

The background of the cover is a photograph of a brick clock tower with a blue roof, surrounded by greenery. The tower has two clock faces, arched windows with white lattice, and a white arched entrance at the base. The text is overlaid on this image.

# WASHINGTON AND LEE SPECTATOR

THE Student Journal of Fact and Opinion

AN ANALYSIS OF  
OBAMA'S CABINET

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE  
HONOR SYSTEM

THE FUTURE OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC  
ORDER



Dear devoted fans,

Welcome to the Winter issue of the Spectator; I apologize for its tardiness. Hopefully you were able to maintain your delightfully conservative opinions without our influence.

This issue focuses on the state of the economy and the future job market, concepts which, as a graduating senior, consume me. Caught up in job hunting and thesis writing, I have been observ-

ing my fellow classmates prepare for full-fledged adulthood. All the emphasis on moving forward has made me wonder about what we are leaving behind. Is it possible for every class, or every person in every class, to leave some sort of legacy at Washington and Lee?

At first, I wanted the answer to be no: only magnificent accomplishments leave their mark, and certainly not everyone accomplishes something magnificent in four years of attendance. I have become convinced, however, that the answer is, in fact, the opposite. For better or worse, W&L is not a static institution. Every organization, every fundraiser, every athletic victory, every student and every faculty member, help mold this university. Not unlike other colleges, Washington and Lee is constantly changing to better reflect the identity of its students. Unfortunately, this means that every honor trial, every recruitment violation, and every case of sexual assault also alters the community. It is in our best interest to remember that we are operating in a system that has been shaped by hundreds of years of equally positive and negative, big and small, events. With only a few more months to graduation, it's time for my class to be asking for which, if any, we will be remembered.

Jen Sanow - Editor-in-Chief

# WASHINGTON AND LEE SPECTATOR

Volume XV, No. 2 Winter 2009

JEN SANOW  
Editor-in-Chief

MATHEW O'SULLIVAN  
Managing Editor

## Writers/Contributors:

JACKIE DIBIASIE  
STOCKTON BULLIT  
JARRETT BROTZMAN  
SHREYA DURVASULA  
ART ROA  
ROSS ISBEL  
NEVILLE FOGARTY  
CECILIA WHITEHURST

## MISSION STATEMENT

The W&L Spectator is a non-partisan publication dedicated to promoting the free exchange of ideas in an environment where meaningful debate and ideological diversity are often lacking. We, at staff, seek to serve the W&L community by infusing it with the ingredients necessary for a balanced educational experience. These ingredients include conservative, libertarian and classical liberal thought. We believe that peace is best achieved through strength, that utopia is nowhere, and that true equality is blind to race, creed, sex, and sexuality. We take it as our mission to expose the inadequacies of the non-traditionalist ideas that do not understand and fail to work with our student body. We strive to adhere to the beliefs of the student body that the administration often overlooks. We invite the active participation of any student or alumnae who shares our vision and would like to join our movement.

## DISCLAIMER

THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THE ARTICLES HEREIN ARE SOLELY THOSE OF EACH RESPECTIVE AUTHOR. THEY DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE OPINIONS OF ANY OTHER STAFF MEMBER OR OF WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY.

THE SPECTATOR IS A MEMBER OF THE WASHINGTON AND LEE MEDIA BOARD, WHICH CAN BE REACHED AT [MEDIABOARD@WLU.EDU](mailto:MEDIABOARD@WLU.EDU)

---

## CONTENTS

---



4 Spectator's Pix: Unusual Jobs



7 Obama's Cabinet



10 A Politically-minded  
Crossword



11 Immigration Reform

3

# *Shocks and Surprises*

*Mathew O'Sullivan*



MATHEW O'SULLIVAN EXAMINES THE EFFECT THE ECONOMIC CRISIS  
WILL HAVE ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE NEXT FOUR YEARS OF GRADUATING STUDENTS.  
WHAT DOES IT TAKE TO SUCCEED IN A NEW WORLD ORDER?

---

### DEPARTMENTS

---

#### 5 CAMPUS

WHEN BEHAVING HONORABLY CONTRADICTS SELF-INTEREST

#### 6 NATIONAL

ONE PERSON'S RESPONSE TO THE PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

#### 9 NATIONAL

AN ANALYSIS OF MCCAIN'S LOSS BASED ON THE CHANGING POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

#### 11 NATIONAL

THE PROBLEMS FACING LEGAL IMMIGRANTS, SO OFTEN OVERSHADOWED BY THEIR ILLEGAL COUNTERPARTS

#### 13 NATIONAL

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN AND GLOBAL MARKETS ARE LINKED. WILL THE CURRENT CRISIS SEE A RETURN TO MORE CONSERVATIVE VALUES?

#### 14 NATIONAL

WHY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S LOOSE CONFEDERATION WILL NEVER RESEMBLE AMERICA



# SHOCKS AND SURPRISES

## A PLEA TO FELLOW STUDENTS

I came home during winter break to find my father absolutely frantic. The global financial fallout, the challenges for the next presidential administration, and his deteriorating stock portfolio consumed him. "Everything that you're experiencing right now," he asserted, "you will remember for the rest of your life."

He's absolutely right. As we continue to endure universal economic turmoil and the ever-shifting nature of our globalized world, our surroundings will begin to change faster than anyone previously expected. The geopolitical significance of Russia will fall and South America will rise, the economies of Southeast Asian states will flourish, and Sub-Saharan Africa will become a hotspot for proxy-wars over everything from cobalt to diamonds. Simultaneously, the American manufacturing industry will undergo a monumental transformation that will be both painful and rewarding, and the European Union will possibly become an economic and political entity far superior to the United States. Even our own National Intelligence Council released a report predicting "major discontinuities, shocks, and surprises" in the international realm over the next few years. It would be nice to think that in the confines of a university we can escape the chaos in Washington or the turmoil on "Wall Street and Main Street"—as the pundits incessantly emphasize. Unfortunately that's just not the case, and whether you are a politics or biology major, now is the time to brace yourself and reconsider how you relate to the current state of international politics and global finance.

Let's begin with the latter of these. The key point to remember when considering the economic crisis is that it fundamentally differs from past recessions of the last two decades. Unlike the financial setbacks of 1991 and 2001, notes Jagadeesh Gokhale of the Cato Institute, today's financial woes emerged amidst waning production growth and declining consumer demand, reducing the likelihood that this will be a brief economic lapse. In addition, the cause of our present difficulties is not an external force that has temporarily damaged the market—rather, the epicenter lies within the framework of our financial system, and recovery will occur through a long and excruciating process. Economic revival will require treatment, surgery, and subsequent rehabilitation.

I emphasize this for a single reason: We cannot just worry about the job opportunities for this year's graduates—current freshmen will eventually encounter employment obstacles, too. So chemistry majors: Be prepared for depleted funding at research labs; finance majors: No, opportunities at Merrill Lynch will not open up a bit after four years; and politics majors: Amidst employment cuts in the private sector, there will be a flood of applicants looking for government jobs. Finding work will be a challenge for students majoring in nearly every

academic field. This is especially important as one goes on to consider how disturbances in the economic realm relate to monumental shifts in the political realm. Competitors for that awesome Washington internship or that job in New York will no longer be from UNC or Vanderbilt or Dartmouth—they'll be from Beijing, Dubai, and New Delhi. And they just might be better than you.

Think back to *The World is Flat*, in which author Thomas Friedman argues that we are experiencing a leveling of the economic playing-field, ultimately bringing in competitive participants from the once forgotten corners of developing countries. While globalization was the main instigator of this transformation, the aftermath of our current financial meltdown will tie the final knot in our new web of international economics. China, India, Brazil, Singapore and a variety of other states will all emerge from the rubble of the former financial system even stronger than before, with economic models that are far less dependent on the wellbeing of the United States (in order to avoid being, once again, harmed by the instability of the American market). Within these new geopolitical powers, enhanced educational systems will facilitate an outpouring of young professionals ready to take control of once-Westernized multinational corporations. All of this is not only inevitable, it's already happening.

If students hope to succeed in the new world order, they'll have to do two things. First: Do extremely well in college. Reduced employment means more people applying to graduate schools, and a higher education will most likely be a powerful asset when competing with qualified individuals from around the globe. Second: Adopt a globalist point of view. The various financial and political institutions of the world are no longer simply interdependent—they are interlinked, and unipolarity is no longer relevant. If students cannot step outside of the "American" point of view, they will not be able to grasp the new direction of financial firms, international corporations, or governmental organizations. I hope this all sounds dreadfully ominous (personally, as a college freshman, I'm terrified). So best of luck to all my fellow scholars—the next few years are going to be chaotic, even from the confines of a dorm room.

---

MATHEW O'SULLIVAN KNOWS THAT THIS ARTICLE ALONE WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MORE THAN A FEW TEARFUL PHONE CALLS HOME. TO REQUEST A PERSONAL APOLOGY, CONTACT HIM AT OSULLIVANM@WLU.EDU.

---

# SPECTATOR'S PIX

## JOB SUPERLATIVES

Did Mathew's article on the rapidly shrinking job market strike fear into your heart? Are your law school, med school, or business school plans not working out? Do you have nightmares about living in refrigerator boxes and subsisting only off things you can catch? Fear not! We always have your best interest at heart and have combed the internet tirelessly to compile a collection of future professions you may not have considered. From the ridiculous to the obscene, here are a few jobs that might actually be worse than unemployment.

### Most Desperate: the Human Lab Rat



This job has absolutely no qualifications, except for a fairly strong constitution, a risk-taker's outlook on life, and an ability to accept "Death" as a potential side effect. Human lab rats are often

lacking in any kind of job training and have a very limited skill set. According to one website, a University of California at San Diego study paid students \$15 an hour to have the root killer and World War I nerve agent chloropicrin shot into their eyes and noses, all in the name of science!

### Most Awkward: the Chicken Sexer

This person's job is to examine baby chicks and determine if they are male or female. The gender of the chicken hatchlings influences the type of nutrients they receive, so this job is critical in raising big, strong, delicious chickens.



### Hottest: the Volcanologist

Becoming a volcanologist would allow you to join the ranks of celebrated scientists like David Johnson (killed at Mt. St. Helens), Katia and Maurice Krafft (killed at Mt. Unzen), and Tommy Lee Jones in the movie *Volcano* (narrowly escapes death at Mt. Wilshire). Volcanologists study volcanoes, lava, magma, and other geological phenomena. Though it does require you be a little science-oriented, there are always plenty of openings.



### Most Disgusting: the Orangutan Pee Collector



Yes, there are people who are paid to do nothing but collect urine samples from monkeys. Our minds are blown by how gross this job is. The goal of this type of work is to better understand great ape reproduction through DNA analysis in urine, but we're pretty

sure we'd sacrifice science in this case. If we're being honest, it is probably better to be unemployed. They aren't even cute.

### Loneliest: the Forest Fire Lookout

This is the ideal job for solitary individuals who enjoy communing with nature, hate civilization, and are looking for the chance to write the next great American novel. Forest fire lookouts man a tower located on a park or reserve and watch for signs of - you guessed it - fire. The only drawbacks are the loneliness and the monotony. And



the nature. Significantly, Jack Kerouac served as a lookout. He gave up after 63 days of pure, unadulterated boredom.

### Most Altruistic: the Volunteer



Ever year, thousands of misguided individuals sign up with a variety of international organizations and pay about \$3,000 a week to pitch in on a scientific expedition. While your generous nature is no doubt appreciated by all your friends, paying people for the opportunity to help

them do their research does not sound like a path to getting off the Raman diet.

# MOTIVATION MATTERS

## THE TRUTH ABOUT THE HONOR SYSTEM

No semester at Washington and Lee is complete without a scandal, and Juicy Campus has risen to the occasion this semester, flooding the internet with a barrage of vitriolic and generally false accusations. The victims of these attacks have been quick to respond, insisting that participation in the Juicy Campus phenomenon undermines the cornerstones of honor and gentlemanly conduct upon which our school is founded.

I have no desire to launch into a digression on our “community of trust,” on the merits of the honor system, or on the ways in which it sets us apart from other universities. I am not, in short, an admissions brochure. I would not have believed that a system that has institutionalized honorable conduct and mutual respect would be conducive to the penchant for destruction and verbal abuse Juicy Campus bloggers have demonstrated. The very fact of their existence – despicable though it may be – reveals the contradictions inherent in our honor system.

When engaging in this type of discussion, one must remember that it is in human nature to act in one’s best interest, to maximize one’s utility. If, when faced with a choice, students consistently chose the honorable option the honor system would be unnecessary. The honor system exists because of our tendency

---

IF PEOPLE BEHAVED  
WITH HONOR, THE  
HONOR SYSTEM WOULD  
BE UNNECESSARY. THE  
HONOR SYSTEM EXISTS  
BECAUSE OF OUR TEN-  
DENCY TOWARDS DIS-  
HONORABLE BEHAVIOR.

---

towards dishonorable behavior. Its importance to our community, bordering on ascendancy, reveals that students often do not choose honor on their own. Why? Because in circumstances in which the honorable path is in opposition to the self-interested one, and in which either there are no consequences or the potential gain outweighs the risks, individuals will frequently choose the latter.

Let us imagine a student taking an exam. If, facing a poor grade, he chooses not to cheat because to do so would violate his moral code, he is acting with honor. If, however, he chooses not to cheat because one bad grade pales in comparison to expulsion from the university, he is not acting honorably. It

may be in his nature to cheat, but he has realized that the benefits do not outweigh the risks. He is acting in his own self-interest, which is intelligent and completely understandable, but not born from any noble aspirations.

The honor system’s success is based on deterrence. Countless times have I heard students, including members of the Executive Committee, discourage dishonorable behavior because it’s “not worth it.” Even the video shown to every incoming freshmen class upon their introduction to the honor system suggests that the risk of being caught is not worth the potential gain. The student’s decision to write his own paper is not made in the name of honor, but in self-preservation. I’m sure I don’t need to point out the world of difference that exists between something that is “dishonorable” and something that is “not worth the risk.” The motivation to avoid the first is adherence to a moral code, but the motivation to avoid the second is purely self-interested.

On a fundamental level, honorable behavior should exist without regard for consequences, without expectation of reward or fear of punishment. Yet it is this aspect – fear – that makes the honor system a success in the academic environment. There is always the danger of being caught, there is always someone watching, and there is always tangible evidence. Like the video suggests, plagiarism isn’t worth it.

Juicy Campus, however, has one quality that other aspects of campus life lack – anonymity. This single characteristic negates any possible consequences for behaving dishonorably. Juicy Campus presents a risk-free environment in which the only entity able to sit in judgment is one’s own conscience, an asset many students appear to be lacking.

Now we as a community have a decision to make. Juicy Campus is an example of the depths to which human nature will sink if consequences for dishonorable behavior are removed. Surely our current state, one in which “honorable” behavior is more profitable than dishonorable, is preferable. We can continue calling it an honor system as long as we are willing to embrace the misnomer, overlooking the contradiction inherent in an institution that enforces honor by punishing dishonor. This voluntary blindness, however, is hardly more appealing. Perhaps all that can be hoped for is that students who have been acting honorably out of self-preservation will become so accustomed to the system that they will begin acting honorably out of habit, and eventually, out of a true commitment to their own notions of honor.

---

JEN SANOW APOLOGIZES FOR HER GRIM VIEW OF HUMANITY, BUT HER WALLET WAS STOLEN RECENTLY. SHE WELCOMES COMMENTS AND INFORMATION ON ITS WHEREABOUTS AT [SANOWJ@WLU.EDU](mailto:SANOWJ@WLU.EDU).

---

# INAUGURATION DAY

## THE BIRTH OF AN ERA

I'll happily admit that while in D.C. on January 20th I could feel the rampant Obama-mania. From about 6:45 in the morning to 4:30 in the afternoon I spent my time with over two-million people parading our capitol and bearing the agonizing cold, immersed in what was undoubtedly a momentous occasion in American history. Yet on the ride back home, I found myself pondering a somewhat frightening question: Did any of that really matter? The swarms of political fanatics were fun and it was touching to see such an eclectic group of people so moved by the event, but it's hard to determine whether the day was anything more than a patriotic spectacle. In his inaugural speech, Obama emphasized that "it is ultimately the faith and determination of the American people upon which this nation relies." If the individual efforts of our countrymen and women fail to extend beyond political enthusiasm, President Obama's own initiatives will matter very little.

While considering this topic I think back to September 11th—a horrific day, yet a spectacular opportunity to rally our country into a new era of global politics and economics. We could have utilized the unity and willpower produced by the catastrophe to shed ourselves of senseless partisanship and, as Thomas Friedman likes to say, move onto September 12th. But we didn't. Instead we became stuck on 9/11—we galvanized the neoconservatives, rejected diplomatic initiatives, squandered our alliances and continued to borrow money with little concern for the consequences. Over the past eight years, we've not only wasted a chance to revitalize the United States—we've moved into decline. I pray that following the euphoria of the

inauguration Americans don't simply retreat back to their homes to wait out the financial crisis and then carry on as before, only to maintain our path towards geopolitical ruin.

Fortunately, the sense of political romanticism I felt over the course of inauguration day helps me to believe that we

---

OVER THE PAST EIGHT YEARS WE'VE NOT ONLY WASTED A CHANCE TO REVITALIZE THE UNITED STATES, WE'VE MOVED INTO A DECLINE.

---

will avoid doing such a thing. There was something about the passion exhibited by the crowds of spectators in Washington that reminded me of...well, I hesitate to say of the excellence formerly exhibited by the United States, because neither I nor any other freshman here has consciously experienced the great nation cataloged in our history books. I suppose what I sensed on the National Mall was the willpower of the "greatest generation" and the idealism of the 1960s and the humanitarianism of the Clinton administration. Every single person I saw walking towards the Capitol was energetic and excited about the opportunity to define a new era in American history.

The United States will never return to the level of global dominance it maintained during the 20th Century. We will never again be the powerhouse industrial power of the Cold War or the world's only superpower. But we can become an invaluable asset to the age of globalization.

---

MATHEW O'SULLIVAN WELCOMES THE SUPPORT OF OTHER OBAMA SYMPATHIZERS AND CAN BE REACHED AT OSULLIVANM@WLU.EDU.

---



# OBAMA'S PIX

## UNDERSTANDING THE CABINET BEHIND THE MAN

**Editor's Note:** The Staff of the Spectator recently came across an ancient Assyrian proverb, which states, "Tell me your friends, and I'll tell you who you are." With this mantra in mind, and after extensive internet research, we have analyzed Obama's choices for Cabinet officials and developed a complex and elaborate rating system for the ones we found the most interesting. We hope you appreciate it as much as we did.

**Chief of Staff:** Rahm "Rahmbo" Emmanuel

**Fun Fact:** Rahm studied dance as a child and is a graduate of the Evanston School of Ballet.

**Pros:** known for his "take-no-prisoners" attitude; strong supporter of Israel against Palestinian insurgents; supported President Bush's position in Iraq

**Cons:** a loose cannon, and ironically a staunch supporter of gun control

**Approval Rating:** 3 out of 5 stars, based purely on projected cursing and ass kicking



**Attorney-General:** Eric Himpton Holder

**Fun Fact:** will be the first African-American Attorney General

**Pros:** when entering the 4th grade he was selected to participate in a program for intellectually-gifted students

**Cons:** believes that the Second Amendment does not protect an individual right to keep and bear arms for purposes unrelated to a State's operation of a well-regulated militia; opposes the Patriot Act, NSA surveillance, and US interrogation techniques

**Approval Rating:** 1 Rotten Tomato



**Secretary of State:** Hillary Clinton



**Fun Fact:** served as President of Wellesley College's Young Republican organization.

**Pros:** has threatened to "annihilate" Iran should they launch an attack on Israel

**Cons:** is an advocate of socialized health care; believes that the free market is "the most radically disruptive force in American life;" due to space limitations, we are content with the adjective "Communist"

**Approval Rating:** Surely you jest.

**Secretary of the Treasury:** Timothy Geithner

**Fun Fact:** spent most of his childhood overseas, including countries like Zimbabwe, India, and Thailand



**Pros:** is brilliant, has oodles of experience, played a critical role as a Treasury official in managing several international economic crises in the 1990s; supports pressuring China to stop manipulating its currency values

**Cons:** probably cheated on his taxes, is not Paul Krugman

**Approval Rating:** it is every American's god-given right to pay as little taxes as possible, so we doubly approve

**Secretary of Defense:** Robert Gates

**Fun Fact:** was an Eagle Scout

**Pros:** is a Republican! was also a member of the CIA; was not in favor of withdrawing from Iraq or direct negotiations with Iran

**Cons:** probably involved in the Iran-Contra scandal

**Approval Rating:** Obvious.



**Secretary of Homeland Security:** Janet Napolitano

**Fun Fact:** served as the attorney for law professor Anita Hill when Hill testified against U.S. Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas.

**Pros:** believes the right to bear arms is fundamental

**Cons:** ambiguous, hypocritical position on immigration and border control

**Approval Rating:** would be higher if she were a man





**Secretary for Energy:** Steven Chu  
**Fun Fact:** is a co-winner of the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1997 for the "development of methods to cool and trap atoms with laser light"  
**Pros:** supports nuclear power as an alternative energy source  
**Cons:** taught himself pole vaulting from a book  
**Approval Rating:** radioactive



**Ambassador to the UN:** Susan Rice  
**Fun Fact:** nicknamed "Spo," short for "Sportin," during her basketball-playing days  
**Pros:** will adopt a strong position on genocide and other crimes against humanity  
**Cons:** implicated in missing an opportunity to neutralize Osama bin Laden while in Sudan; not related to Condi, which would make Thanksgiving really awkward  
**Approval Rating:** second favorite Cabinet member, after Gates



**Secretary of Education:** Arne Duncan




**Fun Fact:** suggested opening the country's first gay-friendly high school  
**(Editor's Note: we are confused about exactly how this high school would differ from others)**  
**Pros:** friends with R. Kelly  
**Cons:** friends with R. Kelly  
**Approval Rating:** pending until musical abilities can be determined

**Not exciting enough for documentation:** Secretary of the Department of the Interior Ken Salazar; Labor Secretary Hilda Solis; US Trade Representative Ron Kirk; Secretary for the Department of Agriculture Tom Vilsack; Transportation Secretary Ron Lahood; Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Shaun Donovan; Secretary of Veterans' Affairs General Eric Shinseki.

Upon first examination, one is struck by the enormous diversity on the Cabinet. There are five women, two African-Americans, two Asian-Americans, two Hispanics, four basketball players, and two Republicans. Then one remembers that there are 16 liberals, and any hope for balance, bipartisanship, and rational judgment is lost.

FUNCTIONALLY ILLITERATE?  
 CAN'T TELL THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A COMMA AND AN APOSTROPHE? LIKE MAKING OFFENSIVE COMMENTS WITH LITTLE SUPPORTING EVIDENCE?

If you answered yes, or grunted in assent, to any of the above questions, then the Spectator is the place for you! We need obnoxious, inflexible, and frustratingly dense writers to compose articles - and by articles we mean political diatribes - for the magazine. Contact us at [spectator@wlu.edu](mailto:spectator@wlu.edu) or come to our next meeting if you are interested.



# MCCAIN'S LOSS

## UNDERSTANDING THE CHANGING POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Why did McCain lose? It's a question that's been plaguing conservatives since election day, and there are almost as many answers as there are questioners. Obama's massive electoral victory may seem inevitable in hindsight: so inevitable, in fact, that we forget how close the race really was, even weeks before election day. In polls taken in early September, McCain led by as much as ten points nationally despite Obama's perceived advantages. Classical political wisdom ("It's the economy, stupid") holds that the beginning of the current economic crisis spelled the end for McCain: bank failures, global financial instability, and his involvement in the unpopular bailout plan quickly reversed his popularity. Other factors contributed as well, however. Of particular interest is the case of our own home (or, as the case may be, temporarily adopted) state of Virginia, and the factors that led one of the most famously red states to turn blue.

Virginia's conversion is historically surprising, as the state has not voted Democratic since Lyndon Johnson carried it in 1964. Bush took Virginia in 2000 and again in 2004 by an even higher margin. The state was clearly shifting away from its reliably red status, however, and recent elections for the Senate and for Virginia's governorship have underscored this changing reality. In 2005 Tim Kaine won election as governor after a race in which he trailed his Republican opponent Jerry Kilgore until only weeks before election day. The immediately preceding governor, Mark Warner won a decisive victory over Republican Jim Gilmore in the 2008 Senate race, a particularly significant event given Gilmore's status as a fellow former governor and in the details of the election: Gilmore carried only four counties and lost with only thirty-five percent of the vote to Warner's sixty-five.

Perhaps the most powerful indication of Virginia's changing status, however, is Jim Webb's defeat of high-profile Republican George Allen in the 2006 Senate elections. Before the race began, Allen was viewed as a certain winner, his name often circulated as a possible Republican presidential candidate. Webb, however, a former Marine and Secretary of the Navy under Ronald Reagan, turned what was projected to be an easy reelection for Allen into an intense struggle. Following a racial gaffe by Allen (the macaca incident), Webb took the lead in the race, winning a narrow victory. With the announced retirement of Republican Senator John Warner, Webb will become the senior senator from Virginia, and with Mark Warner's election the state will have two Democratic senators for the first time since 1970.

Clearly the political landscape has changed, but why? Changing demographics tell part of the story. Virginia in 1996, for instance had a white population of approximately 81% and

a black population of around 16%. In 2008 the demographics were white 70%, black 20%. Thus, although Bob Dole won around 53% of the white vote in 1996, he carried the state by two points over Bill Clinton, while McCain with a higher percentage of whites voting for him (60%) lost the state by five and a half points. Northern, urbanized Virginia is becoming more inclined to vote Democratic, and the traditional Republican strongholds in the south and west of the state are unable to outweigh a united Democratic base such as was seen in this past election.

From the start, then, McCain faced challenges in a state he might once have considered safe. Demographic shifts combined with increasing economic worries and the surging popularity of Barack Obama caused worry in Republican circles that Virginia might go Democratic. The state was viewed as a kind of barometer for McCain: problems there would be deeply troubling for his larger campaign. And problems developed, concurrently with his national decline: the last poll indicating a McCain lead in Virginia was in early September. Polls taken in the weeks leading up to the election gave Obama a lead of anywhere between two and four points, a lead that remained stable throughout the final months of the campaign. Additional polling data supplies further insights: voters trusted Obama over McCain on the economy by huge margins (70%-28%), negating McCain's advantage on national security.

Virginia's conversion, then, was not as surprising as it may have seemed. The state which elected two Democratic senators and installed a Democratic governor could hardly be considered a purely Republican stronghold, even on the national level. In the end it was a confluence of factors demographic and political, welded together by adverse economic conditions and the advent of Barack Obama, that McCain simply could not overcome.

The future political alignment of the state remains uncertain: such a perfect storm cannot be relied upon to happen again, and Republicans are far from abandoning one of their traditional strongholds. Yet it is fair to say that Virginia has taken on a much more purplish hue after the last election, and the color shows no signs of fading.

---

ART ROA WILL BE FOCUSING HIS CAMPAIGN EFFORTS ON VIRGINIA IN 2012. HE WELCOMES COMMENTS AT ROAR@WLU.EDU.

---

# PRESIDENTIAL TRIBUTE

**ACROSS**

- 1 Pests fought off in a "Mario Paint" mini-game
- 6 "Jabberwocky" opener
- 10 Picture problem
- 14 Containing gold
- 15 Coleridge work
- 16 Rory's friend on "Gilmore Girls"
- 17 Attack ad, maybe
- 18 Exuberance
- 19 "Metamorphoses" author
- 20 1974 hit by Hues Corporation re-recorded as a tribute to our new president?
- 23 Hole-making tool
- 24 Missile type
- 25 Mar. follower
- 28 Like a certain citrus fruit
- 31 Melodic
- 35 Page, in a way
- 37 Indian bread
- 39 Tidy
- 40 1982 hit by The Clash re-recorded as a tribute to our new president?

1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8	9		10	11	12	13
14						15					16			
17						18					19			
	20					21					22			
			23				24							
25	26	27		28		29	30		31			32	33	34
35			36		37			38		39				
40				41					42					
43					44					45				
46					47		48			49		50		
			51			52			53		54			
	55	56					57	58				59	60	
61					62					63				64
65					66					67				
68					69					70				

- 43 PayPal scrip
- 44 Schlep
- 45 Alvin and the Chipmunks, e.g.
- 46 Submitted
- 48 1952 Olympics host
- 50 Lt.'s subordinate
- 51 Burden of proof
- 53 CBS logo
- 55 1978 hit by The B-52's re-recorded as a tribute to our new president?
- 61 Opera star
- 62 Regan's father
- 63 Bombastic
- 65 David Archuleta, nearly
- 66 Dublin's land
- 67 Elicit

- 68 Pool member
- 69 Contents of some cartridges
- 70 Darn again

**DOWN**

- 1 Its price fell below \$2/gal in Nov. 2008
- 2 How a paresthetic feels
- 3 51, e.g.
- 4 Royal headwear
- 5 Write awkwardly
- 6 Kirk led one
- 7 Weaken, as a flower
- 8 Housemaids
- 9 Nero's tutor
- 10 Antietam, compared to other Civil War battles
- 11 Basalt source

- 12 The U in "Law & Order: SVU"
- 13 Cardinal color
- 21 Post-toast sound
- 22 Pakistani woman's clothing
- 25 French clergymen
- 26 Ben & Jerry's flavor "Imagine Whirled"
- 27 Played over
- 29 Seahawk Hasselbeck
- 30 Swift creature?
- 32 "The Rape of the Lock" card game
- 33 1982 World Cup site
- 34 Cultural values
- 36 Country music?
- 38 New Jersey five
- 41 It's anthem is "March of the Volunteers"
- 42 Red carpet VIP

- 47 Atomic cores
- 49 Type of bar
- 52 Group of geese
- 54 Short piano piece
- 55 Tarry
- 56 Calling company?
- 57 Songbird
- 58 Bonanza finds
- 59 Flightless flock
- 60 Houston university
- 61 Archaeological site
- 64 Soft drink "Mountain"

NEVILLE FOGARTY IS TOO CLEVER FOR HIS OWN GOOD. HE CAN BE REACHED AT FOGARTYN@WLU.EDU.

# IMMIGRATION REFORM

## AN INSIDER'S PERSPECTIVE

The recent Wall Street meltdown shifted the presidential candidates' focus to the economy, job creation, and the role of government in the financial sector. An issue at the forefront of voters' minds just a few months earlier, immigration, was no longer a major concern. "Immigration" immediately brings to mind illegal immigration concerns and increasing security along U.S. borders. For the current 26.6 million legal immigrants (the largest percent of the US population in history), a host of other queries and concerns emerged during the election.

The United States has long been known as the nation of immigrants, but foreign-born people have not always been treated with care or even respect. A quick overview of the history of immigration over the last hundred years will reveal the mistreatment of millions of people before they even officially stepped onto U.S. soil. Once they had arrived at their new home, the situation rarely improved. After the Great Wave of Immigration in the early part of the 20th century, the number of people moving to the U.S. trickled down, and stayed down during the subsequent World Wars.

The later part of the century saw significant changes in U.S. policy. Congress passed the Hart-Celler Immigration Bill in 1965, which fundamentally changed the system. Doing away with the old nationality quotas, the bill allowed for people to move to the U.S. regardless of country of origin. The bill was seen as an extension of the civil rights movement, and the following flood of immigrants was unexpected. This new

structure was supposed to strengthen family reunification and fill needed employment skills, which it achieved, but it also dramatically changed the makeup of the American population.

The September 11th attacks were a rude awakening, and made painfully clear the holes and gaps in the U.S. immigration system. All 20 attackers were foreign-born, and they had entered the country on tourist or student visas. Four of the visas had expired, and the illegal aliens had slipped by unnoticed, exposing the lack of enforcement within the system. The attacks forced a revitalization of the immigration system, increasing background checks of applicants, as well as tightening border controls.

For immigrants trying to legally get to the U.S. there are several avenues available. A tourist or business visa (B-2 and B-1 respectively) are non-immigrant visas, which means the applicant, barring a visa renewal, must leave the U.S. There cannot be any intention to live in the States. Work and student visas are also common, and often have a grace period after the employment or schooling period has been completed. For people intending to move permanently to the U.S. there are three options; family immigrant visas, employment-based immigrant visas, and diversity program immigrant visas. The first requires a sponsor who is a U.S. citizen or permanent residence, the second requires an employer to sponsor the applicant, and the third is a lottery system, which draws from countries that have low immigration rates to the U.S.

For many immigrants, the road to becoming a permanent resident is filled with obstacles and pit holes. Hidden fees (attorney and processing fees) abound, and unexpected bureaucratic red tape becomes increasingly frustrating. Once an application has been received, there is a rigorous paperwork process, which is also an expensive one. Each visa application costs \$335, and there are many more fees that begin to add up. Each applicant must undergo a medical examination (whose costs are borne by the applicant), and any serious medical or psychiatric condition is grounds for disqualification.

In addition, immigration enforcement officials often see the rights that are afforded to immigrants as privileges. Often, minor infractions of the law





can lead to immediate deportation, regardless of the length of stay in the U.S. or family members who are citizens or permanent residents. Most immigrants are discouraged from buying property since a failure to secure a permanent resident status (or green card) would make selling the property a financial burden. Children or spouses of the main applicant can become burdens on the applicant as well, since they are not allowed to work. Students who are on any visa that is not a student visa are placed in a difficult category, since they are neither official U.S. residents, nor international students. This middle ground between immigrant and green card holder is a perilous one, and difficult to navigate.

It is yet unclear how president-elect Obama's immigrant background will (if at all) affect his views on immigration policy. Obama's record has been favorable to legal immigrants, while cracking down on illegal aliens. Obama worked on the Citizenship Promotion Act, which ensured that "application fees are both reasonable and fair". In addition, the Senator introduced amendments to "put greater emphasis on keeping immigrant families together."

With the recent decline of the U.S. economy, as well as emerging giants in Asia, it is unclear if immigration rates will

---

THE AMENITIES, DEMOCRATIC FREEDOMS, AND TECHNOLOGY, WHICH HAVE LONG BEEN THE ATTRACTION FOR IMMIGRANTS...ARE NOW AVAILABLE IN OTHER COUNTRIES AT A CHEAPER COST.

---

continue to increase. The amenities, democratic freedoms, and technology, which have long been the attraction for immigrants looking for a better life, are now available in other countries at a cheaper cost. For many natives, a decrease in immigration is a good thing, an event that will increase the number of jobs



available for citizens. However, it is important to keep in mind the fact that this country, from her very inception, has been a nation of foreigners, of outsiders.

The U.S. is no longer at the forefront of technology and agriculture. Tightening immigration controls for scientists, engineers and students may increase the number of spots at research institutes and universities for Americans, but at what cost? Proponents of the free market should revile these restrictions; allowing for the flow of intellect across borders in order to ignite science and technology programs in high schools and universities in the U.S. make them more competitive and allow them to turn out individuals capable of holding their own against foreign nations.

The increasing use of the internet and subsequent shrinking of the globe may make this discussion outdated shortly, but until then, the United States needs to continue looking at its immigration policies and ensuring that all its inhabitants, whether they were born here or not, have the equalities they deserve.

---

SHREYA DURVASULA IS GETTING MARRIED IN ORDER TO STAY IN THE COUNTRY. SEND YOUR CONGRATULATIONS AND OTHER COMMENTS TO DURVASULAS@WLU.EDU.

---

# WHAT LIES AHEAD?

## THE FUTURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

The recent Madoff scandal seems to epitomize the character of oversight and due diligence in the last few years, both of which have left much to be desired. Over 20 years, Madoff was able to accumulate 50 billion dollars in capital into his "fund," which was little more than a complex ponzi scheme. A ponzi scheme is a system where investors are promised guaranteed returns on their capital if they invest in a fund. However, when investors want to withdraw their earnings, they are actually withdrawing the deposits of the fund's newer investors. In effect it's like a revolving door hotel, where the valet pockets the guests luggage. Most ponzi schemes never get too far because inevitably they get too large to hide.

It is remarkable, then, that one man, audited not once but numerous times over the years by the Securities Exchange Commission, was able to keep this secret so long, masking his activities by making legitimate investments. Whether it started out as a legitimate hedge fund or not is irrelevant compared to the 50 billion that has been wiped out. The regulators should bear the brunt of the responsibility for not noticing what was right in front of their faces.

Poor regulation has been a problem at large and played a significant role in the formation of the crisis we are seeing today. During the Long Boom, a term used by economists to describe the unparalleled period of economic expansion during the 90's, attaining credit became irresponsibly easy. New products such as low-doc and no-doc mortgages, requiring little more than a signature, became commonplace. Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae made good business buying up these mortgages and neatly packaging them into securities. These securities, then approved by the rating agencies, were bought like a junkie looking for his fix by mutual funds, retirement funds, investment banks, and even a few countries. When it became apparent that these weren't good loans and foreclosures began to increase in mid-2006, no one knew how far the debt had spread.

Now we know, and thanks to globalization we're all in this together, for better or for worse. So what should we expect? Will foreign investors feel safe putting their cash into AAA rated bonds, knowing that rating agencies during the housing bubble had given the same rating to absolutely worthless bonds (AAA rating implies that the investment has no risk of default, i.e. guaranteed return). Will the international economic order stay intact, or will it degenerate into isolationist pockets reminiscent of the 1930s?

Perhaps that's an extreme, yet as Alan Greenspan pointed out in his autobiography, trust is the key to the capitalist system. You trust that your waiter won't steal your credit card number; you trust that your deposit at the bank will be there at the end of the day, and businesses trust that their suppliers and buyers will cooperate. The Chinese, who have been happy to funnel their trade surplus back into the U.S. economy, have kept the latter strong and devalued the wan. Both these forces kept Chinese goods flowing over the Pacific, allowing their nation to profit exponentially.

Yet with increasing domestic calls for more spending on infrastructure and welfare programs, will the current crisis convince the Chinese to stop the money flowing into Wall Street? Analysts estimate that foreign investments in the U.S. over the last 15 years have depressed interest rates by a full percentage point. Now that even most U.S. investors are flocking to the safety of treasury bonds from the bear market, will the money keep coming from overseas? And will those developing economies that strive to emulate the American economy become disillusioned with our model and look to more mixed economies for guidance? Certainly the answers to these questions will probably require Americans to tighten their belts and stop spending money that they don't

---

### WILL THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER STAY IN TACT, OR WILL IT DEGENERATE INTO ISOLATIONIST POCKETS REMINISCENT OF THE 1930S?

---

have.

Recent years has seen the average savings rate in this country go negative, as Americans have grown too used to robust economic growth, despite the fact that history dictates such things do not last forever. Thankfully, seeing your portfolio drop 40 percent or more is a rather sobering event, so we should see that savings rate rise again as people remember the warm fuzzy feeling of guaranteed returns. Maybe now the financial system will be tethered again to conservatism, and not the unbridled 'casino finance,' that the Germans have accurately dubbed our establishment.

---

ROBERT WARNEFORD-THOMSON IS CHECKING HIS STOCK PORTFOLIO AND CAN BE REACHED AT WARNEFORD-THOMSONR@WLU.EDU WITH QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS.

---

# CONSTITUTION AND CONFEDERACY

## WHY THE EUROPEAN UNION IS NOT THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

After coming off the period of an American election, it easy to take for granted the system of governance and the structure and stability our constitution provides. It was no accident that our constitution formed how it did, a result of the pressures our new nation faced after a revolution. All constitutions are products of the political, economic and social situations under which they were written. Differences in circumstances and which social element of society pushed for reform, to vast differences in the strength of the new constitution, the goals of the constitution and the methods of governance. Due to theses circumstances, the American Constitution has turned out very differently than the E.U.'s resulting mélange of treaties and agreements.

Situation is everything. During the late 1700's, Americans eventually formed a Constitution out of necessity. Though relatively isolated from the European countries geographically, America realized the Articles of Confederation simply did not provide for what the colonies needed at the time: a manner of minting money, a strong national army, a national government to organize infrastructure and deal with foreign affairs. Several situations including Shay's rebellion and the problem with British troops preventing continued westward expansion helped spur Americans into creating, and, relatively quickly, ratifying a new Constitution.

Europe's experience attempting to develop a new constitution has occurred during a time of vastly different circumstances from the period of American constitutional formation. Instead of forming during a time of rebellion, the roots of the EU come about as a common trading bloc- an attempt to create economic incentives for peace in the unstable post-WWII Europe. Series of weak, voluntarily binding treaties and the rapid proliferation of additional member countries has led to much more than a common trading group- instead forming a semi-super national governing body. In addition, Europe has not bound together during a time of a great threat (nor have they really had to), as was the case with America uniting against Britain.

The primary objective of American unity was to provide security while allowing and protecting, to a large extent, personal liberties and economic freedom and growth. In contrast, the E.U is an experiment in liberalism, building economic bonds between past enemies to prevent another World War. Consequently, much of the focus of the E.U. has been on economic policy, freedom of travel and goods, and a single common market.

Another difference between the formation of an American constitution and the failed attempts of the E.U. has been the perceived need among the different classes: the masses and the elite. In America, the stake in the new structure was very much



shared: universal white male suffrage, secure personal liberties, and economic freedom- it was fairly simple to understand. However, in Europe, the stakes are much different. Many of the common people in Europe see no need to change the system- freedom of travel, the euro, and trading standardization are working out fine for them. Any change to the E.U. is also very complicated, which causes much of the European populace to vote against any adoption of governmental change. E.U. constitutional adoption has also been largely driven by the political elite, raising the resentment of the masses of an E.U. constitution. The differences of class-based stakes in constitutional formation help to explain the differences in processes and outcomes between the U.S. and the E.U.


The "failure" for Europe to adopt a constitution and become a "United States of Europe" is largely situational. An apparent lack of need, no single threat and commoners not buying into its promises have put any adoption of a constitution on hold. If Europe is to move forward with the process of political consolidation of power, it will have to happen under the auspices of the masses in response to a perceived threat- social, military or religious. Until then, the E.U. will continue to remain a loosely tied but powerful confederation of member states.

---

JARRET BROTZMAN HOPES YOU VALUE HIS GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE. HE WELCOMES QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS AT [BROTZMANJ@WLU.EDU](mailto:brotzmanj@wlu.edu).

---

MEANWHILE, ON THE ROAD TO RECOVERY...



[www.CoxAndForkum.com](http://www.CoxAndForkum.com)



[www.CoxAndForkum.com](http://www.CoxAndForkum.com)

CARTOONS COURTESY OF COX AND FORKUM