

King for a day

Women should not be prom king



ANDI BACA

Prom night is the highlight of many students' high school careers. For Kristine Lester, the night may not be so magical. According to MSNBC, Lester, an openly gay high school senior, wanted to run for prom king instead of prom queen. The school principal and school board refused to allow Lester the opportunity to compete for king. Encina High School made the best decision in deciding not to let a female run for prom king.

Every school and competition has rules that maintain order and organization. If rules do not exist, events such as a high school prom become chaos. A traditional male and female prom court is the norm in society. However, some people want to see these rules and laws amended for them and their specific instance. MSNBC said Lester wanted to run for king because she identifies more with the male role than the female. However, a competition is not based on how a candidate feels. It is based on the rules of the competition, in this case gender. With the many different opinions and ideas individuals have, if every person asks that the rules change for them, there is little point in establishing rules at all.

Encina High School stands behind the principal's decision not to allow Lester to run for prom king. Just because there are students who think differently, and there always will be, does not mean the whole system should be changed for their satisfaction. There are simply too many people in this world to please everyone.

In a society where equality is deemed a top priority, the decision to stick to a traditional male-female prom court is not limiting any students' equality. Encina High School's decision was a logical and fair response to a student's request. Every student is offered the same opportunity to run for king or queen, based on their gender. No student is denied the opportunity to participate; however, there must be guidelines. Although Lester may disapprove, the guidelines for prom court include gender, placing her into the queen category. Students may not like how the system operates, but the argument that they are being discriminated against does not hold water.

According to MSNBC, Lester had over one hundred students sign a petition for her to run as prom king. If Lester was set on making the prom court, she could have easily run for queen. Every gender-related issue can be argued into the ground, but eventually someone must make the decision that enough is enough. There comes a point when society tries to make every issue so politically correct that something as simple as a high school prom becomes compared to a natural disaster. High school students should enjoy the fact that they have prom, not get caught up in meaningless details.

Lester's request to run for prom king is not the first of its kind. In our country's mass confusion of sexuality, males are trying for female roles and females are running for male spots. According to Advocate magazine, a similar instance occurred at Ferndale High School, where a female student ran and won the title of homecoming king. Though it seemed like an equality victory to some, the Advocate said that even the female king thought she was elected as a joke.

Encina High School made the best choice by not letting Lester run for prom king. Prom is one night of many in a student's life. If people are set on changing the world for the better, they should reconsider the issue they are fighting for.

Andi Baca is a senior journalism major.



RUBEN DELUNA • THE BATTALION

Environmentalists and junk science fuel Kyoto Protocol

As any attentive pupil of the public education system knows, humans are the scourge of the Earth. In between stories of butchered baby seals and rain forests seared by acid rain, students are indoctrinated to believe humans are causing global warming. These impressionable children are told the Earth is headed towards a meltdown. Oceans will rise and deserts will flourish, leaving mankind stranded somewhere between Water World and Dune. The public school system is merely a microcosm of the world today, in which hysteria has dominated logic. The greatest extension of this gloom and doom is the Kyoto Protocol.

The Kyoto Protocol is an international treaty drafted, with the help of Al Gore, by the United Nations in 1997. The Kyoto Protocol calls for successful nations of the world to restrict their carbon dioxide emissions to pre-1990s levels. The treaty has faced near-100 percent opposition in the U.S. Senate, and with good reason. Global warming is junk science.

For proof that global warming lacks credibility, one must only reflect on the track record of global warming's "experts." Gore gained recognition in the environmentalist community by writing a paper on how man was causing global cooling. Global cooling was the apocalypse predicted not long ago by today's global warming zealots. For years, Americans have been told Styrofoam and aerosol cans would gouge the ozone layer, leaving everything on the surface of the Earth baked to a crisp. There is a reason why this fear tactic is not used anymore: the ozone layer has grown, and life goes on.

Little opposition exists in the scientific community that Earth's climate has changed in the past and will change in the future. At the same time, there is little evidence that past ice ages or future warming trends can be linked to human activity. Theories that humans could impact the planet's weather rely on extrapolated forecasting and weak reasoning.

The Kyoto Protocol targets carbon dioxide, methane and other "greenhouse" gases as the main culprits behind a supposed warming trend. While human activity is undoubtedly a source of such materials, its contribution to the overall picture is dwarfed by that of Mother Nature. Carbon dioxide, while a byproduct of manufacturing, is also a byproduct of decomposition. Studies have shown that more carbon dioxide comes from decay in the Amazon Basin alone than from industrial emissions worldwide. Over a decade ago Mount Pinatubo erupted, spewing billions of tons of green house gases and other pollutants into the atmosphere. Mt. Pinatubo's contribution made



MATTHEW MADDOX

decades of human activity pale by comparison, but environmentalists still cry wolf.

The logical link to why the planet may warm lies in the sun itself. Rarely mentioned in the debate is the fact that the Earth's orbit and angle to the sun changes in cycles that vary over eons.

Defying common sense, U.N. members and a growing contention of American policy makers favor the Kyoto Protocol. If enacted, the impact on the U.S. economy would be devastating. American companies, burdened with skyrocketing energy and production costs, would flee to Mexico, China and other developing nations that are not restricted by Kyoto. Thousands upon thousands of American jobs would be lost, according to reports done by the respected Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Associates. Texas, the petroleum mecca of North America, would be one of the hardest hit. The Department of Energy has predicted that Kyoto might cause a four percent drop in the GDP at current levels. Since free-market incentives for efficiency are the strongest driving force behind less consumption of fuels, once restricted countries would no longer be able to afford to develop efficient technologies, and third world countries left unrestricted will continue to pollute.

If something appears questionable about the Kyoto Protocol, there is good reason. Those opposed to the treaty include liberal and conservative members of Congress, Clinton-Gore era white house officials, all sectors of American business, and the president. Its strongest supporters have been third world countries, environmental extremists, the Green Party and Socialists International. The Green Party's website states that Kyoto does not go far enough, and the next steps should be the eradication of the internal combustion engine, an end to nuclear power stations and no more suburbs. The reason the Kyoto should smell fishy is that it is simply a socialist ploy to redistribute the world's wealth from the United States and other developed nations to third world countries.

According to the Green Party's statement on the Kyoto Treaty, "... Kyoto represent(s) a vital juncture in world affairs where humanity has a real opportunity to avert ecological, human, and economic disaster." It could not be stated better. The Kyoto Protocol would be terrible for Texas, the United States, and the world. It must never be allowed to go into effect.

Matthew Maddox is a junior management major.

French book blaming U.S. for 9/11 an insult

Negligence on behalf of the U.S. government concerning the Sept. 11 attacks has been in the spotlight for weeks now, and many Americans are bothered by the lack of unity the finger-pointing suggests. What may bother them even more, however, is a book that has been on the best seller list in France since its release March 11.

The book is entitled The Horrifying Fraud and was written by notorious French radical Thierry Meyssan. This book does not merely suggest that the U.S. government failed to protect its people, but it argues that the government actually carried out the attacks using remote controlled airplanes. Meyssan refers to the universally accepted version of the tragedy as a "loony fable" comprised of a series of lies perpetrated by the White House and Defense Department.

The fact that Meyssan would write this novel is an insult. That the publisher would choose to release it just six months after the incident is despicable. What is frightening, however, is that the people of France are eating it up.

Meyssan's contention cites an actual desire for war with Iraq and Afghanistan as the reason why the government would risk such an act with such unpredictable domestic repercussions. Any American who remembers how it felt to watch the Twin Towers fall on television would dismiss the notion that such a book could be written in our homeland.

The lessons being learned now are that these convoluted conspiracy theories regarding the omniscient, evil U.S. government are far-fetched and sometimes ridiculous. American homeland security has been so entangled in bureaucratic red tape that the FBI could not even get permission to search the computer of Zacharias Moussaoui, a man they suspected of planning terrorist activity and who was later linked to the attacks.

During his trial, Moussaoui represented himself and proceeded to denounce American society, American people and the government. His disdain for this country runs so deep that he stood in the courtroom and



CHRISTY RUTH

ranted to the judge for an hour about how force, even terrorist acts, must be used to change the despicable American system. This same system he detests allows people like him to voice opinions and represent themselves freely in a court of law.

Moussaoui's admission of plotting to harm Americans proves, if only ex post facto, that the FBI was correct in pursuing him. It seems Meyssan overlooked all the Al-Qaida fighters who profess their hatred of America and their so called Islamic duty to destroy it when writing The Horrifying Fraud. Perhaps Meyssan even failed to look at himself as another anti-American radical, completely independent of the U.S. government's puppet strings.

The Horrifying Fraud has yet to be translated into English, but is projected to be in the near future. Not only will it be released in England and America once its translation is complete, but the publisher has sought its translation into 16 other languages for all the world to read. It is unclear what the publisher hopes to accomplish by releasing the book in America, but there will undoubtedly be severe backlash.

While Americans will most likely dismiss Meyssan's argument as an irresponsible attempt to profit off the Sept. 11 attack, a tragedy that killed thousands, the response of other countries is harder to predict. The reader patronization in France alone is alarming. Perhaps the French citizens read it for its outlandish entertainment value only. Regardless, Meyssan is getting rich for his utter disrespect towards all American people.

Like it or not, when the U.S. government is criticized on such an alarmingly large scale by a book written in another country, all of America suffers, even Americans who object to some of the government's practices. Such is the justification used by terrorists for killing innocent people. They make no distinction between the government and the people.

Christy Ruth is a senior journalism major.