



"I do not agree with what you have to say, but I'll defend to the death your right to say it." - Voltaire



"I respect people. I respect their religion. I respect human rights. I respect human dignity." - George W. Bush, Washington, D.C., May 20, 2004.

## Road Trip with Bush. Destination: Heaven

Matt Stucke  
Staff Writer

George W. Bush, as you all know, won the presidential election on November 2nd, 2004. That momentous Tuesday will be remembered as a day that divided our country further than it has been since the Civil War. It is likely that our country would have been just as divided had Senator John Kerry had won. So what, then, does the mightiest country in the world have to be so divided about? Why can't those silly liberals graciously accept defeat and wait 4 more years?

The most obvious answer is the war in Iraq. It is still over two years after its initiation unclear why we went there. What is vividly clear is that there was no substantial stockpile of weapons of mass destruction. Whatever weapons Iraq did possess caused no direct threat to the United States. Iraq has never attacked America, unless in clear self-defense. Part of the reasoning for war must have been to protect an economic interest: oil. A destabilized middle-east means restricted access to the oil fields that litter the region. For a nation that consumes 22.4 million barrels of oil a day, this would mean disaster. Of course the war is about more than oil. But what else? If America is occupying Iraq to free their people, then why are we, as a nation, standing on the sideline watching the people of Darfur undergo genocide? Are we halfway around the world to spread democracy to those direly in need of its virtues? Who are we to enforce our ideals on Iraqis? The King of England sure thought she knew what was best for America before the colonies revolted and won independence. Why are we in Iraq? No one seems to know. It is a fact that we are there, though, and as such must not pull out. A hasty exit would leave Iraq open for despotism. A mess has been created and it must be dealt with.

The dissent runs much deeper than a horribly failed foreign policy. The homeland may be more secure from terrorist attacks, but it is the internal warfare that should be cause for worry. The privacy and other human rights of our own citizens are being sacrificed for imposed religious morals. The national issues, not international issues, are what truly divide our country. Through an onslaught of doublespeak Bush somehow convinced a significant portion of the population that he genuinely cares about human rights. If human rights in America do not include the right to privacy, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness then he may just be right. How does what I do to myself, or with my loved ones, in the privacy of my home affect anyone else in a direct way?

The three biggest issues of this election were the war on terrorism, same sex marriage, and abortion. We have millions of people below the poverty line, an equally absurd number unable to afford health care, a haphazard K-12 educational system, a decaying natural environment, and an overcrowded jail system. With these issues looming large, what the American people really care about is whom I marry? Folks, I have news for you. The sanctity of marriage is not in jeopardy from same sex marriage, but from

the lack of respect for marriage itself. About half of all marriages end in divorce. If we were so concerned with the sanctity of marriage why haven't we addressed that? If, on the other hand, we simply need to camouflage our moral prejudices as justifiable so they can be politically imposed on others then we as a nation must grow up. If God is going to send the "sinners" to hell for eternity, why must we feel it is our duty to make their lives miserable? It is not our place as humans, especially politicians, to impose divine will on others.

When asked whether they voted on the issues or on the politician's moral stance, an overwhelming number of Americans said it was morals that determined their vote. If a politician's personal religious and moral conviction is more important than his stance on foreign policy, especially in our globalized world, maybe it is time to start looking into moving to Canada; I've heard Toronto really isn't that bad. All jokes aside, a conservative President, House of Representatives, Senate, and Supreme Court spell disaster for anyone living in the United States whose morals don't agree with the religious right. You're "either with us or against us" no longer refers strictly to the "Coalition of the Willing," but now extends to American citizens. There is a pervasive sense that it is no longer "we the people," but we, the moral, that will save you, the immoral.

Mr. Bush, I humbly request the liberty to make my own mistakes and damn myself to hell should I so choose. I am a proud American who values my freedoms. How can we grow as a nation, sir, if we repress the freedoms of a large portion of our population? Wait, I think I've misunderstood you. You are for freedom; economic freedom. I am free to trade, at the cost of human rights and the environment, with anyone I please. Oh, wait. I don't have the right to buy waterpipes anymore do I? I can see how that is much more harmful than starting a war over economic gains and loosely defined morals. You really are starting make sense to me Mr. Bush. I should have voted for you. And while I'm repenting, do you still think I could make it to heaven?

## Controversy

Gilbert Abraham  
Staff Writer

Controversy; the public only becomes animated when there is something controversial going on. I must admit that I also indulge in this juvenile behavior from time to time, but I make an effort not to participate in it and it also does not justify that form of behavior. Matthew Peak wrote an article in the last issue of the Lance, which was objectively controversial. What perturbs me with a great malevolence was that the article directly beside Mr. Peak's that was on the same subject seemed to be neglected. It was my article, and at the risk of sounding selfish, I believe I wrote a more objective article. Yet, that is not what has aroused me to the point of anger. What occurred as a result of what Mr. Peak wrote is phenomenal to me, and not surprising at the same time. So, let me get this right: if someone writes something that is debatably racial people will actually talk; they will attend forums; they will become engaged all of a sudden. What an epiphany! Well, if I do that what will happen? I won't do that, but I will say that those people that became activated by his article would be perceived as shallow and those people that engaged in this ignorant behavior know who they are.

Why? Why do we subject ourselves to this foolishness? We have real issues, real problems, facing our generation, our state of being, right now, but we want to get upset when an article is written without all the facts in an attempt to make another point. Is it in this attempt to identify and find purpose and meaning that we watch and get sucked into this reality television addiction? We have such boring and drama-less lives that we have to do whatever we can to identify with The Real World. First of all, people should have read the Peak article in its entirety, not just the part about the white student union. Then you, as an individual, not as a part of a collective group or the forming mob mentality or the miraculously engaged LBG Circus, should have come to a conclusion of your own.

This is St. Andrews, home of the critical thinkers, engaged activists, and deliberating rebelectuals. Why not ignore Mr. Peak's article? Why not disregard it? Why not? Instead we want to rave and carry on about it as though it was a threat. Who stopped to have a conversation with MP and attempt to understand his vantage point or perception? Who? I did, and I commend any others who did the same and decided to investigate for themselves or responded constructively. We so quickly want to start

(Continued on page 10)