advantage of the diversity of lifestyles on the Princeton campus. She did not institute mechanisms to require cross-cultural interactions. Anything of that sort would be imposing a moral judgment on students.

One of the key assumptions in the University's attitude toward diversity is that a diverse community, once given the chance, will manifest itself and spread organically. The University only needs to break down barriers to diversity, such as the types of students who are admitted; then, students, out of their own volition, will embrace the diversity that they find amongst themselves. A few lectures during freshman week, administrators think, should be enough to

push students in the right direction, since students want diversity and will make the right choices.

This is a very optimistic proposition, and it is severely challenged by the phenomenon of self-segregation. Of course, by the numbers, Princeton has been quite successful in achieving diversity. Each successive class becomes the "most diverse" class in Princeton's history. In the class of 2012, 45 percent of admitted students come from minority backgrounds, 10 percent of students are international students, and over half of students are on financial aid. In spite of these statistics, self-segregation has been a perennial subject of concern among University administrators, and for good reasons. Princeton's so-called community is still a fractured and divided one, and this does not seem to be changing with the Admissions Office's recruitment efforts. Somehow the numerical diversity in the

The more aggressively the University promotes diversity and fights self-segregation, the more it infringes on students' freedoms and strays from being a liberal institution.

ing part of the Princeton experience is the opportunity to interact in a diverse society.

But beyond the concept that everyone is an equal, diverse, and valuable member of the university "community," Princeton avoids advocating particular views on how society and individuals should function. The University allows students almost unlimited freedom in terms of how they spend their time inside and outside of class. In terms of its education, Princeton wants to teach students how to think, not what to think. In this respect, Princeton is a classic liberal institution: it takes no stance and gives little guidance on what constitutes the good life or a good university education. Instead it gives students the liberty to decide their paths for themselves, both intellectually and socially.

Of course, the University does have a vision for itself—a paidaieic society with rich cross-cultural interactions. But it

Princeton student body does not translate into real personal and intellectual interactions.

The freshman orientation activities promoting diversity are just one component of the University's feeble attempts to combat self-segregation. Others include academic courses relating to diversity, special "Centers" that promote diversity and protect the interests of minorities, and efforts to diversify students' social life. All of these efforts come in conflict with the University's liberalism and they ultimately fall short of their intended goal.

One way of achieving greater diversity and more cross-cultural interactions is for the University to require students to take courses about non-Western cultures or minority cultures in the United States. Today students from minority groups are vastly over-represented in areas such as African-American Studies or Judaic Studies.

However appealing the idea of requiring the study of other cultures, it is a step at imposing a vision of an ideal education on students and going against the University's liberalism. Princeton rejected the idea in 1994, when a committee chaired by Dean Malkiel and Religion professor Cornel West concluded not to impose a Cultural Studies requirement. There is no way that the University can force students to take its many multicultural courses without somewhat delegitimizing the courses. As the committee noted, "the study of diversity...should be seen by students as an integral part of their education, rather than as something set apart as a special category."

Although, so far, the University has seen through the fallacy of the Cultural Studies requirement, it has become an active if unwitting participant in its balkanization through special diversity centers. The University has multiple groups working to promote diversity and good citizenship, including the International Center, the Women's Center, the LGBT Center, and the Fields Center. But these groups are perceived more as the domain of particular student demographic groups rather than forces working to unite the student body.



President Tilghman must come to terms with the limits of diversity.

According to the USG's Survey on Race, 90 percent of black students have visited the Fields Center, compared to 48 percent of whites. The University's diversity groups contribute more to the problem of self-segregation than they alleviate it.

One of the Street's great virtues is that anybody who *wishes* to belong to an eating club can find one to join. But there is a substantial part of the student body that does not wish to be part of the Street. These students—many of whom are minority students—are inevitably somewhat marginalized. Although four-year residential colleges were created to accommodate this group of students, it is not clear that this two-tier social system will all viate social divisions rather than exacerbate them. Just as in the case of academics, there is little the University can do besides drastic measures such as forcing all students to sign on to a four-year meal plan.

Since the beginning of the liberalization of American universities in the middle of the twentieth century, which led to the admission of women and minorities, one of the main goals of universities has been to have a diverse but unified student body representing the whole of American society. Exclusive socialization represents

an important challenge to this goal. To combat self-segregation, however, would require a heavy-handedness that would be a serious departure from universities' current liberalism. American universities find themselves in a crisis in which their liberal neutrality hinders their pursuit of the basic goals of liberalism.

Princeton administrators are spending this week welcoming the class of 2012 to the "Princeton community." But don't be fooled by their language. Princeton University, in spite of its aspirations, is not a community in the proper sense of the word (what social scientists call a *Gemeinschaft*). Rather, it is a society (*Gessellschaft*) composed of many small communities—ethnic communities, religious communities, eating club communities. The inability of

the Princeton administration to respond to many current problems comes from its blind belief that with a little bit of help, the "Princeton community" will take care of itself. But today there is no longer such a thing as the "Princeton community." Princeton is closer to a liberal society, with all of the benefits and disadvantages that such societies entail. However much the University might wish for a true university-wide community, creating one would require much stronger institutions and coercive forces to prevent atomization and weaken the ethnic and religious communities.

Princeton finds itself in a great contradiction: it cannot advance its ideals of community and diversity without dropping all pretenses of being a liberal institution. It will have to accept self-segregation of some form if it wishes to remain true to its educational ideals. Princeton needs a better understanding of true diversity, and it must come to terms with the limits of what it can achieve as a liberal institution. **P**

Leon Furchtgott is a senior majoring in Physics, and Editor-in-Chief of the *Tory*.



“QUEERING” THE LGBT LINE

INTERNAL HYPOCRISY AT THE LGBT CENTER

Robert Day '10

It is a conundrum that faces all organizations representing a specific, yet heterogeneous minority group: how to accurately represent the identity and aspirations of a group that is, in itself, diverse? This is a challenge from which the LGBT Center, particularly as a university sponsored organization (and one whose development and progress our president has made a top priority), is not exempt.

The LGBT Center's mission statement suggests that the organization is facing this problem directly, boldly pronouncing its goal to “[create] an open and affirming environment void of homophobia, heterosexism, and gender bias.” The repetition of key words like “support,” “safety” and “community” cement an image of an organization that wishes to create an environment where everyone feels comfortable, no matter one's gender or orientation.

Though I am not persuaded of the legitimacy of this cause, which seems to consider personal comfort and universal inclusiveness as some sort of fundamental moral right, it is certainly within the LGBT Center's right to define its purpose however it wishes. Yet with this right comes the responsibility of maintaining the standard it sets for itself, and an organization that fails to do so should

always be held accountable. The testimony and experiences of students within Princeton's gay community indicate that the Center is not meeting this responsibility, that this organization, constructed around the promotion of acceptance, is in fact alienating many gay students on campus.

Consider the accounts of two separate gay students, one now a senior (we'll call him Todd) and the other a sophomore (we'll call him John) about their introduction to University-sponsored LGBT organizations, the old LGBT Student Services in Todd's case and the modern LGBT Center in John's. For both

presentations created an atmosphere in which he felt very uneasy. The emphasis of the representatives on the importance of showing outward displays of support caused John to feel that those who did not speak up in the discourse were “non-supporters.” Though he felt obligated to say something in the discussion group, at the same time, John was also embarrassed to bring up his sexual orientation. He felt uncomfortable with the prospect of automatically being treated as a “survivor” because of his sexual orientation, an aspect of his identity that he did not think deserved special treatment. Not wanting to be associated with this identity of vic-

timization, John actively decided not to reveal to the group his sexual orientation.

Todd was particularly perturbed by the representatives' recommendation that students actively find out if their roommates were gay. After

the Peer Educator presentation, Todd's roommates followed instructions by asking everyone in their quad if they were gay; Todd, startled by the question, was not ready to come out to his roommates, so he denied being gay, something that he hadn't done in years.

Both of these students considered themselves very open and comfortable with their sexuality at the time, and yet both avoided divulging their orienta-

The testimony and experiences of students within Princeton's gay community indicate... that [the LGBT Center] , constructed around the promotion of acceptance is in fact alienating many gay students on campus

students, the Freshman Week RCA group meeting hosted by the Peer Educators created an extremely uncomfortable environment. A presentation was made in both instances by “representatives” of the gay community, who shared their own “stories” either as gay students or allies. They encouraged the students to be supportive of their gay friends, who might be dealing with certain emotional burdens.

From John's perspective, the



At the Grand Opening of the Princeton LGBT Center

tion for no other reason than uneasiness directly caused by the LGBT Peer Educators.

One would think that the LGBT Center, in its mission to promote “support” and “community,” would be sure to adjust its own representation of homosexuality so as to be more inclusive of those who find it personally problematic and generally unproductive. And yet, even when these students voice their differences, their requests for inclusion go largely ignored.

Todd was so disheartened by his experience that he decided to get involved with the LGBT Peer Education program himself, hoping to improve it. His differences in opinion were immediately met with resistance during the program’s training session. In one exercise, he asked his fellow “trainees” to not use the word “queer” for the remainder of the orientation, because the word was highly offensive to him. His fellow students rejected his proposal outright, thereby ignoring the purpose of the exercise, which was to accept people’s requests as a means of creating a supportive environment. Instead of feeling like a part of a reassuring community, Todd felt like a distinct minority.

According to the students interviewed for this piece, Todd’s and John’s feelings are far from unique. As a Peer Educator, for example, Todd found himself interacting with many freshmen

who shared a similar sense of estrangement from the LGBT Student Services’ victim-based portrayal of homosexuality. Indeed a number of freshmen told him that they felt more comfortable talking to him than to other representatives of the LGBT Student Services who imposed a singular image of what it meant to be gay at Princeton.

The LGBT Center’s presentation of itself and of the community it supports is one that is largely rooted in the history and ideology of the modern Gay Rights Movement. One of the major focuses of the movement is the idea of “gay pride” and with it, the emphasis for gay people to always feel free and comfortable to

Men + Sex = ?”, it is clear that the LGBT Center has committed itself to the fullest expression of “queer” sexual orientation.

There are a large number of gay students who disagree with and try to disassociate themselves from this image of the LGBT community dominated by an emphasis on its differences from the community at large, the embracing and exploiting of those differences and the related ideology of victimization, all of which have roots in the aforementioned stress placed on the history of the “movement.” Some believe that using symbols from a previous generation’s activism is artificial and thus cannot relate to them. Others believe

that the Center’s propagated image and motivation is simply counterproductive. They argue that the historic emphasis on activism – not simply political and social, but very personal activism – creates an unnecessary “us vs. them” mentality, by which students are forced to make blanket assessments about large groups within the student body based on their sexual orientation.

Forcing such generalizations has had several results that would seem counterproductive to the LGBT Center’s aims. According to many gay students, this emphasis on gay identity, which is supposed to be part of a support structure, ends up only making people who are conflicted

The “us vs. them” ideological fervor of the Center erects an unnecessary fence between the LGBT community and the campus at large.

express their sexual identities as freely as they want.

This historical emphasis on “gay pride” activism manifests itself in the Princeton LGBT Center’s appearance and message. From the rainbow-colored wall of the actual center itself, to the many lectures with such titles as “Gay

about their sexuality less self-assured about confronting their struggle to find their true selves. These students argue that the Center’s ideology forces people to make collective judgments about gay students as a primary assessment of character, rather than making such judgments based on individual personalities.


Furthermore, placing so much import on sexual orientation within one's complete identity can be uncomfortable and off-putting for students of all gender and sexual identities.

In some ways, it is hard to see how the LGBT Center could show such apathy to the concerns of those students who exist within the purview of its mission statement, yet are highly uncomfortable with its image. For example, despite the fact that many gay students find the word "queer" to be personally insulting, eight of approximately 28 LGBT Center-sponsored events in the past semester contained the word in their titles. Imagine the uproar that would result if the NAACP began hosting events that used the n-word in its title. By virtue of the fact that there are people in the gay community who find the word so offensive, the LGBT Center should be showing some consideration to this concern. Rather, the Center prioritizes the historic language of the "movement" over the sentiments of its constituents.

Why have these students who take such offense or feel so alienated not been more forthcoming in protest? It is in answering this question that we come to the most pernicious aspect of the seg-

regation occurring within the Princeton LGBT community. The "us vs. them" ideological fervor of the Center does not just erect an unnecessary fence between the LGBT community and the campus at large, but it is now extended to within the community itself. Those who are not in lockstep with the image of sexuality advocated by the Center find themselves on the other side of this fence from many others within the LGBT community and from the support which they seek. Indeed some of the students I interviewed have experienced rather offensive personal attacks by fellow gay students, who use terms such as "self-hater" and even "homophobe" in trying to convince them that they are giving into a societal, "heteronormative" outlook merely because of the fact that they are not in full communion with the LGBT Center's viewpoint.

Thus, within the LGBT community there is an unrealized, yet very real bias and discrimination against those who disagree with the conception of gay identity propagated by the LGBT Center. It suggests that within the gay community itself, there are lines being drawn in the sand. It is simply unacceptable that gay students feel alienated, unheard and attacked for their sense of identity by the

organization that ostensibly seeks to nurture and defend them. If the Center wishes to remain consistent with its mission statement, it ought to examine and rectify its own hypocrisy. 

Robert Day '10 is a philosophy major from Philadelphia, PA.

YES! I want to help *The Princeton Tory* keep conservatism strong at Princeton. I am enclosing my tax-deductible contribution for:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$25	<input type="checkbox"/> \$250
<input type="checkbox"/> \$50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$500
<input type="checkbox"/> \$75	<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100	<input type="checkbox"/> \$_____

Name: _____ Class of _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Email: _____

Comments: _____

HELP!

We cannot continue to spread the conservative message without your financial support. The magazine receives **no funding from the University**, so we rely on you.

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

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



A CLINIC PLAGUED BY ETHICS LAPSES, INCOMPETENCE LEAVES STUDENTS AT RISK FROM STDs

Matthew Schmitz '08

Shortly before the unexpected departure of Princeton's chief medical officer last summer, an investigation by the State of New Jersey revealed that since 2003, Princeton's McCosh Health Center failed to comply with state laws for reporting STDs. The state investigation, which involved a visit from a surveillance team and an official warning, was concealed from students and administrators. Vice President Janet Dickerson, who directly supervises the head of McCosh, did not learn of the state investigation until three months after it occurred. When a *Tory* reporter asked her to comment on the case she was caught unawares. "I'm looking surprised here," Dickerson said, "and it's not often that I look surprised."

McCosh's motive for concealing the event was not clear, but details gathered over several months provide context for what was a significant breach in protecting public health at a health center harried by ethical difficulties. The investigation came at a time of instability. A month after the investigation, Daniel Silverman, head of University Health Services and McCosh Health Center, left Princeton to work for a consulting firm that he had assisted in winning no-bid contracts from the University.

On June 25, 2007, the State of New Jersey sent a surveillance team from its STD program to meet with officials at McCosh. Sexually-transmitted diseases, or STDs, is the official term used by the state of New Jersey for what McCosh calls

sexually transmitted infections. The surveillance team instituted a plan of "corrective action" and "remedial measures" to ensure that all past cases were reported. They also instituted a plan requiring McCosh to submit to quarterly reviews in order to ensure continued compliance. The warning Princeton received is the first step in a process that can lead to fines and even revocation of the license for Princeton's University Health Services and its clinic, the McCosh Health Center. Such steps will be pursued if University Health Services (UHS) fails to remedy its reporting failures.

New Jersey law requires that STDs be reported within 24 hours of diagnosis. While most communicable diseases can be reported to local officials, STDs like gonorrhea, chlamydia and syphilis are grouped with tuberculosis and hepatitis C in a more serious class that must be reported directly to the state. For years before last June, the state had received no STD reports from McCosh. Local health officials were also not notified.

Janet Finnie '84, interim director for UHS, downplayed the importance of the state's investigation, saying in an email,

"We make every effort to be in compliance with state health policies." According to her statement, reporting STDs was the responsibility of Quest Diagnostics, the lab that the University hires to conduct STD testing on samples collected from students. However, since 2003, state regulations have also required reporting directly from the health provider. New Jersey law, which is similar to that of most states, requires doctors to file confidential reports that include the name, age, race and home address of any person diagnosed with an STD.

Details gathered over several months provide context for what was a significant breach in protecting public health at a health center harried by ethical difficulties.

The reports are the state's primary means of tracking infection rates and preventing outbreaks. Thomas Slater, press secretary for the state Department of Health and Senior Services, stressed the importance of the STD reports: "It gives us an overall picture to see what disease we need to address, to see whether or not there are public health emergencies." Reports from a health institution like McCosh corroborate positive test results reported by labs like Quest and provide additional information such as treatment administered to a patient. Due to McCosh's reporting failures, this extra layer of public health protection has been absent for much of the time current students have been on campus.



Daniel Silverman & Janet Finnie '84

Being Task Force was awarded at the urging of Silverman and Dickerson. Dickerson had dealt with Keeling & Associates at Duke, where she worked before coming to Princeton. Vice President Bob Durkee, whose office handled the contract, declined to produce it, citing a change in secretaries.

Silverman's dealings with Keeling continued as late as last August, when he hired Keeling to organize a retreat for staff at the health center. Silverman is also continuing to

work on an intercollegiate health panel that he joined as a representative of Princeton. Silverman did not respond to phone calls and emails requesting comment.

A Conflict of Interest

Around the time of the investigation, Silverman left the University for a job at Keeling & Associates, a higher-education consulting firm that Silverman helped gain several no-bid contracts. As a consultant for Keeling, Silverman will be advising Princeton on how to improve its health services. Keeling & Associates provides consulting services to universities seeking advice on how to improve their operations. It has provided Princeton with a range of services, from producing reports on how to improve McCosh to organizing retreats and conferences.

Finnie, Silverman's former employee and his temporary replacement as well as the daughter of Bruce Finnie, the University's registrar from 1969 to 1984, said that she expects Silverman to be working with Princeton in his capacity as a Keeling employee.

In one case in 2004, Silverman endorsed Keeling for a no-bid contract worth \$15,000. None of the people involved in the contract could offer a reason for why no bid was asked for. Though others also favored the contract, Silverman was the only one who later sought to benefit financially from his dealings with the firm. In the end Keeling received the contract for \$15,000, and did so without facing any competition.

University administrators flatly denied that Silverman's dealings with Keeling involved a conflict of interest. Vice Presidents Janet Dickerson and Bob Durkee both pointed to Keeling's "sterling reputation." The contract for the Health and Well

A Student Inquires

The events that led to New Jersey's censure of McCosh began on a Saturday night in April, 2007. Then-Princeton sophomore Kyle Smith was studying with a group of friends. When conversation turned to Princeton's 'hookup scene,' someone remarked that one in four students on campus is believed to be infected with genital herpes, an incurable STD that causes regular outbreaks of blisters for many of those afflicted. The one-in-four figure reflects campus health administrators' belief, affirmed in multiple conversations with McCosh officials, that Princeton's rate of infection reflects the national average. Concerned by such high figures, Smith decided to learn more.

At the campus health center, triage nurse Miriam Torres told Smith that state regulations require the reporting of new STD cases. Months later, Finnie and Silverman, who ran the

When [Princeton senior Kyle] Smith called the state to learn how many STDs McCosh had reported, state officials—who later cited Smith's inquiry as the impetus for their investigation—discovered that McCosh had broken the law.

clinic, claimed ignorance on changes in the state reporting law. State law requires that administrators take responsibility for STDs on campus. In addition to physicians and certain types of nurses, people overseeing institutions of higher education are

required to report cases of STDs.

When Smith called the state to learn how many STDs McCosh had reported, state officials—who later cited Smith’s inquiry as the impetus for their investigation—discovered that McCosh had broken the law.

Months after Silverman’s departure, the University is well into a search for his replacement. In January it convened an informal dinner meeting that included administrators and applicants for Silverman’s post. Notably absent, according to one participant, was any mention of the state investigation of McCosh or of Silverman’s history with Keeling & Associates. ¶

Danger from STDs

The problems that would lead to the state investigation were noted over three years ago in a University report. The report, written by the Health and Well Being Task Force, cited failings in regulatory compliance and data collection. According to the report, there was “simply no way for UHS to operate” without hiring additional staff. The University heeded this warning by giving \$195,291 to health services. Despite the warning and funding increase, the state did not receive STD reports from McCosh for Princeton students.

Princeton’s failure comes at the same time other colleges face problems with STDs. Miriam Grossman, a psychologist with UCLA’s Student Psychological Services, argues in her book *Unprotected* that during her tenure at UCLA, administrators did not do enough to make students aware of the physical and psychological consequences of casual sex. Last year, nearly 10% of students at ten southeastern colleges tested positive for chlamydia. Grossman faults campuses nationwide for the lack of medically accurate health education: “Too many young people, especially young women, are paying a very high price.”

Matthew Schmitz recently graduated as an English major and is also Publisher Emeritus of the *Tory*.

MCCOSH CLINIC: A TIMELINE OF BROKEN LAW, BAD ETHICS

2003 **McCosh begins to break STD reporting law.**

2004 **Task force cites problems with regulatory compliance.
Consulting firm Keeling & Associates receives \$15,000 contract endorsed by Silverman.**

2005 **Consulting relationship continues.**

2006

2007 **June 11 - Investigation begins.
June 20 - McCosh begins to advertise for Silverman replacement.
June 25 - Surveillance team visits.
August 15 - Silverman leaves for Keeling.
Sept 30 - Dickerson first hears of STD failures.**

2008 **Meeting to select new director.**

THE STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS

WHY THE USG MUST KEEP IT RELEVANT

Emma Yates '11

During freshman week, the Class of 2011 was educated on a variety of topics. From the availability of extracurricular activities and the importance of making informed decisions regarding alcohol, to issues of diversity and sexual health, my class was shown, formally and informally, what being a Tiger entails. Yet it would seem as though we were educated with a mind towards the extracurricular factors of Princeton life, rather than the substantive content of a Princeton student's academic rights and responsibilities.

Amidst the assemblies and packets of information with which the university greeted the freshman class, not a word was spoken of the Student Bill of Rights. The Student Bill of Rights (SBOR) was passed by referendum on the USG Bal-

lot on April 26th, 2006 with 51.8% of the vote. The Bill seeks to "further promote an intellectual environment of free inquiry and free speech without intimidation of any given set of beliefs." The text of the Bill itself recognizes that, "While we have not the power to declare [these principles] binding or irrevocable... any act

ed the Bill, they "consciously departed" from the Horowitz model. According to Will Scharf '08, then press secretary of the College Republicans, this was because aspects of Horowitz's model were "not well-suited" for Princeton.

Even marginal affiliation with David Horowitz, however, was enough to raise voices of dissent in spring 2006 when the student body began discussing the issue. In fact, Asheesh Siddique '07 created a new student group, Free Exchange at Princeton, in order to challenge the "bill of restrictions."

The College Democrats echoed these challenges as well, claiming that the SBOR seemed narrowly tailored toward protecting a conservative ideology.

One of the more controversial aspects of the bill is its provisions directing classroom discussion. According to section two, "Teachers are entitled to freedom in teaching their subject as they see fit, but not to the point of political, ideological, religious, or anti-religious indoctrination, or to the exclusion of other opinions or viewpoints. Such actions represent a violation of the principles of a student's academic freedom and the principles of free and open sharing of ideas." Professor David Botstein, director of the Lewis-Sigler Institute for Integrative Genomics, expressed the concerns of many of the department heads, saying, "I think the faculty is the faculty, and the students should use their own good judgment. We can't make believe everything is a debate... A philosophical debate distracts from the reason students want to learn the science."

Wyatt Yankus '09 echoed Scharf's comments that part of the motivation for passing the SBOR were instances of students being unfairly graded and criticized for expressing unpopular viewpoints. Though both Yankus and

The Student Bill of Rights is not merely a project of the College Republicans: it represents the official position of the Princeton student body and the USG.

in violation would contravene the 'fundamental principles of free discovery' to which Princeton University is committed."

The idea for a Student Bill of Rights was popularized by David Horowitz of Students for Academic Freedom, now the David Horowitz Freedom Center. When the College Republicans draft-



Professor Botstein has been one of the more vocal opponents of the SBOR.

Scharf declined to comment on the precise nature of these allegations, Scharf cited “anecdotal evidence.” The text of the SBOR in no way implores professors to refrain from presenting their scholarly points of view, no matter how controversial they are; Yankus recognized the fact that there are necessarily “two academic freedoms involved” here.

It would seem that all that is being asserted by the SBOR is academic freedom of thought. Professors as scholars, and fundamentally as persons, possess the freedom to believe, disseminate information, and educate their students as they will. It is only when such “education” becomes condescending and patronizing that students’ freedom of thought is abridged. Professor Botstein is surely correct that it would be difficult to conceive of a circumstance in which an organic chemistry professor reprimanded or graded down his students because of the content of their beliefs. It is difficult to imagine a “gradient of belief” in undergraduate organic chemistry. However, if on an exam a student argued against a professor’s purported scientific evaluation regarding affording human embryos moral protection and was graded down for it, then that student’s freedom of thought is necessarily being infringed.

Yet according to Yankus, the reception from the faculty department heads was generally poor. It seemed that many academic departments viewed the Bill as a violation of their freedom to teach, perhaps concurring with sentiments that the Bill was crafted to protect specific viewpoints.

According to Scharf, the current status of the SBOR is “the same as it was a day after it passed -- it is a document endorsed by a voting majority of Princeton students.” As the evidence of academic malpractice was anecdotal upon formulation of the bill and remains anecdotal today, it is impossible to attribute any decrease in unfair grading practices to the passage of the Bill.

The College Republicans cite anecdotal evidence such as the fact that students have responded with respect and thoughtful comments at controversial



USG President Josh Weinstein

lectures and have not defaced posters put up by other student groups in claiming that the Bill has perhaps been successful in facilitating “an environment conducive to the civil exchange of ideas.”

Such tolerance was surely a desired end in passing the SBOR, yet it seems that both the College Republicans and the USG have dropped the ball in

It seems that both the College Republicans and the USG have dropped the ball in publicizing and realizing the SBOR to the largest extent possible.

publicizing and realizing to the largest extent possible the remainder of its more central points. Former USG President Rob Biederman '08 claimed that because of the explicit recognition in the Bill that it cannot be enforced, there is nothing for the USG to do in reference to it. Further, Biederman commented that, “the responsibility falls more to the College Republicans, as the USG doesn’t even go out of its way to publicize every position it itself has ever taken.” This might have been true in the past, but it should not be the case this year: the USG has recently created a Communications Committee with a dozen members, with the goal of publicizing the USG’s activities.

Furthermore, the SBOR is not a merely a project of the College Republicans: it represents the official position of the Princeton student body and the USG. As Alex Lenahan '07, the USG President at the time that the SBOR passed, explained to me, with the passage of the bill, “the referendum becomes the position of the Senate as a representative body of the undergraduates of Princeton University.”

One very easy way of publicizing the SBOR would be to put a copy of it—along with other bills passed by the student body—on the USG website. Nobody in the USG that I contacted—including President Josh Weinstein '09 and Communications Director Andrew Malcolm '09—could comment on this idea.

The College Republicans and the USG have undoubtedly tackled many new and pressing projects since April 2006. Though it would be unrealistic to assert that they should continually press this one issue, the ease with which the Student Bill of Rights has been forgotten suggests that both groups are guilty of negligence. The responsibility for publicizing the Student Bill of Rights falls both with the College Republicans, as they proposed the SBOR, and with the USG, as the elected representatives of the student body that passed the bill. The SBOR, originally a brilliant publicity coup for the College Republicans and now the official position of the USG, is quickly sliding into irrelevance. It deserves greater deference and publicity from both organizations. ■

Emma Yates is a sophomore from South Florida who intends to pursue an independent concentration in bioethics.

In Memoriam

The *Tory* dedicates this last page to the valiant soldiers who have given their lives in the service of their country in Iraq and Afghanistan in the month before each publication. We do not intend for this to be partisan or seen as promoting or protesting any particular policy. Rather, we simply believe that every Princetonian should take time to read the names and reflect on the unimaginable sacrifices of our troops and their families. We should never forget that but for these noble souls we at Princeton would not be able to enjoy the privilege of receiving an outstanding education, nor would we have the leisure to enjoy all the freedoms we take for granted.

Pvt. Jair De Jesus	August 1, 2008	IED
Spec. William Mulvihill	August 1, 2008	IED
2nd Lt. Michael R. Girdano	August 1, 2008	IED
Pfc. David J. Badie	August 1, 2008	IED
Sgt. Ryan P. Baumann	August 1, 2008	IED
Sgt. Brian Miller	August 2, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Spec. Kevin Dickson	August 2, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Pfc. Jennifer Cole	August 2, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Spec. Ronald Schmidt	August 3, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Sgt. Jaime Gonzalez, Jr.	August 3, 2008	IED
Sgt. Errol James	August 4, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Pvt. Timothy Hutton	August 4, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Capt. Garrett Lawton	August 4, 2008	Hostile Fire
Spec. Jonathan Menke	August 4, 2008	IED
Sgt. Gary Henry	August 4, 2008	IED
Cpl. Stewart Trejo	August 7, 2008	Hostile Fire
Cpl. Adam McKiski	August 7, 2008	Hostile Fire
Master Sgt. Danny Maybin	August 7, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Petty Officer 2nd Class Anthony Carbullido	August 8, 2008	IED
Sgt. Jose E. Ulloa	August 9, 2008	IED
Sgt. Kenneth Gibson	August 10, 2008	IED
Pvt. John Mattox	August 10, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Cpl. James M. Hale	August 13, 2008	IED
Lance Cpl. Jacob Toves	August 14, 2008	Hostile Fire
Lance Cpl. Juan Lopez-Castaneda	August 14, 2008	Hostile Fire
Cpl. Anthony G. Mihalo	August 14, 2008	Hostile Fire
Pvt. Janelle F. King	August 14, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Pfc. Daniel McGuire	August 14, 2008	Hostile Fire
Pfc. Paul Conlon, Jr.	August 15, 2008	Hostile Fire
1st Lt. Donald C. Carwile	August 15, 2008	Hostile Fire
Staff Sgt. Kristopher Rodgers	August 16, 2008	IED
Lance Cpl. Travis Stottlemeyer	August 16, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Pfc. Jonathan Luscher	August 17, 2008	Non-Combat Related Incident
Staff Sgt. 2David Paquet	August 20, 2008	Hostile Fire