



Criticism unwarranted

Columnist Vaughn does not deserve censure.

Last week I could not help but notice the words of Angel Hsu as she asserted that we, as Americans, need to question our government so we do not fall "into an abyss

Albert Rattacasa

GUEST COLUMNIST

of governmental abuses, corruption and cover-ups" ("Making a crucial distinction," Oct. 9). Strangely enough, one person comes to mind when I hear those words, and you all know to whom I am referring.

William Jefferson Clinton epitomizes "governmental abuse, corruption and cover-ups." The leader emeritus of the Democratic Party is known for behavior so disgusting and utterly reprehensible that it likely took weeks for the White House custodial staff to sanitize the Oval Office for President Bush.

I found it terribly ironic that a liberal would complain about not searching for corruption, cover-up and abuse by politicians when their own party is plagued with each of the aforementioned.

Keep in mind, when President Clinton was sexually molesting women in and out of the White House, lying to the American people, perjuring himself in front of a grand jury and covering up his repulsive actions through a complex web of deceit, those who questioned him were automatically thrown into that "vast right-wing conspiracy" as coined by his equally repulsive wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton. And why were those same individuals who questioned the Clinton Administration investigated by the FBI and/or audited

The problem with liberals is they only find it necessary to question Republicans and never even think it feasible to scrutinize the sleaze within their own ranks. So since they won't ask the tough questions of the people on the left, I thought I would pose a few of my own.

by the IRS? So much for questioning what was going on inside the "People's House."

Fritz Vaughan is certainly a true patriot, and what Angel Hsu overlooked last week was the fact the Mr. Vaughan was indeed questioning his government, as much as I would hate to concede that Senator Kennedy is actually a representative of this great country.

Mr. Kennedy's recent lunacy on the Senate Floor has most undoubtedly added to greenhouse gases and an increase in global warming - if you believe in either of those.

The problem with liberals is they only find it necessary to question Republicans and never even think it feasible to scrutinize the sleaze within their own ranks. So since they won't ask the tough questions of the people on the left, I thought I would pose a few of my own.

How can Senator Byrd attack anyone on race issues when he himself is a former member of the Ku Klux Klan?

How can former Senator Torricelli discuss fiscal issues and corporate scandals while being immensely intertwined with corrupt labor unions, "waste management" industries and the Tony Soprano-types of the world?

How can Senator Lautenberg discuss legitimacy when his own position in the U.S. Senate is illegitimate?

How can Senators Kerry and Edwards attack President Bush on Operation Iraqi Freedom, when they, in fact, both voted for it?

How can liberals scream, "you're killing the Iraqi children!" when they are the same folks who advocate the slaughtering of fetuses? These same people are also highly concerned about eating a piece of veal but have no moral compunctions about ravaging their own wombs.

Why was it okay for President Clinton to launch military air strikes against Iraq on the same premise laid out by President Bush without question from anyone or approval from the UN, House of Representatives, Senate, etc. while in the middle of his grand jury investigation? Why didn't anyone question the government then?

Why didn't President Clinton take out Osama bin Laden any one of the dozen times he had the opportunity? Why wasn't there retaliation for the attacks on the USS Cole and the various attacks on U.S. embassies in the Middle East?

Why won't liberals let us look over swarthy men who want to board airplanes at American airports?

Why haven't we totally revamped our border patrol and INS systems in a post-Sept. 11 world?

Why does the state of California allow illegal immigrants to obtain driver's licenses?

Why can't we explore our own domestic fuel resources?

I have major issues with people who say Republicans are blindly allying themselves with the Bush administration because we support the efforts President Bush is making on behalf of all Americans to keep our homeland safe. Just remember who was blindly behind a sexual predator in the White House who dragged the country through eight years of sex-capades and scandal.

No party is perfect, and I certainly have issues with some folks in my party, but you better think carefully before you start throwing stones at a glass house.

Albert Rattacasa is a junior political science major.

Rush to judgment leaves some starved for oxygen

Satiric article should prompt thought, not anger or misunderstanding.

Bravo to senior Paul Sheaffer on his column last week ("Going to the logical end," Oct. 9). Last week, I was not in the office much and did not read the article before print. So I was surprised to receive an e-mail about "some abortion column." Curious, I paged through my copy of the beloved *Old Gold and Black*. I must

If this was a sincere belief, I would hope that the author would have been stopped long ago. No, Sheaffer, if I can so presume to explain his work, meant to give *OGB* readers cause to pause and consider their positions on the abortion issue.

Yes, Sheaffer's article was a surprise. But if you were disgusted by it and could not even force yourself to finish it, I urge you to try again. Maybe even read at least a partial excerpt of "A Modest Proposal."

Honestly, we're a university known for academic rigors. If this was a sincere belief, I would hope that the author would have been stopped long ago. No, Sheaffer, if I can so presume to explain his work, meant to give *OGB* readers cause to pause and consider their positions on the abortion issue.

While adoption is feasible, partial-birth abortions are legal and do occur. Why not give the child up for adoption after two long trimesters? Who knows? That's not an issue that Sheaffer or I can explain; the matter is why such a procedure is an option given the presence of adoption.

Mothers currently retain a judicial right to terminate their pregnancy. I am a pro-lifer; family members of mine have gotten pregnant unwed - a big gasp - in old-school Catholic families - and, despite family issues and lack of a partner, kept their baby bunnings. There are also adopted kids residing happily in my extended family. My life would be incomplete without these "abortion candidates."

I cannot say whether it is my place to take away the "right to abortion," that is something that still plagues me, but I know that Sheaffer's argument advances a valid point. Why stop at nine months when - if you find a young, equally helpless "born" child a burden - you can drop this compilation of your DNA off somewhere and just never pick them up?

Consider it. You may be horrified now, but that's reality; at some point, as a responsible citizen, you should face such realities and form your opinions about them. To ignore them in light of discomfort is irresponsible and is what leads to events like abortions in the first place.

Stephanie Bennett is a sophomore.



Stephanie Bennett

EDITORIALS EDITOR

admit, I read Andy Rigsby's column on studying abroad before beginning Sheaffer's, but once I started, I was hooked.

I've always been a fan of satire. I'd like to think of myself as a bit "smarmy," and though that cynical, sarcastic and even occasionally ironic side can get in the way, it paid off last week when facing this column. Jonathan Swift, author of the brilliant "A Modest Proposal," would have been proud of it, I think, at least on a superficial level. Sorry, Paul, you're no Swift, but I found your article well-written and your argument well-advanced.

I'm a bit disappointed, actually, in the student body's ability to appreciate the article.

I guess it helps that I'm a stereotypical pro-life Catholic, but Sheaffer's argument made perfect sense to me. Some of my friends were sickened by the graphic quality of the article and the affront to their motherly side.

But that was the point of the article! You should find partial-birth abortion, at very least, a sickening procedure. This is a child that could live on its own.

Pre-mature babies, though they usually have prolonged hospital stays, often survive even births a few months early. What is unsickening about partial-birth abortion? Nothing. It is a travesty of humanity, contested by even some who are "pro-choice."



Political apathy troublesome for dedicated dems

Democrats wait and see in primaries and hurt chances to beat Bush.

Since I began working on Howard Dean's campaign for the presidential nomination, I've noticed a prevailing attitude among most Democratic voters. Rather than wanting to know about

they don't want, another four years under G.W.

While this may seem all fine and good, those dissatisfied with the state of our country need to realize that this attitude is having a hugely counter-productive effect. Specifically, it's causing Democratic voters to sit back passively and simply observe the campaign for the nomination, as they wait for a front-runner to emerge, a front-runner that looks like he can beat Bush. What these voters fail to realize, however, is that front-runners don't simply happen; they are made by the people that get behind them and offer their support. Furthermore, this same support is necessary if people hope to see the Democrats put forth a candidate that is capable of winning the election next November.

One of the most disturbing, yet least discussed results of the recent polls taken concerning the upcoming primaries is the fact that many potential voters have no idea who any of the candidates for the nomination are. In a poll less than a month ago, fewer than half of those polled knew anything about any of them.

One of the most disturbing, yet least discussed results of the recent polls taken concerning the upcoming primaries is the fact that many potential voters have no idea who any of the candidates for the nomination are. In a poll less than a month ago, fewer than half of those polled knew anything about any of them.

When I first heard this, I was deeply saddened. I thought that the war on Iraq and the other various catastrophes we've seen come out of the White House these past three years had been enough to shake the American populace out of their political stupor, ending the apathy that was so prevalent in the preceding decade. This was supposed to be the rebirth of political activism, dammit! What happened?

Unfortunately, what happened was that we all decided to wait and see. Wait and see what alternatives would

emerge, wait and see who would prove to be a strong candidate, wait and see who could beat Bush. What this has left us with, sadly, is a field of candidates that lack the enthusiastic support necessary to make their names be heard. With everyone waiting to see, no one is helping these candidates BE seen!

This is doubly troublesome. More immediately, this leads to a primary election where the voters selecting their candidate are entirely ill-equipped to make a proper choice, lacking the requisite exposure to the various candidates to make an informed decision. Good luck getting the best candidate elected when the majority of voters, if they even vote, are picking the name that looks the most familiar.

When the primaries are finished and we have drawn our nominee's name from a hat, selected from a pool of equally unknown individuals, it is simply foolish to believe that, overnight, this nobody can be transformed into a formidable candidate. If the populace doesn't know who your nominee is by the time you've selected him, they aren't

going to get to know him by the time the November elections roll around. And, if that is the case, all of those undecideds and fence-sitters are going to be lost to the Bush camp by default. Even if they don't particularly like Bush, they don't think he's worse than something drawn at random.

If change is scary, change at random is terrifying, and the moderates and independents are going to be inclined to stick out another four years of the Bush regime, rather than opting for whatever's behind door number two. It may be a raw deal, but at least they know what they are getting themselves into.

Long story short, if you want to see Bush, i.e. what you don't like, voted out of office, the best thing you can do is to find some candidate you DO like and get behind them! Get their name heard and make their agenda familiar to Americans at large. It's only if you start publicizing your candidate now that they are going to have any shot against the establishment come November.

Ryan Doerfler is a senior philosophy major.



Ryan Doerfler

OLD GOLD AND BLACK COLUMNIST

your candidate's stances on the various issues, the first question that is asked is, "Can your candidate get George W. Bush out of office?" At this point people don't really know, nor do they visibly care about, what they do want. Instead, the focus is entirely on what