FRIENDS,

WE WILL NOT ALL AGREE ON THESE MATTERS. IN FACT WE GAIN MORE BY OUR DISAGREEMENT THAN AGREEMENT. IN DISAGREEMENT WE MIGHT FIND THAT ONE, OR EVEN BOTH, OF US HAVE BEEN WRONG.

WE HOPE YOU WILL CONSIDER THESE IDEAS. LOOK FOR IDEAS OF YOUR OWN. SHARE THEM, DON'T KEEP THEM TO YOURSELF.

AND THANK YOU FOR MAKING CNU A BETTER PLACE.

The SSH

Tolerance & Free Speech

Spectrum's recent good work didn't go unnoticed. We believe they have done a great service for the community in taking a stand against bigotry, defending the speech rights of even those they disagree with, and doing so in a non-violent manner.

However, during "The Preacher" visit some in Spectrum sought to silence those who disagreed with his bigotry, but didn't want to follow Spectrum's path. We can't respect one person's freedom at the expense of others.

No one is required to let bigotry go unanswered. You sought to create a buffer t prevent angry outbursts, but instead it seems some members were hushing people who disagreed with your stance of refusing to engage them directly.

Thank you for working towards equality and acceptance. But as we all know doing so will require engaging in conversations, not silence.

The Falling Apple

Society of the Severed Hand

Volume 6
Issue 1
November 2015

To Defend Another

The world is a violent place.

A self-proclaimed Islamic State is establishing itself. It has attracted people not only from within areas it operates in but from outside as well.

Make no mistake, violence in the name of religion is not a new phenomena. Whether or not they truly believe or are just using religion is not the question. But within the areas they control people risk punishment for having a different opinion/religion.

Do we have a duty to act to protect those people who risk punishment simply because their ideas offend those with power?

Then what to do about Europe, where some opinions can, ***and have***, resulted in imprisonment? Or the U.S., where some would punish microaggressions?

Perhaps if they stopped short of executions it would be acceptable to then punish speech?

We Don't Need Sexual Assault Platitudes

Sexual assault is a crime. It isn't an unwitting mistake. Saying we can all commit sexual assault is a bit like saying we can all commit burglary,vandalism, or murder. Technically true, but not very useful. So why is consent thought to be messy.

"Consent is a voluntary act given by clear and unambiguous words or actions, as long as those words or actions create mutually understandable permission regarding willingness to engage in a specific sexual activity. "

Consider a heteronormative couple: without speaking they kiss, fondle, engage in oral sex, and then one penetrates or envelopes the other.

Was consent present? Remember, consent to one act doesn't equal consent to another. Someone is going to "make the first move", but absent words how can you truly know consent is present?

YOU CAN'T.

Talk to your partner, if you can't they don't belong in your bed.

Justice

The wronged aren't made whole by hurting the innocent. This seems so simple a concept, but has been lost on so many.

CNU has a problem, we have enacted a system which will hurt innocent people. The lower the burden and the more it will be done.

The CNU policies for determining responsibility for acts is minimal without crossing into overtyl unjust., we will punish innocent people that is a fact. And unless we have a policy of accepting students who have left other schools after similar findings then we must confess this also expels some number of innocent people from higher education opportunities.

By their own admission the Dear Colleague letter of April 2011 is not enforceable. It is also demonstrably unjust. But even if they could enforce it we ought not.

An unjust law is no law at all.

note: I'm a survivor, I ache for others who also are and will be. But we are not made whole by punishing the innocent. No victim should be served at the expense of the innocent.