

Providence College

DigitalCommons@Providence

Black and White

Student Publications

2-2005

Volume 1, Number 1 - February 2005

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/blackandwhite>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

"Volume 1, Number 1 - February 2005" (2005). *Black and White*. 4.
<https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/blackandwhite/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Publications at DigitalCommons@Providence. It has been accepted for inclusion in Black and White by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Providence. For more information, please contact dps@providence.edu.

BLACK & WHITE

February 2005

~ An Independent Publication ~

Volume 1, Issue 1

An Inaugural Edition

You, sir, are no
Jack Kennedy

BY: THE LEFT

Conservatives, in their defense of the war in Iraq, continually correlate the Bush Doctrine of preemption to a precedent supposedly established by the Kennedy administration during the height of the Cold War. It's standard policy to use the rhetoric of an adversary to garner support for one's own cause in the game of politics—a strategy this administration brilliantly employs as it links George W. Bush's Yee-haw foreign policy to Kennedy's fortuitous policy. Kennedy, in regards to modern political games, is the go-to Democrat for Republicans. They constantly conjure images of the Democrat's conscience in their campaigns to haphazardly lower American taxes—even if Kennedy would never fathom the benefit of lowering taxes on the have-mores during times of national struggle.

These days, pundits have again created comparisons between Kennedy and Bush—likening the latter's second inaugural call to arms in a continuously expanding conflict to Kennedy's inaugural call to the common good. Columnists and Bush supporters labeled his latest indictment of foreign sovereignty a defining oration on America's future in the world just as Kennedy's speech ushered in "a new generation" of ideas and idealism. Bush, though, failed to address the larger ideals of peace in the way Kennedy melodically called upon the nation and the world to "begin anew the quest for peace."

Forty-four years ago, John

Continued on Page 2



President George W. Bush at a campaign stop in Portsmouth, NH in late October.

OUR MISSION

We agree on nothing, Max.

Yes, sir.

Education, guns, drugs, school prayer, gays, defense spending, taxes—you name it, we disagree.

You know why?

Because I'm a life-lived, bleeding-heart, liberal, egghead communist.

Yes, sir. And I'm a gun-toting, redneck son-of-a-bitch.

Yes, you are.

We agree about that.

- The West Wing -

Debate marks the steps a society has made toward understanding its own democratic evolution. There is no question that our society is comprised of countless divisions—some pronouncedly polarizing, others subtle disagreements. To ignore these divisions forgets the debates, compromises, and discussions that founded this nation and brought it to realms of success unfathomable by even the most forward-looking figures of cultural history.

This evolution is documented by the words of Hamilton in the Federalist papers and the famous exchanges between Lincoln and Douglass. While honest debate has been abandoned by many, it is the intention of this publication to provide a modest forum of intellectual discourse between different outlooks on American culture.

Ideology will undoubtedly lead the way of our writing, but it will not blind our pragmatism. Breaking the arguments of national interest into a liberal/conservative, Red/Blue framework is too simplistic. We approach our audience in an effort to change minds and alter the language of debate within our own ideological circles. When we allow ourselves to be steered from reason with *ad hominem* adherence to our idealism, we fail to see the larger picture of our goals. It is the means upon which we are divided, for it is rare that our ideologies compete for different ends.

As the editors of this publication, we hope to live up to the preceding mission in a genuine effort to create true, honest debate on this campus. We welcome your response, for we can only thrive if we engage your involvement.

For George W.,
it's clear...

BY: THE RIGHT

Despite a gloomy forecast of gray blanketing the skies, visibility was crystal clear from at least one corner of Washington on Inauguration Day—the president's podium.

George W. Bush met the eyes of a watchful nation and proved yet again that he is a man endowed with great clarity of vision. On Thursday, January 20, the day of his second inauguration, President Bush revealed a vision of America's mission that was clear, coherent, and right on target.

Some have already begun to call it "The Freedom Speech," as the words "freedom," "free," and "liberty" were pronounced nearly 50 times. Many of the usual pundits have blasted its focus on freedom, calling it an excessive distraction from many of the country's more pressing issues which went unmentioned throughout the address. However, the attentive ones in the audience knew that Bush marked the occasion with nothing less than what it warranted—an oration on his presidency's defining moments and objectives.

Bush's initial efforts in office were violently disrupted and forever redefined as a result of an infamous "day of fire" (to use his own inaugural description of September 11, 2001). To expect that an address marking the start of his second term would not outline his vision for a sustained response to this event is entirely unfair and unwise. The president had no choice but to dwell on the importance of freedom

Continued on Page 3

...You, sir, are no Jack Kennedy

From Page One: F. Kennedy stood before the American public and called upon our parents and grandparents to serve the interests of our nation. "Ask not what your country can do for you..." We were entrenched within the only war truly comparable to the War on Terror, for it was a war that was fought with weapons but won through the pragmatic prudence sparked by Kennedy's first speech as the President of the United States. It was Kennedy's true belief in the ideals of democracy and liberty that allowed his speech to transcend the foreign conflicts of the Cold War and mobilize the domestic agenda that rewrote American history—an aspect of political leadership the Bush administration has failed for four years to incorporate into its plans.

There are links in language between the two speeches. Kennedy, early in his address said, "let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty." Before accepting this excerpt as a doctrine for preemptive invasions of foreign sovereign powers, reflect on the rest of Kennedy's message:

"...If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich..."

"...We offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new alliance for progress—to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty..."

"...To those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction..."

"...So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate..."

"...Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to 'undo the heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free...'"

And finally, "...Only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world..."

These are the words that wrote the first draft of a vision for progress—progress against the forces of temptation into war—that spared the U.S. from engaging in catastrophe. It is this progress that is unfathomable to the current administration as they avoid the hopeful and inspiring language of peace in pursuit of selfish, invading conflict which smears the historic definition of Ameri-

can liberty both within our borders and throughout the world.

Our endeavors in Iraq, which saw its greatest success last week-end through open elections, will continue under the current administration. The president laid no hope for a peaceful solution, even though we have won all that we can truly win—we plowed the soil of Mesopotamia for a future of democracy. What, then, is the virtue of continued struggles for American soldiers? What, then, is the virtue of extending the tours of our stretched military?

The president answered that question by laying out a preview for expanded invasion: "The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world." He reads a good sound byte, but fails to light the "fire that can truly light the world" in the fashion that Kennedy was able to. Bush, though, made allusions to this eternal struggle for worldly liberty (continued war) throughout the speech. Here's what he had to say:

"...So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world..." Well, unless you're China or Saudi Arabia with full service McDonald's open for American investors to eat lunch on business trips.

More nerve-racking to the 50 million Americans who didn't vote for him and the majority of Americans weary of his Yee-haw diplomacy, Bush said this: "Democratic reformers facing repression, prison, or exile can know: America sees you for who you are: the future leaders of your free country." Where was this commitment to the democratic

reformers of Liberia two summers ago? Does the rest of the democratic world not see them for who they are also?

He did talk to the other democracies of the world, begging for their friendship: "And all the allies of the United States can know: we honor your friendship, we rely on your counsel, and we depend on your help. Division among free nations is a primary goal of freedom's enemies. The concerted effort of free nations to promote democracy is a prelude to our enemies' defeat." Some call it pandering, I call it grand, near-sighted rhetoric.

President Bush gave a great inaugural address in terms of delivery and language. It is undoubtedly historic based only upon the principle that his second term will be the focus of our children's textbooks for what will or will not be resolved in the next four years. History will judge this president as no modern president has been judged before him. But, let's end the rhetoric of comparison to Kennedy. The Democrat's rhetoric laid the groundwork for Reagan's (a Republican) success in the Cold War—a success only possible through courageous restraint. Bush's rhetoric has laid the groundwork for years of foreign turmoil and dangerous global resentment.

Here's hoping I'm wrong about the message of Bush's speech.

IT WAS KENNEDY'S TRUE BELIEF IN THE
IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY THAT
ALLOWED HIS SPEECH TO TRANSCEND THE
FOREIGN CONFLICTS OF THE COLD WAR AND
MOBILIZE THE DOMESTIC AGENDA THAT
REWROTE AMERICAN HISTORY - AN ASPECT
OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP THE BUSH
ADMINISTRATION HAS FAILED FOR FOUR
YEARS TO INCORPORATE INTO ITS PLANS.

...Global freedom guarantees U.S. security

From Page One: in his speech. Merely 10 months into his first term, Americans' freedom came under attack like never before. At the onset of his second term, Bush knows that to preserve his people's liberty, he must complete an equation which features the spread of freedom on a global scale.

This equation is neither novel nor complex, and Bush explained it as succinctly as many of his predecessors have. He called advancing the ideals of universal freedom, dignity, and rights "the urgent requirement of our nation's security, and the calling of our time." The equation follows thus: global spread of freedom = security for the homeland.

The truth of this equation was not lost on Franklin Roosevelt, who recognized the depravation of freedom by fascist regimes as a threat to the American way of life. It was not ignored by presidents from John F. Kennedy to Ronald Reagan, who sought to contain communism and ensure that the seizure of Americans' liberties would never accelerate the expansion of an evil empire. President Bush also learned this equation when he witnessed firsthand the danger our country faces when freedom is at risk halfway across the world.

Bush may not have branched a neon sign inscribed with this equation, but the message of his inaugural address was unmistakable—America is not secure if the world's peoples are deprived of their freedom. Indeed, he recognized as much in his declaration that "the survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in all the world." That is, Americans and their way of life are threatened when much of the world lives under the suffocating veil of oppression.

The president's speech met with roaring applause from the hundreds of thousands of spectators attending the inauguration and rightfully so. Bush deserves credit for pursuing the best course of American action for defending the homeland in the twenty-first century—helping provide freedom to those who go without.

The address outlined his vision for a safe, secure, and free America with great clarity and ingenuity. As the president astutely acknowledged, the United States will only exist in true safety, security and liberty when a few conditions are met.

When the people of the world can freely and fully profit from the fruits of their own labor; when every individual can fully exercise his right to worship freely; when the government of each nation is fully accountable to its people and defends the free exercise of their rights; when free states recognize their stake in each other's stability, prosperity, security and liberty; and like the old adage, do not make war on each other—then and only then will Americans be completely safe, secure and free. Bush clearly understands this.

While the president explained how his vision for the country is fueled by the pursuit of these ideals, he tempered his address by recognizing the time it will take to fulfill them: "The great objective of ending tyranny is the concentrated work of generations." Furthermore, he wisely acknowledged that the spread of liberty in the U.S. has not always proceeded without interruption

or flaw: "America has need of idealism and courage, because we have essential work at home—the unfinished work of American freedom."

Though the American experiment with freedom has not always been perfect, the need "to show the meaning and promise of liberty" endures and Bush has pledged to fulfill it. It may not occur in our lifetime (or ever) but he knows that if he doesn't make an attempt, our nation's security will suffer the consequences.

More significant, perhaps, was Bush's call for assistance from the global community. Take note, all who love to label the administration as "going at it alone." The president, as always, recognized that such important objectives cannot be achieved without the contribution of our neighbors and allies. He didn't identify the spread of freedom as a wholly American responsibility or mission. Rather, he noted its universal scope: "And all the allies of the United States can know: we honor your friendship, we rely on your counsel, and we depend on your help... The concerted

effort of free nations to promote democracy is a prelude to our enemies' defeat." To his credit, Bush not only understands freedom's expansion as a prerequisite for America's security, but for the security of every nation.

Critics of the speech have also said that it failed to mention specific domestic policy initiatives, despite its overt references to raising education standards, increasing home ownership, strengthening the nuclear family,

reforming Social Security, and protecting the unborn—"We must always remember that even the unwanted have worth." It seems they were not satisfied by a year-long duel between the president and Senator John F. Kerry in which both men had plenty to say about every issue under the sun. Nor does it seem like they remember that Bush will deliver the State of the Union address this week, at which time he will outline his domestic policy agenda—just as he has on four previous occasions.

They've also frothed at the mouth over the absence of the word "Iraq" from the speech, as if Bush's references to "outlaw regimes" and the "duty and allegiance in the determined faces of our soldiers" don't speak for themselves. These criticisms demonstrate more than just a feeble incapacity to read between the lines: they are symptoms of a blind, visceral, and ignorant disdain for the president—one which the nay-sayers haven't been able to overcome since his victory in 2000.

What makes them even less worthy of serious consideration are the initial results from Sunday's elections in Iraq. These results point towards a step forward for freedom and democracy in that country, and vindicate a key line from Bush's address: "Our goal instead is to help others find their own voice, attain their own freedom, and make their own way."

The proof is right before us that the spread of freedom—the hallmark of the president's speech and vision—is indeed helping others make their own way. Lucky for us Bush is committed to the cause, because until this way is made available to everyone and each human being becomes "an agent of his or her own destiny," our nation's security—and that of every nation—will be compromised indefinitely.

THE TRUTH OF THIS LIBERATING
EQUATION WAS NOT LOST ON . . . JOHN F.
KENNEDY OR RONALD REAGAN, WHO
SOUGHT TO CONTAIN COMMUNISM AND
ENSURE THAT THE SEIZURE OF AMERICANS'
LIBERTIES WOULD NEVER ACCELERATE THE
EXPANSION OF AN EVIL EMPIRE.

SHORT TAKES: THE IRAQI ELECTION

From the Left:

An honorable peace was the prize of the Vietnam War. President Richard Nixon spent the first four years of his doomed presidency searching for this illusive victory. While he spent political capital stitching the seams for such a peace, thousands of lucky Americans returned from South Asia without limbs—lucky because thousands more didn't make it back. These were the times that brought a young Boston soldier into the national spotlight when he asked the simple question, "How do you ask a man to be the last to die for a mistake?"

There are many correlations between the Iraq conflict and the devastation of Vietnam. Open up the *New York Times* from last weekend and there's a pointed column describing the historical parallels: initial domestic support thins with casualties, soldiers don't know the cause for which they are sacrificing or the enemy which they are fighting. This war, however, has something Vietnam never had. This conflict actually has a real opportunity to get out of Iraq honorably while standing on the world's stage. We never should have been there, but now is our opportunity to get the hell out and save face domestically and abroad.

How, you ask, do you pull out 100,000 American troops while violence continues to plague the Iraqi countryside? Easy, give the Iraqi police officers guns, keep a collection of American training officers in the desert to equip and prepare the Iraqi forces for inevitable civil war (a war, mind you, that is going to happen whether we're around or not) and get the rest of our over-extended troops back under their own roofs with their own families.

Now is the only time we can claim such an honorable victory. Iraq held successful elections last weekend—the biggest victory of the Iraq War and of President Bush's tenure in Washington. I didn't vote for the guy, but I'll let him celebrate this feat.

The world is ecstatic at the birth of real Iraqi democracy. Kofi Annan, Bush's diplomatic foe from the United Nations, declared elections a great victory for the international community. Let's get out of there and let the spinners do their job.

The argument over Bush's legacy would end if we can get our right now, so long as newly appointed Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice can put together a contingency plan in the tradition of Truman's Monroe Doctrine.

Who am I kidding, though? Reasonable people have no voice in this White House. If they did, do you really think the foreign policy advisers who advised one Bush not to invade Baghdad would position another to willingly create a firestorm twelve years later?

For the next four years, our leaders will be searching for an honorable victory as this conflict continues to degenerate into our generation's Vietnam. If only they could see the light of last weekend's honorable opportunity.

From the Right:

Memorable symbols usually go hand-in-hand with memorable elections. In the U.S. general election of 2000, a little-known guy named "chad" quickly became a household name and for many, a national scapegoat. A few weeks ago in Ukraine, the orange scarf and banner became icons of the people's solidarity and sovereignty. And this past weekend in Iraq, the stained index finger quickly took its place among the recent images of democracy in action.

Early reports from the Independent Electoral Commission in Iraq state that approximately 60 percent of the country's electorate had earned their own stains by the time polls closed on Sunday. Joining them were 93 percent of the 280,000 Iraqi expatriates who registered to vote in 14 different nations around the globe. All and all, over eight million Iraqi citizens turned a preventive measure for voter fraud into what is likely to become an enduring symbol of the country's experiment with democracy.

The volume of ink dispensed has both fulfilled the predictions of some and left others scratching their heads in confusion. "How did this happen?" asked the latter. "How could it have not?" replies the former.

Read the first few paragraphs in the coverage from most national newspapers and you're bound to come across something like "turnout appeared to exceed expectations." What with the daily focus on apocalyptic threats from insurgents and scattered car-bombings in corners of the country, it's no wonder that the numbers have shocked the usual suspects and pessimists. Yes, security conditions are less than optimal in parts of Iraq, but the cause is by no means a lost one. Progress is a reality and for many, Sunday's results were merely the next logical step in its path.

Take the Friends of Democracy. As a network of ordinary Iraqi citizens and correspondents, it has endeavored to inform the public about the day-to-day challenges of life in Iraq. Knowing that a pre-election national poll recorded the intentions of more than 70 percent of the population to vote, Sunday's turnout came as no surprise. It might've been slightly lower than expected, but that will be confirmed in the days to come. One thing is for certain, though—the vast majority of their respondents had no second thoughts about casting a ballot.

Of course, we must not be hasty and claim that this automatically marks the end of Iraq's troubles. The election itself was by no means perfect, with many in the Sunni minority objecting to its legitimacy and threats of execution undoubtedly deterring many others from participating. Nevertheless, one fact remains incontrovertible—the majority of Iraqis have taken a valuable first step towards self-government.

And although it's tempting to underscore the valuable role played by coalition forces in this drama, I'll happily decline. Today the brave voters of Iraq deserve more praise, applause, credit and respect than we could ever provide. The proof is in the ink.

WWW.
PCBLACKANDWHITE
.BLOGSPOT.COM

WANT TO RESPOND?
PCBLACKANDWHITE
@HOTMAIL.COM

Black & White is an independent political journal written, edited, and published by students at Providence College. The views in this publication are in no way the universal views of the College, its students, or its alumni... but we hope we can ruffle your feathers just a little bit.

TO CONTRIBUTE TO
BLACK & WHITE
CONTACT US AT:
FRIAR BOX 181914
PROVIDENCE, RI 02918