

The fiLibuster

Op. 1 No. 1

January 9, 2005

Calendar

Sunday. **Bluebook Party**. 8.30. Branford D12.

Monday. **Lib Dinner**. 5.30. Commons.

Wednesday. **Debate**. 7.30. J. Edwards Common Rm. [R: **Genius is a social phenomenon**]

News & Reviews

Sunday, 1.09.05. **Bluebook Party** to be held in Branford D12 from **8.30** until we quit.

Stop by to join us in reviewing the importance & effect of classes other than socioeconomic ones. Find out, before you shop, which where to find the poor, brilliant scrivener whose work and instruction will undoubtedly enlighten you. Or stop by to share your own thoughts. Or just stop by to see some

Monday, 1.10.05. **Lib Dinner** in Commons at **5.30**

Still in Commons. Still at 5.30. Still under the portrait of Bush, President #41. Still on Mondays. Join us for our conventional conviviality.

Wednesday, 1.12.05. **Debate** in the JE Common Room at **7.30**.

Resolved: Genius is a Social Phenomenon.

Is genius an inherent aspect of an individual, or is genius defined by social expectations & evaluation? Can a genius only flourish with the proper support, like leisure time for arts & letters, so that only the rich are geniuses? Is anyone truly a genius, since revolutionary ideas are often just well-phrased collections of the rumblings of a society? Come to the debate to hear at least some of these questions addressed, or to be the genius who answers all of them.

Links

[<http://www.uah.edu/woolf/roomout.html>]: Outline synopsis of *A Room of One's Own* by Virginia Woolf. Woolf suggests that the genius of many a woman in the past has been lost to society because she lacked "money and a room of her own." Chapters 3 and 4 are particularly relevant.

The full text is available online [<http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/w/woolf/virginia/w91r/>]

[<http://www.cse.emory.edu/sciencenet/mismeasure/genius/research02.html>]: Brief summary of Howard Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences. Gardner explicitly states that intelligence is culturally defined when he writes that, "Intelligence is a biopsychological potential to process information that can be activated in a cultural setting to solve problems or create products that are of value in a culture." Got a problem with that? Come say so.

Additional information at [<http://www.indiana.edu/~intell/mittheory.shtml>]

The fiLibuster

Op. 2 No. 1

January 16, 2005

Calendar

Monday. **Lib Dinner**. 5.30. Timothy Dwight.

Tuesday. **YPU -- Nadine Strossen of the ACLU**. 7.30. SSS 114.

Wednesday. **Debate**. 7.30. Timothy Dwight Common Room. [**R: Terrorism is a legitimate form of political expression**]

News & Reviews

Monday, 1.17.05. Lib Dinner to be held in **Timothy Dwight (probably in the South Common Room)** at **5.30**

Come by to Timothy Dwight for an unusual and temporary setting for our communal dining experience and, perhaps more importantly for some, different food.

Tuesday, 1.18.05. Yale Political Union in SSS 114 at **7.30**.

The first YPU debate of the semester features an ensemble cast with some great liberals. It's the org. meeting, so our illustrious chair Jade will be speaking. The guest for the night is **Nadine Strossen**, the **President** of the **ACLU**, who will be speaking on the preservation of civil rights in the face of terrorism. Moreover, it's still early enough that you probably don't have that much work and, even if you do, the first twinge of procrastination should get you down to SSS 114 to sign in with the Libs. Following the YPU's conclusion, there will be a reception with free, ahem, refreshments in a location to be determined. So come out to the meeting to hear Jade & the President of the ACLU & to find out the location.

Wednesday, 1.19.05. Debate in the TD Common Rm at **7.30**.

Resolved: Terrorism is a legitimate form of political expression.

If actions speak louder than words, isn't it especially dangerous to restrict expression that comes through individuals' deeds? Practically, do you find it acceptable to punish people for an organization that was 'terroristic,' if that's the only crime that can be proved after the fact? Can there be a line drawn where terroristic threats are no longer an acceptable means of conveying one's message? Are they ever an acceptable means? An effective one? Come hear the Libs share their thoughts, but not their threats, at this week's debate.

Community Event: **Rally** for Financial Aid Reform. **Monday, 1.17.05. Woolsey Rotunda** at **3.00**.

On Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, a group of students has organized a rally supporting financial aid reform at Yale. An online petition briefly outlines their position

[<http://www.petitiononline.com/yaleaid/petition.html>]. Sign on and show up if you agree.

Community Event: Upcoming: Relay for Life (Amer. Cancer Soc.) @ Yale

The Relay for Life raises funds in the fight against cancer. ♦ There are two chief components carried out by individuals working in small teams: the actual work of fund-raising in the months prior to the relay and walking in the Relay for Life itself (Apr 9-10).

Links

[<http://tinyurl.com/6lur5>] This Financial Times article from 14 Jan 2005 outlines the apparent slow demise of ETA, a Basque separatist group that has long been characterized as an active source of violence in

Spain. Following the train bombing likely carried out by Al-Qaeda, one police group's spokesman says: "Even among Eta's own supporters, there is no stomach for the continued use of terror as a political instrument." An older article from the BBC in 2002 outlines the (ab)use of law by a crusading judge to ban a political party that had purported links to ETA, such as the failure to denounce ETA bombings, before a separate two-month old law could be applied against the party by the ruling government: [<http://tinyurl.com/3wv4j>]

You might want to look into discussion of the Supreme Court's rulings on 'fighting words' and the like, as most of the terroristic acts that most people will find potentially legitimate will likely be words. The opinion in *Brandenburg v. Ohio* (1969), which can be found at [http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/cas/comm/free_speech/brandenburg.html] along with a brief summary, saw the Supreme Court hold that only imminent danger could be outlawed -- not simply vague threats -- and thereby establish a standard for allowing some, but not all, terroristic comments.

Official biography of Nadine Strossen [<http://www.aclu.org/About/About.cfm?ID=9320&c=187>]

ACLU's "Safe and Free" initiative [<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFreeMain.cfm>]

