

Providence College

DigitalCommons@Providence

Black and White

Student Publications

4-21-2005

Volume 1, Number 5 - April 21, 2005

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



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

"Volume 1, Number 5 - April 21, 2005" (2005). *Black and White*. 1.
<https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/blackandwhite/1>

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

April 21, 2005

~ An Independent Publication ~

Volume 1, Issue 5

Using Alaska's Coast in the Oil Crisis

The Wrong Discussion

MICHAEL RALA
THE LEFT EDITOR

What is wrong with exploring the Alaskan coastlines for oil reserves? Our country is facing an oil crisis that has driven the cost of gas up to two dollars and fifteen cents throughout New England. Families are facing double digit increases in their gas and heating bills. Roundtrip tickets on major airlines continue to climb. Why shouldn't we open our own reserves for exploration?

Because searching for oil isn't as simple as looking for your keys. Exploration is a nice word. It conjures images of the rugged curiosity that opened the frontier to American pioneers. Exploring for oil involves permanent ecological damage. To find these reserves, we will have to drill hundreds of feet into the majestic lands of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska.

The ANWR bill sets a dangerous precedent that could slide down the slope that may one day weaken the conservation legacy of one of the GOP's greatest icons, President Theodore Roosevelt. His uncommon devotion to the gems of America's landscape sparked the glorious lore of our natural wonders. The Grand Canyon and Yellowstone National Park have become international icons of the American experience. ANWR shares a natural beauty and inspiring backdrop with these National Parks. Poking holes in the awed Alaskan scenery would be comparable to putting a cigarette out in the eyes of Stuart's great portraits.

Why destroy the picturesque region when 95 percent of the Alaskan coastline is already open to oil exploration?

Make the argument that the ANWR region will provide a resolute answer to America's oil dependency all that you'd like. Just keep in mind that geological and energy experts almost universally acknowledge that these oil fields—if they exist—will provide the country with

Continued on Page Two

Security and Diversity

PAT BROWN
THE RIGHT EDITOR

Anyone who's had the burden of recently filling up his car with gas knows that America's current energy situation is far from perfect. With prices at the pumps nearing record highs, it seems that any measure which could be taken to reduce refu-

eling costs would be a welcome one.

Combine these prices with the persistent volatility of oil-exporting markets like Venezuela, Russia, and the Middle East, and the situation appears bleaker. Americans are not only being forced to purchase oil at expensive rates, they must also do so from countries with whom they don't enjoy the coziness of diplomatic and security relations.

Enter the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR, pronounced "an-wharr") onto the scene. ANWR, a 19.6 million-acre chunk of territory in northeastern Alaska roughly the size of South Carolina, has long been heralded as a great potential reservoir of oil by industry and other pro-development forces. Located mere miles to the east of the largest U.S. oil field ever discovered and still in operation - Prudhoe Bay - ANWR may indeed help facilitate a simultaneous reduction in gas prices as well as dependence upon foreign sources of oil.

Of course, there's a catch. At least, that's what certain environmentalists would have you believe. They're concerned that any oil exploration or production within the refuge would disrupt and destroy the many wildlife habitats which ANWR houses. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the refuge's "rich pageant of wildlife" includes 36 species of fish, 45 species of land and marine mammals, and more than 160 species of birds. Indeed, even the most cursory of glances at photos of the refuge is sufficient to vindicate its titles of "America's natural treasure chest" and the "Serengeti of Alaska."

Continued on Page Three

~COMMON GROUND~ FAREWELL PC

MICHAEL RALA & PAT BROWN
CO-FOUNDING EDITORS, BLACK & WHITE

We started this publication three months ago with the hopes of raising the bar on campus. We promised ourselves, as well as our readers, that we take the highroad in our debate and open a forum of dialogue about the important topics of the day. We've done our part and we can only hope that our work brought about a discourse in your dorms, your classes, and your lunch tables.

Our time at Providence College is coming to a final end. Like our classmates, we are leaving Providence College changed people—hopefully for the better. Each of us in the Class of 2005 is taking a new road toward our future. Graduate schools, law schools, and even medical schools are just exits on some of our trips. Others are jumping right into the work force to begin careers. Each year, a new class leaves PC and a younger group takes its place. But the institution remains, building on each contribution from those who have left it behind in the past.

Black & White will continue to print under new leadership. While we are transitioning to a new class of writers, our mission will remain intact: we will continue to provide intellectual debate; we will keep our blog open to every idea and opinion; we will push the College to be more open to the virtues of student leadership.

An independent voice at Providence College has emerged during our three month campaign. We have been accepted by the student body and the faculty. With the hopes of future transparency and openness in a new administration, it is the hope of the graduating editors that *Black & White* will be a true alternative source of news, opinions, and information that will rival the readership of other campus publications.

While we have expressed concerns with the College in the past, we have done so because we hope to see a place we love live to its absolute potential. We are both walking down the aisle of the Dunk with the pride in knowing we will soon be graduates of Providence College.

From Page One: The Wrong Debate

the oil to last for less than 180 days and provide a minimal 0.7 percent of the global community's oil between now and 2020. Is six months a great enough benefit to justify the destruction of a natural treasure? Is one year?

Does six months of limited oil dependence validate the massive ecological disasters that would ensue? Does it substantiate the inherent risks of spills that would cost American's billions of dollars in clean up costs? What about the 129,000 wild caribou that are unique to the refuge?

The arguments against ANWR outweigh those in support of drilling—especially on the logistical level. Drilling will not make us sufficiently independent from Venezuelan oil—the country that provides us with the vast majority of our oil since the OPEC crisis from 30 years ago. We'll have a six month party and face an even greater political and energy crisis when we transition back to total dependence on our international partners. ANWR is not the right answer. It's not even the right debate.

We love our SUV's, don't we? We have absolutely no problem showing fifty dollars across the counter at PC Mart to drive our obnoxiously unnecessary trucks to ballgames and internships. The bill Congress passed last month to open ANWR is a disaster, but that isn't the dialogue we should be facilitating. It is past time that Congress steps up to the auto industry to pass strict regulations on emissions and gas mileage and commission an honest discussion among environmental engineers about the virtue of alternative and renewable energy.

As early as 2001, the National Academy of Sciences declared that fuel-efficient SUV's (SUV's that will get up to 47 percent more miles per gallon compared to today's standard tanks) were only a few years down the assembly line. The biggest roadblocks to introducing these new machines have not been hardships in technology—Ford introduced a version of the Explorer in 2003 that gets more than 28 miles per gallon. Manufacturers have no incentive to build such automobiles. We'll buy a Suburban that gets 12 miles a gallon without a second thought and the government has not reintroduced reasonable federal regulations on the automotive industry since seat belts were universalized.

As a society, we are incredibly short-term focused—no example better displays the drive for instant gratification over sound long-term planning than the ANWR bill. As a consumer though, it is in our interest to push Detroit in the direction of environmental leadership. Look at these numbers:

An environmental SUV would cost roughly \$800-\$1,000 more than the standard gas chugging shell. That ain't chump change, I'll admit. But, when you factor in the cost of filling 25 gallon tanks every three days at \$2.15, the average driver would save more than \$1,400 annually. So, in simple terms, a one-time \$800 investment can save you \$1,400 per year. Considering most SUV's last seven to 10 years, each of you driving your "Pimped" Explorers and Cherokees will save \$10,000 to \$15,000 over the next decade. That's a season ticket package at Fenway Park, a new SUV, a fantastic weekend in Vegas, or a minimal dent in college loans.

This is just one solution to the gluttonous and materialistic aura of our success. (I'd even argue it's the best one out there—it allows us to continue to appear gluttonous and materialistic while acting responsibly.)

We can do better, though.

The federal government should be opening its research facilities and its checkbooks to those willing to search for a viable source of renewable energy.

The U.S. auto industry continues to slip beneath the efficiency of foreign hybrids. With the cooperative efforts of Detroit's engineers and Washington's Rolodex of industry scientists, renewable energy reserves will inevitably revive the American auto industry and bring substantive jobs back to the American heartland.

ANWR is a sexy topic. The opponents of drilling can send pictures to Sierra Club sympathizers with a caption reading, "Save this Landscape—Oppose Drilling." The bill's supporters can easily claim American oil independence. It is one of the few topics that can split the population into clear sides—for and against. But it isn't the issue. Do I want to see holes dug throughout the pristine acreage on the Alaskan coast? Absolutely not. I don't

think six months of gas justifies the destruction of the last remaining American frontier. But I'm tired of being a member of the "gang that can't shoot straight."

The Democrats should seize this opportunity to reshape the discussion. Instead of whining to the *New York Times* environmental lobby, it is long overdue for the People's Party to mobilize it's blue collar base in Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the rest of the blue collar belt in the industrial Midwest and offer Ford, Chevy, and Dodge an incentive to reshape their industry.

I'll keep driving my 34 mile per gallon Dodge Stratus in the meantime.

DOES SIX MONTHS OF LIMITED OIL
DEPENDENCE VALIDATE THE MASSIVE
ECOLOGICAL DISASTERS THAT WOULD
ENSUE? DOES IT SUBSTANTIATE THE
INHERENT RISKS OF SPILLS THAT
WOULD COST AMERICAN'S BILLIONS
OF DOLLARS IN CLEAN UP COSTS?
WHAT ABOUT THE 129,000 WILD
CARIBOU THAT ARE UNIQUE TO THE
REFUGE?

From Page One: U.S. Secure with ANWR

the Arctic.”

And therein lies the crisis—do we leave ANWR alone out of appreciation for its aesthetic terrain and wildlife? Or, do we risk doing damage to it by drilling for oil? Though this debate has gone unresolved since before Alaska's entry into the Union in 1959, we can no longer afford to let this opportunity remain in limbo. The advantages to opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil exploration far outweigh the disadvantages. For the sake of American livelihoods and our energy supply, development should commence as soon as possible.

There are a few important arguments to consider when it comes to determining what ANWR's future should hold. First, one must keep in mind just how much territory within the refuge would actually be affected by oil exploration and production. If oil exploration ever occurs, it can only take place within a 1.5 million acre stretch of land along ANWR's northern coast. This territory, known as the Coastal Plain area, represents less than 8 percent of the refuge's entire acreage. Thus, the vast majority of ANWR's land is not even being considered as a site for development.

More importantly, though, industry experts have concluded that only 2,000 acres within the Coastal Plain area itself would be needed for drilling to take place. This relatively minuscule amount of land is equivalent to 0.01 percent of ANWR's territory. These 2,000 acres are also located on a flat, treeless stretch of tundra, 70 miles away from the refuge's scenic mountains and terrain. What's more, technology employed by the oil industry would allow drilling to occur only during the eight-month long winter, when ice covers the Coastal Plain and no wildlife is present. This means that all roads, airstrips and platforms would melt come summer time, leaving mere dents in the landscape.

Granted, the oil industry is not immune to mistakes, and the realities of unforeseen spills and accidents would undoubtedly manifest themselves during ANWR's development. Similarly, to think that fumes and exhaust from production will not reach other sectors of the refuge is grossly naïve. Nevertheless, the precision capabilities of drilling technology and the tiny portion of land that developers themselves would be dealing with cast a strong shadow of doubt over environmentalists' doomsday forecasts of total disruption and destruction. In fact, industrial activity at the nearby Prudhoe Bay oil fields has proven the compatibility of development and wildlife. During the fields' first year of operation in 1978, the local caribou herd totaled 6,000. Today, after more than a quarter-century of activity, the herd exceeds 27,000 members.

A second important argument to keep in mind is the economic benefits and growth which ANWR development is sure to bring. Perhaps the most difficult point of contention for the mostly Democratic opposition to refute is the abundance of jobs which oil exploration and production in the refuge will generate. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, one of the country's most powerful labor unions and long-standing ally to the party of JFK and FDR, has continued to lend its support to ANWR development knowing that it will create between 250,000 and 735,000 new jobs.

While Alaska, which already depends on oil for more than

80% of its revenue, stands to gain from increased profits, state and federal treasuries will also be beneficiaries from ANWR exploration and production. Current estimates from the White House Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Interior project \$4.2 billion in revenue for state and federal coffers during the first five years of oil operations. Because the refuge is technically considered federal land, the whole country is set to profit from its development.

Finally, and most importantly of all, oil extracted from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge can serve as one of many vital steps which must be taken to release us from our dependence on foreign sources of energy. An assessment conducted by the United States Geological Survey in 2001 found that upwards of 10.5 billion barrels of oil will likely be recovered from underneath ANWR's Coastal Plain. Last year, the Department of Energy announced that if ANWR development began in 2013, production could peak in excess of 1 million barrels of oil per day by 2025.

Such quantities would significantly reduce the need for oil imports from volatile markets like Russia, Venezuela, and Saudi Arabia, and thereby bolster our national security. While some of us may be uncomfortable making a correlation between our energy supplies and our security, it is a reality nonetheless—one that has been painfully apparent over the last three decades.

At the onset of the 1980s, President Jimmy Carter told Congress that “an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America.” (Vital interests being oil imports, among others). Similarly, during his second term in the Oval Office, President Clinton went so far as to equate the oil-reserve potential of the Caspian Sea basin with American national security.

The security of the U.S. homeland is essentially a matter of protecting American livelihoods and the means which render these livelihoods possible. When we rely upon corrupt countries and regimes to provide these means, we are making ourselves vulnerable to a persistent and powerful threat to our very way of life. Oil development within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one way of ensuring that the pillars propping up our way of life are subject to our own control and therefore pose no threat to our security.

Admittedly, ANWR development is not the *only* way of ensuring this. Alternative sources of energy from hydrogen to corn-based ethanol must continue to be integrated efficiently and economically into our day-to-day lives, and I long for the day when cars will operate on environmentally-friendly fuel sources.

Until that day comes, though, and the energy infrastructure no longer depends on crude oil for its operations, we must strive to increase our own production, reduce our dependence on volatile foreign markets, and consequently, strengthen our own security. The ANWR's Coastal Plain presents us this opportunity, and the chance to generate significant economic growth while doing minimal damage to the environment. It alone will not solve our energy problems, but it is an excellent springboard from which to continue trying.

THE SECURITY OF THE U.S. HOMELAND IS ESSENTIALLY A MATTER OF PROTECTING AMERICAN LIVELIHOODS AND THE MEANS WHICH RENDER THESE LIVELIHOODS POSSIBLE. WHEN WE RELY UPON CORRUPT COUNTRIES AND REGIMES TO PROVIDE THESE MEANS, WE ARE MAKING OURSELVES VULNERABLE TO A PERSISTENT AND POWERFUL THREAT TO OUR VERY WAY OF LIFE.

A Democratic Thanks to the GOP

DAN KACHUR

THE LEFT

Those who know me might be surprised to hear me say this, but I love Tom DeLay. Why would I not want the downfall of a leading Republican whose political style is probably more caustic than any other Republican? Because DeLay's years of hubris and greed have finally culminated into a litany of ethical abuses so blatant that they threaten the health of the entire Republican Party. Every day that Tom DeLay remains the House Majority Leader is a gift to the Democratic Party.

DeLay gained national attention as the architect of a redistricting effort aimed at sending more Republicans to Congress. Not only was this effort in blatant violation of the Texas Constitution, it was also surrounded by major ethical lapses. The redistricting effort was possible because the Texas GOP was able to gain control of the state legislature, thanks in part to an effort by a group called Texans for a Republican Majority Political Action Committee (TRMPAC), co-created by none other than Tom DeLay. In 2002, TRMPAC sent \$190,000 to the Republican National State Elections Committee. Exactly two weeks later, the same committee sent \$190,000 to legislative candidates supported by TRMPAC. The problem comes from a Texas law that expressly prohibits corpo-

rate donations to state races. Since the original money included corporate donations, it appears that TRMPAC colluded with the GOP in a not-so-subtle violation of Texas law. DeLay claims he has no knowledge of the transactions, but with a GOP committee involved, one has to wonder how the Congressman was ignorant.

When the illegal redistricting effort finally got underway, the only option that Texas Democrats had to uphold the law was to actually leave the state. Naturally, DeLay decided to respond by abusing his power as a Congressman. DeLay used contacts in the FCC to track down the absent legislators, an act so far outside the pale that DeLay was admonished by the House Ethics Committee. The committee also frowned on DeLay's solicitations of donations from Westar Energy just before a vote that was important to the company, and for offering a bribe to former Rep. Nick Smith (R-CA) to win support for the Medicare reform bill.

Just as DeLay was beginning to feel heat from the press following these and many other ethics violations, he saw a glimmer of hope in the form of a dying woman in Florida. Even though he had previously been in favor of removing a feeding tube from his own father, DeLay joined the fight to keep Terri Schiavo alive. Unfortunately for DeLay, this time even his hypocrisy

couldn't save him, and his bizarre diatribe against the courts following Terri's passing made things even worse. DeLay's attempt to use a brain-dead woman and her family's tragedy for his own political gain backfired and, as the polls suggested that the public was turning against him, so did his fellow Republicans. Senator Lincoln Chafee (R-R.I.) said, "We've got to uphold the highest standards of legality and ethics... You can't have your leader under a cloud." Even extremist Rick Santorum (R-PA) called for DeLay to better explain his actions to the public.

But these Senators are only speaking out against DeLay because they have difficult re-election races in 2006. The real GOP opinion about DeLay comes from House Majority Whip Roy Blunt (R-MO), who stated Sunday that "Tom DeLay will stay as leader." DeLay never could have attained power if his ethical violations were not tolerated in his own party, and he would not remain as leader of House Republicans if his colleagues did not condone his actions. DeLay serves as evidence that the GOP is corrupt to the core, and it is my hope that rank and file Republicans across the nation and especially in his home district will condemn his unethical ways. And as for DeLay remaining as leader, all I can say to Rep. Blunt is, "Thanks."

Holding the UN Accountable

KYLE DRENNEN

THE RIGHT

In recent years, there has been a growing tension between the United States and the United Nations. Though the U.S. was one of the nations instrumental in founding the U.N., it has now become clear to many Americans that the international body is increasingly ineffective and desperately in need of reform. It is through this hope for reform that President Bush nominated Undersecretary of State, John Bolton as the American Ambassador to the U.N.

Bolton has been a long time critic of the U.N., along with many other Americans. He has seriously questioned the ability of the organization to meet important world issues with action, rather than mere discussion. He is quoted as having said that "if you remove ten floors from the U.N. headquarters, it would not make a difference" - a comment which has drawn criticism from many in Washington, especially Democratic opposition to his nomination. These critics have grilled him in congressional hearings and demanded that he apologize for his critical remarks. First, I wonder if we should demand apologies from leading Democrats like Sen. Ted Kennedy who repeatedly called President Bush a liar or from former Vice President Al Gore, who labeled the President a traitor during the 2004 campaign. Second, I believe John Bolton's past comments about the U.N., though harsh at times, are completely accurate. Can anyone honestly argue that the United Nations is not in need of complete reform from the top down? Bolton's criticism was not an effort to destroy the

U.N., but rather challenge it to do a better job. I am confident that this is the same reasoning that Democrats would use to explain their own harsh comments.

John Bolton is exactly who we need at the U.N., a person who is not afraid to ask the tough questions and hold the organization accountable for its mistakes. In addition, I think that if more people within the U.N. had the same outspokenness, the organization may have been able to avoid some of its recent scandals as well as strengthen its influence throughout the world. As much as those on the left like to claim that U.S. has lost respect throughout the world due to President Bush's foreign policy, they are unwilling to hold the reputation United Nations to any kind of standard.

As far as Bolton's nomination goes, there is another obstacle to him being approved by Congress, which stems from allegations that he pressured intelligence officials when he did not agree with their analysis. Apparently, while working in the State Department, Bolton came to believe that Cuba might have been in possession of weapons of mass destruction and tried to get intelligence agents who disagreed fired. However, these allegations seem to be mainly conjecture rather than backed by solid evidence. If such allegations were proven true, then Bolton's appointment would be seriously jeopardized, which would be justified given the intelligence failures leading up to the war in Iraq. If these allegations remain unfounded, I believe that Bolton will be appointed the next U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. and will be the right man for the job.

www.PCBlackAndWhite.blogspot.com

What moral guidance are you writing off?

Posted by Marine Mom

Exactly whose moral guidance would you kiss off? The Pope's? Christ's? The 11th Circuit Court's? The most frightening component of your essay is the first sentence—even if modern science were an unalloyed blessing (which it isn't—ask the citizens of Hiroshima, or the forcibly-sterilized mentally handicapped, or the children of thalidomide users), one would hope that a semester or two at PC would have taught you that the greatest blessing known to man has been freedom to worship God, most particularly in the Church of his Son, the world's only religious tradition with a predominant doctrine of forgiveness.

That aside, there are a few things you ought to be aware of. There is nothing compassionate about dying of thirst. People who do to dogs, cats, and horses what was done to Terri Schiavo go to jail. If she was, as her husband's camp asserted, "not there," compassion would dictate that he arrange for a lethal injection—even blowing her head off with a shotgun would have been more compassionate. But messy. And too real for the right-to-die crowd.

Speaking of which, what ever gave you the idea that "those sympathetic to the right to die with dignity" opted to stay away from this fray? They were the major players: neurologist Cranford and lawyer Felos have both made their careers on the business of hastening death. Do some homework on these two—and be afraid, be very afraid.

You might also do some homework on the conflicts of interest all over this case, with Judge Greer as well as other players being members of the board of the hospice where Terri "persisted," a facility for the terminally ill (Terri was not, and no one was foolish enough to assert otherwise) where residents routinely die within weeks or a few months after arrival.

Not, by the way, has anyone in the media or Congress been foolish enough to assert that the infamous Schiavo memo originated from anyone specifically associated with DeLay or Frist, because there has never been a shred of evidence to suggest that. That amateurish brain-fart has now been traced to the staff of freshman Senator Martinez, who is left looking (deservedly) like a schmuck, and the media and Democrats have naturally lost interest because they can't pin it on any of their favorite bogeymen.

The late Pope (of happy memory) did have a simple answer for this supposedly complex case. It was the right one. Not because he was the Pope, but because he was one of the wisest and most compassionate men to ever draw breath.

"Pop Science" Distorts Debate

Posted by Keith Carr

There has been a lot of "pop" medicine thrown about concerning Terri. For one thing, her condition was not static over the past 15 years. Terri had been in a degenerative neurological state and was by no means showing any signs that could even possibly be conceived of as "improvement." Her condition, known as Persistent Vegetative State (PVS), was documented by several—at least three—physicians, one of whom was appointed by the court. The diagnosis was unanimous: PVS. Not a single person, in the annals of medicine (modern or not) has ever made a recovery from PVS. PVS is not a coma, it's not a deep sleep, it's not even just brain "damage"—rather it's brain "entropy." Terri literally did not have a brain, other than the brain stem, which controls involuntary bodily functions (i.e. breathing, heartbeat, etc.). The science is very clear on this: consciousness is carried out by the

cerebral cortex, an area of the brain which Terri no longer possessed because it had been replaced by spinal fluid following atrophy. Terri had multiple PET scans and MRI's, contrary to popular myth. The PET scans revealed no brain activity, the MRI's showed an empty space occupied by fluid. These have even been leaked to the public and are available to the curious. (And no, you don't need to be a physician to know what empty space looks like on an MRI—it's obvious even to the layman).

Part of this program meant drawing upon antiquated neurological diagnosis from 15 years ago, when it was not certain to what extent she had suffered brain damage. Core ideologues exist in medicine as well as politics and there were some who would go on the record as "unsure" or the PVS diagnosis. This fringe element was played up by the media, giving the impression that physicians were split 50/50 on the issue. In actuality, there are very few physicians who would even dispute the diagnosis of PVS, let alone offer an alternative. After all, how could they? Terri did not have a brain, that was demonstrated by her MRI. How could she not be in PVS? Of course, if you listen to Dr. Frist's "expert" diagnosis from a 10 minute video he watched, you might believe that Terri was just fine, a step away from penning her memoirs. However, Dr. Frist (and I struggle to apply the title "Dr." to a man who believes HIV can be contracted through tears or sweat) has already demonstrated, many times, that he is an inveterate liar, one willing to do or say anything that catches the winds of political expedience. This situation was not the exception, but rather the norm for the good "Dr."

In the end, the court concluded, in the absence of a living will, that Terri had expressed her wishes to many people and would not wish to be artificially maintained in a persistent vegetative state. Nobody made this decision for her—rather the court concluded that Terry HERSELF had made the decision and expressed it to many people, including her husband, before she suffered her cardiac arrest and subsequent brain damage. It is unfortunate, yet understandable, that her family did not want to let her go—I think that to many who are not familiar with PVS, her condition looked like limited consciousness. Sadly, it was not, but this wasn't apparent to her family who wished beyond hope to see consciousness. But can we really override Terri's desire not to be maintained as a vegetable because her parents (and the U.S. Congress) refused to accept her diagnosis?

I hardly think that there is a "culture of death" in this country, unless you mean in those red states where Republicans are so hell-bent on maintaining the barbaric practice of capital punishment. Those who bravely stood up for Terri's right to peacefully die as she had wanted, rather than be maintained as a breathing corpse, belong to a culture of compassion, in my opinion. I also believe that many simply stood up for the individual's right to determine, in consultation with their physician and in private, one's own medical care. Very few people in this country believe that the president or the Congress should be micro-managing an individual's health care—especially when they are openly doing so to appeal to their conservative constituency. Paradoxically, at the same time that conservatives want to micro-manage the care of Terri, they refuse to extend health care to the neediest in this country. Of course, the open hypocrisy of the U.S. Congress really isn't a secret, so I won't bother to discuss it further here.

In sum, this entire issue was a highly misunderstood medical case, politicized by conservatives wanting to portray the Democratic party as part of a "culture of death." From the language of your post, it appears that they have had some success, at least in mobilizing their base and promoting their divisive message.

SHORT TAKES

The Left's Website of the Week

How do you open people's eyes to the lunacy of moral crusades? You make the public laugh. Jon Stewart and *The Daily Show* can pin a joke on Republican and Democratic agendas and make even their staunchest supporters question the rationale of their ideology.

Earlier this week, my high school buddy forwarded me a link to technicalvirgin.com—a satirical website that asks teens to sign a pledge to avoid *original* sex until "marriage or college—whichever comes first." It's part of their "everything but" campaign.

Sure it's crass, but when moral zealots are spouting the message that only technical intercourse constitutes "sex," teenagers and college students are facing the risks associated with other forms of gratification. The debate over teaching safe sex or abstinence ignores that we can do both. No one wants a society where 15-year-olds are more sexually knowledgeable than their older siblings and parents, but nurturing a society that propagates 16-year-old parents ignorant to the responsibilities that come with hormones should be more worrisome to the moral leaders of any denomination.

Want to see abortions decline, STD's disappear, and more children born into loving families? Encourage abstinence while teaching responsibility.

That said, I'm off to graduation and George Washington University Graduate School of Political Management. It's been fun PC—keep the College on their toes.

- Michael Raia - The Left Editor

Foreign-born citizens, the constitution and the presidency

When you think of who you want in the Oval Office, I'd wager some of the following adjectives come to mind: honest, principled, gutsy, compassionate, inspiring, wise, patriotic, resourceful, intelligent, and sympathetic. (Whether or not past and present presidents have actually lived up to these descriptions, we'll leave for another debate.)

I think we can all agree that the American we want leading our country should possess these qualities and similar ones. I'm inclined to believe we can arrive at a consensus recognizing the universal manifestation of these characteristics among all members of the human race. What is unfortunate, however, is the lack of consensus over granting these fellow members, who have since become U.S. citizens, the right/privilege/burden (however you want to look at it) of running for president.

Article II of the Constitution stipulates that "No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President." Over the centuries, the interpretation of this clause has rendered it impossible for any U.S. citizen born outside the country to run for president.

Proponents of a constitutional amendment to eliminate this clause and replace it with a length of citizenship requirement have recognized how anachronistic Article II's prerequisite has become. Constitutional scholars say that the constraint placed upon foreign-born citizens was originally intended to prevent a wealthy European with allegiances to other countries from usurping control of a U.S. government and nation in its infant stages.

Though it has its fair share of flaws, America's democratic system of governance is certainly one that has outgrown its diapers. The U.S. Constitution and government have weathered enough storms in nearly 230 years to make the potential threat posed by foreign-born citizens to the executive branch a moot point. In its time, the United States has witnessed the incredible contributions which immigrants and future citizens have made to its well-being and reputation. If these citizens have proven themselves to be loyal, industrious and patriotic, why should they be prevented from holding the country's highest office?

This question is especially apt when we consider how immigrants have held virtually every major post in the arena of public service with the exception of the presidency. Madeleine Albright, a native of Prague, and Henry Kissinger, who spent the first 15 years of his life in Germany, were both responsible for executing U.S. foreign policy as Secretaries of State.

It's worthwhile for us to reflect on who is worthy of representing this country as president. I fail to see why the place of birth of Democratic Congresswoman Nydia Velázquez (Puerto Rico) or my older brother, a 2nd Lieutenant in the U.S. armed services (Canada), matter more than virtue, character and patriotism in the eyes of the U.S. Constitution. They may not have come into this world on American soil, but they have pledged to forever serve those who inhabit it. What could be more presidential?

- Pat Brown - The Right Editor

BLACK & WHITE
EST. 2005

EDITOR'S NOTE:

BLACK & WHITE
WILL BEGIN A
SUMMER HIATUS
THIS WEEK. THE
PUBLICATION WILL
RETURN NEXT
SEMESTER UNDER
NEW LEADERSHIP.
CURRENT
SOPHOMORES
KEVIN ROE AND
KYLE DRENNEN
WILL LEAD THE
DIALOGUE THAT
WE HAVE STARTED
FROM THE LEFT
AND RIGHT,
RESPECTIVELY.

WE WISH YOU ALL
THE BEST OVER
THE SUMMER AND
WANT TO
CONGRATULATE
OUR FELLOW
SENIORS ON
GRADUATION AND
OFFER OUR
MESSAGE OF GOOD
LUCK TO YOU ALL
IN YOUR FUTURE
ENDEAVORS.

REMEMBER:
VERITAS

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