

NEWS IN BRIEF

Had info before
thoma bombing

WASHINGTON (AP) — Two federal law enforcement agencies had information before the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing suggesting that white supremacists living in the area were considering an attack on government buildings, a federal intelligence report says.

Headquarters officials in Washington were so concerned about white separatists at the City compound in Tulsa, Okla., that they might lash out on April 19, 1995 — the day Timothy McVeigh did choose — a month earlier they questioned a reformed white supremacist familiar with an ear to bomb the same Alfred P. Murrah federal building in Oklahoma City.

They thought their only real concern was Elohim City," said a source, the witness questioned by the FBI on March 28 — just a few weeks before the building was bombed and killed more than 160 people.

avalry

Continued from page 1

"When cadets are involved in something that warrants a grand jury investigation, it's a concern, but it's still too early to say how this will turn out," he said.

Burke Wilson, the Corps public relations officer and senior speech communications major, said the allegations against the cavalry were not reflective of behavior among the rest of the Corps.

"It was an isolated incident," Wilson said.

The unit, founded in 1733, was a revival of the 1st Cavalry's storied horse cavalry, which was disbanded in 1943 after the U.S. Army eliminated its cavalry branch.

Love...

ate... Personal...

Heart Package

Your choice of
Champagne

Chardonnay
Glasses,
Strawberries,
Baked Breads

0

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

E

ation

35

OPINION

THE BATTALION

Page 9 • Wednesday, February 12, 2003

DOCTORS LEAVING THEIR MARK

Kentucky doctor who branded uterus with his alma mater cheapened profession



RADHIKA THIRUNAVANAN • THE BATTALION

One shouldn't brand a uterus. It is tacky, disrespectful, and can get you into trouble.

Dr. James Guiler of Lexington, Ky. is facing a lawsuit after his patient, Stephanie Means, discovered that he had used a cauterizing instrument to

brand the initials of his alma mater — University of Kentucky (UK) — on her uterus to distinguish between the organ's left and right side. The Associated Press reported in January. Means discovered the markings after viewing a video of the procedure.

Marking the uterus before removing it is a standard hysterectomy procedure, but such markings have traditionally been limited to stitches or burn marks. Kim Alumbaugh, chairwoman of the Kentucky chapter of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, told the AP. What Guiler did was in bad taste because it not only cheapened the value of the organ, but it also showed utter disregard for the dignity and self-worth of his patient.

The uterus is important; it contains and nourishes during development before birth. When Stephanie Means went in for surgery, she trusted Guiler to perform the operation in a dignified manner. After having two children, parting with her uterus was surely difficult. She



MELISSA FRIED

was about to lose a part of herself that had helped bring her two children into the world.

When we brand something, we strip the item of its intrinsic value and replace it with some conditional worth. Marking her uterus "made her feel insignificant — as if she did not matter," Means' attorney, Brenda Popplewell, told the AP.

“Doctors are not artists, and they are not expected to sign their work. Others expect them to perform their job — to heal people as best they can — but not to leave markings so that they can be identified for a job well done.”

Doctors are not artists, and they are not expected to sign their work. Others expect them to perform their job — to heal people as best they can — but not to leave markings so that they can be identified for a job well done. Dr. Nick Kafoglis, a former Kentucky state senator and retired gynecologist, told the AP that he agrees that most people would consider the branding of the initials "UK" on a uterus grossly

inappropriate.

What is even more outrageous in this case is that Guiler chose to use the initials of his alma mater to mark a body part. Guiler has every right to be proud of his accomplishments and of being a graduate of the University of Kentucky College of Medicine, but that in its own right does not give him license to mark "UK" on any and everything that he wishes. There are appropriate times and places to use the initials of one's alma mater: on a letterhead, a pen case, or a nameplate. Not only is it inconceivable to brand people, people should not be branded with the initials of a university — no matter how honorable someone believes this to be.

Means was right in speaking out against Guiler. For a man in a profession where human life is regarded with the utmost dignity, he managed to debase a rather vital organ and transform it into a piece of collegiate paraphernalia. It was not fair to Means or the University of Kentucky, for neither gave their consent to use these initials on human organs. If sensible, rational alumni have to seek permission to use a trademarked symbol, what makes Guiler an exception?

If Guiler needs to be reminded of his past accomplishments in medical school, rather than brand uteri, it is recommended that he simply hang his diploma on his office wall. Then he can look at it and be reminded of his achievement whenever he pleases.

Melissa Fried is a sophomore international studies major.

Reflections on Powell's speech

Does Bush administration's case against Iraq merit war?

Secretary of State Colin Powell presented the most articulate case yet against Iraq and for this he should be lauded. He had much to show and even more to tell. His presentation was intelligent, engaging and further proof that not only is Iraq not complying with the U.N. Resolution 1441, but the time for action is now.

"I cannot tell you everything we know," Powell was quoted as saying according to Fox News. "But what I can share with you is deeply troubling." Indeed it was. Powell unleashed his evidence in a brutally revealing look at the current Iraqi regime. Tape recordings, satellite images and intelligence from clandestine sources formed the brunt of his presentation.

U.N. Resolution 1441 requires Iraq to grant unlimited access to any and all buildings and facilities that the U.N. Inspection Team wishes to examine. However, Iraq is not complying.

Satellite images substantiated the United States charge of Iraqi non-compliance. Powell pointed to certain signs on close-up photographs of Iraqi munitions, factories and bunkers. "The two arrows indicate the bunkers are storing chemical munitions. The truck is a decontamination vehicle in case something goes wrong," he said.

But why did the U.N. inspection team not find this? Powell showed a later picture — the image of the bunkers as they were on Dec. 22, 2002. The signature items of a chemical munitions plant were gone, including the truck. Clearly visible, however, were U.N. vehicles driving up to the gates of the facility. Coincidence? According to Powell, this phenomenon was repeated at nearly 30 different sites. All of this is, of course, in

clear violation of U.N. resolution 1441.

Like a teenager in a furious and panicked state stuffing his Playboys under the bed as he hears the turn of the doorknob to his room, Powell revealed that Iraq moved damning materials outside the back door as inspectors walked through the front.

Juvenile antics merely prolong the inevitable. Eventually, mother will discover Miss December; eventually, the United Nations will discover stashes of chemical and biological weapons. One hopes that the United Nations will realize that resolutions, like rules, are worthless without consequences for noncompliance.

Powell revealed, in detail, the extent that Iraq and al-Qaida are associated. According to detained members of the terrorist group, Iraq and al-Qaida have been conspiring for the past several years. Their strength has been building, and their resolve has been growing.

Powell made it clear that time has become too expensive for anyone to buy. "Given what we know of his terrorist associations and given his determination to exact revenge on those who oppose him, should we take the risk that he will not some day use these weapons at a time and the place and in the manner of his choosing at a time when the world is in a much weaker position to respond," Powell said.

The promises of President George W. Bush's State of the Union were not empty. Powell engaged the world and presented the strongest case yet for forceful action in Iraq. His evidence was irrefutable; his poise, honorable. It is with great optimism that one hopes his words did not fall on deaf ears.

Michael Ward is a senior history major.

Last week, Secretary of State Colin Powell presented evidence for the United Nations to convince the U.N. Security Council that Iraq is in material breach of U.N. resolutions. His presentation had the intent of justifying U.N. military action against Iraq, even though the United States and its few allies are already planning the inevitable war with Iraq, which could occur as early as March. While Powell's speech offered damaging evidence about Iraq's actions, it did not offer enough concrete evidence that justifies military action at this time. Instead, U.N. inspectors need more time — possibly months — to find conclusive proof that Saddam Hussein has not only violated U.N. resolutions, but has biological, chemical and nuclear capabilities.

There is a distinct consensus among most of the world after Powell's speech: Iraq is not fully cooperating with the United Nations or its inspectors. However, many still do not believe this is reason enough to attack Iraq. Director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control Gary Milhollin said, "I think he made a strong case that Iraq is not cooperating with the U.N. and is in material breach of Resolution 1441, but Mr. Powell had not demonstrated that the U.S. faced an imminent threat from Iraq," according to The New York Times.

While many agree that Iraq has not been complying with U.N. Resolution 1441, weapons inspection only began on Nov. 27, 2002 — less than three months ago. The inspection teams have just begun their search and have not had the chance to thoroughly investigate Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. While inspections may continue for weeks, Powell warned the council that the United Nations has little choice but to act in the face of such evidence of Iraqi behavior, essen-



BRIENNE PORTER

tially serving notice that the Bush administration has made up its mind and is ready to launch an invasion of Iraq to force Saddam from power with or without formal U.N. backing, according to The Washington Post.

Powell's speech and the Bush administration's stance have made it clear that regardless of the evidence of an Iraqi threat, or lack thereof, nothing is going to stop the war machine from rolling into Iraq. As for the Iraq/al-Qaida link, it has not been definitely proven. According to The New York Times, Powell asserted that Osama bin Laden met with senior Iraqi intelligence officials, and he even went as far as to add that "extremists" affiliated with al-Qaida have taken up residence in Baghdad and set up a base of operations there. Yet, this evidence does not provide concise or compelling connections between the terrorist groups and the Iraqi government. Many countries, because of their diverse inhabitants, are both unwilling and willing homes to terrorist cells without being directly involved with those groups. It is hard to conclusively say whether Iraq is linked to al-Qaida with the evidence Powell offered, but it is clear that it is a claim that should be investigated by U.N. inspectors.

Instead of setting March as the possible start date for the war, inspectors should be given adequate time to investigate the allegations and evidence provided by Powell's speech. War is not inevitable. If anything, Powell's speech has shown the need to allow weapons inspectors more time to do their job. If Iraq has biological, chemical or nuclear weapons, then appropriate action should be taken, but not until the U.N. inspectors find sufficient evidence.

Brienne Porter is a senior political science major.

MAIL CALL

Ross Volunteers are men of honor

I learned via e-mail the reasons surrounding the suspension of the Ross Volunteers as reported by The Battalion on Feb. 6. Also included in the e-mail was a letter by a non-Corps student present at the location the rally was held. As a witness, he is adamant that no confrontation took place between the Ross Volunteers and those gathered for the peace rally. I hope that the investigation takes this witness into account.

I was not present, so I make no pretense to offer judgment. However, I would like to ask those pressing complaints some questions. Are you aware of who the Ross Volunteers are and what they do? Are you aware that they drill with inert weapons? Are you aware that they, as well as other Corps units, run and march around the campus at regular intervals (at least they did when I attended) accompanied by their cadence calls?

I know that this may sound trite to professors, students, and others heavily involved in a "peace movement," but are you aware that most of those young men have probably obligated themselves to serve in one of the branches of the Armed Forces that will work non-stop to preserve your right to gather and to protest war, government policies, and about anything else you can come up with? Are you aware that they will literally put their lives on the line at some point in their service to defend the freedoms and liberties we all hold so dear? Everyone should be aware that the statue in the vicinity of the rally is a statue of Sul Ross and, subsequently, that it makes sense that the Ross Volunteers would regularly drill in front of said statue.

I was not aware that such public areas could be "reserved." Protesters gathered to protest one nation attacking another nation, but found it necessary to press an attack against another legitimate University organization that happened to be in the same place at the same time. Even if you received an unfriendly look or two during the course of your rally, certainly you could find it in your hearts to give these young men a break.

The Rev. Charles A. Layne
Class of 1977

