

Dole for president: the sequel

Elizabeth Dole's many accomplishments, spirituality makes her prime candidate



CHRISTINA BARROWS

After a turbulent year in the White House, there is little doubt Americans are looking for a refreshing new leader. For a nation tired of baring about sex, it might be beneficial for the next presidential election to look at a person who is wearing skirts rather than chasing them.

Elizabeth Dole has devoted herself to public service throughout her career, working to improve the quality of life for American citizens. Her strong character and vast achievements make her a highly qualified candidate for President of the United States.

Dole was the outstanding leader of the American Red Cross for eight years. During this time she secured medical care, balanced funds and coped with one disaster after another.

According to campaign information, when Dole was head of the American Red Cross she supervised some 30,000 staff members and nearly 1.4 million volunteers at the Red Cross's many educational and humanitarian programs. Her work there showcases her deep care for humanity and her heart for service, something few of her opponents can claim with proof.

Dole also has a political resume that many candidates will find difficult to compete with.

While many candidates for presidency gain their experience in leadership roles such as Governor or Senator, Dole has a much greater understanding of the internal workings of our federal government. She has worked for five U.S. presidents, holding two cabinet positions. Her experience is on a national level, not local or state, and this experience has made her a prime candidate.

Because of her accomplishments as Secretary of Transportation under President Reagan and Secretary of Labor under President Bush, Dole has made herself a high contender with the broader public and is expected to draw many independent voters.

In January, Time reported that Dole aided in the development of air bags, rear windshield break lights and airline safety measures while serving as Secretary of Transportation.

And as Secretary of Labor she helped push for the first minimum wage increase in eight years. These small but highly popular changes could make all the difference when election time arrives.

There is no doubt Dole is extremely popular among women voters. Time reported in recent polls she might draw independent women voters back to the GOP for the first time in 20 years.

She was named in both the 1996 and 1997 Gallup polls as one of the "Ten Most Admired Women" and under the Bush administration fought to bring down the corporate "glass ceiling" for women and minorities in the workplace.

But one of the most refreshing things Dole would bring to the White House is her spirituality. Her faith in God and His place for her is something she takes very seriously.

Dole dedicates 30 minutes everyday to a Bible study and Time reports she can truly move people with her scriptural account of rediscovering God at midlife.

In July 1996, Dole told Time that by 1982 her career had become the center of her life.

In theological terms, to lose oneself in ambition is a form of idolatry, and Dole realized God did not want worldly successes. He wanted her heart.

Dole has a goal to beautify America's soul, and truly improve the United States. She is a woman confident in the source of her strength and powerful because of its origin.

In Feb. 1999 Dole said during an interview, "If I run, this will be an important reason: because the United States of America deserves a government worthy of her people. We are a good and great nation and we must demand a government with the integrity to inspire trust and the straightforward strength to keep us free."

Christina Barrows is a sophomore English major.



MICHAEL WAGENER/THE BATTALION

United States should not send troops into Bosnia, action improper

Americans are again at a fork in the road. We have left behind the White Rabbit, and now we are dancing with the Mad Hatter.



JASON STARCH

The White House has decided to take military action in the great crisis and civil war between the Albanians and Serbs, where the death toll continues to rise each week. The struggle is both ethnic and territorial. And America has no business interfering in it.

In 1984, then Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger developed six questions concerning the involvement of American military forces in the affairs of other nations.

It became known as the "Weinberger Doctrine," and was followed rather faithfully until the current administration took office. The six questions Weinberger proposed were simple and direct concerning the involvement of U.S. troops in combat: Is it a vital national interest at stake? Will we commit sufficient resources to win? Will we sustain the commitment? Are the objectives clearly

defined? Is there reasonable expectation that the public and Congress will support the operation? Have we exhausted our other options?

If a reasonable person looks at that set of questions, it should be obvious that Casper Weinberger's intentions were not politically motivated so much as morally motivated.

He knew full well that involvement of U.S. troops in combat leads to the loss of American fighting men and women. That is no small consequence for any decision-maker to weigh.

American actions in the Persian Gulf were both morally and ethically justified. The U.S. was protecting its economic interests by protecting both the Middle Eastern nations and the oil supply. America committed enough resources to win. America stayed committed until the task was complete.

The objectives were simple and clear: to remove Iraqi troops from Kuwaiti soil and protect the other oil producers in the Gulf region. The public overwhelmingly supported the action, and Congress echoed that support.

The U.S. also exhausted diplomatic efforts right up until the war kicked off. America was sending a clear message to

the world: you cannot march into a country that has American national interests involved and then expect to get away with it.

Now compare that to the Bosnia question. Are there vital American interests at stake? This question is a hard one to answer. America certainly wants stability in the world, but that interest is not vital to national security.

The U.S. has no business in their civil war. This is not like the humanitarian efforts in Kenya or Somalia, where natural disaster struck and the helpless cried out for relief. Those missions lost their national interest when they turned from humanitarian aid to peace keeping. The issues really dies on the first Weinberger question, but the rest of the points can be addressed as well.

The U.S., of course, does have enough troops to commit and to sustain a committed effort, but will the American people and the Congress support it? More importantly, should they support it?

They did not support the same situation in Vietnam. And there may still be some means that are available in the diplomatic arena to end the conflict. So it is time to answer another pressing

question: Will any of these efforts, diplomatic or military, actually stop the war in Bosnia?

The American Civil War did not end overnight when European countries enforced trade restrictions on the states. That is because there were causes that Americans believed were worth fighting for, as ideologically different as they were.

The ethnic struggle in Bosnia, as terrible as it is, may be a defining moment for the people of that charred and ruined country.

Many of the principles Americans hold dear are the same ideals other people in the world consider fundamental. Do we really think we are so much smarter and better than the rest of the world in assuming their reasons are not as justified as ours?

The most disturbing point to address in determining military involvement in Bosnia concerns the training and readiness of our troops. It has been voiced that American troops could use the combat experience for development in case of a real war.

What the heck is a "real" war, anyway? Are guns and killing and death not enough? It is pure stupidity to send our

fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, sons and daughters into harm's way for the sheer experience of gaining combat leadership training.

If I never bury another fellow Marine it will be too soon. We train for the possibility that war might occur, but we pray that it will not.

Incidentally, the oath military members take says they swear to "defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic." There is nothing in there about solving the world's problems, nor should there be. Yet soldiers still obey orders and go where they are sent.

Daniel Webster once said, "God grants liberty to those who love it, and to those who are willing to guard and defend it."

Citizens need to be ready and willing to protect American liberties, and let the rest of the world fight for the causes they hold dear.

And when this country's interests are once again at stake, it would behoove America to stand firm against the aggressor.

Jason Starch is a junior rangeland ecology major.

MAIL CALL

Meat, industry not portrayed correctly

In response to Lisa Foox's Mar. 3 opinion column.

First of all, I do not want to overshadow the anecdote about the little girl that was mentioned in the article. Her unfortunate illness is a sad reality that affects our society.

I am pleased to see that your article was printed in the opinion section of *The Battalion*, because that is truly what it was, and not based on factual information.

My advice to Foox (since she is a journalism major), would be to research the topic on which you are writing your opinions.

It is understandable to be ignorant about a topic, but it is

foolish to broadcast one's ignorance to the entire campus.

James Allen
Class of '99

Lisa Foox needs to get her facts straight about the meat industry. With a little research, she would realize that her statements about food-borne illnesses and slaughter facilities are incorrect.

Most strains of E. coli are harmless and a normal part of a mammal's digestive tract, but E. coli O157H7 is a deadly pathogen.

The beef industry takes an unfair share of the blame for E. coli illnesses. Raw milk, lettuce, sprouts and apple cider are other foods that carry E. coli O157H7. Proper cooking of ground beef and simple hand washing dramatically decreases the chance of E. coli

0157H7 poisoning. Slaughter facilities are not dirty, disease-ridden places as Foox would have people believe. Plants have detailed plans to clean, sanitize and disinfect their equipment in order to prevent contamination.

The Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) system has been implemented in all slaughter plants, required by law.

Animals are subjected to a pre-slaughter exam by a veterinarian and if any abnormality is found, the animal is not used for human consumption.

No animal can be slaughtered in a plant without a USDA inspector present at each phase of slaughter.

Such a false column about the meat industry has no place in the school newspaper at one of the country's leading agricul-

tural universities. If Lisa Foox wants to know the truth, she can come over to West Campus and take Animal Science 307, a class on meat production that will educate her on how the meat industry really is.

Laura Booth
Class of '99

Column misread, writer not hypocrite

In response to Jeff Becker's and Joshua Hill's Mar. 25 Mail Calls.

As any other reader would naturally do, I think you have each taken Parekh's article and twisted it into something to scoff about. I do not think Parekh was in any way being hypocritical. If you would re-read, she clearly states that "it would be easy to dismiss Short as an igno-

rant, illogical man, but to do that would be to ignore the threat that his breed of intolerance poses to everyone."

Basically Jeff, she admits and recognizes that this also includes her. She did not need you to fill an entire column turning that into negativity towards her.

And how is she "demanding that all subject themselves to her own views of tolerance." I guess we as a University should not come together and love one another for who or what we are, huh? Is that too much to ask?

Well, I ask that we do. And Joshua, do you suggest that God is not human? And how do you know? Why does it make it a problem that Parekh, in your opinion, "supposes all religion is as based on humans as her own." I don't recall Tom Short preaching to the birds and insects on campus.

The matter in question refers to

us as humans, right? Where is the problem? So what about God?

I think that was answered in the paragraph you obviously failed to read: "God expects us to love one another, not to condemn anyone," which was the main focus of Parekh's article that I hope you now see.

B.J. Selman
Class of '01

The Battalion encourages letters to the editor. Letters must be 300 words or less and include the author's name, class and phone number. The opinion editor reserves the right to edit letters for length, style, and accuracy. Letters may be submitted in person at 013 Reed McDonald with a valid student ID. Letters may also be mailed to:
The Battalion - Mail Call
013 Reed McDonald
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX
77843-1111
Campus Mail: 1111
Fax: (409) 845-2647
Email: batt@tamvml.tamu.edu