**QUOTE OF THE WEEK**

“The best argument against democracy is a five-minute conversation with the average voter.”

- Winston Churchill

---

**Conservative Corner:**

**World of journalism rocked by fake memos**

As you know, Dan Rather, the face of CBS News, ran a story on 60 Minutes II a few weeks ago. In question was the service of George W. Bush in the Texas Air National Guard. Leaving aside that the media beat this story to death back in February, the evidence Rather used in the piece, memos from then-Lt. Bush’s commanding officer, turned out to be fraudulent.

An internal investigation is currently being run at CBS, but now that the fiasco is more or less over, the rest of the media is going back to business as usual. What I want to talk about is why.

Dan Rather, a known liberal, has generally been good at reporting the news. This slip-up, however, was the product of haste. Rather wanted this story to be out as fast as possible, whether to discredit the president or lift his sagging ratings. Either way, he and his fellow CBSers dropped the ball.

People who follow the news with more than a passing interest know, slip-ups at CBS News are becoming more and more frequent. With the media being run by corporate conglomerates, the journalism business has shifted its emphasis from journalism to business.

Behind all of this, of course, is money. Newspapers, TV networks and magazines are all supported mainly by advertising revenue. The more people that watch, or read, the more money they make on ads.

No more and more, news divisions are looking for the ratings-grabbing story, instead of the most relevant one. There has been less and less emphasis on news and more on the opinions of the supposed news-gatherers.

Take a look at the cable news channels. CNN and Fox News have hour after hour of talk shows instead of actual news programming. But according to the ratings, both channels are programming. But according to the ratings, both channels are
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**The Political Forum: Women’s liberties in danger**

With the first Presidential Debate behind us and only a month to go before the big election, it is important to look at where the candidates have been to see where they’re likely to go over the next several years.

With that in mind, analyzing President Bush’s legacy, whether his term ends in a few months or a few years, it is likely that afterwards he will be most known for his offensive strikes. However, with the focus on the ongoing war in Iraq, one of the victims of Bush’s strategic maneuvers has likely gone unnoticed: the American woman.

A protest, which women celebrated the 30-year anniversary of the landmark Roe v. Wade case that secured a woman’s right to have an abortion if she so chooses, this April, when Bush used the public’s fixation with the Scott Peterson trial to sign into action the Unborn Victims of Violence Act (other, similar referred to by Bush as “the Baby Body Parts Law” to entitle the sentimentally inclined) it became his most recent step in a campaign that has endured as long as his war on terror.

In one of his first maneuvers in office, on January 22, 2001, Bush reinstated the Mexico City policy that denies U.S. money for international groups that support abortion.

“It is my conviction that taxpayer funds should not be used to pay for abortions or advocate or actively promote abortion, either here or abroad,” he said.

In addition, Bush placed strict restrictions on human embryonic stem cell research, extended state health coverage to “unborn children” and signed the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003, making the late-abortion procedure illegal.

The tragedies of Laci Peterson’s murder, as well as the family’s loss of the unborn child, are not atrocities to be ignored. Indeed, the murder of a mother-to-be is a monstrous crime of a species that goes unaided without debate, but using an innocent woman’s death to advance your own agenda is low for a president who started a war over imaginary weapons.

It is possible that in the years to come, using the Unborn Victims of Violence Act as a pretext to extend the decisions of Roe v. Wade could be overturned and a woman’s right to choose whether or not to abort a pregnancy could be deemed unconstitutional.

After all, the specific wording of the act refers to an unborn child as a “member of the species homo sapiens,” at any stage of “development.”

Thereby, using that definition as a basis for appeal, one could easily define abortion as murder in the first degree as the intentionally orchestrated murder of a member of the human species.

Perhaps worse than Bush’s campaign against pro-choice proponents though, is the fact that these laws are consistently changing from presidential administration to administration. The previously mentioned Mexico City policy was announced by former President Ronald Reagan in 1984, only to be rescinded by Bill Clinton in 1993, only to be restored by Bush in 2003.

It is a known fact that presidential candidate John Kerry voted against both the Partial Birth Abortion Act and the Unborn Victims of Violence Act. When asked the question, if elected, will Kerry try to “right the wrongs” of his predecessor and rescind Bush’s pro-life legislation?

The issue of abortion is too sensitive to be juggled around from president to president every four years simply because of an elected official’s personal views on the subject. When a leader accepts a position of power and influence it is not their duty to change every aspect of their organization or country to meet their own personal agenda.

Therefore, people should begin to realize that taking up the mantle of President of the United States comes with a certain level of responsibility and does not entitle them to overturn 30 years worth of legislation simply because of their own beliefs, be they liberal or conservative.
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**‘Draft’ from pg. 8**

target of 56,000 new volunteers this year because potential soldiers don’t want to spend a year away from jobs and families on active duty. A Pentagon spokesman has said that planning was going ahead on the basis that U.S. forces would have to remain in Iraq in large numbers “until at least 2007.”

In an August 6, 2001 briefing, President Bush outlined 40-50 countries that were potential ones to invade because they harbored terrorism. Yes, 40-50 countries and we don’t have enough troops to fight one!

According to Republican Senator John McCain, “It’s clear, at least to most observers, that we don’t have sufficient personnel.” Representative Jim McDermott, a Washington Democrat, said “Every day it’s closer, and if Bush is re-elected I think there is a 100 percent certainty we’ll re-institute the draft.”

Some say Congress won’t vote for a draft because the government only wants volunteers in the military, but if we don’t have enough troops to fight, we are going to need more. The Selective Service clearly states that a draft will be implemented “if and when the President and Congress so direct.”

What can you do? You can call your local congressmen or write and urge them to vote against this atrocity but again, if we need more troops, we need more troops. You can also think long and hard before deciding which lever to pull to this election, especially parents and teenagers. “There will be no draft when John Kerry is president,” Vice-Presidential candidate John Edwards said.

John Kerry believes Bush has no plans for attacking other countries that were this election, especially parents deciding which lever to pull to vote against this atrocity but again, if we need more troops, we need more troops. You can also think long and hard before deciding which lever to pull to this election, especially parents and teenagers. “There will be no draft when John Kerry is president,” Vice-Presidential candidate John Edwards said.

John Kerry believes Bush has no plans for attacking other countries that were this election, especially parents deciding which lever to pull to vote against this atrocity but again, if we need more troops, we need more troops. You can also think long and hard before deciding which lever to pull to this election, especially parents and teenagers. “There will be no draft when John Kerry is president,” Vice-Presidential candidate John Edwards said.

As the violence in Iraq escalates and Bush continues to wage wars, we will need one, but he won’t tell us about the draft now because he wants to get re-elected. John Kerry has no plans for attacking other nations pre-emptively without the U.N.

Another thing that needs to be considered is the fact that Bush gave the Selective Service $28 million dollars and ordered all the positions on the board to be filled by April 1, prior to Iraq who aren’t normally supposed to be in active duty.

John Kerry said he won’t reinstate the draft but Bush has put, Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense only says “there are no plans for a draft, which doesn’t mean there won’t be.”

The Bush administration is on a crusade to make the world safe for democracy and part of that ... is eliminating countries of anti-Western aggression,” said Loren Thompson, a military analyst at the Lexington Institute in Washington. “They may not like me to say that on the eve of the election, but that’s a fact. It’s less likely to happen with a Kerry administration.”