

# BYU Political Review

A CAMPUS FORUM FOR POLITICAL AND INTERNATIONAL DISCUSSION

byupoliticalreview.com byupoliticalreview@gmail.com September 2010 - Vol. 6, Issue 1

A STUDENT PUBLICATION OF THE DAVID M. KENNEDY CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND THE BYUPAS STUDENT CHAPTER

## COMING EVENTS

### Political Affairs Society

Opening Social

Friday, Sept. 10 @ 11:30 AM

WSC 3228

Oktoberfest

Thursday, Sept. 23 @ 6:00 PM

Stay alert for more details!

Practical Politics and Policymaking

Lecture Series

Thursdays @ 4:00 PM

238 HRCB

### Kennedy Center

India's Master Sitarist Nishat Khan

Tuesday, Sept. 21 @ 7:30 PM

de Jong Concert Hall

Development Internship Forum

Wednesday, Sept. 22 @ 6:00 PM

238 HRCB

Fall Career Fair

Wednesday, Sept. 29 @ 10:00 AM

WSC Ballroom

Kennedy Center Lecture Series

Wednesdays @ 12:00 PM

238 HRCB

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

<i>Immigration</i>	PG. 2
<i>Tea Party</i>	PG. 2
<i>British Elections</i>	PG. 3
<i>Sustain Haiti</i>	PG. 3
<i>Prop 8</i>	PG. 4
<i>Understanding China</i>	PG. 4
<i>Social Innovation</i>	PG. 5
<i>Russia's War on Terror</i>	PG. 7
<i>Letter from the Editor</i>	PG. 8



## TERROR MOSQUE AT GROUND ZERO

### 3 Things Sarah Palin Doesn't Want You to Know

Alex Christman & Eliza Campbell



Unless you're behind on reading Sarah Palin's Twitter feed, you know that there is a Terror Mosque slated to be built near the site of Ground Zero in lower Manhattan. As Palin, Fox News, and Newt Gingrich speculate, this building would be a headquarters for radical Islam that would lay siege to New York City and, eventually, the country as a whole. And we believe them. What better place to carry out covert terrorist plots than a public community center in the middle of Manhattan, complete with a 9/11 memorial and swimming pool? Luckily, a few well-timed remarks by various pundits made us all aware of this opportunity we have as we approach the anniversary of the tragic attacks of 9/11—an opportunity to unify our nation by fostering anger and alienating our own

citizens. Here are some facts that Palin doesn't want you to know:

**1. The "Terror Mosque" isn't strictly a mosque.**

The project, part of a complex called Park51, will include, among other things, a pool, a gym, a theater, a multi-faith worship area, and public rooms open for reservation. A mosque will take up a small part of the final space. According to the project head, real estate developer Sharif el-Gamal, the building will be modeled after New York's Y.M.C.A. and Jewish Community Center (where Mr. Gamal's own children take swimming lessons). As LDS members know and should appreciate, religious affiliation does not turn a building into a place of worship—would we worship or carry out sacred covenants in the Beehive House or the Visitor Center in Temple Square?

**2. The "Terror Mosque" isn't at Ground Zero.**

Park51 would be constructed on the ashes of a former Burlington Coat Factory, on a space blocks away and around the corner from the actual site in question. Manhattanites

# Immigration: A 'We' Approach

Jeffrey Swindle



MSNBC analyst Andrea Mitchell recently questioned Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio about Arizona's new immigration laws. She asked, "There was some issue as to whether the jails could even hold all

the people...You were going to do outdoor jails. It's pretty hot in Arizona. How was that going to work?" Sheriff Arpaio responded, "I put up tents, Korean war tents, in 1993...I still have 200 illegal aliens in our tents anyway doing their time... and I still have plenty of room..." In contrast, Elder Marvin Jensen said the following in an *Interfaith Dialogue on Immigration* at Westminster College in February 2008: "Immigration questions are questions dealing with God's children...I believe a more thoughtful and factual, not to mention humane approach is warranted...Meet an undocumented person. Come to know their family." How citizens and policymakers approach the immigration

debate will ultimately determine the sustainability of immigration reform laws. If immigrants are separated from Americans in the debate, creating an 'us' and 'them' situation, discriminated groups will continue to feel marginalized. If, however, the issue is approached as Elder Jensen suggests, through a more inclusionary or 'we' outlook, then the potential for enduring agreement on immigration reform is more likely.

## Background of the Law

Since Arizona enacted SB 1070 in May, the immigration issue has been in the media's hot seat. The law, written by Arizona Senator Russell Pearce, a Latter-day Saint, states that policemen should ask for legal documentation whenever there is "reasonable suspicion" to believe otherwise. Supporters argue that the law will decrease crime, most notably the drug trade. Opponents claim that it allows racial profiling and will lead to unnecessary hassle for all non-white individuals, regardless of their legal status. It is entirely plausible, they claim, that a citizen could be taken to jail if they do not have their driver's

license or another form of identification on their person at all times. What "reasonable suspicion" means, and how the courts will interpret it, is unclear. Recently, the Obama Administration challenged the law, taking it to the Justice Department for review. Portions of the law have been temporarily suspended during the review process.

One portion of the law outlaws citizens from transporting undocumented immigrants in their car anywhere in the state. Social service agencies and churches alike are concerned about this portion of the law—after all, it brings into question the legality of their work. Many local Latter-day Saint leaders have argued that Senator Pearce's immigration law is diminishing their congregation's missionary efforts.

## 'Us' and 'Them' Versus 'We'

As Americans, we stand for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." However, there is a tendency, mostly stimulated by fear, to guard those virtues by differentiating between 'us' and 'them.' Depending on the issue, 'us' may mean Americans and 'them'

Continued pg. 8

# Why I Don't Support the Tea Party

Doug Partridge



If you have ears that can be yelled into, you have probably noticed the dull roar of the angry Tea Party movement, which has sounded its call over the last year. Those

within the movement have proclaimed on various occasions that "tea" stands for "Taxed Enough Already" and that they are opposed to the current administration's spending.

I would agree with them about their issue with government spending. It is doubtful that many Americans would deny our current national budget problems, and if you are like me, you believe that reducing spending is of critical importance. But it is the emphasis on taxes that loses me.

The problem is that their semantics are all wrong. Now, before you accuse me of nitpicking, remember our Constitution and the importance we place as a nation on our choice of words. To me, a more correct and accurate name for the Tea Party would be the "Bea" party—"b" for "borrowed." This is more in line with not only the current administration but with what EVERY administration has done for the past 30 years.

Americans hate taxes. We always have and

always will. Our country's revolution began with people fed up with unjust taxes (the real tea partiers). And for that reason, taxes have declined since the 1950s. Today's top income tax bracket is less than half of what it was during the Eisenhower administration (including adjustments for inflation). President Kennedy cut federal income taxes for all brackets and so did Presidents Reagan, Bush 41, and Bush 43. Federal income taxes during the 1990s were all considerably lower under a Democratic president than they were under the early years of Reagan's administration. And if you feel that President Obama's tax policy is leading us on the road to tyranny, do not forget that a massive part of his bailout package came in the form of tax breaks and cuts, and all of his proposals to raise taxes would merely have them return to the levels of the Clinton administration. In 2009 alone, 43% of Americans did not pay taxes, and close to 70% of the federal tax revenue came from those in the highest tax bracket (if all tea partiers fell into the top bracket, I would understand their complaint and a desire for equality, but many of them do not, and I once again have to take issue with their choice of words).

But during all of this, there has not been a corresponding decrease in government

expenditures. Our national debt has grown larger and larger over the past 30 years, and the size and scope of the national government and its spending have become bloated during that same time period. And how has this growth been funded? Through borrowing. Not taxes. Our government has been paying for much of this growth through borrowed funds and inflating the national debt by issuing debt through bonds and other securities that have been bought up by other countries, private corporations, and individuals. The real problem we have is a government that loves to borrow and rack up debt so that it can continue its spending habits.

To label Obama as a "tax-and-spend" president and say that you are "taxed enough already" indicates that you are either unaware of recent political and economic history or completely dishonest and disingenuous. This kind of rhetoric is irrelevant to the current political climate. If you want to truly make headway with your complaints about the government's size and spending habits, then use proper rhetoric. Bring up the issues of national debt and deficits funded through borrowing. Stop talking about taxes.

*Doug is a senior studying business management and Spanish.*

# British Elections

*Jonathan Evans*



In the 2000 Presidential Election between George W. Bush and Al Gore, voters and political pundits stayed up into the early hours of the morning to discover who the next

President of the United States would be. This past May, across the Atlantic Ocean, a close Parliamentary election unfolded in the United Kingdom. However, the immediate results of the election were obvious to most; in a recent interview, Dr. Peter Martland, a Cambridge University historian, claimed, "I went to bed."

Dr. Martland's comments reflected the general expectation that the Parliamentary elections would result in a hung parliament—when no one party claims a majority in the House of Commons. The mystery lay in what would transpire over the next few days as the parties worked to form a coalition government. Coalition governments are common in many parliamentary systems, but the United Kingdom Parliament has historically tended towards a two-party system, with the last coalition government existing 65 years ago during World War II. Dr. Martland believes the British electorate to be the most sophisticated in the world; not willing to entrust full power to any one party, it forced its elected representatives to compromise.

The Conservative (or Tory) Party had won the most seats with 306 Members of Parliament (MPs) being elected, short of the 326 required to have a majority in the House of Commons. Their traditional rivals, Labour, saw 258 MPs elected, while the strongest third party, the Liberal Democrats (Lib Dems), won 57 seats. These results gave a great deal of power to the Lib Dems; a coalition government would require Lib Dem support, despite the Lib Dem loss of seats in the elections.

The Labour Party attempted to work a deal with the Lib Dems but failed. Over the next five days, the leadership of the Conservatives and the Lib Dems held talks to iron out the necessary agreement for a coalition government. These talks had not even completed when the previous Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, resigned and Queen Elizabeth II invited David Cameron to begin the new Parliament. This speed stands in sharp contrast to the month of court cases that decided the United States Presidential Election of 2000.

This coalition government has existed for over 100 days. It has met some bumps along the way, but signs of success have highlighted

Continued pg. 7

# Dispatches from "Sustain Haiti"

## Lessons on Development

*Dustin Homer and Zach Christensen*



One of the most common English clichés suggests that teaching a man to fish is preferable to giving that man a fish because teaching allows the individual to support himself for a lifetime.

Though we risk banality by invoking such a well-worn thought, this principle is increasingly relevant to international development and is now referred to as "sustainable development." This past

summer, we were part of a group of nearly 50 driven individuals, most of whom are also BYU students, who made it their personal mission to promote sustainable development in disaster-stricken Haiti. Our organization, Sustain Haiti, worked exclusively in the small city of Leogane, Haiti, located at the epicenter of the January 2010 earthquake. Though plagued with challenges, our efforts benefitted our Haitian friends, and in the process we gained valuable insights into good development practice. Based on our experiences, we offer three key principles that have broad application for all who advocate third-world development.

**Principle 1: People are hungry for opportunity—give it to them.**

Sadly, stereotypes of the developing world often disparage the work ethic of the poor. While some who we encountered had indeed lost personal motivation, Sustain Haiti volunteers found that most Haitians they met were both ambitious and resourceful. Despite their tragic circumstances, these people relentlessly clung to hope. They worked tirelessly at whatever education or employment was available, though opportunities were few. For example, one day we saw two crowds of people lined up in Port-au-Prince. One was for food handouts, while the other was to submit a job application. Incredibly, the line for one or two low-wage positions far outnumbered the line for food. Realizing that people want opportunities more than handouts, we implemented a business plan competition that elicited over 150 detailed, innovative, and workable proposals, despite the participants' lack of formal education. Additionally, nearly 200 people faithfully attended our 6:30 AM English classes, eager to obtain a new marketable skill. Through these and other programs, Sustain Haiti volunteers sought to provide opportunities—however small—to those desiring a better situation. Given a vision and a chance to reach it, people will

fight to pull themselves out of poverty.

**Principle 2: Roll with the punches.**

Flexibility became a hallmark of Sustain Haiti's mission. Despite hundreds of man-hours spent preparing for the summer, most of our initiatives changed dramatically when we arrived in Leogane. Though often frustrating, this willingness to adapt allowed the organization to address urgent local needs. For instance, the curriculum for our sanitation and hygiene education program was prepared by volunteers well in advance of our Haiti arrival. Once the material was presented to schoolchildren, however, we found that we were teaching redundant concepts to the students. So the volunteers adapted. We interviewed local medical personnel to better understand the area's most urgent sanitation and hygiene needs. Then we significantly altered our curriculum to directly address these issues, providing valuable instruction on hand-washing and injury care, among other things, to the participating students. Our willingness to place relevant local needs over pre-planned programs allowed Sustain Haiti to make tangible positive impacts in Leogane. Those who pursue effective development should be willing to make any necessary changes to better serve their target population.

**Principle 3: Let the locals lead.**

Non-Haitian Sustain Haiti volunteers strove, as much as possible, to take secondary roles in project leadership. Those most familiar with the culture and its needs—the Haitians themselves—were given the reins instead. Rony Charles, Sustain Haiti's dynamic country director, is a Haitian BYU student who oversaw all operations in Leogane for the summer. His tireless leadership, along

Continued pg. 6

## Get Involved

Want to know more  
about Sustain Haiti?

E-mail  
[sustainhaiti.info@gmail.com](mailto:sustainhaiti.info@gmail.com)

Visit  
[sustainhaiti.blogspot.com](http://sustainhaiti.blogspot.com)

# Confused on Prop 8?

Grady Nye



You are not the only one. The issue of same-sex marriage is controversial because it challenges our assumptions about people and their role in society. Both sides must recognize that the debate is fueled by fundamental differences of opinion about these ideas. In my argument supporting Proposition 8, I will focus on four issues in particular:

First, I differ with Proposition 8 opponents regarding whether morality alone is an appropriate basis for law. In the ruling that struck down Proposition 8, Judge Walker discussed the judicial precedent that prohibits government enforcement of private moral views that do not advance a legitimate government interest. However, he writes as if the terms of this precedent (which was established in 2003) are broad, non-negotiable, and uncontroversial. This point of view is politically rash and legally problematic. For example, what other laws might this standard invalidate? Laws against polygamy, public obscenity, public displays of pornography, prostitution, animal cruelty, and perhaps even adult incest would not be enforceable if we could not show that they advance a “legitimate government interest.” This type of broad judicial interpretation is a political excuse to remove morality from public life, and it denies the fact that morality has sewn together many threads of America’s legal fabric since the writing of the Constitution.

Second, I disagree with opponents of Proposition 8 regarding whether same-sex marriage is different than heterosexual marriage. Opponents of Proposition 8 are inconsistent on this point. For example, in order to change the definition of marriage to include same-sex marriage, they rely on a strictly legal conclusion that “gender no longer forms an essential part of marriage,” regardless of how the majority of society has chosen to define it. But if it is suggested that civil unions could also provide equal legal rights, opponents of Proposition 8 vehemently object, saying that domestic partnerships “do not provide the same social meaning as marriage” (from page 115 of Walker’s opinion). This double standard indicates an overt intention to not only change the legal definition of marriage, but also what we think about marriage and family.

In that agenda lies the third difference between myself and opponents of Proposition 8: whether legalizing same-sex marriage

would be harmful to society. I vigorously oppose official government sanction of same-sex marriage because I believe that society cannot be perpetuated without families built on heterosexual relationships. Of course, even when marriage is defined as between a man and a woman, families are not without problems, and neither are people. But society ought to have an ideal. Families are the context in which individuals find social meaning and relate to both future and past generations. If you change the definition of marriage, I believe that you create uncertainty about the expectations and obligations of parents and children to each other, making it a complex issue that transcends mere “individual rights.”

Just as money provides the medium for most transactions in our economy, the family provides the context of most interactions in our society. If we drastically change what counts as money, the dollar loses its value and economic uncertainty results. Changing the definition of marriage will prompt future generations to search for their own meaning and sense of responsibility in places other than the family. This deprives individuals of a consistent relationship to their most basic social reference point. When Californians passed Proposition 8, they essentially said, “We don’t want to be a part of this social experiment.” And that is their right in a democratic society.

Fourth, I differ with some opponents of Proposition 8 over the role of religious belief in public debate. I have heard the argument that religion is inherently irrational and therefore has no place in academic discussion—but I disagree. There are no grounds to assert that religion is irrational because we lack the capacity to prove its tenets by the latest academic standards. To do so would be shortsightedly self-assured. Just as religious people can mistake the source and subject of their faith, secularists can overestimate the strength of their assumptions, the precision of their logic, and the appropriateness of its application to an incomplete set of facts.

Finally, some of you that support Proposition 8 might avoid these discussions because you fear appearing judgmental or intolerant. But for me, tolerance means accepting that we all make mistakes; it does not make me doubt my moral beliefs about what is right for society. Tolerance is important, but it can also betray your sense of right and wrong if you do not anchor it to a foundational belief in absolute truths.

*Grady is a senior studying political science.*

# Misconceptions on China Today

David Cramer



Two months in China this summer was just long enough to discover how much I don’t know about the Chinese people. It is a nation of contradictions—rich and poor, free and oppressed, tradition-bound and progressive. The most important lesson I learned is that American perceptions of the Chinese are typically very shallow. By necessity, we caricature peoples and histories, but for most of the ideas we have about China, the Chinese have a very different take. I spent a lot of time talking to Chinese on the streets and in their homes, and the following are commonly held beliefs I found to be more nuanced than we tend to think:

## 1. Mao Zedong was evil, so the Chinese people must hate him.

Not so. You meet a lot of well-informed people who still love Chairman Mao. The official party line is that his policies were “70% good and 30% bad.” This is a laughable summation of a man’s life—but many Chinese share that feeling. By some estimates, Mao Zedong was responsible for more deaths than Stalin (due to the disastrous consequences of the forced collectivization and harebrained industrialization schemes of the Great Leap Forward). He caused the irreversible destruction of thousands of years of Chinese historical and cultural artifacts during the Cultural Revolution, and he destroyed families for generations with the purges and persecution he instigated. These facts are not hidden from the Chinese people. They universally acknowledge the horrors that dotted Mao’s reign. So why do they still have such reverence for the man?

This is a question steeped in history. The Chinese are a people who live in their history, and views about current issues are most often shaped by the past. In the century preceding World War II, China suffered military and economic humiliation at the hands of various Western powers. Chiang Kai-shek’s Republic of China offered a semblance of independence but quickly disintegrated into a heavy-handed and corrupt regime struggling to maintain control over a chaotic China. These years were and are deeply troubling to a people who have considered themselves a leading world power for thousands of years—militarily, culturally, and economically.

Against this background Mao appeared. He helped resist Japanese aggression, achieved domestic unity, and freed China from foreign interference. To understand the Chinese perspective in international affairs, we must understand the importance

Continued on the opposite page

that Chinese place on these two values: domestic unity and national independence. For many Chinese, a unified China is more valuable than a free China. Any time they sense interference in their domestic affairs, the knee-jerk reaction is to fight back. Mao ejected Westerners and ended the rampant warlordism, corruption, and disunity of the years preceding the Japanese invasion. And for that they love him.

## 2. China is a communist country.

After Mao's death in 1976, Deng Xiaoping stated, "Socialism is not poverty. To get rich is glorious." In 1978, Deng instituted a policy of openness and reform aimed at jumpstarting economic growth. Since that time, private ownership and free markets have made enormous strides in China. That being said, the Chinese economy maintains a bizarre mix of state planning and free enterprise. Decisions are still made from the top down, where government bureaucrats decide which industries to protect and foster. Areas of the country are designated as tourist attractions, biomedical research centers, or manufacturing havens. And then the government makes sure that it works out. 'If you build it, they will come' is the reigning philosophy.

A popular saying of Chairman Mao's, "Serve the People!" has become "Serve the People's Money!" The government is focused on creating jobs and sustaining growth so

it can maintain its legitimacy—which is not a legitimacy of fair and free elections but instead a legitimacy of progress and efficiency. Oddly, this has created a situation where the fiercest allies of the Communist Party are the wealthy elite rather than the oppressed proletariat of yesteryear. They are champions of the status quo, not of the Revolution. The old rhetoric occasionally rears its head, but the Party's primary interest is staying in power, not pushing Marxism on school children. Reading Xinhua's quasi-official news releases and watching old-school Chinese propaganda videos has given Americans the view of a more hard-line, idealistic Communist Party, but I was hard pressed to find any signs of that vanishing era. Instead, I found a thriving economy (now the second largest in the world), and everywhere fervent adherents of capitalism.

Some of the misunderstandings I had about China arose because China changes so quickly that it is hard to keep up. But as one of the most dynamic countries of the 21st century, China begs study and understanding. And as it becomes more powerful and more assertive on the world stage, we must engage China with understanding or risk hostility and conflict. The most important outreach we can make begins by correcting simple misconceptions.

*David is a junior studying economics.*

## Submit an Article

Send your 400-700 word articles to [byupoliticalreview@gmail.com](mailto:byupoliticalreview@gmail.com)

Successful submissions will be:

- **Original**
- **Academic**
- **Well written**

## Join the Staff

Send your cover letter, resume, and one-page writing sample (for editor applications) to

[byupoliticalreview@gmail.com](mailto:byupoliticalreview@gmail.com)

Seeking applications for:

- **Editors**
- **Graphic designer**
- **Web manager**
- **Layout manager**

## An Overdue DTR: Government and Social Innovation

*Scott J. Jackson*



On July 22, 2010, the President's administration announced the first eleven recipients of the new Social Innovation Fund (SIF). These eleven organizations will use federal money to fund innovative community organizations that tackle problems related to education, youth development, health, and economic opportunity. All in all, \$50 million of federal grants will be matched three-to-one in a search for new, sustainable, and scalable solutions for intractable social problems.

The SIF is just one of several programs that characterize a young but deepening relationship between government and social innovation. What is social innovation? It refers to the process of creating and capturing value from new ideas or inventions in the social sector. Just as business innovation is concerned with harnessing opportunity within markets to create profit, social innovation seeks to harness opportunity in the social sector to create positive social impact. Famous examples include the Nobel prize winning Grameen Bank and

Teach for America. In a testament to their growing traction, social innovation or entrepreneurship centers have been set up at Harvard, Stanford, Oxford, and recently BYU.

How did government and social innovation meet? Mutual interests. Our government, grappling with deep economic problems amidst increasing public frustration, is searching for new ways to "promote the general Welfare." Social innovation is a hot field that promises new, more effective, and self-sustaining ways of addressing social problems without relying on government programs. The potential match-up has led to considerable interest in determining whether partnership could mean fewer taxpayer dollars per square inch of social impact. But should the government be funding social innovation? Questions about the propriety of such a relationship, along with growing governmental support for social entrepreneurs, have ushered in a season where government and social innovation must "determine the relationship."

The relationship seems to have a lot of potential. Though we have very little track record, some case studies lend insight as to where there may be room for partnership: Teach for America's ability to reroute college graduates into disadvantaged schools has led to funding of \$1 million or more from AmeriCorps, the Dept. of Education, and several state and city education agencies;

Soraya Salti's and Greg Mortenson's work have enabled rising generations in the Middle East to become positively engaged in their region's future; and the Delancey Street Foundation's job training and rehabilitation program earns 60% of its own operating costs through employing its participants directly in its 12 business ventures, which include a restaurant and café, a shuttle service, and an event planning business. Could education policy be improved through other partnerships with social innovators? Could Middle East peace efforts or anti-terrorism be better served by teaming up with civic sector actors? Could job training projects in our "jobless recovery" have more impact by utilizing earned income strategies or direct employment business ventures? The possibilities are tantalizing.

However, as with all relationships, there are doubts. Can government, which is regarded as slow, bureaucratic, and unimaginative, ever be compatible with a partner whose prime characteristic is a spirit of innovation? It is certainly possible. But it may require government to restructure its priorities and organization to be more innovative itself or to develop mechanisms for outsourcing the actual work of social innovation to more independent organizations such as in the case of the SIF.

A second concern is that if it is judged to be proper and beneficial for government to

Continued pg. 6

## Social Innovation

Continued from pg. 5

get involved with social innovation, how far should the relationship go? One bill currently in Congress—H.R. 5533—is designed to create an advisory council to help nonprofit and community organizations, including social innovation firms. This hints to a more hands-off and distant relationship. However, the SIF's ultimate goal is to yield models that can be integrated into government programs, certainly a sign of more extensive cooperation.

Third, it is an open question as to how long this commitment will last. Will interest in social innovation dry up with a change in administration or majority party? Will the evidence prove that social innovation is better able to deliver solutions than other options? Will government involvement hurt or hold back social innovation? Government is about managing limited resources—a commitment to social innovation will inevitably be balanced against other obligations.

For those who want to see the relationship succeed, a recent article in the Economist gives substance to hope. The authors argue that government funding solves social innovation's difficulties with speed and scale and injects innovation into the government's programs. In theory it is a win-win scenario. But the return on the SIF's \$50 million investment over the next few years, as well as the success of other public-private partnerships, will go a long way in determining whether this relationship goes all the way or ends in a nasty break-up.

*Scott is a junior studying economics.*

## Terror Mosque

Continued from front page

would be obligated to walk for about a tenth of a mile to be able to see it. The mosque itself serves a community need: several hundred thousand Muslims live in New York City, and the area lacks many public facilities for worship. (Masjid Manhattan, a nearby mosque, recently was overcrowded to the point that worshippers were forced to say their prayers in the streets.) The real importance of Park51's location is that it serves a need of a specific community in Lower Manhattan—one that would benefit from community bonding, or at least some interfaith basketball. Think for a moment: would feelings leading to terrorist activity more likely be felt by communities feeling alienated and underserved in their own neighborhoods or by citizens who could swim some laps, worship freely, and commemorate a tragic event in their American heritage, all in the same building?

### 3) The "Terror Mosque" is not sponsored by terrorists.

Mr. Gamal is a real estate broker who also leases trendy lofts in NYC's TriBeCa neighborhood. Having secured approval by community and city leaders for his project through every avenue of legality, he plans to raise money by organizing a board of civic leaders of multiple faiths—including Russell Simmons, for example. He will be working with Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf, an imam from the area, as well as his wife, Daisy Khan. All are New York citizens who have repeatedly stressed their commitment to developing their community, in which they are invested and proud. Sarah Palin took her fight for justice to Twitter when she asked "peace-seeking" Muslims to "refudiate"[sic] the project. As "peace-seeking Mormons"

(as opposed to our violence-seeking counterparts), should we not take note of this sloppy and inconsiderate rhetoric? Newt Gingrich went further when he referred to sponsors as radical Muslims, comparing them to Nazis. The Palin-Gingrich team invents words and pulls the Nazi card to distract from the reality of Park51's actual background and investors. Is there an excuse for this open discrimination and ignorance?

Now that the facts are straight, let's talk about something more sensitive: sensitivity. The main rhetorical argument against the Terror Mosque is predicated on a willful rejection of legal rights, so the word "sensitivity" gets tossed around a lot. "It's their right to build it... but should they?" This doesn't seem like a sensitive thing to say to a religious group well-represented among those killed on 9/11. That is probably the most insidious part of this whole debate: it insensitively exploits the emotions, religious beliefs, and ethics of our citizens. Yes, there is merit in considering the complicated emotions and biases felt by people involved in a national tragedy. But there is no merit in willfully ignoring the facts, dismissing the American tradition of religious tolerance, or being openly discriminatory in the name of sensitivity. There is also no merit in abusing Twitter for the purpose of spreading fear. Facts make us sensitive. Facts make us aware of our responsibility as citizens to respect and uphold our own rights and those of others. And that's something that Sarah Palin definitely doesn't want you to know.

*Alex is a junior studying comparative literature.  
Eliza is a junior studying political science.*

## Sustain Haiti

Continued from pg. 3

with his cultural understanding and strong desire to help his fellow Haitians, was the cornerstone of Sustain Haiti's success. In addition, many local volunteers joined the initiative, playing key roles in our organization. Junior Senecharles, a young father and Latter-day Saint, supervised Sustain Haiti's square-foot gardening project. He spent many hours training new garden participants, building new gardens, and maintaining existing gardens, usually with a handful of American volunteers in tow. This type of local leadership enhanced Sustain Haiti's community involvement, improved our ability to meet local needs, and added longevity to our projects. Empowering

local leadership is crucial to effective and sustainable development work.

Despite many roadblocks, these three principles, among others, helped Sustain Haiti make a difference in Leogane. By providing opportunities, adapting to local needs, and empowering local leaders, we helped many of these wonderful individuals to help themselves. In our own small way, we "taught them how to fish." We respectfully submit that these principles are critical to the successful future of international development.

*Dustin is a senior studying political science.  
Zack is a senior studying political science.*

What do **you** think?

Like what you read?  
Hate what you read?

[byupoliticalreview.com](http://byupoliticalreview.com)

Think more.



Left: Mourners at the funeral of Maxium Mareyev. The 20-year-old student was killed in the twin bombings in Moscow on March 29.

## Russia's War on Terror

*Chandler Grigg*



On March 29, two young women blew themselves up in the Moscow subway system, indiscriminately killing men, women, children, and elderly people. On August 29, Ramzan Kadyrov, the president of Chechnya, personally lead a team into a house of Chechen rebels, killing 12 of them. In response to the rising violence, Russian president Dimitry Medvedev responded by saying that the Russian government would resort to harsher tactics than used previously in order to find the culprits of the suicide bombing. This remark was criticized in the West as being a sign of a brutal totalitarian regime that will stop at nothing to achieve its goals. In reality, the Russian government is simply acting in its nation's best interest.

Russia is being caught between an inter-tribal Chechen fight. The Moscow subway bombers had been recruited and trained by a man named Dokka Umarov, who has a personal vendetta against Ramzan Kadyrov, the president of Chechnya. Umarov finds bereaved widows who have recently lost their husbands to fighting in Chechnya and trains them to be highly effective explosive weapons nicknamed the "Black Widows." The Black Widows, being female, can penetrate deeper into society, move around with less suspicion, and consequently cause more casualties than their male counterparts. They also excel at recruiting men to the cause. This threat is closer, more embedded, more violent, and more powerful than the threat of Al-Qaeda to the US.

By buying off the leaders of Chechnya, Moscow has tried to quell uprisings, but

instead it is building pressure that will eventually erupt. After the second Chechen war, Moscow struck a deal with a family of one of the rebellion leaders, the Kadyrovys. Moscow got resolution to the conflict, the Kadyrovys got wealthy and locally powerful, and the Chechen people got peace and resolution. Over the next decade, Russia invested heavily in the region and Chechnya's economy prospered. Unfortunately, the other rebellion leaders felt bitterly betrayed by their former leader and have not stopped fighting. President Kadyrov was assassinated six years ago at a parade by a bomb placed under the stand where he was seated. His son, Ramzan Kadyrov, took over and has proven to be a ruthless and effective president, using fear to keep the region stable and attractive to investment, but recent fighting suggests that the peace is fragile.

Kadyrov Jr.'s harsh actions have inflamed the passions of the rival rebels, now led by Umarov. War is likely, and it is Chechnya—not Moscow—that would suffer the most. Still, Umarov does not seem to care. His rebels were willing to blow up a movie theater full of noncombatant Muscovites, they slaughtered hundreds of innocent children in Beslan, and now he is sending out young widows to kill indiscriminately. Western media may decry Putin and Medvedev for their hardline tactics, but Umarov must be stopped. However harsh Moscow's tactics may be, they are in the best interest of Chechnya, as well as the rest of Russia, to prevent further war and to stop men like Umarov and Kadyrov from escalating the conflict.

*Chandler is a senior studying political science.*

## British Elections

Continued from pg. 3

these first 100 days: furtherance of voting reform legislation, National Health Service reforms, and new education initiatives. However, this success might falter, and even existence of the coalition is not guaranteed. In a recent article in *The Guardian*, Jonathan Freedland points out that the first 100 days of Gordon Brown's leadership of the Labour party three years ago were also considered a success. But this election showed how opinions can shift, with Labour losing over 90 seats in the House of Commons.

When asked if the coalition will last, Dr. Martland's reply, "the problem will be if the Liberal party splits," reflected the history of the Liberal parties in the United Kingdom. If rumors of MPs splitting from the Liberal Democrats over the alliance with the Conservatives prove true, the coalition government could lose its majority in the House of Commons. Dr. Martland believes that a new round of elections would follow to form a new government. However, a split could result in a merger of Lib Dems into the Conservative Party. This uncertainty over the continued existence of the Tory-Lib Dem coalition could weaken the government and prevent legislation.

This election highlighted both strengths and weaknesses in the UK parliamentary system when compared to the United States' congressional system. Many citizens in the United States prefer the system we use and its relative stability of government. However, the speed with which an entire government can be formed—even out of possible deadlock—stands as a testament to the effectiveness of the parliamentary system.

*Jonathan is a junior studying organ performance.*

## Immigration

Continued from pg. 2

may mean Russians, Hispanics, or Muslims. 'Us' may also mean Mormons, with 'them' referring to everyone else. These distinctions create false identities and lead to "the false gods we worship," said former LDS president Spencer W. Kimball. Further, extreme patriotism, nationalism, zionism, etc., are all motivated by an 'us' and 'them' outlook.

Instead of focusing on keeping people out of America, a 'we' approach would require searching for a win-win solution for both Americans and would-be immigrants. Of course, all parties should stand by their core values, but that does not rule out the need for empathy or compromise. Thomas S. Monson, president of the LDS church, demonstrated a 'we' approach while visiting tsunami stricken villages in Indonesia. After asking, "What do you need?" to one village leader, he learned that they desired copies of the Koran. Instead of declining to assist them because of religious differences, President Monson made sure that "a few days later the Church presented the village with 700 copies of the Koran." In the same way, the "we" approach assumes that the greater good is best served by decency, tolerance, and humane respect instead of egocentricity and arrogance.

Solutions can be found as Americans and immigrants seek to better understand each other's situation. This summer I came face-to-face with the plight of immigrant Mexican farmers when I spent two months interviewing them in a few Mexican villages. I quickly learned that the men in the villages had all, at one time or another, emigrated to the United States and lived there for a portion of their lives. Some had done so with documentation and others without. The money they earned working for a few years in the US was enough for them to survive for the rest of their lives. Unfortunately, the time the men spent away from their homes was problematic—the fathers had a smaller role in raising their children, marriage problems occurred, etc. In response, several humanitarian organizations based in the US and Mexico partnered to help the villagers start a modest goat cheese factory in their villages. The jobs provided by the factories enabled many men to travel less often or not at all to the US and still have enough money to provide for their families. While some problems with project ownership and sustainability need to be addressed, it demonstrates how humanitarian efforts can build empathy and understanding, which in turn lead to amenable policies.

This project is just one method of resolving the immigration conflict, while multiple solutions will be needed on both sides of the border. Solely supplementing Mexico's economy, while helpful, shys away from a

bigger real issue—the lack of desire to "love thy neighbor." Sticking to dogmatic 'us' and 'them' assumptions will not bring long-term solutions but will increase defensiveness and political divide. Conversely, a 'we' approach will lay the foundation for meaningful political dialogue.

*Jeffrey is a senior studying sociology.*



## Letter from the Editor

For five years the BYU Political Review has existed as a student-run open forum for political discussion. Its purpose is simple: provide a medium of exchange for ideas so that students, faculty, and alumni can increase their understanding of local, state, national, and international political affairs. It is a forum for intellectual and respectful debate, discussion, and disagreement.

Those of you familiar with the Political Review will notice significant changes this semester. We are in the process of redesigning the website, recruiting additional staff members, and expanding the publication. These changes are aimed at increasing readership and involvement among students, faculty, and alumni.

It is our dream to see our inbox overflowing with cogent and passionate political opinions from every member of our campus and print them all. To that end I encourage you to join in the debate. Submit your articles, comments, questions, and suggestions via email ([byupoliticalreview@gmail.com](mailto:byupoliticalreview@gmail.com)) or apply to join the Political Review staff.

We warmly welcome you back to another semester at BYU, and we look forward to your involvement in what Thomas Jefferson once exhorted of Thomas Paine: "Go on then in doing with your pen what in other times was done with the sword: shew that reformation is more practicable by operating on the mind of man than on the body of man."

## WHAT YOU MISSED

### THIS SUMMER

#### National News

##### **April 20: Deepwater Horizon Oil Rig explodes, setting off largest oil spill of its kind in history**

The well, owned by British Petroleum, leaks oil into the Gulf of Mexico. After 86 days and several attempts to cap the well, the leak is stopped on July 15. Scientists estimate the spill dumped nearly 5 million barrels of oil into the Gulf Coast.

##### **April 23: Arizona passes controversial Immigration Bill**

The Bill gives local law enforcement the power to identify and deport illegal immigrants. The US Justice Department sues Arizona, arguing that immigration is a federal issue.

##### **June 23: President Obama fires General McChrystal**

Following a controversial interview with *Rolling Stone*, Obama replaces McChrystal with General Petraeus as the commander in Afghanistan.

##### **August 4: California Proposition 8 overturned**

Judge Vaughn Walker rules that Proposition 8 is unconstitutional because it discriminates against gay men and women.

##### **August 5: Senate confirms Elena Kagan to the Supreme Court**

The Senate votes 63-37 to confirm President Obama's nomination, making her the third female member of the Court and the only justice with no previous judicial experience.

#### International News

##### **May 19: Russia and China join US sanctions against Iran**

Other major world powers join the US in an attempt to stop the country from enriching uranium by passing what is considered to be the "toughest" round of sanctions yet.

##### **July 6: Iran bans mullets**

In an effort to "fight back against the Western cultural invasion," Iran's cultural ministry releases a list of approved haircuts for men. In addition to mullets, ponytails, long hair, and too much hair gel are not allowed.