

Continued from page 5

UPEI Students for Life is a pro-life campus group that will head off its first year as a society in the upcoming 2005-06 school year. Unfortunately we have not been able to attack all the world's injustices in the 3 weeks we've been a society. But, we do plan to work closely with organizations like PEI Right to Life to promote awareness and education on life issues such as abortion and euthanasia. We are interested in exploring and encouraging positive choices (ie. adoption). We are both politically and personally for life.

Thanks for your concerns,
If you wish to contact the society, you can do so at
upe_i_students_for_life@hotmail.com

Sincerely,
Maria Trainor

Dear Mr. Editor,

I am writing in regards to the letter published in the March 30th edition of The Cadre, concerning the validity of the pro-life argument. I am somewhat confused by many of the points that the writer made, especially in regards to: people's unworthiness to define what is just and the contradiction between being personally pro-life, but politically pro-choice.

The writer of last week's letter questions how pro-lifers can define what is just. People have been defining what is just for endless ages. Justice is defined through sound arguments and dictated by reason, conscience, and a natural sense of what is fair to all. It is supposed to be free from favoritism or self-interest or bias or deception; or conforming with established standards or rules. Think of female suffragettes: was it wrong for them to define justice as equal voting rights for men and women? People can and will define what is just, and those who consider abortion to be a serious act of injustice have the right to make the statement, based on sound arguments.

Secondly, I am perplexed at how

the writer could consider herself personally pro-life, but politically pro-choice. With such a moral issue at hand, how can there be a separation between the two? : If she personally feels that abortion is wrong, but politically feels that it is right, it is like saying that she would never abuse her own child, but she does not mind if other people abuse their children. The statement is contradictory.

I do have another question, if I may. I am wondering if a person does not become a person at conception, then when does personhood start? The question of when personhood begins is relevant because if a fetus is human, I think everyone will agree that it should not be killed - we do not kill a human alive for 4 years, how is it right to kill a human alive for five-minutes? If personhood does not begin at conception, is it 1 minute after conception, 6 months after conception, 4 years after birth, 25 years after birth or 60 years after birth? If not at conception, is there a little light that goes off signaling personhood?

These questions are just a few thoughts on my part. I am very happy that the writer of the article in question started off this discussion. Abortion is a serious question of justice that should concern every human being - male or female - and the topic needs to be discussed. With 315 abortions happening everyday in Canada alone, not to mention the 150 thousand mothers and fathers of high school and university age who have been seriously wounded physically, emotionally and spiritually by the unspeakable crime, abortion is a portion of the pro-life argument that should be discussed, especially on campus.

I only wish that instead of threatening the pro-lifers as people and considering herself to be a constant thorn in their side, that the writer would step up to mature and serious discussion about abortion.

Sincerely,
Maureen O'Connor

Dear Mr. Editor,

There is a certain responsibility that comes with being a political representative figure. For the purpose of this article I have defined this responsibility as the constant balancing of *practical political concerns*, and *ideal political concerns*. Practical political concerns are those involving basic financial issues and deadlines, while ideal political concerns, in the case of the SU, involve basic democratic principles (perhaps a respect for the equality of individuals, etc...). The current SU is feeling the pressure of balancing these concerns in the face of contentious election issues. Unfortunately, from what has been revealed so far, there is an imbalance of concerns, which seems to give pragmatism ultimate priority over political ideals. This is a situation of, or which will lead to, political mediocrity. In the following passage I will outline two examples relating to the recent SU elections in which a so-called practical approach has left discarded the political ideal:

a) Over the course of the elections there were several complaints of technical difficulties. That is to say, certain individuals stated that they could not vote (at least on first try) for certain candidates, as the candidates' names would not appear on the online ballot. Of course, finding any evidence of these technical errors is difficult as it lies obscured by the vast indeterminacy of the technological realm. In attempt to investigate the matter election CRO Pat Curley, as he stated in the past issue of the Cadre, "checked into the matter and signed into voting about 30 times and each time the candidate's name came up." However, this method is inadequate and incomplete by the very fact that it relies on the experience of a single individual. It seems obvious that the fact of 4 individuals *stating* that they *have* experienced a problem is speculative, but far more concrete than one individual *stating*, also from personal

experience, that there is no such problem (no matter how repetitive and frenetic that experience was). Yet, at a recent SU meeting, Curley's experience seems to have held more merit than the experience of the five other candidates, and a petition, raising awareness of the possible technical difficulties and demanding a re-vote, signed by 106 individuals, including some current council members.

When I bring this forward, I do not necessarily mean that the *stated* experience of 4 individuals should necessitate a re-vote (although a thorough investigation/evaluation of these allegations may prove this necessary), but rather that the electoral process, as well as the allegations themselves, should be *carefully* scrutinized and corrected accordingly. Interestingly, the SU discarded the notion of a re-vote altogether before having a full and thorough investigation of the matter, providing a plan for what seems to be a "mediocrity now, democracy later" approach. Pat Curley stated in a written correspondence to me that, "it was decided at the last Student Council meeting that in the future there will be a committee struck to look at the online voting process and consult with computer services to try and improve the system." I agree that this is a good preventative measure for the future, but it neither dispels nor addresses any of the current controversy in relation to the recent 2005 SU election.

Although there was a general agreement among the SU (meeting, Tuesday March 29th) that there very well could have been a technical problem with the ballots, they discarded the possibility of a re-vote based on practical issues such as (1) the fact that, if a re-vote were to/could occur now it would extend inconveniently into the exam period, and (2) that, more realistically, if it would occur in the fall, a whole summer of work for the SU would be wasted.

Continued on page 7