

es plague program


ACT score of 68, and a combined recentered SAT score of 820. The two basketball prodigies did not, however, pass Boston College academic standards. According to an article in the *Boston Globe* on Sunday, O'Brien had threatened to resign after hearing of this rejection. However, when asked by a *Globe* reporter if he even thought about resigning, O'Brien said, "No, absolutely not."

O'Brien and Mahoney have already disagreed on numerous occasions this year. According to an article in the *Globe* on Sunday, Mahoney did not support the acceptance of *Paula Martin* because of his poor English. Maglos, undecided 2000, currently attends Boston College and has the privilege to reside in Gabelli Hall as a freshman.

Scandals and athletes with academic difficulties are nothing new to the BC athletic program. Scoonie Penn, communication 1999, a star recruit last year, is currently on academic probation. The earliest Penn can return to the team is January. Chris Herren, another academic disappointment, transferred to

Continued on page 4

am Kilpatrick



Rabbi Schiller urges united spiritual struggle; honest religious disagreement

By Matthew Monnig
THE OBSERVER

Jews and Christians must stand together against a secular culture that is hostile to their religious beliefs and values, according to Rabbi Mayer Schiller, who spoke at BC last Thursday. He said that our culture was essentially lost in the eyes of religion, and that therefore all religious people must "abjure the realm" and hold on to their religion.

He characterized contemporary culture as inimical to the ~~of religion~~, because it has been infected by a loss of respect and an overemphasis on the individual. "When one lives in a society in which all the means of communication," he said, "are dominated by those who abhor traditional faith, we must make a mental act and resolution that their world is not ours.... Their decrees are not the decrees that a believing Catholic, Protestant, or Jew can ever accept."

Rabbi Schiller's talk was titled, "Is hate our fate?," and he presented a model for relations between Jews and Christians based on an honest acknowledgment of differences.



Kysa Edsall

Schiller addresses the question, "Is hate our fate?"

He criticized the work of "ecumenicists" who seek to gloss over differences. Both Jews and Christians, he said, think the other is objectively wrong and therefore naturally want to convert the other to their own belief. "I don't see how a Jew can approach a Christian and say to him 'you must not want to convert me.' By the mere act of being a Christian, the Christian must want to convert the Judaist faith." This is simply the honest result of true faith, and should offend neither party. He acknowledged that

there was a history of Christian anti-Semitism in the world, but said he had never experienced it. He gave Christians much credit for having recognized and overcome animosity toward Jews, and lamented that history makes it difficult for Jews to do the same. He said attempts to evangelize are part of being religious, and are welcome as long as they do not coerce or deceive.

Acknowledging objective disagreement does not require

Continued on page 16

Racial tensions develop; students discuss issues

By Ajay Sequeira
THE OBSERVER

Town meetings dealing with safety, white privilege, and Asian American issues were recently sponsored by UGBC, the AHANA Leadership Council, and Asian Caucus.

ing of this nature." Woodward said that his incident was not isolated, "It's just that I decided to do something about my incident instead of taking it like most students do."

That a problem exists was widely agreed upon. UGBC president Mea Quinn said, "I definitely feel like racism is

dents on campus, particularly white students, are either apathetic, ambivalent or ignorant of race issues. The incident that occurred involving TerRance — a lot of students are shocked that something like that would happen. But, for a lot of AHANA students, they know it happens

Kysa Edsall

night during his victory speech about the passage of proposition 209. "This is not a victory for white men. It is not a victory for white people. It is a victory for all of us... It belongs to those who came before us who said in 1776, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men were created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

or is the impetus a real hostility for Western culture, traditions, and religions?

OBSERVER: A big watch word in today's society is "tolerance." How does this fit into everything mentioned already?

Kilpatrick: It often seems to me that tolerance is the only virtue we have left. The problem is, of course, that tolerance can be taken to an extreme. Do we want to show tolerance for the values of the Mafia, drug dealers, pimps, or pornographers? I don't think we do. I think we paralyze our ability to make moral judgments if we over-stress tolerance. The other thing I see is a one sided emphasis on tolerance. Herbert Marcuse, one of the gurus of the sixties radical Left once said that when we talk of tolerance we, of course, only mean tolerance for the Left and no tolerance for the Right. The tolerance being practiced on many college campuses is a very selective tolerance.

where we played. It was right where Merkert is now. It was a commuter school back then, very provincial. Now it's an international school; it's recognized as one of the best schools nationally. Athletically, going to a bowl game was a dream back then. Not too many teams went to a bowl game. I think basketball-wise, clearly the formation of the Big East conference has changed everything. We were just an independent, playing an independent schedule, we were not affiliated with a league, and the Big East has really changed

present course . . . And then, stupefyingly, he concludes that we must not continue the present course in America toward multiculturalism, for this would destroy our "Western" identity: multiculturalism is, you see, relativistic!

In short, Dr. Huntington appeals to our reason even as he subverts it. A mountain of detail, a vision sweeping in its grandeur, and all without a base...

For a foreign policy that demonstrated little attention and less consistency over the last four years than any Administration since Hoover's, *The Clash of Civilizations* is a virtual gift, a vision from the gods. It spells out most of the global trends and their consequences, and not just for the next American elec-

banker or lawyer, strategist or statesman, something more is needed. Something that engages the philosophical-theological underpinnings to our actions, something that understands us, not merely as products constituted by Chinese or Islamic or Western civilization, but also as the constituting subjects of civilization. Something that overcomes determinism and its collapse into relativism and then into the triumph of the will, the survival of the fittest.

Imagine if Dr. Huntington, having now described every chess piece on the global board and its next move as no one has ever done, should turn and treat those pieces as flesh and blood, embodied souls, true subjects. Imagine if he should reject that succession of ever lower viewpoints, inject that hyper-realism

Imagine if we re-appropriated to ourselves the sense of the '40s, that the Second World War, the fight for the four freedoms, was the good fight, a fight for all, a fight that must needs be taken up to higher levels today. Impossible?

Only if we deny the intrinsic workings of the mind, the desires of the subject, the structure of the good. But such denial is self-defeat: no strategy at all! Beyond *The Clash of Civilizations* must lie a better book, and a better world: not just "the sum of all our fears," but a perennially renewed constitution of faith, hope, and love. For inasmuch as we are given to understand it, the desire for the good is not only rational, but universal.

Rabbi Schiller:

Continued from pg 1

animosity, because as he pointed out, both religions worship the same God. Therefore, Jews and Christians, while maintaining that the other is no error, can believe that the subjective faith and practices of the other are welcomed by God and that his mercy extends to those actions, making them valid and holy expressions of faith.

Rabbi Schiller described his political and intellectual development from his origins as a non-practicing Jew in Brooklyn. He told of having seen a powerful Christmas episode of the TV show "Bonanza" when he was young that affected him tremendously. He recounted the episode of a touching story of the Christmas spirit at some length. Even though as a Jew he did not believe in Christmas, he was touched by the beauty and power of the holiday, and said he never understood how Jews could feel threatened by this practice of Christian faith.

As a youth, Rabbi Schiller became involved in conserva-

tive politics, both as an intellectual and as an activist. His readings of early American conservatism, he said, exposed him to the power of America's Christian heritage and need to preserve it, and these thoughts caused him to rethink his own religion. It was at this point, he said, that he embraced Orthodox Judaism and began to practice and study his religion more carefully.

Rabbi Schiller strongly criticized what he called the "kvetch and retreat" strategy of American conservatives. According to him, the right has never won a significant battle in American politics or culture. Conservatives, he said, merely throw up a fuss, and then surrender ground to take up a position further back. They've gone back so far, he said, that they caught up with old-line liberal Democrats who became the "neo-conservatives." He said he had been influenced by the 1970's conservative political journal *Triumph*, run by Brent Bozell. Bozell criticized his uncle William Buckley, godfather of American conservatism, for treating the Catholic critique of culture too lightly, and said

that this ultimately stole the heart from the arguments of American conservatism. Rabbi Schiller pointed to the change in tone in the flagship conservative magazine *National Review* from its early days. "Read *National Review* today and experience a faceless, soulless magazine, and then read *National Review* and William Buckley of fifty years ago and compare it to the meandering chit-chat one encounters in his articles today."

Rabbi Schiller said explicitly several times that he did not mean to sound gloomy. He said that this was a great opportunity for religious people, and said not to be too upset over the cultural change that has resulted in hostility toward religion. He said that it is the nature of civilizations to rise and fall, and that by "abjuring the realm," religious people can avoid the pain that comes with it.

In a display of cooperation between secular, Jewish, and Christian forces, the event was co-sponsored by UGBC, the Jewish Students Association, and the St. Thomas More Society.

Happy