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"We need to talk.

We need to be able, as the saying goes, “to disagree without being disagreeable.” We need to be able to debate ideas vigorously, but in a civil manner. What does this perhaps anachronistic idea of “civility” entail? I think it is simple: It means that one respects the views of others, speaks thoughtfully, listens carefully, and responds appropriately...

But here at Belmont Hill? We need to talk. The fact is that our country faces some hugely challenging issues, and the issues are getting lost in all the rhetoric and noise. Think about just a few. We have to think about proper immigration policy as we face the fact of 11 million illegal immigrants now in this country. What do we do, especially as a nation that has been called a “nation of nations” where people from around the world have found refuge for over 200 years? What should be our role as millions flee form the quagmire in the Middle East—including many Muslims—or seek to escape terrible conditions in Central America? Or, what do we do to improve our economy? How do you feel about a minimum wage? How do you feel about equal pay for equal work for men and women, or the need to repair our nation's infrastructure—roads and bridges and highways? What should be the core principles of our foreign policy? How should the United States approach the challenges of the Middle East, or rising power in China, or Russian aggression? Or, after the hot, dry summer here and the frightening mix of heat and drought in some parts of the country and record floods in other parts, how would the nation approach the issue of climate change? Or, here in Massachusetts, how do you feel about charter schools, as a referendum to expand the number goes on the ballot in November? Or, going back to our summer reading, how do we react to injustice in our judicial and prison systems, issues of both race and class in our country?

...if a core goal of this school is for you to become a man of good character who does good in the world, with that comes an awareness of the world around you. And to be aware of the world around you requires thinking and talking about complicated issues that influence our lives. Many years ago, in his opening address, our school president Doug Nannene talked about the “Belmont Hill bubble.” Yes, in some ways we are in a bubble: we are insulated, perhaps isolated, from the rest of the world on this beautiful campus. But we are also part of the world. My hope is that we can engage in civil terms in discussion of issues that matter. In fact, one of the hallmarks of our classrooms is the use of the Harkness table. As you sit down at a Harkness table today, I want you to think about that space. It puts the teacher in a seat at the table with the students; it is designed for discussion. But more than that, the concept behind the Harkness table allows you, in both metaphorical and real terms, to put ideas on the table. You can and should be willing to debate ideas. The ideas are not you; you should be able to put out an idea and not face personal attacks. Will people disagree with your ideas? Of course they will, and that is healthy. If we can debate ideas in an open and civil way, we will have taken an important step forward. After all, Belmont Hill in some ways is an experiment. We bring together students from 60 different cities and towns, from 110 different schools: public, private, and parochial. We come together and we work together—and if “working together” is to remain the motto of this school, we need to find ways to exchange ideas.”
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Dear Readers,

Our first edition of Volume II is highlighted by a new cover design, one that embodies The Podium's continued growth and embrace of change. After a strong first year cementing our identity, The Podium remains committed to publishing the best student-written work in history and current events. At the same time, however, over the past semester, we've expanded into the English Department, publishing Seth Israel's ('18) American Literature essay, Nick Daley's ('19) profile, and Bradley Hart's ('17) Just Mercy essay. We've also worked to expand the involvement of middle schoolers, adding two strong contributors, Jack Weldon '20 and Jeff Segel '20, to the staff. Finally, Dr. Buckley has also been added to the team, serving as a polling consultant and helping staff members design surveys for our Data Analysis section.

Five op-eds are being published in Volume II - Edition I. Hosting two competitions, one in September 2016 and one in November 2016, we received a record-breaking number of submissions. Thus, for each competition, two winners were chosen. In September, Gavin Colbert’s ('18) winning piece, “Mr. Trump, Tear Down that Wall!” advocated for creative immigration reform. Colbert, in stressing the “human side of immigration,” suggested the creation of a middle-ground citizenship status to ease burdens on the understaffed US Citizenship and Immigration Service. Jason Fischman ‘17 also claimed victory in September with an op-ed on the financial onus of America’s death penalty. Avoiding considerations of morality or a discussion of sentimental anecdotes, Fischman’s piece used logic and cited facts to argue the death penalty is “a shameful waste of money.” Jason Fischman won his second consecutive competition in November (first consecutive win in Podium history) by writing an excellent op-ed on gambling. Fischman convinced readers to see casinos as troublesome “economic parasites” responsible for addiction and income inequality. David Paine ‘18 was also a winner in the November competition, writing a lengthy piece acknowledging Belmont Hill’s right to restrict YouTube, but ultimately criticizing the overarching nature of the policy. In addition to the four winners, Massimo Auferio’s ('18) piece on Colin Kaepernick’s protest is being published. Auferio drew rich historical comparisons in his support for Kaepernick, using quotes from Frederick Douglass, Henry David Thoreau, Harriet Jacobs, and more.

Finally, readers will notice the inclusion of excerpts from “We Need to Talk” as a preface to Volume II. Dr. Melvoin delivered “We Need to Talk,” a speech we feel resonates deeply with the message and mission of The Podium, on August 30, 2016. Dr. Melvoin’s remarks highlight some of Belmont Hill’s most important educational values: an emphasis on civil debate, the importance of considering all thoughts and opinions, respect for other’s beliefs and ideas, and a commitment to global awareness. As the search for a new Headmaster begins, the School will be given a chance to reaffirm its key convictions and principles, and The Podium hopes Belmont Hill will continue to value the exchange of ideas. For now, enjoy Volume II - Edition I.

William McCormack ‘18 – Editor-In-Chief
Ishaan Prasad ‘18, Jared Stier ‘18 – Executive Editors
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Hark! Before the tide of time,  
And darkest dusk descended on the Hill,  
Mighty mellifluous music was made there.  
In hallowed halls was heard the rich resounding,  
Of the ranks of players, the profound as well as  
The pupils. Alas, none now know nor remember  
What once was. This work has been written  
To memorialize the magnificent music.

A decade and three years ago began,  
The tale of how the Music blossomed forth.  
Primordial rippling waves of sound did flow,  
But instruments were not counted among  
Those voices, sprites, and souls atop the Hill  
Who sang the Music loud and clear for all  
To hear. The B-Flats and the Glee did be,  
Bereft of unity and harmony. Until two souls,  
Beyond the Void, took shape and ascended,  
To bear the mantle of making the musicians one.  
Daniel, from the Fiorian line through many long years,  
And Donnell of the house of Patterson, declared:  
“Hear, O Belmont! Nevermore shall ye musicians  
Endure the pain of disunity and dispersal!  
Henceforth, a music program shall there be at Belmont Hill.  
May ye fill the halls of the School with your sonorous charm,  
And may ye carry on the musical Fire that We set for you.”  
The Fire dwelt in the Prenatt Building,  
Erected newly for the Music.  
The Tune-Men, disunited now no more,  
Who with a home now blossomed, grew, and rose  
To cherish the Eternal Fire, the Fire  
Of Music, given to them by the Lords.

For five years the First Age of the Orchestra,  
The Tune-Men rallied themselves and reigned in  
Arrangements ranging from jazz to chamber ensemble.  
Gradually the Tune-Men would create a grand Symphony,  
Increasing their numbers. Initially nonexistent, they counted  
Circa ten. A firm foothold was founded for the future,  
As Fate led the dreamers of dreams to kindle the Fire.  
A base from which to boldly build was born.

The subsequent Second Age lasted one year less,  
Than its proud predecessor that produced the pillars  
Upon which the Music has rung out and resonated.  
The First-Age seed of the Orchestra, Keepers of the Fire, sprouted,  
Swelling their size to circa fifteen. The jazz program matured into a  
magnitudinous mood, and the B-Flats and Glee grew into grand splendour.  
Konrad, Hero of Hedderick, stood with James the Miller, and Jeremy Well-Born,  
remaining steadfast. The Music coalesced, and the power waxed.  
This was the Second Age.
Time passed and brought the Men to the Third Age. 
The epoch lit by brightest orange Flame, 
Did pass a little while ago in name. 
Yet some who served survive and live today, 
To tell the Story, lest it fade away. 
Now George, an ætheling, from Hu's bloodline, 
Had virtuosic skills that grew with time, 
On keys of ivory, displayed on stage. 
Eight years after the Breathing of the Life, 
He poured his might into renewed strength, 
The Third Age, under him would be for length, 
A period of culture and of art, 
United, brought to one, no more apart. 
A mighty host he led to battles then, 
With Spencer Kim, and Didier as his friends. 
The time for glory now was blooming ripe. 
In ruling, George was prudent and was wise, 
Imparting musicality to all. 
He helped the Fire's flame and brightness rise, 
Inspiring, radiating through the Halls. 
The expertise and craftsmanship did grow, 
And knowledge of the Music did abound. 
No limit of successes did they know, 
When ringing anthems of theirs did resound. 

New Captains of the Order did emerge, 
In Armin, Austin, Andrew, Coleman, thence. 
They fought and played with passion and with heart, 
And served the Music and the Fire with intense, 
Devotion, fervor, and respect for Art. 
Together under banner of the Guard, 
Of Spencer, George, and Didier at helm, 
They flew up to transcendent heights unbarred, 
By previous constraints of Elder Realms. 
They founded for themselves, an order new, 
A Secret Chamber, for the music to 
Convey the Fire to All from the Few. 
The best in all the Ages, now made one, 
To write the Histories as has been done. 
The Third Age would shine bright as noonday Sun. 

On twentieth of May, in twelfth of years, 
The Orchestra and B-Flats did play, 
Beethoven's final symphony. “My peers, 
My favorite lyric from the text is the line: 
Alle Menschen werden Brüder. 
All men become brothers. 
Tonight, all of us, under the stars, 
Become brothers, keepers of the Fire, 
Servants of the Music laid out before us 
By the Lord of Elder Days.” 
These words Arminius did say to them, 
As he stood on the podium, to lead, 
Prepared to accept the crown of George the Hu. 
And true they were. The players and crowd rose, 
And Andrew and Arminius shook hands, 
And the changing of the guard was set. 
The Captains brought about the greatest time, 
In music's storied history on the Hill. 
These notes would resonate until the End, 
Reverberating through the halls and fields, 
The Story's greatest moment. This is true.
As a country, we pride ourselves on being a melting pot of diverse cultures and people. But for a country built on the immigration of our ancestors hoping for better lives, there is a surprising amount of xenophobia circling the issue of immigration. With the rise of conservative ideals highlighted by a certain man named Donald Trump, this issue has become increasingly quantitative and less human, and therefore less empathetic. A new approach must be taken towards this polarizing issue through a bipartisan alliance that refocuses and expands upon the successes of the US Citizenship and Immigration Services and terminates the failed programs.

According to the Pew Research Center, there were 11.1 million unauthorized immigrants living in the US in 2014. While scenes of people running and climbing over a fence into the US may immediately come to the forefront, this stereotype can be disproved in many ways. First, entry of illegal immigrants from countries other than Mexico rose from around 350,000 in 2009, to now 5.3 million from regions such as Asia, Central America, and Sub-Saharan Africa. More people are legally visiting the US and then outstaying their visas. Second, while building walls and improving border security might seem like the infallible choice, the strengthening of US-Mexico border security has actually increased the number of illegal immigrants in the US. While seemingly counterintuitive, the strong border traps people in our country as the border has become more difficult to cross and therefore less of a revolving door that facilitated population fluctuation for decades. Instead, the US must maintain a more active, revolving door status with easier ports of entry and exit between the countries that promotes family immigration with a special immigration status. A strong border patrol should alternatively focus on preventing the trafficking of narcotics, terminating the operations of human traffickers called coyotes, preventing deported prisoners from re-entering the country, and enforcing correct durations of stay.

Considering the numbers is undoubtedly important, but the human side of immigration needs more attention within our immigration system. The US Citizenship and Immigration Service is currently backlogged with thousands of cases and there are very few immigration courts that decide on deportation. These understaffed immigration courts are now more like kangaroo courts that do not even provide public defenders.

Therefore, the budget for this department needs to be expanded and employees trained to be understanding and helpful in relations with immigrants. The country must also move away from the major binary situation with two pathways in granting citizenship, receiving a green card and applying for full citizenship or having a US citizen parent. There must be a new, middle-ground citizenship status granted to the immigrants living here, as they become citizens and pay taxes but cannot vote until they undergo the full citizenship process, which for them would be expedited. All this depends on the ability of government to expand their understaffed, underfunded immigration department, to move into a brighter and more prosperous future for all Americans.

I have put much of the onus on the government to effect change but as Americans all across the country, we must empathize with these people who are escaping violence and poverty, striving for a better life in a country that can at least provide them with some peace and sustenance. Starting with our public education, kids all across America must be taught to respect the diversity of our vast and great country and to accept people who might not look or speak like themselves. If we could meet, smile, and laugh with the people trying to achieve the American Dream, so distinctly a part of our nation’s brilliant history, we could tear down the mental and physical walls surrounding our present immigration issue and meet the challenge head on, face to face, and heart to heart.
All too frequently, the death penalty debate becomes bogged down on account of both emotional anecdotes and philosophical arguments; however, one fact should make the decision much easier for both sides: the death penalty is a shameful waste of money. While many believe that the death penalty is a cheaper solution than life without parole, as the inmates are executed rather than being clothed, fed, and housed in prison, the truth is that capital punishment is far more costly.

In a potential death penalty case, on top of the regular trial, an extra court session is conducted to determine whether or not the crime warrants America’s highest punishment. This secondary trial requires more lawyers, more witnesses, more jurors, and greater expenditure from the government, a heinous misuse of taxpayer dollars. Because of the weight and irreversibility of the verdict, the courts try to ensure a fair and extensive trial, and the taxpayers are left holding the tab. Furthermore, the vast majority of death row inmates cannot afford private legal counsel and have to resort to public defenders; these overworked lawyers scramble to keep their clients alive, sending Uncle Sam the bill. A recent study on the cost of capital punishment in Washington found that, in any case where the state seeks the death penalty, the cost of prosecution immediately rises from just over $2 million per case to nearly $3.1 million, a 50% increase. In the five death penalty cases the state has achieved since 1997, each execution has cost the state an average of $24 million each.

In Kansas, the state found that, in trials where the state sought the death penalty, the cost of the trial was four times more than in trials seeking life in prison. The study also revealed that death penalty cases took an average of 40.1 days, while comparable cases opting for life in prison took a mere 16.8 days.

The facts are simple: death penalty cases take longer, are far more complicated, and, most importantly, are too expensive for the hard-working American taxpayers. Even while overlooking the immorality of the issue, the high rate of wrongful convictions, or the overt racism embedded in the justice system, abolishing the death penalty is the pragmatic solution. Life in prison without parole takes a criminal away from society permanently and provides ample punishment for their crimes. These criminals have been convicted of horrible atrocities, and the judicial system has determined they should never return to society. Why should we keep spending our money on them?
The singing of the national anthem before professional sporting events has been an enduring tradition for years, honoring the United States and the liberties and principles for which this country stands. The First Amendment right to freedom of speech ranks among the highest esteemed of Americans’ coveted liberties. As citizens of the United States of America we enjoy the unconditional freedom to express our views on political and social issues and to critique the government with impunity, as the government cannot constitutionally repress or punish dissenters. The freedom of speech forms one of the foundational pillars of American civilization for the past eleven score and five years since the passage of the Bill of Rights in 1791 to protect the liberties of the people from government encroachment. Colin Kaepernick has been criticized by several “patriotic” citizens as “un-American” for refusing to stand for the national anthem, thus disrespecting the country and its veterans. While these people certainly have the right to disagree with his perspective on social issues and with his actions, what could possibly be more “un-American” than disregarding one of the inherent liberties on which our nation is founded, the freedom of speech, by attempting to restrict someone’s ability to effectively exercise this freedom? What is more “un-American” than blindly adhering to a flawed and oppressive government and ignoring your right to speak out against it? Were the abolitionists of the nineteenth century “un-American” for their endeavors to bring an end to the institution of slavery? Was founding father Thomas Jefferson “un-American” for petitioning the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 which empowered the president to deport “dangerous” immigrants at will and outlawed libel against the government, respectively? How about Susan B. Anthony and the suffragettes in their struggle for women’s voting rights or Martin Luther King, Jr., Rosa Parks, and other civil rights activists of the 1950s and 1960s?

Just as Frederick Douglass famously declared before a white audience on July 4, 1852, “This Fourth [of] July is yours, not mine. You may rejoice, I must mourn,” Kaepernick has stated, “I am not going to stand up to show pride in a flag for a country that oppresses black people.” In doing so, he publicizes defiance to an injustice in our society that he hopes to see resolved to thus better our nation; he does not, however, condemn America altogether. As Henry David Thoreau wrote in his essay Civil Disobedience, “A very few - as heroes, patriots, martyrs, reformers in the great sense, and men - serve the state with their conscience . . . and they are commonly treated as enemies.” Despite his efforts to improve the moral condition of American society, Kaepernick has been unfairly denounced as un-American.

While opinions concerning his decision and his message may vary, Colin Kaepernick has the undeniable American right to kneel during the national anthem to protest oppression. In the words of Harriet Jacobs, “God bless those, every where, who are laboring to advance the cause of humanity!”

An American Protest
Gambling has few economic benefits and an enormous social cost, and casinos have no place in society. While many expect casinos to result in new jobs, tax revenue, and hefty profits for the casinos themselves, they disproportionately affect low income individuals, take profits away from local businesses, and consistently fall short of their profit expectations. Casinos prey on gambling addicts, who are frequently the poorest individuals, for the majority of their revenue. A Canadian study found that 75% of a casino’s customers provide a mere 5% of its revenue, and the remaining 25%, who are often problem gamblers, provide 95% of its revenue. The University of Buffalo found that people living below the poverty line are more than twice as likely to be gambling addicts; only 5% of the general population has a gambling problem, but 11% of society’s poorest individuals are addicts. Casinos are taking advantage of those who cannot afford to lose. When gambling was illegal everywhere besides Las Vegas, the gambling addiction rates were far lower. For the vast majority of the country, travelling to Nevada was expensive, and thus provided a barrier for someone who wanted to gamble. The clientele of casinos were, on average, wealthier, and thus statistically less likely to have a gambling problem. However, as casinos began to appear on street corners in other large cities, it became all too easy for a low income individual to walk across the street and gamble away an entire paycheck or develop an addiction.

Aside from Las Vegas, which gambling advocates consistently point to as an example of the benefits of legalization, every subsequent attempt to create a thriving city built around casinos has failed. Gary, Indiana legalized gambling in the 1990s in an attempt to revitalize the city, but, since opening casinos, household income has fallen and crime has risen drastically. In Atlantic City, once heralded as the Vegas of the east, four casinos have closed in the past two years alone, and 8,000 jobs disappeared with them; the city itself is bankrupt as tax revenue has fallen rapidly. Furthermore, during their heyday, the casinos pushed out many of the non-gambling businesses like restaurants, meaning that economic recovery will be even more difficult.

Gambling is not beneficial to the economy. Casinos are economic parasites, sucking money away from other local small businesses. Areas surrounding casinos lose customers and profits as all local spending is directed towards the casinos. While some jobs are created, most are low-wage, and, as gambling technology improves, the traditional dealers and casino employees are being replaced by glowing electronic slot machines. Furthermore, areas near casinos have a significant uptick in petty thievery, drunk driving, and domestic violence, an expected outcome considering the nature of casinos.

Overall, gambling is a problem both economically and socially, and casinos have no real benefit to the area around them. Economically, they siphon money away from local communities and outcompete small businesses. Socially, casinos lure in and profit from the poorest Americans who find themselves tantalized by the flashing signs and promises of wealth. Gambling leads to increases in crime and exacerbates income inequality, and society should strike down all attempts at gambling legalization.
Belmont Hill’s YouTube Restriction: Practicality and Viability

Author—David Paine ’18  
Section—Opinion Pieces

In theory, the “restricted mode” of YouTube (currently in use by Belmont Hill) serves to filter out content which the school might or might not deem to be objectionable by the use of an algorithm which takes into account the internet community response, age flagging, and other various criteria. This school policy has largely been implemented for the dual purpose of prohibiting access to videos that could be considered inappropriate or out of line with the school’s values and improving student productivity by the removal of what could be considered to be a potent distractor. A number of concerns have been raised by both the student body and some of the faculty: the policy is implemented through the mail server, thus restricting access outside of school property; many educational and news videos are blocked despite claims that the algorithm will leave them unrestricted; a substantial portion of music and art is blocked and unavailable; and, often, a search will not show unrestricted videos. The consideration of the issue of whether Belmont Hill actually ought to place YouTube in its “restricted” mode begets a series of issues and questions that must be considered. In order to examine the flaws with this technology policy, we must address two specific questions: (a) Does the Belmont Hill School have the right to restrict the use of the internet on personal computers outside of the school itself? (b) Does YouTube’s algorithm function in a way that is effective and actually beneficial to the school?

To speak to the issue of whether Belmont Hill can restrict YouTube access outside of its campus – the answer is actually that it can. Belmont Hill places a great deal of restriction on our lives outside of school without many of us realizing that this is the case, and it is even in the honor code that our actions both inside and outside of school reflect on ourselves and the institution. For example, if a Belmont Hill student were to commit an egregious act of violence outside of the campus, they could face disciplinary action at the school. Granted, a student’s use of YouTube is drastically less extreme; however, it does fall under the school’s jurisdiction, as the technology policy for the BYOD system does apply. The policy states, “The School reserves the right to discipline users for actions performed on campus or off campus if they adversely affect the safety and/or privacy of the community or constitute behavior that jeopardizes the reputation of the School.” Since we, as members of the Belmont Hill community, voluntarily sign this policy, we are subject to its terms; thus, the school can restrict and monitor our YouTube usage off campus. Whether this policy infringes on personal freedom and is within the rights of the school is not up for debate here and is better left to the school legislature. As it stands, the policy is as such, and we, the student body and faculty who have voluntarily signed it, must abide by it. Knowing that the school can restrict YouTube, the question becomes whether it is in the school’s best interest to actually do so.

Thus, the actual benefit of the restriction and the issue of effectiveness come into question. Effectually, the restriction of YouTube is not actually useful for the purpose Belmont Hill wishes it to serve – although the restriction does block some videos that are truly not appropriate for an academic institution, it does this by blocking basically everything useful as well, and places a tremendous limit on one of the most useful academic resources in existence. Simply put – the algorithm is too mercurial and ineffective to filter the bad and ends up filtering most of the good as well. The restriction places a damper on student access to music (the Hamilton soundtrack being an issue of contention), as a significant percentage of any music sought out by students has been deemed inaccessible. In addition, as the restriction currently stands, a plethora of news and educational resources are lacking to the Belmont Hill community, such as videos from CNN, a well-esteemed news source. A further issue concerns the unblocking process: the approval takes a surprisingly long time, and videos cannot be unblocked by category in a consistently successful way, therefore raising concerns about actual access to videos that teachers and students require for their academic pursuits. Another issue is the actual effectiveness of the restriction as a means of increasing productivity and focus in the student body. If a Belmont Hill student wishes to procrastinate and distract himself rather than focus on work, a YouTube restriction simply cannot prevent this: if a student is truly determined to be unproductive, it is a certainty that he will be unproductive. Trying to place a restriction on YouTube to stop distraction is somewhat akin to trying to place a piece of paper in front of a firehose to stop the water – useless. As a result, since the YouTube restriction can be considered effectually useless and also functions as a major impediment to a valuable learning asset, then it is not actually in the best interests of the school to continue with the restriction.

Thus, although it is currently within the rights of the school to restrict YouTube as it sees fit, restriction is a virtually useless – if not detrimental – practice, and it is guaranteed to bring more frustration (as we have seen) than benefit.

Competition 2 (Nov. 2016), Co-Winner
Equal Protection vs. 10th Amendment

Subtitle-Analyzing their Relationship in School Segregation

Author-Justin Paré ’21

Section-Research Papers

The United States of America, a meritocracy founded on the ideal that “all men are created equal,” has taken centuries to truly embody this lofty goal. In an effort to ensure citizens’ liberties and state power, the Founders added the 10th Amendment, in order to protect all rights not granted to the national government for the states and the people. Ironically, the 10th Amendment, which was drafted to ensure people’s rights, has been perhaps the most significant hindrance to African American equality. Instead of securing African American rights, the 10th Amendment was used to protect states’ and citizens’ freedom to segregate. Consequently, many years passed before African Americans would find complete, long-lasting equality under the law. This was in large part due to the fact that the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, which empowered the federal government to override the states to provide its citizens with “equal protection of the laws.” The Clause conflicts with the 10th Amendment, which previously kept for the states and people all the national government’s power gained under the Equal Protection Clause. The natural conflict between the previously enacted 10th Amendment and the 14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause would make the Supreme Court’s interpretation and balancing of the two powers vital to segregation in America. The precedents set in The Civil Rights Cases, which ruled The Civil Rights Act of 1875 unconstitutional, and in Plessy v. Ferguson would favor the 10th Amendment and usher in the Jim Crow Era, a time of legalized segregation. Segregation would continue to flourish until the Court used the Equal Protection Clause to overturn Plessy’s “separate but equal” precedent, both for state colleges in Sweatt v. Painter, and later for all public education in the landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. In the wake of Brown, the Supreme Court used its newfound precedent to add on to Brown’s ban on segregation in public schools and deem all segregation unconstitutional. After years of the Court fighting to criminalize segregation and the executive working to enforce integration, the High Court began to confront the daunting task of fixing the years of harm inflicted by segregation. In a series of decisions, including Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, United States v. Fordice, Gratz v. Bollinger, and Grutter v. Bollinger, the Supreme Court interpreted the 14th and the 10th Amendments to set guidelines for both necessary, and prohibited affirmative action admission policies in higher education. However, the balance has yet to be struck. There is a wide spectrum of opinions, from both the justices and the people of the United States, on how the Equal Protection Clause and affirmative action in schools should be used to combat the history of racism in the nation, and how the clause’s power should be balanced with that of the 10th Amendment.

Although it took until 1954 with the Supreme Court’s use of the Equal Protection Clause in Brown, along with Brown’s resulting cases, for the United States to fully outlaw racial segregation, the North did fight for African American rights during the Civil War and Reconstruction. They did so most effectively with the enactment of three amendments, including the 14th and its Equal Protection Clause. But before this, a long time passed before African Americans found any justice in a slave-powered South. Tensions between the North and the South over the Supreme Court’s decision that slaves were in fact property in Dred Scott v. Sandford, ultimately propelled the nation into Civil War. A slavery driven South believed that they were fighting in order to protect their own property, while the North believed that no human could ever be considered property. Afterwards, a victorious North occupied the South and enacted a series of Amendments, one being the 14th. Perhaps the most controversial clause of the Amendment, The Equal Protection Clause, reads, “nor shall any State deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” Because the Amendment guaranteed all Americans equality under the law, it would be instrumental in securing rights for African Americans, and, later, in ending segregation. With slavery abolished and three new amendments drafted to protect African American freedoms, this period, known as Reconstruction, brought an increase in African American rights. However, the decreasing Northern influence in the South, and the failure of the South to accept African American equality, would ultimately cause Reconstruction to collapse and segregation to flourish with two key Supreme Court decisions.

In those rulings, the High Court would expose the 14th Amendment’s one glaring flaw: the Amendment, by establishing another power of the national government over the states, directly challenged the previously enacted 10th
Amendment. The 10th addition to the Constitution was drafted in America’s infancy, when two parties, the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists, argued over the content of what would become the nation’s Constitution. While the Federalists were confident in the proposed government, the Anti-Federalists feared it granted the national government too much power. To settle the dispute and ensure the document’s ratification, the Framers agreed to add on the Bill of Rights, a series of ten amendments protecting the people from the national government, after the Constitution was ratified. The 10th Amendment to the Constitution decreed that, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.” Therefore, because another power was granted to the federal government by the Equal Protection Clause, the courts would be forced to strike the balance between national authority and the 14th Amendment, and the liberties of the states and the people, protected by the 10th Amendment. An excerpt from The Anti-Federalist Papers, argued that, “The powers vested in Congress by this constitution [not including the Bill of Rights], must necessarily annihilate and absorb the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of the several states, and produce from their ruins one consolidated government, which from the nature of things will be an iron-handed despotism.” The Anti-Federalists fought for the 10th Amendment to preserve citizen and state liberty against a potentially abusive central power.

Years later, the same amendment would be applied and pitted against the power of the 14th Amendment to help preserve segregation and disregard African American freedoms, starting with The Civil Rights Cases.

Amidst Reconstruction, a divided nation witnessed Congress pass a Civil Rights Act supported by the Equal Protection Clause, and an overwhelming 8-1 Supreme Court rule against the Act, due to the 10th Amendment. The Civil Rights Act of 1875 outlawed segregation in hotels, churches, cinemas, and public transportation. However, the High Court used its power of judicial review to rule the act unconstitutional in 1883 and therefore void. The eight Justices in the majority argued that the Equal Protection Clause was only intended to forbid state action, hence “no State shall...” Meanwhile, the Act encroached upon liberties of private institutions, which, due to the Court’s interpretation, fell outside the jurisdiction of the 14th Amendment, and were protected by the 10th Amendment. The Supreme Court set a precedent that restricted the Equal Protection Clause to exercising its power only on the states. Because the Court eliminated the effect of the Equal Protection Clause over private establishments wishing to segregate, they increased the power of the 10th Amendment by solidifying individual liberties against the 14th Amendment. By being the first Court decision to limit the 14th Amendment, the Act severely inhibited the efforts of Reconstruction.

Thirteen years later, a second Supreme Court decision would solidify the end of Reconstruction, and the beginning of the Jim Crow Era. The State of Louisiana passed the Separate Car Act in 1890, which required “separate but equal” cars for white passengers and passengers of other races. A man who was one-eighth black, Homer Plessy, purchased a ticket for a white car and was arrested after he sat down. Plessy proceeded to file suit, citing the Equal Protection Clause, and eventually appealing to the Supreme Court. A 7-1 Majority ruled in favor of Ferguson. Justice Brown, in the majority opinion, wrote that the 14th Amendment and its Equal Protection Clause were drafted to create racial equality, however, “[they] could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social...equality.” The Majority asserted the power of the 14th Amendment to create legal equality, but restricted it from “enforcer[ing] social equality.” The decision simultaneously diminished the effect of the 14th Amendment, and held the effect of the 10th by continuing to allow states to segregate. The sole dissenter, Justice John Harlan, believed that the segregation-backing law ingrained a sense of inferiority among African Americans. Harlan went on to write that the United States cannot “permit the seeds of race hate to be planted under the sanction of law,” and must make for “no superior, dominant ruling class of citizens.” While the Supreme Court of the time voted to create the “separate but equal” precedent that would end Reconstruction and make way for black codes and Jim Crow laws, Harlan’s passionate dissent would eventually win a future Court over.

However, the High Court needed numerous years to reverse its decision, and in 1950, with Sweatt v. Painter, they began to confront their predecessors “separate but equal” assertion. Hemar Marion Sweatt was rejected from the University of Texas Law School for being black. Sweatt filed suit on grounds of the Equal Protection Clause, eventually reaching the Supreme Court. After Sweatt originally went to court, Texas announced that they planned to open the Texas University for Negroes in 1947, in order to satisfy the “separate but equal” requirement. The state of Texas proceeded to argue that the all-black school qualified as equal, and therefore the University was justified in their decision. However, every Justice on the Court sided with Sweatt. The majority opinion explained that the Court found the two schools unjustly different in many ways. The Justices found that the buildings, staff, reputation of the schools, and number of available courses made the University of Texas Law School superior. Additionally, the Court believed that black students being denied the ability to study, bond with, and learn from their future clients and competitors hurt their chances to succeed. Through the first Supreme Court decision to challenge the precedent of Plessy, the Court set a
precedent requiring all state colleges to be integrated, increasing the effect of the Equal Protection Clause, and shrinking that of the 10th Amendment.

While Sweatt v. Painter changed the tide in the struggle between the 10th Amendment and the Equal Protection Clause, Jim Crow laws still dominated most facets of life in the South, including public schools. The laws forced Linda Brown and her sister to cross through a potentially harmful railroad switchyard to reach the bus stop. Meanwhile, without segregation, the girls could simply attend a closer all-white school and avoid the problem entirely. The Brown family was able to argue their case to the Supreme Court, where a unanimous Court ruled that public school segregation violated the Equal Protection Clause. The decision overruled the Plessy precedent pertaining to public schools, and would be a catalyst for The Civil Rights Movement that ended segregation in the United States. Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote the majority opinion, in which he outlined and expanded upon much of the argument of Justice Harlan, the dissenter in Plessy. Due to its being vital to democracy, future occupations, and culture, Warren described education as, “a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.” Therefore, any doctrine that unjustly favored or disfavored any group of people’s education, would be unconstitutional, as there would be no “equality under the laws.” When it came to comparing the white and black schools, the Justices agreed that they were equal when it came to “tangible factors,” such as the material covered, the condition of the buildings, and the pay of the teachers. However, the Majority also found that segregation had a damaging effect on the “hearts and minds” of young African Americans, instilling a sense of inferiority in them that may be irreversible. The Justices thought that imposing this belief on African American children lowered their eagerness to learn and succeed. Believing that school segregation interfered with the education of African Americans, the Court decided that “separate educational facilities are inherently unequal,” because of the Equal Protection Clause. The landmark decision immensely increased the effect of the Equal Protection Clause on integration, and greatly decreased that of the 10th Amendment’s protection of segregation.

With the 14th Amendment bringing an end to school segregation in Brown, certain schools felt the responsibility to enact affirmative action policies, both to help minorities who were disadvantaged due to past segregation, and to ensure integration. However, in the eyes of some, certain schools journeyed too far and came to disadvantage majorities. Allen Bakke, a white male, applied for such a school, University of California, Davis (UC-Davis). The School used a policy in which 16 spots were reserved for minorities only. After being rejected from the school, despite having better test scores and grades, Bakke claimed that the policy discriminated against non-minorities and therefore violated the Equal Protection Clause. The Supreme Court decided to take the case and apply strict scrutiny. In order to pass the strict scrutiny test, the policy must have a “compelling goal,” be “narrowly tailored” to that goal, and be the least restrictive method of accomplishing that goal. This set a precedent for future colleges and universities hoping to enact affirmative action policies. Still a highly-debated issue today, the topic was just as controversial then, clearly shown in the decision. With four justices believing that Bakke should be admitted, and four wishing the opposite, the ruling came down to Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr. By agreeing that the use of race, as one of many factors in admissions, is constitutional, Justice Powell set a landmark precedent in 1978 for future school affirmative action cases. He and the other four justices believed that race can be used when considering accepting a student, if it passes strict scrutiny, in order to serve the “compelling” goal that student bodies are diverse and successful role models of all backgrounds are produced. However, by also deciding that the extensive use of race, in this case in the form of seat saving by UC-Davis, violated the Equal Protection Clause, Justice Powell set guidelines for permissible and unconstitutional affirmative action in school admissions. While preserving a lot of colleges’ and universities' freedom to admit whom they see fit, the Court, by creating further guidelines with race and school admissions, broadened still the jurisdiction of the Equal Protection Clause.

However, despite the fact that the Court felt the need to limit some schools from overcompensating for the effects of segregation, they also ruled to enforce affirmative action policies in other schools. In 1991, a case, United States v. Fordice, arrived at the Supreme Court regarding the public universities of Mississippi. The state had complied with anti-segregation laws by applying admission policies that did not factor in race. Despite technically following the law, the previously enforced all-white and all-black schools had failed to diversify. In an 8-1 decision, the Court ruled that Mississippi had not sufficiently altered admission strategies to satisfy the Equal Protection Clause. They decided in 1992 that, “until it eradicates policies and practices traceable to its prior dual system that continues to foster segregation” a state must keep changing to promote integration in its schools. For example, the Court believed that despite race being ignored for the admissions process, other factors originating in the previously segregated schools, such as certain admission qualifications or the focus of the school, can create largely segregated colleges and universities. The High Court decided to allow the state courts and officials to choose how to sufficiently reform the system for this specific case. Setting another precedent that limited the power of the 10th Amendment and higher education schools to choose whom they admit, the Court once again made the Equal Protection Clause even more
Even though the Supreme Court had utilized the Equal Protection Clause to set precedents for necessary, permissible, and unconstitutional affirmative action admission policies, more cases arose that blurred the lines and required the High Court to further interpret and define the law.85 The Court proceeded to draw these lines in 2003 with Gratz v. Bollinger and Grutter v. Bollinger.86 The University of Michigan’s Office of Undergraduate Admissions (OUA) enacted an admission point-based policy in 1998 that accounts for a number of factors, and in which “underrepresented minorities” received a number of points.87 To provide more review, especially of aspects not calculated in the system, the school created the Admissions Review Committee in 1999.88 Two white applicants, Patrick Hamacher and Jennifer Gratz, were rejected from one of the University’s schools, despite being told that although they scored high enough to be admitted, too many other applicants surpassed their scores.89 Together they filed suit, claiming that the point strategy was unconstitutional, as the Equal Protection Clause prohibits what they saw as “[i]nequality under the laws.”90 Due to previous judicial precedent in Bakke, the Court applied strict scrutiny, and in a 6-3 decision, sided with Gratz.91 The Justices believed that the admissions process was too broad and not “specifically tailored” to its goal of diversification, because the process aided all “underrepresented minorities,” like the seat saving in Bakke,92 instead of considering race as one of many factors for separate individuals. Justice Sandra Day O’Connor wrote a concurring opinion in which she stated that while the review committee helped “tailor” the goal, it was not enough to pass strict scrutiny.93 Similar to their ruling in Bakke, the Supreme Court interpreted the Equal Protection Clause to entail more restricting guidelines for affirmative action admission policies in higher education. In doing so, previous admission liberties wielded by colleges and universities, which had been protected by the 10th Amendment, were taken away by the Equal Protection Clause, once more rendering the 10th Amendment less powerful.

However, on the same day of their ruling in Gratz, the Court ruled in Grutter v. Bollinger to preserve remaining school admission freedoms by not expanding on the effect of the Equal Protection Clause.94 Another white applicant, Barbara Grutter, was rejected from the University of Michigan Law School.95 Although the school considered race when admitting future students, they did not use the point system of the undergraduate program. In another very tight decision, a 5-4 majority ruled in favor of Bollinger, declaring that the admission strategy used was indeed constitutional.96 In the majority opinion, Justice O’Connor proclaimed that, “in the context of its individualized inquiry into the possible diversity contributions of all applicants, the Law School’s race-conscious admissions program does not unduly harm nonminority applicants.”97 The Majority believed that because race was used as a factor for specific applicants, as opposed to a whole group as in Bakke and Gratz, the use of race passed strict scrutiny, and appropriately considered other important variables in diversity besides race.98 They believed that this method was sufficiently “narrowly tailored” to the “compelling” pursuit of diversity as to not disadvantage non-minorities,99 and was the least restrictive method of achieving that goal. While the precedents were vastly different, through maintaining school admission freedoms, Grutter marked the first time since Plessy that the Supreme Court had kept the Equal Protection Clause from gaining further traction over the 10th Amendment.

In 2016, the Supreme Court would make a similar decision that would retain the power of the 10th Amendment in Fisher v. Texas.100 The State of Texas had passed a law in 1997, which obligated the University of Texas to admit all in-state applicants from the top 10% of their high school graduating class.101 Once the University found irregularities with the ethnic and racial demographics of Texas with that of the undergraduate students, they chose to implement a policy which factored in race for the Texan applicants that fell outside of the 10% margin.102 One Caucasian woman who had failed to qualify as a part of the top 10%, Abigail Fisher, like Bakke, Gratz, and Grutter before her, attempted to sue the school, using the Equal Protection Clause to back her case.103 The Court’s narrow, as most of their previous rulings on the topic had been, 4-3 decision sided with the University.104 The strong controversial subject divided the more conservative justices, who sided with Fisher, and the more liberal justices, who found with the school.105 The Majority argued that prior cases affirmed that diversity in higher education is “compelling,” and, because they thought there were no other viable alternatives, the policy was “narrowly tailored” to its goal in the least restrictive way.106 While the small Majority believed that the admissions process passed strict scrutiny, Justice Alito wrote a dissent, backed by the other two dissenters, claiming that it failed on two accounts.107 The opinion stated that although similar aspirations had been considered “compelling,” the goal of the University was too vague to fit the judicial precedent.108 Additionally, Alito believed that a less restrictive alternative existed in an examination of an applicant’s life experiences as opposed to his race, as the dissenters believed this would produce the same diversity while avoiding promoting one race over another.109 Meanwhile, Justice Clarence Thomas, the most conservative justice on the bench, wrote his own dissenting opinion expressing his belief that race playing any role in college and university admissions automatically violated the Equal Protection Clause.110 However, despite Justice Thomas and two others
 siding with Fisher, the Majority supported the University and preserved the power of the 10th Amendment by holding back the Equal Protection Clause. However, the narrow majority and strong dissenting opinions prove that affirmative action in college and university admissions will very likely be further interpreted by the Court, and the future precedents will lean on the stances of the new Supreme Court justices.

The battle between the Equal Protection Clause and the 10th Amendment over school segregation was destined since the 14th Amendment was drafted, and it continues on today in the form of affirmative action in higher education. In the aftermath of the 14th addition to the Constitution, the Supreme Court first made decisions in The Civil Rights Cases and Plessy to limit a possible expansion of 14th Amendment power that would limit segregation, thereby maintaining the 10th Amendment’s protection of the practice. Since then, the Supreme Court’s decisions in a number of affirmative action cases that present a fundamental conflict between the 10th and 14th remain hotly debated. Last year’s narrow 4-3 ruling in Fisher vs. Texas, indicates that new justices and their beliefs will further shape the ongoing rivalry between the Equal Protection Clause and the 10th Amendment over school affirmative action. Even after almost 150 years, it remains to be seen how the Court and the American public will ultimately weigh the Equal Protection Clause and 10th Amendment.
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In the past century, China’s environment has had high and low points, from pollution and smog to renewable and clean energy. Since 1960, global carbon emission from human activities has grown exponentially each year. In 2005, as a result of economic growth, China overtook the United States as the world’s largest carbon emitter. In an effort to counter the carbon emissions of the country for the first time, China’s 12th Five-Year Plan (2011-2015) called for the production of three gigawatts (GW) of solar capacity by 2015. This proved to be a low ceiling for the country, as China installed over 43 GW by the end of 2015, while becoming the world’s leader in solar energy capacity. In the 13th Five-Year Plan (2016-2020), China will double its solar power market, adding 15-20 GW of solar capacity annually until 2020. In 2015, Premier Li Keqiang promised that in 2030, carbon emissions per unit of GDP would be down 60-65% from 2005 levels. For the 21st century to become “China’s Century,” China must continue to increase solar capacity and solar production annually as well as meet their goal of dropping carbon emissions per unit of GDP by 60% for 2030.

There are two prominent issues regarding energy and environment in China. The first is that China’s major cities, such as the capital Beijing, are overwhelmed with pollution and smog, coming from extensive carbon emissions. The environment differs greatly based on location in China, and the cities are much more polluted with smog than rural areas. Pollution in China is not just a danger to the environment, but also to the people. As of 2015, over 55% of citizens in China are living in urban areas, all of which are greatly affected by pollution. An academic paper by Nanjing University’s School of the Environment found that smog is a factor in nearly one-third of all deaths in China, second only to smoking. The smog runs through the city in large waves, known informally as ‘airpocalypses,” the most recent of which occurred on December 22, 2016, affecting 500 million citizens in Beijing. The presence of smog in major urban areas has decreased life expectancy by an estimated 25 months.

The second major issue in China is the mass use of coal energy from private businesses and the resistance of these businesses to switch from fossil fuels to renewable energy. Private businesses are burning tons of fossil fuels, such as coal, in order to operate their businesses. In 2013, 88.14% of China’s total energy consumption was through fossil fuels, and that number has been above 85% since 2005. Although fossil fuels are a large portion of China’s energy source, China is actually using less coal every year, resulting in a 2.1% drop in carbon emissions per unit of GDP in 2014. This was the first drop in carbon emissions in China after over ten years of steady rise in emissions. During this drop in carbon emissions, China invested $89.5B into renewable energy research and production, the most of any country in the world. China’s investment represented 29% of global renewable energy investment.

The issue of high pollution in major cities can be slowly improved by a policy change from the Chinese government related to tax incentives for manufacturing and adopting solar energy. In 2013, the Chinese government announced that for a two-year period ending in 2015, they would offer a 50% rebate on value-added tax for solar panel manufacturers in China. In theory, by lowering the tax on manufacturers, prices of solar panels would drop, boosting the adoption rate of renewable energy in China’s major cities. This tax rebate helped China to become the world’s leader in solar panel production in 2013. This increase in solar production correlates directly with the drop in coal-based energy in 2014 and 2015. In order for China to maintain the high growth rate that was evident in the short tax rebate period, the Chinese government must continue to offer a tax rebate on solar panel manufacturers. Using the 50% tax rebate as a jump-start to the market, a 15-20% rebate to solar manufacturers for the entirety of the 13th Five-Year Plan would allow the market to continue to thrive.

From 2013 to 2015, however, while the Chinese government offered a 50% tax rebate to solar panel manufacturers, it did not offer any rebates, incentives, or benefits to the actual businesses that adopted solar energy. The lack of incentives for businesses led to only a small portion of businesses installing solar during 2013-2015, the period in which solar panel manufacturers were offered a 50% tax rebate. Had there been a rebate for manufacturers and businesses adopting solar, many more companies would have made the change from fossil fuel to solar energy. Therefore, another change that China needs to consider in order to make this “China’s century,” is to offer a tax rebate to businesses that adopt solar energy, enticing companies to switch. For the entirety of the 13th Five-Year Plan (2016-2020), the Chinese government should offer a 15-20% tax rebate to any company that switches from fossil fuel energy to solar energy or other forms of renewable energy. This rebate will instantly incentivize switching to solar energy or other forms of renewable energy from fossil fuels. This tax rebate, if added, will also greatly benefit the environment, because many companies will switch to renewable energy, helping China reach its goal of a 65% decrease in carbon emissions per unit of GDP by 2030.
Reinstating the tax rebate for solar panel manufacturers, as well as adding a tax rebate for businesses that adopt solar energy will allow China to make the 21st century “China’s century.” These two tax rebates will allow China to meet and even surpass its goal of lowering carbon emissions by 60-65% by 2030. China can also incentivize and improve on other forms of renewable power currently being used to further reduce its carbon emissions. Wind energy, the use of wind turbines to generate energy, and hydroelectricity, using dams and reservoirs to produce power, are both forms of renewable energy rising along with solar energy in China’s renewable energy market. For example, wind energy capacity in China reached 140 GW in 2016, an 8.5% increase from 2015. Although China has a large capacity for wind energy, the country is not taking advantage of its resources well. The average time wind turbines spent generating electricity in 2016 was only 917 hours, a decrease of 85 hours from the 2015 average of 1,002 hours. Li Peng, an official from the National Energy Administration of China states that the wind energy capacity has grown quickly, but “the quality of equipment needs to be improved.” A tax rebate for manufacturers of wind energy equipment could incentivize the development of better technology for wind power. China also has the highest capacity in the world for hydroelectricity, which uses water flowing through dams to power generators that in turn provide power to large areas throughout China. Hydropower is China’s second largest source of power, following coal, and the country has 300 GW of capacity for hydroelectricity. The downside to hydroelectricity is that the dams necessary to produce power, despite lowering carbon emissions and improving the overall environment in China, destroy natural rivers as well as habitats for fish. If China can produce hydroelectricity without impacting the natural habitat, it can be another way for the country to improve the smog and pollution in the environment.
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Introduction

China’s economy has been growing for the last three decades with an average of 10% annual growth. The acceptance of a more capitalist style economy by the government has resulted China’s booming economy. In addition to more production, the country has also started to use less of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP), meaning that out of all the annual money the Chinese government makes, China spends less and saves more. In the 1980s, China used about half of its GDP every year, but recently “it has fallen, reaching only 35% of GDP in 2007.” This combination of increased production and less spending has resulted in a wealthier China.

Although the Chinese economy has been growing at a fast rate, its growth has imposed its own consequences. One of the main consequences its prosperous economy has brought is a largely polluted environment. China is home to “sixteen of the world’s twenty most polluted cities.” and recently, on January 3, 2017, China’s capital had an orange smog alert. As a result of all the pollution, many Chinese citizens live with some sort of respiratory issue, and the dissatisfied middle class has started voicing their complaints.

During the early stages of economic liberalization, China could support its own energy needs. That is no longer the case. China has now gone offshore to search for resources in order to sustain its economic growth. In an effort to become energy secure, China has gone to countries in Africa and in Asia to find resources it needs. According to the Observatory of Economic Complexity (OEC), in 2014, China’s main import was crude petroleum, accounting for 13% of all its imports. The OEC says that 16% of that oil came from Saudi Arabia, 13% from Angola, 11% from Russia, and 4.1% has come from South Africa and Sudan combined.

Chinese State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and National Oil Companies (NOCs) are responsible for all of China’s oil imports; they heavily rely on these to bring oil to the country. The SOEs and NOCs are influenced heavily by the government because of China’s communist system. As a result of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) large influence on SOEs it is the government who determines the supply, pricing and distribution of its oil imports.

China’s main import is oil, but China is also in need of many minerals. In addition to oil imports, China imports different minerals from different places. In 2014 China imported 63% of its Iron from Australia and 27% of its copper from Chile.

China’s relationships with certain third world countries has not been without controversy. China is commonly criticized by western nations for doing business with countries that have serious human rights violations. “International organisations also criticise Beijing’s financial help to Africa, raising issues such as environmental damage and human rights abuses.” The Chinese are currently in a very complex situation. China’s environment is in great need of care and it needs to secure energy in order to keep its economy growing. In order for the twenty-first century to be China’s century, the Chinese will need to invest more in green and renewable energy in order to remain energy secure and to improve its environment and self-reliance. To ensure it will have energy in the future, the Chinese need to continue to make long-term energy contracts, but also while continuing to invest in green, renewable energy, which will provide it with energy for long periods of time. As a result, it will become energy secure and more self-reliant. Its production of energy will allow for it to rely less on other countries. Renewable energy will improve its environment and lower the amount of GDP the government spends on medical care, allowing China to use that GDP elsewhere. With more renewable energy sources China will be healthy, energy secure, and produce more of its own energy instead of relying on other countries.

China-Angola Oil Trades and Energy Security

China is home to 11.2% of the world’s coal reserves. In 2011, China’s coal supplied 70% of its energy needs and oil, supplied 20%. With China now trying to use more oil, a cleaner fuel than coal, the oil demand has risen. The Chinese need to ensure that they are presently receiving oil, and that will continue to in the future, as oil has become their main import. There are different ways in which China is taking steps to improve its energy security. One way of ensuring energy security is by diversifying its imports. In 2014, China imported oil from 40 different countries. Having multiple trade partners prevents China from becoming too reliant on one country, allowing it to continue to receive natural resources if a deal were to fall through. The second way that China secures energy is by making long-term contracts. One of the reasons that China does business with Angola is because China is able to make long-term contracts, knowing it will be getting oil for a steady price no matter what happens in the market. The final way China remains energy secure is by protecting its trade. Recently, China has established a military base in Djibouti. The naval base would be there to “protect its national interests-monitoring its merchant vessels passing the Bab el-Mandeb Strait and for naval refuelling and restocking.” China wants to protect its ships from...
piracy and wants to assure that the country is receiving its resources. Another reason behind China's decision to make a naval base in Djibouti is because the Chinese also need more control of that area, as approximately 30% of the world's trade passes by Djibouti. The US military has many naval ships in those waters, making it possible to close down the shipping paths to China if anything between the two countries were to happen. The need for this military base is why China is renting the land for about $20 million a year.

Chinese trade with Africa has grown significantly since 2000. In 2000, bilateral trade added up to less than $1 billion, by 2007 it reached $73 billion. In 2009, Africa accounted for 30% of China's imported oil. China's main target on the continent was Angola, which had 17% of the continent's oil. Approximately 14% of China's oil came from Angola in 2010 and bilateral trade with China exceeded $120 billion that same year. The increase in Chinese trade with Angola is as a result of the CCP's realization that it could make long-term oil contracts, ensuring energy security. Out of all Angola's exports in 2014, 96% of it was crude petroleum. China received 53% of Angola's oil exports. The next year, in July of 2015, Angola exported 3.1 million tons of oil to China, and increased its exports to China to 6.51 million barrels. China's increase in oil imports reveals its need and desire to be energy secure. “China's oil deals with Angola are characterized by loans and credit lines in connection with infrastructure projects.” To Angola and other African countries China has made many promises, mainly comprising infrastructure type work or loans. In 2015, China's loans to Angola amounted up to $20 billion. Angola's cities are not very developed so the government is willing accept many deals it can make with China to gain development. There is still some controversy around China's deal with Angola and other African countries, western nations who are pushing certain countries for governmental reforms criticize China for trading with those nations. In its defense, China claims it is only in Africa for business.

China relied on Angola for 13% of its oil imports in 2014. Although China has many trading partners it relies on Angola for a large amount of crude petroleum imports. This is advantageous if Angola continues to do business with China, but is threatening to China's economy if the foreign countries chose not to. This reliance on other countries is potentially very harmful for China. By building renewable energy in the homeland, China will not rely on Angola as much as in previous years. The benefits of investing in green energy are worth it, relying so much on Angola and African countries for oil could be very hurtful. A decline in trade or imposed sanctions could put China in an energy-insecure position. Investing in renewable energy is a great way of preventing energy insecurity, while becoming more self-reliant and keeping its environment healthy.

China's Relationship With Other Countries and its Search for Minerals

China has many countries in which it does business with, and Russia is a large exporter of oil and gas. The recent sanctions imposed on Russia by the US and by Europe for its invasion of Crimea pushed Russian to find countries to trade more with. One country that would buy large amounts of Russian oil and gas is China. Recently, Russia became the largest exporter of oil to China, “China's crude oil imports from Russia stood at 4.64 million tons in August, surpassing Saudi Arabian crude at 4.36 million tons.” At the end of 2013, China made a $50 billion trade deal with Russia for oil. In addition, in 2014 eleven percent of China's crude petroleum came from Russia and fourteen percent of China's refined petroleum came from Russia. China also imports some natural gas, both countries have made deals to transfer 20 to 30 billion cubic meters of gas per year.

China has a wide variety of trading partners, one of which is Saudi-Arabia. The relationship between these two countries is fairly new, and as an ally of the United States (U.S.), Saudi Arabia has only recently recognized China as a country. Saudi Arabia gave diplomatic recognition to China after the U.S. normalized relations with China in 1972. Saudi-Arabia has the most oil reserves in all of the world, and in 2011 it had 262 billion barrels of oil in its reserves. The Chinese noticed the need to capitalize on Saudi Arabia’s position, and have done so accordingly. “Saudi-Chinese trade has exploded from around $1 billion in 1990 to more than $70 billion by 2013, surpassing Saudi-U.S. bilateral trade in the process.”

With the exception of China's need for oil, other natural resources that China lacks are minerals. According to the South China Morning Post, Elizabeth Economy, director of Asia studies at the US Council on Foreign Relations said “China takes up one-fourth of world demand for zinc, iron and steel, lead, copper and aluminium.” For different minerals China seeks different trading partners. For iron, China imported 63% from Australia in 2014 and that same year China imported 27% of its copper from Chile. China trades with African countries for minerals, diversifying its partners but most of China's mineral-based trade is outside the continent. In addition to diversifying its trading partners, China also has a bonus of limiting diplomacy of these countries to Taiwan. This is an extra motive for CCP to make relationships with multiple countries.

Trading is healthy, and no country is 100% self-reliant, or has everything it needs to keep functioning. Although this is the case, China relies heavily on other countries. Importing large quantities of oil, minerals, gas, and energy could be very harmful if countries applied sanctions or began to trade less. China needs these natural resources from other countries to keep
working. Establishing renewable energy sources could cover much of the costs of oil and natural gas. China would save money in the long-term, improve its environment, become more self-reliant and ensure energy security. Without the renewable energy China faces many potential risks, and the CCP is bound to witness many long-term gains if it invests more in renewable energy.

**Renewable and Green Energy**

China's economy has risen for three decades, and a result of this has been a highly polluted environment. The Chinese have started to address this issue and have started to invest in renewable energy. By 2020, China plans to spend $361 billion in renewable energy, and this will be able to produce the same amount of energy as 580 metric tonnes of coal. All the new renewable energy will save the toxic coal from polluting China’s environment. An additional bonus to investing in renewable energy is that 13 million jobs will be created in the renewable energy sector. Renewable energy will reduce the amount of soot produced, and will lower the amount of greenhouse gases China emits. In addition, the CCP will be energy secure, knowing that the renewable energy will keep producing electrical energy. The New York Times explains that the Chinese are producing “one wind turbine every hour of every day in 2015, and covered the equivalent of one soccer field every hour with solar panels.” China's investments are bound to have good consequences. There are also a number of sectors of renewable energy, “renewable energy includes hydro energy, biomass energy, wind energy, solar energy, geothermal energy and ocean energy.” China can select which kinds of renewable energy may be most beneficial, and can spend more money in those sectors. China is not limited and can use many natural resources to its advantage. The current leader of China is very supportive of its future plans saying “green mountains and clear water are as good as mountains of gold and silver.” The CCP's investment in renewable energy has already made a difference, as China's number of blue-sky days has improved (in 2016 there were 198, 12 more than in 2015). Investing in renewable energy has many benefits but does have certain consequences. The Three Gorges Dam on the upper Yangzi will be able to produce “electrical power equivalent to that of 40-coal burning plants.” Although this is acceptable, the project required displacement of about 1.3 million inhabitants and raised concerns about soil erosion, silting and salinity in the lower Yangzi. There are a wide range of renewable energy sources, but even though some projects will have negative effects, the losses will not outweigh the long-term benefits that green and renewable energy brings to the table. Renewable energy brings more self-reliance, long-term energy security and a healthy environment. Benefits of a healthy environment are not only nature related, a healthy environment will make people in China happy, reducing the risk of retaliation against the government. These are all much more positive benefits than a little soil erosion and deposits of sediment.

**Conclusion**

China has been a success story for 30 years, and its economy has endured growth no other country has ever seen. With that, China has also suffered environmental issues for quite some time. The CCP’s investment in renewable and green energy has began to prove benefits. In order for the twenty-first century to be China’s century, one in which China is strong, energy secure and dominant, the CCP first needs to fix national issues. Further investment in renewable energy will allow for energy security, it will also improve the environment. The Chinese will no longer rely on other countries for oil and resources in order to support itself. With these reforms, it will be self-reliant, healthy and strong. China's cities have already started to see improvement even though are still well behind where it needs to be. China seems to be on a good path for the future, it has started to see the consequences of their actions. An ideal case for China in the future would be: as China's economy continues to grow less and less as the years go on, its coal use diminishes and its oil demand declines as a result of its renewable energy sources. Chinese investment and its renewable energy sources increase, producing even more green energy. This would result energy security and in turn cleaner environment, making the country will be less reliant on other countries. Once these reforms are made the CCP will then be able to focus its money and attention elsewhere, striving to improve other sectors of its government in order to dominate to globe. China’s situation is slowly improving, but the only way to ensure that the twenty-first century will be China's century is by improving its environment by investing in green and renewable energy. The renewable energy will improve its environment, provide them with ongoing energy and self-reliance, lowering risk of disaster in the meantime.
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Introduction

The Republic of Ireland is a small nation that resides next to the west coast of the United Kingdom, with a population of around 4.5 million. Ireland is a country of great culture, history, commonly known for leprechauns, Guinness, and having a good time. Despite this notion of thought, it was not always rainbows for the people of Ireland. The Irish were under the rule of the British for over 800 years, and the people of Ireland went through unimaginable efforts in the form of an uprising, in order to receive their independence from the British. An outlook from the Irish Revolt describes what the Irish situation was: “The injustices under which Ireland had suffered for centuries may be classified for our purpose here under five heads: Industrial, Religious, Educational, Agrarian, and Political.” Gruesome days and nights filled with bloodshed and tears were, unfortunately, needed in order to spark their uprising for Home Rule in Ireland.

By the early 20th century, the English were not welcome in Ireland and the rebels of Patrick Pearse and James Connolly would not stop fighting until they achieved their independence. The Easter Rising of 1916 undoubtedly is deemed one of the most revolutionary moments in Irish history, and was successful due to the actions of both leaders of rebel groups and the resistance of the Irish citizens and soldiers.

Historical Background

The Irish people had begun to lose faith in the British and their rule since the Great Famine that occurred in Ireland in 1845-47. They felt that the British did not listen to any of their complaints and did not care about the well-being of the Irish. Another factor that greatly irritated the Irish was that a large majority of the Irish were Roman Catholics who were forced to pay taxes to the Church of England, which made no sense to them because they detested their religious doctrines and it was the Church of the hated Englishman. The majority of the Irish population did not agree with the idea of England fully controlling Ireland. Their main goal was to get Britain out of Ireland and obtain full Irish independence. In other words, the Irish wanted Home Rule. Most rebels came from what is now the southern region of the Republic of Ireland, and they did not agree with the ideas and motives of those from the IRB (Irish Republican Brotherhood). Although the Easter Rising took place solely in Dublin, most Dubliners did not take part in the rebellion.

Groups such as the IRB and the ICA (Irish Countrywomen’s Association) were rebel groups led by revolutionaries such as James Connolly and Patrick Pearse. The IRB was a secret organization that was founded with the goal of Irish Independence. The group was quite small with only around 2,000 members at its peak. Despite this, many Irish were also doubtful with the idea of going against the British and advocating for home rule. Even once the rebellion had begun, only a few locals took the opportunity to join the rebellion. As C.N. Trueman stated in his article, “People were worried about tactics of big rebel (republican) leaders such as Patrick Pearse and James Connolly, and what the reaction of the British would be.” Pearse and Connolly wanted to have a revolution similar to the American revolution against the British. They knew they would not be able to take on the mighty British empire, but since the British were preoccupied with World War I at the time, maybe it would be too much of a hassle for the British at the time if the Irish were able to gather together masses of people to negotiate an independence. In November 1913, the prospect of obtaining home rule led to the creation of a group that went against the rebels: the Ulster Volunteers. They were both loyal to the Union Jack and England. In response to this, people in the south created rival rebel group in 1914: the Irish Volunteers. As many as 200,000 people joined the Irish Volunteers but only a few thousand people were militarily trained. However, they did not have enough military supplies to arm all the volunteers. John Redmond who was the leader of the IRP (Irish Republican Party) acknowledged the fact that the revolution for home rule would have to occur after the World War.

The ICA that was run by James Connolly had the same ideas. The Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Wimborne commanded Chief Secretary Sir Matthew Nathan to arrest between 60 and 100 Irish Rebels in attempt to stop the Rising, but Nathan drove those thoughts away by declaring that the Rising was petty and nothing to lose sleep over. Nathan said this because apparently British spies said that the accepted leader of the Irish Volunteers, Eoin MacNeill, decided not to proceed with the Easter Rising because the rebels weren’t able to get weapons into Ireland from Germany. Patrick Pearse of the IRB thought differently and decided that the rebels should nevertheless pursue with their rebellion. There were those who agreed and disagreed with this, and thus created a bit of friction within the ranks of the Irish Volunteers.

The Week of Rebellion

Easter Monday April 24th, 1916 – Easter Monday marked the beginning of the Easter Rising (Irish Rebellion) and sparked the official revolution against the
British. The events of the day first began at around 11 am when approximately 1,300 members of the Irish Volunteers and Irish Citizen Army assembled all across Dublin. This huge surge of people occupied the center of Dublin and took over various strongpoint buildings. “The rebels occupied a circle of prominent buildings around the city centre of Dublin, barricading themselves in to await the arrival of British forces.” At approximately 12:30 that day, the Tri-colour (Irish flag) was flown over Henry Street corner of the GPO (General Post Office, in Dublin) and a banner inscribed ‘Irish Republic’ was flown at the Prince's Street corner. Later that day the Irish President, Padraig Pearse, emerged on O’Connell street and proceeded to announce the proclamation of the Irish Republic. This proclamation was made for a, “Provisional Government. It is met with confusion due to the fact that thousands of Dubliners have, at the time, relatives fighting for the British in Europe, and most oppose the Rising. Some actually stone the rebels.”

The first shots of the rebellion were fired from the GPO at some time around 1:15pm. In response to this, the British sent a regiment which showed up on O’Connell Street from the north of Dublin. As they reached Nelson's Pillar they received a flood of bullets coming from rooftops and windows from all directions. They had many deaths and the few survivors retreated due to being under fire. This truly showed that the rebels were down to business.

Another early fight between the rebels and the British occurred on the north side of Dublin that day. At around 3:30 pm a group of rebels were put under fire from the Great Northern Railway, where the British were stationed, while transferring supplies to the GPO. Some of the Volunteers took up defensive positions near, while the rest brought remaining supplies to the GPO. The British went ahead and advanced towards Annesley Bridge and were put under heavy fire from the Irish. that were in corner houses. Across the city the British plan was simple: to surround the city with British forces and to go ahead and attack the rebels at the center of their operation which was the GPO. They relied on their superior strength to get them through.

Tuesday April 25th, 1916- On Tuesday morning the British and Irish Revolutionaries were at battle with one another. It was no longer talk but now it was actions that were speaking for themselves. In the late morning accounts in local newspapers write, “Irish Volunteers repulse British infantry from the South Dublin Union. Terrified patients, including the mentally ill, are caught in the crossfire.” Throughout the course of the day, the rebels did not waste any time as they increased their garrison in the GPO which made it possible for them to extend their outposts across the city and acquire new power positions. Whilst the rebels were doing so, the Reis's chambers (a building), was acquired and the rebels were able to set up a radio broadcast on O’Connell Bridge. This led to, from Tuesday afternoon to around midday on Wednesday, news of the rising and fighting was being spread across the U.K. On the other side of the river the British were setting up their own offensives. The British were able to utilize the Loop Line to solidify the northern end of their position. Troops were escorted into these position large number of British showed up on that same day to respond to the needs of a damaged Great Northern Railway line. Whilst doing so, they were marauded by bullets from Connolly Station. In two hours of fighting, the British suffered many deaths and injuries, but since they had more numbers and equipment in their military, they were able to force the rebels to retreat from their base at Connolly Station. This did not have an impact on the position of rebel outposts on the northern side of the city though.

Wednesday April 26th, 1916- This third day of fighting would turn out being perhaps the most crucial of all days of the week, not only because of the fighting that had occurred before but also because of the fact that the British Military had new tactics now that it would deploy and use in battle. As Irish rebels woke up on Wednesday morning, supplies were running low, food is lacking, and news of “British reinforcements arriving at Kingstown” at 8 AM Irish newspapers reported British gunboats, “Helga II and Sealcark conducted an hour long bombardment of Liberty Hall which was a concentration point of rebels and their arsenal.” After an hour of bombing the English pushed ahead with a bayonet charge and took position in an abandoned Liberty Hall and got closer to the GPO. Also on Wednesday morning, Volunteers of the Irish Citizen Army flew their flag, the Starry Plough, on O’Connell Street.

From Wednesday on bullet fire on the GPO and its outposts, became heavy and ceaseless. With intentions to push ahead to O’Connell Street from the north of the city, British forces went forward. It was not going to be so simple. They ended up meeting with a very strong resistance that was led by Commandant, Edward Daly, and his rebel post. This took place in the Four Courts and King Street area. This area experienced heavy fighting and due to this various buildings were set on fire. Despite this, these buildings remained in the control of the rebels as the night approached. British Infantry brigades were commanded to march into Dublin due to the fact that the Irish Military was controlling the railway into Dublin. The British 5th and 6th Battalions arrived just in time to participate in the battles that happened in South Dublin. The 7th and 8th battalions of the British marched in and were stopped by 3 Volunteers outposts on Mount Street Bridge. Here they fought the bloodiest battle that occurred across the Rising. In this battle about 234 men were killed or wounded from the British army. It lasted 9 hours in
Thursday April 27th, 1916- On Thursday morning Fires spread all across Dublin, news of James Connolly being wounded in the ankle came in, and the rebels realized that the GPO was completely cut off and surrounded by the British. On Thursday it was blatantly clear that the main British goal was to attack the GPO and all of the rebel outposts, and to further weaken them. In attempt to achieve this their was a heavy amount fighting in the North King Street and Four Courts. Despite this, it ultimately proved to be unsuccessful for the British and their attempts to eliminate these obstacles to attack the GPO. In the south side of the city, the rebels were able to hold off the British during severe fighting. James Connolly was also wounded in the shoulder outside the GPO. A few moments after the incident occurred, Connolly went ahead without anyone noticing to get help for the injury. He surely did not want anyone seeing him in this state during battle. A number of hours after the initial wound, Connolly took a bullet to the left ankle. The wound completely wrecked the bones in his ankle which left him incapable of standing or walking. He was to spend the rest of the Rising lying on a makeshift stretcher while the wound became dangerous.

Friday April 28th, 2016- On Friday, fires would soon take over and destroy the GPO. By 6 pm the rebels seemed in an inevitable situation of surrender or attempt at escape. The events that proceeded on this day began to cement the end of the Easter Rising despite the valiant attempts of many rebels. In Ashbourne, a five-hour battle proceeded in which 48 Irish rebels defeated 70 British soldiers. The rebels would eventually leave their base, the GPO. Part of the GPO roof collapses and the rebels the GPO and set up their base on Moore Street while under fire. Friday was the unofficial surrender of the rebels, basically when they gave up.

Saturday April 29th, 2016- Under immense pressure the rebels were forced to surrender. He sent Nurse Elizabeth O'Farrell to find out what the British wanted. News came back that the British would accept nothing but surrender and Pearse and Connolly did so. At 3:45 Padrraig Pearse signed the order of surrender issued by the British. The rebels at the South Dublin Union put down their weapons and walked down Sackville street. The rebels were captured and were laughed at by Dubliners, who did not agree with the rebels. The rebels gave it everything they could, but in the end they were defeated. Despite their defeat and surrender, it was not for nothing. A account of the rebels was given, “These weary warriors marched to a prison cell or grave. They were the spark which lit the fuse that will continue to burn until Ireland is united and free.” The week of the rebellion is over.

Aftermath/Analysis – Around 450 people were killed and more than 2,000 people were injured who were mostly civilians. All of this also destroyed much of the Dublin city center. Local Dubliners initially after the events of the uprising had a negative connotation towards the rebels as they had seen them as a sign as death, chaos, and destruction in Ireland. This idea of the rebels changed only after a few weeks after the Rising ended. In May, 15 leaders of the uprising were executed by firing squad. As the BBC stated in an article, “the execution of 15 of the leaders, the arrest of 3,430 men and 79 women (many of them entirely innocent) and the imposition of martial law throughout the entire country - provoked indignation and sympathy for the rebels.” This sympathy for the rebels really opened up the minds of many people and made them support the rebels and their cause. Just as Pearce had dreamed off, the sacrifice of the rebels in the uprising had sparked the fire that would eventually lead to the liberation of Ireland from the United Kingdom. An Irish Citizen describes the horrors of the Rising, “The shooting was every morning about 5 AM. For months afterwards I woke at 5 AM and I never forgot those volleys. I’d never felt so desolate in my life.”

After a July 1921 cease-fire, the two sides signed a treaty in December that called for the establishment of the Irish Free State, a self-governing nation the following year. Ireland's six northern counties didn't want to be part of the Free State and remained with the United Kingdom. The fully independent Republic of Ireland was formally proclaimed on Easter Monday, April 18, 1949.

Conclusion - The Easter Rising was a great success in terms of what the rebels wanted to achieve. The Easter Rising of 1916 is one of the most revolutionary moments in Irish history, and it was successful due to the actions of both leaders of rebel groups and the resistance of the Irish citizens and soldiers. This is true due to the creation of a fully independent Republic of Ireland, which was Pearse and Connolly wanted from the beginning. This had a huge influence in making what the Republic of Ireland is what it is today. It is not only a fully independent country, free from the reigns of the United Kingdom, but it is now able to express its peoples ideas, cultures, and religious beliefs without any persecution or dismay from the British and their overpowering rule.
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Situated on the southern edge of the Northern Triangle, a region infamous for its exorbitant crime and widespread indigence, El Salvador is home to six million people and the world’s highest homicide rate.\(^1\) By virtue of a protracted and divisive war (1979-1992) between the leftist FMLN (Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front) and the Salvadoran government, compounded by El Salvador’s location as a transshipment point in the illicit drug trade and its lack of sturdy bureaucratic institutions, disorderly street gangs have metamorphosed into sophisticated criminal enterprises.\(^2\) Controlling vast swaths of territory and boasting over eighty-five thousand members, the Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) and Mara 18 (M-18) gangs continue to terrorize the country and erode the government’s legitimacy.\(^3\) To achieve a reduction in gang violence and mitigate El Salvador’s security crisis, the government must not pursue further implementation of mano dura (iron-fist) policies or large-scale truces, both of which have aggravated the country’s violence in recent years. Rather, El Salvador’s crime demands a methodological, deterrent-oriented strategy modeled after international examples.

Disconcerted by civilian riots against economic inequality and the suspension of civil liberties, the Revolutionary Government Junta ousted President Carlos Humberto Romero Mena in a coup d’etat on October 15, 1979, precipitating a thirteen-year civil war that killed close to eighty-thousand people and displaced over twenty percent of the nation’s population.\(^4\) Although the peace terms in 1992 stipulated the dissolution of the Salvadoran military government and authorized the FMLN as a sanctioned political party,\(^5\) the war produced a vast and decentralized group of jobless men with nearly unfettered access to weapons.\(^6\) Established in Los Angeles in the early 1980s by Salvadoran immigrants, MS-13 and M-18 quickly made their way to El Salvador at the war’s conclusion.\(^7\) Initially circumscribed to the streets and operated by scruffy teenagers, both maras rapidly improved their capabilities, grew in numbers, and boosted funding through extortions and entrenchment in the global cocaine trade.\(^8\)

Since the turn of the twenty-first century, the Salvadoran government has employed an array of different policies in response to the interminable murder, rape, extortion, and kidnapping perpetrated by the maras. In 2003, President Francisco Flores, spurred by popular support to respond to gang-related crime, enacted a series of mano dura policies designed to cripple the maras.\(^9\) Sentences for mara membership and gang-related crimes increased dramatically, police powers and presence expanded, and thousands of adolescents suspected of gang membership were arrested.\(^10\) Despite overwhelming popular support for such measures, the homicide rate rose unabated, and the maras more than doubled their membership, often through recruitment in crowded prisons.\(^11\) Mano dura policies perpetuated until 2012, when President Mauricio Funes, at the behest of MS-13 and M-18, helped broker a truce ostensibly devised to reduce gang-related violence.\(^12\) Both gangs pledged not to recruit children or assault women, thousands of weapons were handed over, and high-ranking gang leaders were transferred from maximum security prisons to regular facilities in order to foster intra-gang negotiations.\(^13\) Government officials trumpeted reports of a forty percent decrease in homicides in 2012,\(^14\) but El Salvador’s Institute of Legal Medicine concluded that “disappearances” rose by nearly the same number in that time frame.\(^15\) Once heralded by the international community and the Organization of American States as a landmark peace agreement,\(^16\) the truce showed initial signs of unraveling in early 2013, and the government declared the agreement dissolved in 2014.\(^17\)

Instead of undermining the maras’ influence and reducing the carnage exacted by Salvadoran criminal organizations, the two-year truce enabled MS-13 and M-18 to restructure, rearm, devise a coherent strategy, and construct stronger links with the cocaine and narcotics industry.\(^18\) Emboldened by equal negotiating status, the maras fully comprehended the breadth of their political clout.\(^19\) A high-profile gang leader in El Salvador explained this phenomenon in a rather blunt manner: “We dump bodies on the street until they [the government] say yes. And they always say yes.”\(^20\) In 2015, the homicide rate spiked to 117 per 100,000, and murders in 2016 are projected to eclipse that rate.\(^21\) The reinstatement of mano dura policies under current President Salvador Sanchez Ceren has merely served to exacerbate crime rates and augment gang membership.\(^22\)

In order to mitigate the security crisis plaguing El Salvador, a systematic prevention strategy must be pursued by the administration of President Salvador Sanchez Ceren. Large-scale truces and negotiations have only emboldened MS-13 and M-18, and mano dura policies, employed in El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and even countries such as Mexico, have failed unequivocally, triggering surges in homicide rates and increasing the proliferation of gangs, cartels, and criminal organizations. In a comprehensive report examining violence across the globe, The United States Agency for International Development recently concluded that focused deterrence “has the largest direct impact on crime and violence, by far, of any intervention.”\(^23\) Such a strategy demands the mobilization of community leaders and social services, along with rewards for individuals who comply with a law. Methodological deterrence requires enforcement of the law without resorting to...
mano dura tactics. In the early 1990s, mayor Rodrigo Guerrero of Cali, Colombia, one of the most dangerous cities in the world, utilized a data-driven approach to combat crime.24 Finding that crime was heavily concentrated on payday weekends, Guerrero banned the sale of alcohol after 1 a.m. on weekdays and 2 a.m. on weekends.25 The decline of violent crime in Cali was marked and nearly immediate, and other cities quickly emulated his policies; neighborhoods enforcing the ban witnessed a fourteen percent reduction in homicides over the course of two years.26

Ever since its devastating civil war, El Salvador has been perpetually afflicted with gang-related kidnapping, turf wars, extortion, rape, and murder. Iron-fist measures, although popular on the domestic front, have proved to be categorically counter-productive, and recent attempts at achieving a truce have merely enabled the expansion of El Salvador’s maras. The administration of Salvador Sanchez Seren must utilize an epidemiological approach to crime, prioritizing deterrence and prevention, in order to alleviate El Salvador's crime and carnage.
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In 2004, President George W. Bush won re-election, and Republicans bolstered their majorities in the House (232-202) and Senate (55-44). Bush proceeded to name Social Security reform his top domestic initiative, and even called his re-election a mandate from the American public for privatization of Social Security. With strong majorities in both the House and the Senate, Bush launched a massive effort to mobilize public support for Social Security reform. Yet fewer than nine months later, President Bush declared the initiative a failure. Bush’s failed Social Security reform offers an important lesson in politics: unified government does not guarantee policy shift. If it did, Bush, who no longer needed to worry about re-election, would have pushed his reform through the Republican House and Senate with ease. The example of Bush’s failure is relevant today, when, for the first time since 2006, Republicans control the House, Senate, and White House. Unified government does matter, but its influence has a limited scope. Unified Republican control of government in the 115th Congress will facilitate powerful policy shifts in areas of near total consensus within the GOP. But unified government’s impact is limited to those few areas of near total party consensus, and outside of those areas, fractures within the Republican Party will prevent sweeping policy shifts across the board.

Unified party control will lead to significant policy shifts in policy arenas in which there is a complete, or near complete, consensus among Republicans. One such arena is the appointment of new justices to the Supreme Judicial Court. On the campaign trail, Trump promised to appoint conservative justices “who, like Justice Scalia, will protect our liberty with the highest regard for the Constitution.” His recent list of 21 potential nominees confirms that statement and is full of constitutionalist conservatives, including Judge William Pryor of Alabama, who called the 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling “the worst abomination of constitutional law in our history.” Trump is hoping to score a unifying victory with Republicans early in his presidency, and nominating a traditional conservative whose ideology closely resembles that of GOP leadership in the House and Senate to fill the Supreme Court vacancy is an easy way to do so. Moreover, the aging Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Anthony Kennedy could open two more vacancies on the bench in the coming years. If Trump continues to name conservative Supreme Court nominees as a means of appealing to the GOP establishment, he and the 115th Congress could impact policy for the next three decades.

Unified Republican government will also bring about policy shifts in tax reform. President-elect Trump’s proposed tax plan includes broad tax cuts for every earning demographic in America, with an average tax cut of $215,000 for the wealthiest one percent of households. Most Republicans favor drastic tax cuts – in fact, the current House Republican tax reform plan features tax cuts that would reduce government revenue by $2.4 trillion over the first decade. When the issue comes to a vote, House and Senate members will be unlikely to oppose tax relief for every earning demographic. Additionally, the reduced government revenue that results could give Republicans the impetus to cut funding for their least favorite government programs, such as the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency. House Republicans and Trump will find common ground on another aspect of the House reform plan: “border adjustment” taxes, which tax importers while giving rebates to exporters. Essentially a tariff in disguise, the border adjustment tax should play nicely into the protectionist rhetoric that fueled much of Trump’s campaign. With House Republicans and Trump poised for unity on tax cuts and border adjustments, the unified GOP should bring about sweeping changes in tax policy.

While unified Republican government will produce significant changes in areas of general GOP consensus, such as the Supreme Court makeup and tax policy, in larger, more complex policy areas, such as healthcare reform, unified party control will not reconcile divisions among Republicans.

Current debate over the replacement of President Obama’s signature Affordable Care Act demonstrates the limited impact of unified government on policy shifts, because although criticism of Obamacare has been a mainstay of Republicanism for the past six years, Republicans are hopelessly divided on how to fix it now that they control government. Fewer than two weeks after the swearing in of the 115th Congress, significant rifts are emerging within the GOP as it prepares to dismantle the ACA. With the introduction of a budget reconciliation measure in the Senate that would allow for a simple majority to repeal many aspects of the ACA, several notable GOP lawmakers are reconsidering the wisdom of repealing such a large piece of legislation without a plan to replace it. Senator Rand Paul (R, KY) opposes the budget reconciliation bill due to excessive spending, but also opposes repealing the ACA without an immediate replacement plan. Other senators who oppose repealing without an immediate replacement plan include Bob Corker (R, TN), Lamar Alexander (R, TN), and Tom Cotton (R, AR). Assuming the forty-eight Senate Democrats vote unanimously against the repeal, these three Republicans could derail any repeal with a
simple majority. Yet Senate majority leader Mitch McConnell has promised that the Senate will vote to repeal the ACA by the January 13, and Reince Priebus, the president-elect’s chief of staff, has suggested that immediate implementation of a replacement plan ready may not be possible, stating, “full replacement may take more time than an instantaneous action.”

Meanwhile, in the House, the Freedom Caucus, a conservative offshoot of the Republican Party, has vowed to delay voting on the budget measure until more details emerge regarding the ACA replacement plan. House Speaker Paul Ryan has echoed the sentiments of Priebus and McConnell. Contradicting Ryan and Priebus, President-elect Trump has declared that he will not tolerate a delay of more than a few weeks between the repeal vote and the vote for a replacement plan, promising, “It won't be repeal and then two years later go in with another plan.” As GOP leaders clash, progress on healthcare reform will slow until a consensus emerges among Republicans on how and when to repeal the ACA. Despite controlling Congress and the White House, GOP leaders show a shocking lack of organization and have already strayed from their promises of a swift, painless “repeal and replace,” demonstrating the insignificance of unified government in the face of intra-partisan discord.

Moreover, unified government will not diminish the significant logistical challenges of transitioning to a new, nationwide healthcare system without a crisis. The current plan of repealing the ACA through budget reconciliation would remove only parts of the bill – namely, employer and individual mandates to purchase insurance, Medicaid expansion, premium subsidies, and new taxes – without removing popular aspects, such as guaranteed coverage for citizens with pre-existing health conditions. Yet the aspects that Republicans plan to repeal are integral to maintaining the affordability of healthcare, and without them, insurance costs will skyrocket. The subsequent instability could cause many insurance providers to drop out of ACA insurance markets, leaving millions of Americans without coverage, and with the Republican Party to blame. Appearing to control all of Washington, D.C., Republicans must be careful not to upset the American public and trigger a backlash from voters in two years.

With Senate majority leader Mitch McConnell and House Speaker Paul Ryan insisting on repeal now despite protests from atop and within their own party, Congress will likely proceed with repeal of parts of the ACA through budget reconciliation, with the repeal taking effect in two to three years. Trump will have to approve the bill without a replacement plan ready. Having campaigned on repealing and replacing the ACA, the president-elect would lose significant amounts of credibility among both the electorate and the Republican establishment if he were to veto a bill doing just that. The GOP will then fashion a replacement plan in a piece-meal manner while maintaining the beneficial aspects of the current ACA. Unified government will hardly matter in the creation of the ACA replacement, because, despite its majorities in both legislative bodies, the GOP must attain bipartisan support in the reform effort, after criticizing the strictly partisan passage of the ACA. Republicans will repeal and replace Obamacare, but not in the swift manner that many voters and party leaders envisioned under a unified government.

Other policy arenas, such as Social Security reform and foreign policy, further demonstrate the limited scope of unified government’s impact. As President Bush learned, Social Security reform will always be a difficult issue, because it affects the future economic security of every single voter. Presently, Social Security will be able to meet only 75 percent of its obligations by the 2030s. As recently as this past December, Representative Sam Johnson (R, TX), chairman of the House Social Security sub-committee, presented a plan for Social Security reform. Despite unified government, Republican action on this plan is unlikely for two reasons. First, the same disunity evident in healthcare reform will resurface. Donald Trump campaigned on a promise to protect Social Security benefits. On January 10, his chief of staff, Reince Priebus, speculated, “I don’t think President-elect Trump wants to meddle with Medicare or Social Security.” Speaker Ryan, on the other hand, has supported privatization of Social Security. This disagreement alone will impede progress, and the fact that much of Trump’s credibility rests on his promise not to touch entitlements suggests that he and the Republican Party will favor inaction on Social Security. Second, Republicans are taking a significant risk by reforming healthcare. A mistake in this realm could be ruinous to Republican re-election chances. Republicans are unlikely to take on simultaneously the larger, even more risky issue of Social Security reform.

In foreign policy, Donald Trump and his cabinet will control outcomes. Presidential power to negotiate treaties and to make war for sixty days without congressional approval will make Trump the dominant force in foreign policy regardless of a unified Congress. President Obama had no problem directing foreign policy over the final two years of his presidency, despite Republican control of Congress. Two easy targets for Trump are DAPA and DACA, executive orders that provide temporary citizenship to undocumented parents of U.S. citizens and undocumented minors. Targeting law-abiding parents and children, however, would not be a politically savvy move, and would not align with Trump’s plan to deport only undocumented criminals.

Unified government is not the “green light” for policy changes across the board that many outside Washington believe it to be. In the 115th Congress, Republican control of government will drive significant changes, but only in policy areas of general consensus among the party, such as the Supreme Court makeup.
Unified government will have little impact on outcomes in more complex policy realms, such as healthcare. Current divisions among Republicans regarding how and when to repeal the ACA show that unified government can be deceptively divided. Moreover, unified government does not make healthcare reform any less complex than it is in times of disunity, and puts Republicans in a position to be blamed for any policy shortcomings. Further, despite majorities, Republicans must strive to obtain bipartisan support for healthcare reform, to avoid hypocrisy. Social Security reform, though necessary, will see no progress due to further discord among Republicans. Overseas, Donald Trump and his cabinet will be the dominant forces in foreign policy, but not because of unified government. The president’s foreign policy powers far outweigh those granted to Congress by the Constitution, and single-party control does little to change foreign policy outcomes. Unified government can have a large impact, but on relatively few policies. Further, it obscures the fact that politicians in power still have to run for re-election and operate within the bounds of the Constitution. Simply because a policy can be passed or repealed over opposition does not mean it should be – as Republicans are learning in their mission to fix healthcare.
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In 2015, millions of migrants fled their war torn homes in North Africa and the Middle East and flooded into Europe seeking refuge and asylum. Of the European countries, Germany was hit the hardest as over 1.1 millions refugees sought refuge in 2015 alone, with hundreds of thousands more coming in 2016. As the seemingly endless flow of migrants kept pouring into Germany, thanks to Angela Merkel’s “Open Door” policy, the German economy has suffered a downturn. However, despite the initial tolls the migrants are taking on the German economy, the influx of migrants will help the slowing German economy in the long term. The migrants are using up immense government resources, while also creating problems in public safety, education, and facilities. Despite the pitfalls of the migrants, the flow of young laborers will help offset the aging workforce, boost the economy, and eventually pay for itself.

The large proportion of migrants without a proper education creates problems for the government. PISA (Program for Student Assessment) conducted a study demonstrating that nearly two-thirds of Syrians cannot do basic math and have trouble reading, while Turkish studies conducted in migrant camps found that 80% of the refugees did not have a high school diploma. However, a different study conducted by the UN found that 43% of Syrians arriving in Greece have a university degree and 43% possess a high school diploma. Despite contradictory findings, the majority of migrants are under-educated, and most do not speak any German.

The massive increase of public school attendees has created two major problems, a major shortage of teachers and disruption of the education system. The migrants need, and are entitled to, a free education in Germany, including language classes. As thousands of extra students flood the public schools, the German education system is in dire need of teachers, at least 25,000. Furthermore, the public system has been faced with a moral dilemma regarding the new students. Public schools are deciding whether to put the new students, few of whom can speak or understand German, into normal classes or special “Welcome Classes.” If new students were placed into regular classes, they would pick up German relatively quickly and learn the same material as the rest of the pupils their age. However, placing migrants in normal classes runs the risk of taking away from the German students, as classes would be taught at a slower pace. The other option, “Welcome Classes,” would allow migrants to learn language skills and proceed at their own pace. However, they would most likely be far behind their German counterparts, further segregating the two groups, which could lead to increased unemployment for migrants and could also exacerbate social issues. For college-aged migrants, they too face issues in attaining their education, as many lack school records proving their eligibility, as well as much needed language skills.

The housing conditions cause problems within migrant communities and for the German government. As migrants fill designated living facilities, the government mandates that satellite facilities are used to accommodate the refugees. While migrants are living all over the country, school gyms are by far the most utilized resource for housing. Refugees are living without proper showers, toilets, and washing machines; one refugee described her living situation, “The gym hall meant as a provisional solution has evolved into a permanent state which is unsustainable for people.” To make matters worse, fights often break out among varying ethnic groups, and refugees have developed drinking and drug abuse issues while living in the lackluster conditions. As conditions worsen, the German government is receiving constant backlash for the mere seven square meters of living space given to migrants.

The German people are paying billions and burning through cash reserves to support refugees. As housing development is increased to account for the lack of living space, the German taxpayers pay almost $1.2 billion in government subsidies. Educators are costing the German taxpayers over $1 billion a year, with over 350,000 German language teachers costing $37 an hour, social workers costing $250 million a year, and school psychologists costing an additional $42 million. Furthermore, state-provided day care costs $420 million a year and pupil placing costs an additional $1.7 million. An additional 20,000 police officers have been commissioned to help handle the growing crime, costing $1.4 billion a year, and prices are expected to rise by $2.3 billion by 2020. The budget for internal security is also expected to climb from $6.4 billion to $8.7 billion by the end of 2017. When everything is considered, the migrants are costing an estimated $31.5 billion a year.

While the migrants are creating numerous problems for the German economy, the young and motivated labor force will benefit the economy over the long term. The arrival of migrants to Germany has provided the aging country with a young labor force. Germany’s aging population will have negative effects on the economy. In 2015, the population under 20 years old accounted for 18% of citizens and will decrease to an estimated 16% by 2060. The population above 65 years of age currently accounts for around 21% of citizens and will increase to more than 30% by 2060. The working age population, aged 20-64, is expected to decrease from 61% of the population to around 50% by 2060. As the
population ages and fewer people are in the workforce, production is likely to decrease, per capita income will decrease, and younger people will have to pay to support the older population as the age dependency ratio grows.\textsuperscript{28}

The mass arrival of migrants, however, can help to offset the dwindling workforce. In 2015, over half the migrants arriving were under 25, and many German companies view the refugees as a potential solution to their diminishing workforce.\textsuperscript{29} Dieter Zetsche, the head of Mercedes, claims that the migrants are highly motivated and could catalyze a new “economic miracle.”\textsuperscript{30}

The German economy held up better than expected despite the migrant crisis. Unemployment in Germany, at just 6\%, is at a record low despite the mass numbers of refugees seeking jobs.\textsuperscript{31} In fact, there are an estimated 660,000 jobs available to qualified migrants, and over 30,000 refugees have jobs in construction, restaurants, and other low skilled labor.\textsuperscript{32} Unfortunately, as of September, there were only 54 refugees employed at the 30 largest companies in Germany; 50 of them work for a postal carrier service.\textsuperscript{33} Additionally, due to Germany’s government surplus, the massive financial burdens the migrants that have imposed upon the government have damaged the economy, but not sunk it.\textsuperscript{34} The damage is temporary, and the European Commission argues that the migrants will add 0.2\%-0.3\% to the GDP by 2020.\textsuperscript{35}

In order to ensure that the migrants benefit the economy in the future, the government must fix current education issues. The massive influx of students has created a plethora of problems; however, the migrants can help solve the issues they unintentionally beget. The current educational infrastructure cannot handle the numbers of students; thus, new schools need to be built.\textsuperscript{36} While thousand of migrants have already been employed in construction, government-funded school production would call for more workers, thus allowing migrants to secure a stable, well paying job, while also creating financial independence. An increase in construction jobs would also allow migrants to get out of their cramped camps and makeshift homes to positively contribute to the economy, rather than just draining government resources. In terms of classes, migrant pupils should be placed in “Welcome Classes” for at least a year, where they focus heavily on language skills. After a year, students will be able to test out of their initial classes and into the traditional German curriculum. The language classes will allow students to develop valuable skills, while minimizing the separation of German and non-German students. Better-educated refugees will undoubtedly lead to increased employment rates and productivity in the future.\textsuperscript{37} For adults, many large corporations are not willing to educate migrants because the costs would outweigh the benefits.\textsuperscript{38} Therefore, the government should offer tax breaks and other financial incentives to ensure that large corporations take steps to employ refugees. Without jobs or a proper education, many migrants will live poor lives funded by the German taxpayer, but if they are participating in the workforce they can reduce Germany’s aging population issues while also bolstering the staggering economy.

The government must stem the flow of migrants and increase screening. Germany was hit with five deadly attacks during 2016, all carried out by migrants, most of whom pledged allegiance to ISIS.\textsuperscript{39} The attacks have caused social and political turmoil over the course of the year, as citizens feel vulnerable and unsafe surrounded by refugees. The issues arise with deportations, as it is expensive and difficult to deport thousands of migrants.\textsuperscript{40} A man with a criminal record, who was not removed from the country, carried out the most recent attack.\textsuperscript{41} If the initial screening process were longer and more intense, then the smarter and more productive migrants could have priority, and dangerous people with criminal records could be kept out. However, the “Open Door Policy” has allowed dangerous militants into the country, costing the country billions in defense spending and creating fear among the public.\textsuperscript{42}

The housing issues must be resolved to allow migrants to develop comfort and security in their new country. Although there are already billions of dollars worth of housing construction subsidies, there are still not enough places for migrants to live.\textsuperscript{43} Similar to the schools, employing the migrants to further participate in government-funded, low-skilled construction jobs would allow more migrants to develop financial security, safe and sanitary living conditions, and would allow more refugees to join the workforce. If migrants have proper living accommodations, there would be fewer fights in camps, they would not have to worry about their living situation, and instead could focus on becoming a productive member of the economy.

The government needs to enact new taxes to help pay for the migrants. Angela Merkel has continued to rule out any tax increases since the migrant crisis started in early 2015.\textsuperscript{44} Although the public has been in favor of her tax plans, the government needs to increase revenue if they want to continue supporting migrants. The German government is paying billions of dollars a year to ensure that migrants have an opportunity to continue their lives in Germany, but the government surpluses are being used up rapidly, and if tax revenue is not raised, then the country will face further economic troubles.\textsuperscript{45} Although the taxes would increase in the short term, the faster migrants can get an education, integrate into German society, and find jobs, the faster the economic benefits of the influx of refugees will offset the increased spending.

Although there were initial reservations about the drastic and rapid influx of unskilled migrants, many of whom did not have proper educations, the benefits of the immigrants outweigh the downfalls. The migrants are costing the German government billions, but will soon pay for themselves and add to the growing Ger-
man economy. The migrant crisis has created political, social, moral, and economic issues over the past couple of years in Germany, but ultimately, the refugees will add far more to Germany’s future, culture, and economy than they will take away, and the German economy will remain Europe’s powerhouse.
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After receiving and reviewing what the English Department deemed to be some of the best essays written on Just Mercy by Bryan Stevenson, The Podium selected “Mercy in All Forms” as a staff favorite.

Just Mercy by Bryan Stevenson, one of the most difficult, infuriating books to read, holds incredible lessons and information that all Americans should know. One lesson is that a job such as Mr. Stevenson’s, one that requires hard work and pays little, can be more fulfilling than what seems apparent. The book reveals how crooked some justice systems are, such as children being eligible for adult prosecution and underrepresentation of African-Americans on the jury stand. Most importantly, however, Just Mercy not only shows that incredible unfairness exists in the justice system, but also reveals how everyone, the African-American communities, the cruelest officers, and the wrongfully-convicted inmates themselves, contains the power to forgive and a sincere empathy that gives hope for a brighter future for the American justice system.

Walter’s supporters knew that he was innocent ever since the police convicted him of murder. What is admirable is the fact that they remained peaceful, yet strong throughout the whole process of freeing Walter from prison. The will of Walter’s supporters is best exemplified through Mrs. Williams, an old, African-American women who attended Walter’s hearing. After being threatened from entering the courtroom by the police dog, Mrs. Williams’s daughter told Mr. Stevenson how Mrs. Williams resorted to peace instead of violence: “When she got home last night... she just went to her bedroom. We could hear her praying all night long” (180). Resorting to praying instead of fighting shows the strength of Mrs. Williams and the African-American community as a whole. Mrs. Williams showed her courage and devotion to Walter’s cause even more so by returning to the courtroom the next day and walking past the dog: “It was impossible to look away. She made it through the detector and stared at the dog. Then, loud enough for everyone to hear, she belted out: ‘I ain’t scared of no dog!’” (180). Fighting back the pain the police dogs have caused in the past (when the dogs attacked civil rights protesters in 1965), the character Mrs. Williams shows is powerful, and because she represents the African-American community, her walking past the dog symbolizes the willingness of her community to forgive and show empathy.

While anyone associated with the justice system may seem evil after reading Just Mercy, there are signs of hope that even officers have remorse in their hearts. An example comes from a correctional officer during the trial of Avery Jenkins. Initially rude to Mr. Stevenson, the officer actually apologized to Mr. Stevenson after he hears why he is fighting for Avery: “I think you done good, real good... I took [Avery] to a Wendy’s, and I bought him a chocolate milkshake” (202). For an officer with a Confederate flag tattooed on his arm to admit he was wrong to a black lawyer takes a lot of courage, and to (illegally) give a black inmate his desired milkshake takes a lot of heart. This unnamed officer demonstrates how even the most narrow-minded individuals have the basic human attributes of compassion and repentance at heart and can do good when shown the truth.

Lastly, the inmates who are saved by Mr. Stevenson are sympathetic themselves and give hope that anyone can forgive. Nearly every prisoner was gracious and showed empathy when given Mr. Stevenson’s aid, even if the aid was hardly anything at all. Ian, a Florida juvenile inmate who was condemned to die in prison, was not even given direct assistance from Mr. Stevenson, yet he was extremely thankful, as shown in his letter to Mr. Stevenson: “I don’t know how to make you feel emotion and importance of those photos, but to be real, I want to show the world I’m alive! I want to look at those photos and feel alive! It would really help with my pain” (162). All Mr. Stevenson did for Ian was shoot photos of him for his report on children sentenced to death in prison, and Ian is incredibly grateful, not hateful. Ian also offered one dollar from his $1.75 inmate account to pay for a few photos, reflecting how badly his desire for human interaction is. Ian shows us that prisoners are humans too.

While reading Just Mercy, I would become confused at some of the situations that arose from Mr. Stevenson’s pursuits: How could people be this sadistic? How could racism be so rampant, 150 years after the Civil War? How could Amer-
ica, which most people associate with freedom, be the harbor of so much oppression? I think a main reason is because it is easy to dismiss prisoners and their struggles; they are separated from us after all. But there is hope. Everyone in the book, the inmates, officers, and whole communities, has demonstrated his or her ability to show mercy. People just have to be informed. That is why I have even more hope after reading this book: the more people read it, the more people are informed, and the more hope there is for every wrongfully prosecuted individual in America.
Throughout the course of American history, the American identity has fluctuated in a number of ways; to determine a steadfast definition of the American identity is difficult given its fluidity over America's nearly four hundred years of existence. From its start, America was created as a refuge from the philistine policies of Europe; therefore, the first American constituents were bonded by their equal desire for freedom. For the early Americans, unity was a necessity for survival. Without collectivism, the “American dream” of the time, freedom, was unattainable. As the American people's values changed, so did the American identity. As time progressed, America won its independence, and the unifying desire for freedom faded. What was once a homogeneous, undivided body of people became separated into individual parties with diverse interests. Over the course of its existence, America has gone through a transformation in respect to individualism, from America's conception in which newly found land was riddled with God-fearing visible saints, who all shared the same beliefs, to the progressive transcendentalist movement in which writers preached the necessity of individualism. Through the works of John Winthrop's “A Modell of Christian Charity” (1630) and Ralph Waldo Emerson's “Self-Reliance” (1841), America’s evolution towards individualism is evident.

One of the central characteristics of American identity is the individualist spirit and the utilization of free will; however, this was not always the case, as at the birth of America, unity and shared beliefs were the foundation on which American society was built. Therefore, in the beginning of America’s history, unity and collectivism were the linchpins of the American identity, as seen through John Winthrop’s sermon “A Modell of Christian Charity.” Writing his sermon as he traveled from England to New England in the spring of 1630, Winthrop’s primary message was that of collectivism. Winthrop preached the necessity of joining with those in the community to work as a single entity: “For this end, wee must be knit together, in this work, as one man” (9). Instead of singular people working alone to accomplish something, the community worked as one body, or one man, to achieve their goals. Furthermore, Winthrop not only preached the necessity of working together, he also added, “Wee must be willing to abridge ourselves of our superfluities, for the supply of other’s necessities” (9). In order to survive, Winthrop and his community had to separate themselves from their personal desires and completely submit to the communal cause. Finally, Winthrop stated, “Wee must delight in each other; make other’s conditions our oune; rejoice together, mourn together, labour and suffer together, always hauing before our eyes our commision and community in the worke, as members of the same body” (9). The community's identity was entirely collective: even their emotions, which are often personal, were shared by the group as a whole. Ultimately, Winthrop's sermon and model of civilization was that of full unification, reflective of the American identity at the time.

As America progressed socially, the collective nature of its constituents developed into a populace of individual thinkers; the transformation of American literature reflects this ideological change, and Ralph Waldo Emerson's “Self-Reliance” serves as the epitome of this new wave of thought. Emerson's essay, written in 1841, is the antithesis of Winthrop's sermon: Emerson demands of the reader complete independence from society and all of the afflictions which come along with it. In his essay, Emerson explains the troubles of society: “Society everywhere is in conspiracy against the manhood of every one of its members. Society is a joint-stock company, in which the members agree, for the better securing of his bread to each shareholder, to surrender the liberty and culture of the eater. The virtue in most request is conformity. Self-reliance is its aversion” (116). Emerson's warning of the dangers of society are reflective of the new American identity at the time; the American identity became that of freedom through individualism. Furthermore, unlike Winthrop's message of working together as a community, Emerson claims a person is at their strongest when alone: “It is only as a man puts off all foreign support, and stands alone, that I see him to be strong and to prevail. He is weaker by every recruit to his banner. Is not a man better than a town? Ask nothing of men, and in the endless mutation, thou only firm column must presently appear the upholder of all that surrounds thee” (128). Emerson's theory on individualism outmatching collectivism wholly juxtaposes Winthrop's: Emerson states the strongest entity is an individual, whereas Winthrop believes it is a community. This transformation is reflective of the American identity and its change from collectivist to individualist over time.

The transformation of American identity is evident through prevalent literary works of respective time periods, from John Winthrop’s “A Modell of Christian Charity,” which preaches collectivism and the power of unity, to Ralph Waldo Emerson’s “Self-Reliance,” in which Emerson stresses the importance of individualism. To this day, the American identity has evolved and transformed further from these two points in American history; ultimately, it has come to the point where the American identity can be myriad characteristics. Despite whatever traits define the American identity at a given time, it has remained rooted in ideological theories and not on race or ethnicity, which is one of the greatest aspects of American culture and what makes the United States such an admired society.
Glancing out of the window of her coastal Maine beach house, Pat Pratt suddenly noticed a shimmering commotion of bait fish darting rapidly through the water, a clear sign that a large predator was on their tail. It was mid-summer, 1975, and Pat was getting ready to leave for a dinner party, but she did not let her long skirt stop her from pulling on a pair of waist-high rubber boots (“hip waders”) and running down to the water’s edge with a rod and, she remembers, “a funny little popper lure that looked like a marshmallow with a couple of pink spots on it.” On her first cast, she felt a massive tug. The fish quickly took all of Pat’s line as it tried to escape out to sea, leaving her chasing the powerful creature up and down the beach, determined not to let it get away. More than a quarter of an hour later, she finally pulled in a twenty-six pound striped bass. She and her husband showed up late to the party with dirty clothes and a story to tell.

Patricia Ross Pratt, now eighty-seven (but feels “eighteen”), seems not to have lost any of the vigor of her younger self. She is thin, but certainly not frail, and unusually tall. Her short, yellow-white hair frames a cheerful face lit up by two bright blue eyes. She typically wears simple, yet colorful, clothing, and her glasses are ever-present on a string around her neck. She speaks with enthusiasm and exuberance, and her most common refrain is “I feel very lucky.” Many of her sentences seem to end in an exclamation point. It is hard not to be cheered up by her infectious personality.

Over the course of her life, Pat has ventured all over the world, a trend that continues to this day. She only recently returned from a fishing trip in the Peruvian Amazon, where she caught piranhas (“They tasted like flounder,” she reports). Throughout all these travels, aside from pulling on a pair of waist-high rubber boots (“hip waders”) and running down to the water’s edge with a rod and, she remembers, “a funny little popper lure that looked like a marshmallow with a couple of pink spots on it.” On her first cast, she felt a massive tug. The fish quickly took all of Pat’s line as it tried to escape out to sea, leaving her chasing the powerful creature up and down the beach, determined not to let it get away. More than a quarter of an hour later, she finally pulled in a twenty-six pound striped bass. She and her husband showed up late to the party with dirty clothes and a story to tell.

Pat Ross grew up in Cambridge, in a house just a short walk away from where she currently lives, with her two older brothers, who “teased the dickens out of me,” she recalls. But despite her brothers’ antagonism, she describes her childhood as “very happy.” She looks back fondly on the independence of her youth, recalling, “Parents didn’t keep an eye on you all the time, so we were very free.” It was here, spending many unsupervised afternoons exploring the town with her friends, that the roots of her love of adventure took hold. From a young age, Pat remembers feeling the strong presence of “independent women” in her life, particularly her two unmarried aunts, one of whom was the first female legislator in Massachusetts in a time when the State House had no female bathrooms, who read to her and challenged her intellectually. “They would ask me direct questions, and I would have to answer them.” Like many children, she idolized her parents. Her mother was head nurse at Children’s Hospital in Boston. Her father was permanently wheelchair-bound as a result of polio he contracted as a young boy, but his disability did not prevent him from joining his family while they ice skated (he sat in a sled and used poles to push himself across the surface). Immensely strong-willed himself, he visited military veterans and other patients who had lost use of their legs to tell them that “life goes on.” He even took the initiative to travel to meet with and encourage the young Franklin Roosevelt, at that point a former vice-presidential nominee, despite not sharing his political views. “He never, ever, let his paralysis stop him from doing anything,” Pat attests of her father. He drove a car, loved to sail, and left Pat with no excuses.

Although her family lived comfortably in the upper middle class, Pat did not have many “things,” owning “maybe three changes of clothes,” she estimates. This frugality endures in Pat to this day, evident in her modest attire and in the unostentatious interior of her home (she marks it up to her Scottish heritage). Her parents put a strong emphasis on education, something Pat understood and worked hard to honor. For eleven years, up until her graduation in 1947, she attended the nearby Shady Hill School, where she first learned to draw by sketching her science experiments and scenes from ancient history (she later became an avid painter), and which taught her, above all, that there was “nothing you couldn't try to learn,” a mantra that seems to have become a guiding principle in her life.

As Pat tells her story, her eyes narrow slightly and she stares off into the distance. Massaging her hands, she delves into the past, describing the patchwork of her life using incredible specifics, from the dimensions of a historical landmark on her way to school to the way the sun glimmered off the sea on a summer evening of her youth, using her artist’s attention to detail to paint a vivid picture of the moment. She uses terms, like “swell,” that are decidedly from another era, and her deliberate yet cheerful speaking style, slowly choosing every word, captivates the listener and reveals her personality.

For Pat, the decision on where to go to college was clear; she knew she wanted to travel abroad, and the
only two colleges that awarded course credit for a year abroad were Smith College in Western Massachusetts and Sweet Briar College in Virginia, “with a lot of horses, and I wasn't 'horsey,' so I went to Smith.” In high school, Pat had worked at local hospitals, understaffed due to the war, “doing bandages, making beds, giving injections, doing everything,” but soon decided that she “was too selfish to be a nurse.” Still interested in science and medicine, she entered college as a Biochemistry major, but “that lasted about four months,” she claims with a self-deprecating laugh. She ended up pivoting to Sociology and then English, and through her year abroad fell in love with travel. She now looks back on her year in Geneva as a formative experience. For the first time in her life, she had no communication with her parents other than an occasional letter. She was grateful for her parents' trust and exhilarated by the freedom and the taste of a different culture (it also helped that post-World War II Genevans had a very high view of America).

After college, Pat moved back to Cambridge and quickly began working to improve the city. Although she had come to realize that the expected path for women was solely to find a husband, which she noted while in college, she was excited to work for the community she loved. With the help of a mentor and friend who was on the board of the Cambridge Water Department, she got her start cleaning up Black’s Nook, a corner of Fresh Pond which had become a dumping ground for the city and threatened the surrounding ecosystem. Pat outlines with pride how the project became a large group effort involving departments across multiple disciplines, working with the city to redirect the dumping, collaborating with the Cambridge garden club to design a new layout and plant new trees, and even watering the trees by allowing Cambridge firefighters to practice using their hoses on the grounds. This line of work could not have been more perfect for Pat. She loved interacting with nature and helping the city she had lived in nearly all her life, and rewarding outcomes like the restoration of Black’s Nook kept her working on Fresh Pond and other similar projects for thirty-five years, continuing long after she married.

“This sounds really elitist, but… well, it was,” she laughs. Pat explains that she met her husband at the “coming-out party” of a friend of a friend, which she described as an old tradition in which a girl, upon turning eighteen, hosted a dance to “meet the right people.” There she met Herbert Pratt, and they bonded right away, sharing a mutual love of nature and poetry. Pat recounts the night in amazing detail: “It was a foggy night, and we were driven to get to the party in a big black Packard, and Herbert and I sat in the back seat and talked about Robert Frost.” But despite the fun they had that night, they did not see each other again until after Pat had graduated from college.

Pat’s adventures continued. Having studied abroad and become fluent in French, she was recruited into the CIA in 1951, when the agency was looking for young people with language skills. Thrilled by the prospect of adventure, Pat was eager to join more than thirteen of her good friends who had already accepted jobs there. But then her father had a stroke, and she decided to stay close to home. It ended up working out well, however, as Herbert happened to be living a few blocks away. “And we met again, and that was how it all went,” she concludes happily. They soon married and moved in together, into the house in which they lived together until Herb’s death in February of 2015 at the age of ninety-two, and where Pat remains to this day.

Aside from the lone TV tucked away in a small room, the house, about a ten-minute walk from Harvard Square, does not seem to have changed since Pat and Herbert first bought it in 1953. The house is filled with charming, if time-tested, furniture. Covering the window of the side door off the kitchen are bumper stickers from various sources, most with a similar theme; A drawing of a polar bear with the caption “save the Arctic,” the Mass Audubon logo, and an ASPCA sticker are all prominently displayed. The living room is cozy and dark, with a fireplace and two well-worn couches, each a different pattern, against the walls. The throw pillows are mismatched; one reads, “chocolate makes my clothes shrink.” Pat the living room, a diverse array of plants and flowers, large and small, line the floor and windowsill of a hallway. A few feet down the hall is a wall with dozens of unframed pictures, some from as far back as 1900, telling the story of Pat’s life, from photographs of her childhood, to images of Pat with a big fish, to pictures of her husband and grandchildren. Downstairs, a ping-pong table, open to neighborhood kids, is set up in the middle of a cluttered, unfinished basement. All around the house, paintings, many of them Pat’s own work, hang from the walls. Large windows provide a view of a colorful garden, quite large for a house in the city and a popular spot for a surprising number of birds (as we talk, Pat points out to me a particular feeding habit of a rather plump white-throated sparrow). The house is quintessential Pat. It is not fancy in any sense of the word, but has more character than any interior decorator could create. It is a house that truly feels like a home, cozy and welcoming, a perfect match for its down-to-earth, unpretentious owner.

Pat and Herbert had three children, who Pat says with mock exasperation changed her “plenty.” Reflecting on those “wonderful” years, she remembers the simple things the most, like family walks through the woods, “just having good times.” Pat recognizes the profound impact her children had on her life. She describes her role as a mother a “humbling” responsibility; “It made me realize there were a lot of things that I wasn’t very adequate at.” As her children grew up, they inevitably wanted more independence, and Pat, thinking back to her own childhood, was happy to oblige.

After her children went off to college, Pat embarked on two major endeavors that would occupy the next few decades—a landscape design business and a series of trips around the world with Herbert and a few
close friends. As a landscape designer, Pat worked on both private homes and historic buildings. Putting her love of nature together with her artistic abilities and creativity, she drew plans and supervised the construction of gardens at the Henry Wadsworth Longfellow house, which also served as George Washington's headquarters during the Revolutionary War and is a National Historic Site, and the Lee mansion museum in Marblehead, Massachusetts. She even once traveled to Australia to design a landscape for a winery. She loved learning about the native plants and relished the difficulty of making the winery project a "xeriscape," which would need no irrigation. Pat wholeheartedly took on challenges throughout her landscaping career, one of her favorite projects involved planning out a pond and an orchard. She is quick to deflect credit, though, praising her “wonderful landscape construction company” and its “can-do attitude.” Pat loved the variety of her work (“every job was different”) and the freedom it allowed her; “I didn’t have to take a job if I didn’t think it would be interesting,” she reflects. As in so many other aspects of her life, she used her abilities as a landscape architect to try to better Cambridge by, among other projects, being part of the committee deciding the long-term “master plan” for the Fresh Pond Reservation. “I would like to try to ensure that Cambridge remains a good place to live and work, and every good city has quite a lot of green space, so that’s what I’ve focused on.”

When she wasn’t working on various landscape projects, Pat and Herbert took some unusual trips. As exotic as were some of the destinations they would visit, it was the people she traveled with that truly made the experiences meaningful for her. One of these friends was Julia Child, the celebrated chef who Pat says had “a big influence on my life” (as proof, the pots and pans in Pat’s kitchen hang from nails attached to pegboard on her wall, just like in Julia’s kitchen, which was later relocated to the Smithsonian). Pat describes the first meeting between Pat and Herbert and Julia and her husband as “love at first sight four ways.” The couple shared an interest in wine and art, and Julia, Pat remembers, “was just wonderful Julia.” The two became “real soul mates;” Pat looks back with a smile on the many afternoons spent in the kitchen with Julia, soaking up all she could, and the thirteen memorable trips to Europe the two couples took together.

Some of Pat’s most “exceptional” trips were a series of camping expeditions she and Herbert took with a Scottish couple. The details are still fresh in Pat’s mind; the first was in Egypt, sailing down the Nile on a thirty-foot “felucca.” The spartan setup and close quarters, as well as the breathtaking scenery and historical sites, still stand out in Pat’s mind, and she remembers the stutter of the seventeen-year-old boy manning the sails. With the same “wonderful friends,” Pat and Herbert went hiking in the mountains of Kashmir. What Pat remembers most vividly of that “magical” trip was a basket “about three feet round and eighteen inches high with twelve holes, and out of every hole was a chicken head!” The basket was transported alongside Pat on a pony, “and by the time the week was over there were no chickens in the basket,” she says with a chuckle. “We tried to take a trip every year,” she recalls, and most years, they succeeded.

It sometimes seems as though Pat took these trips with a sense of urgency to get the most out of life, and in some ways, it is true. Her outlook on life changed at the age of eight, and she has not taken anything for granted since. On a family trip to Denmark, Pat ruptured her appendix, and was not expected to live. In the hospital, she experienced a spiritual, out-of-body moment: “I was lying in the bed, but I really wasn’t,” she remembers, speaking like even she did not fully know what had happened, “and the walls of the room were shimmering with light, and there was a beautiful music that sounded like music, but wasn’t music. It was an incredible experience.” It was not until her elder daughter was twenty-two and attending nursing school that she learned that the incident was common among people close to death, and she never saw anything the same way. “I’d actually died briefly... It made me realize after that how incredibly lucky I am to be alive; every minute is a gift.” The knowledge of what she had been through led her to adopt a motto, one that she has certainly stuck to: “Do It Now.”

When Pat is not traveling, she is heavily involved with the Cambridge community. She believes strongly in the importance of City Councilors, hosting parties to allow neighbors to meet their representatives, because, as Pat sees it, “they’re the people who make Cambridge work.” She was also the President of the Cambridge Community Foundation for thirteen years, assisting the homeless and the hungry, giving legal aid to immigrants, and helping pregnant teens stay in school and care for their children. It is evident when she tells the stories of her efforts how much she cares about the city and the people living in it. In Pat’s eyes, her most important accomplishments are tied to the work she has done for her city, where she feels she can make a real difference in people’s everyday lives.

It becomes clear from listening to Pat that she is passionate about what she believes in. She speaks forcefully about the importance of honesty, and for her whole adult life, has invested much of her time into causes she cares about. After hearing a speech about the aftermath of a nuclear bomb, she “got completely activated” in the fight for nuclear disarmament. In 1982, she joined the board of the newly formed Women’s Action for Nuclear Disarmament, now a recognized United Nations NGO, and for ten years, she traveled the country giving presentations on the dangers of nuclear waste. She is still involved, campaigning to get women elected to public positions, “because that is how decisions are made in this country.”

She started fishing when she was seven, sitting with her legs dangling off a dock at a beach near a country home in Hingham for hours on end, baiting a hook tied to the end of a stick with bacon and catching small mackerel and flounder. She quickly fell in love with the calming nature of fishing, interrupted by intense sequences of action
when a fish takes hold of the line. She still remembers her first fish caught on a real fly rod, a trout landed when she was eight under the watchful eye of her grandfather. Fishing and the outdoors remain incredibly meaningful to her. She continues to be an avid fisherwoman, chasing salmon in Canada, striped bass and bluefish in Maine, and recently even the piranhas in the Amazon, and now describes fishing, only half-joking, as “a passion! It dominates my thinking day and night!”

Pat loves taking nature walks and looking for birds, and surprisingly, she does not have to go far. Mount Auburn Cemetery, an oasis of nature just off a bustling city street, is a well-known birding spot and only about a mile from her house. She has spent countless hours sitting in the woods or by the ocean and painting landscapes while enjoying the fresh air. Above all, she tells me, “I just love to be outside.”

Pat’s story, in many ways, is a story of Cambridge itself. She has watched it go from having a “village feel” to being a full-fledged city. When she was young, she walked to school across a large open field that is now Memorial Drive, a busy, high-speed street, and picked up milk and eggs at a local grocer in Harvard Square, then a small town center. Her free-thinking mindset fits in perfectly with the community, and her involvement in local projects and government continues to leave a lasting effect.

These days, even in retirement, Pat keeps plenty busy. She enjoys going to museums with friends and bird-watching in various woods around New England. When a snowy owl made a rare appearance in Mount Auburn Cemetery, Pat took me over to search for the bird; we succeeded only in finding its prey. She tends to her diverse and colorful garden and observes the two bee-hives near the back of her house, which she received as a birthday present a few years ago and that supply her with honey. Pat remains involved in the city, sitting on “several committees” around Cambridge, but most substantial of all, she maintains a rigorous schedule of trips, “doing as much travel as I can because I know I won’t be able to do it at some point.” Yet, Pat shows no sign of slowing down; she is off to Cuba in December, and will only be home for a short time before she leaves for Trinidad and Tobago in March. The same little girl who was granted independence to roam free as a child has seen her life go full circle, and relishes the leisure of retirement; “It’s quite heady,” she says, “to be free.”
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Last fall, as San Francisco 49ers Quarterback Colin Kaepernick chose to kneel during the national anthem, the nation was quickly drawn into a fierce debate. While Kaepernick began to inspire others around the National Football League to join him in protest during the anthem, whether through kneeling or other symbolic gestures, Americans who knew nothing about football engaged in passionate discussion about the benefits, disadvantages, and morality of Kaepernick’s decision. The country struggled to weigh an individual's right to free speech with the expected degree of respect due to the American flag. In addition to constitutional concerns, Kaepernick continued a discussion about police brutality in our country, which was his professed intention for kneeling. Maybe most prominently, however, Kaepernick’s protest ignited a debate about whether he was using the proper forum, the football field, for political protest.

Kaepernick’s decision to involve social justice and his own political opinions with football is not necessarily a new phenomenon. Protest, activism, and political expression has long played a considerable role in professional sports. Harnessing the benefits of their broad audience, social influence, and popularity with fans, professional athletes have found themselves well-suited to tackle issues, both social and political, of their concern. In 1967, Bill Russell, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, and Muhammad Ali, refusing to enter the draft, were all vocal in their opposition to the Vietnam War. At the 1968 Olympics, Americans Tommie Smith and John Carlos held their fists up in a Black Power salute while accepting their medals for the 200-meter run. More recently, LeBron James, Dwyane Wade, and other members of the Miami Heat sported hoodies in 2012 to express their solidarity with Trayvon Martin’s family. In 2014, after the death of Eric Garner, prominent NBA stars like James and Derrick Rose, in addition to the entire Georgetown Hoyas basketball team, wore “I Can't Breathe” t-shirts during warmups. In all these instances, decisions to make a social or political statement were accompanied by a fundamental question: Should professional athletes avoid involving social or political opinions with their sport? Or, conversely, do they have a responsibility to use their unique platform to do so? The Podium sought Belmont Hill’s opinion on this key question.

An eight-question survey was distributed to all members of the community. As noted earlier, participation was voluntary, meaning more opinionated individuals may be more represented in the collected data set. Data reveals that the Belmont Hill community mostly respects professional athletes’ decision to express political opinions and their fundamental right to protest. 62.9% of respondents feel there is a role for protest in professional sports, including 80% of faculty respondents. Similarly, 57.3% of respondents feel athletes should not receive league-mandated punishment or fines for political protest in uniform—only 31 respondents believe athletes who protest in uniform should be eligible to receive fines or some form of league-mandated punishment. The question was worded deliberately so that survey takers would only consider athletes protesting in uniform. By forcing respondents to consider the act of protest directly before or during a publicized game, the question excluded athletes who protest or express controversial opinions when they are not directly associated with a league, brand, or organization. The number of respondents favoring fines for such cases would likely have been even less if the question did not specify “protest in uniform,” as most recognize that famous athletes are entitled to act as everyday citizens in their expression of opinion when not “on the job.” Involving private sponsorships and endorsements diluted the community’s opinion. Although most respondents agree professional sports provided a space for protest, exactly 50% of survey takers believe private sponsors be justified in terminating contracts with active athletes who publicly
promote political beliefs with which the company or its executives don’t agree. In some ways, it makes sense that respondents feel that justifying athletes’ expression of political opinion also justifies business executives to express their own opinion in another way: not through protest, but through careful selection of who contributes to their company’s public reputation. The community’s stance on Colin Kaepernick’s protest is not necessarily uniform; however, 69.3% of survey respondents support the quarterback’s right to protest during the national anthem. This finding is consistent with the fact that 62.9% of respondents feel there is a role for protest in professional sports. This being said, a majority of the community does not support Kaepernick’s message.

Of particular interest was the final question of the survey: Should a Belmont Hill athlete be dissuaded from expressing their political views during competitions, matches, or games? Though the survey concerned professional athletes, this final question brought the issue of protest in sports to Belmont Hill’s own fields and gyms. The majority of respondents (46.8%), unlike in professional sports, believe that BH’s athletes should be dissuaded from expressing their political views during competitions, matches, or games. While 80% of faculty feel there’s a role for protest in professional respondents, by responding that Belmont Hill’s athletes should be dissuaded from expressing political views, 44% essentially feel there’s no role for protest in Belmont Hill’s athletic programs. While community members may fear that a particular student-athlete’s expressed stance may misrepresent their own beliefs or the school’s values, upon some consideration, a professional athlete’s situation is similar; their own political views may misrepresent the reputation or perceived values of their teammates, coaches, organization, league, and even fan base. Overall, the Belmont Hill community seems to recognize the concept and right of professional athletes to protest in uniform, but involving sponsorships, the example of Kaepernick, and a hypothetical comparison to Belmont Hill’s own student-athletes reveals the community is much more torn than one might initially assume.

Data

A Do you think there is a role for protest in professional sports?

- Yes 62.9%
- No 25.8%
- Don’t Know
- Prefer Not to Answer
B What do you think of Colin Kaepernick’s decision to kneel during the national anthem at the beginning of NFL games?

- I support his message and his right to protest during the national anthem: 21%
- I do not support his message but do support his right to protest during the national anthem: 26.6%
- I don’t support his message or protesting during the national anthem: 15.3%
- Don’t Know: 11.3%
- Prefer Not to Answer: 46.8%

C Should private sponsors be justified in terminating contracts with active athletes who publicly promote political beliefs with which the company or its executives don’t agree?

- Yes: 33.1%
- No: 50%
- Don’t Know: 15.3%
- Prefer Not to Answer: 0%

D Should a Belmont Hill athlete be dissuaded from expressing their political views during competitions, matches, or games?

- Yes: 39.5%
- No: 46.8%
- Don’t Know: 11.3%
- Prefer Not to Answer: 0%
The 2016 election rocked America... and Belmont Hill. Emotions were strong on both sides both before and after Election Day. So naturally, The Podium sought to gauge the Belmont Hill community's reaction. The following is what we found.

The 24-question poll was conducted from January 17th, 2016 to January 20th, 2016, nearly three months after the election. The added space between the election and the poll would, in theory, allow respondents to take a step back and think of the election in a more meta point of view.

All in all, 246 people from the Belmont Hill community responded to The Podium's poll. Of those people, 15% were faculty, 19.5% were from Form VI, 17.5% from Form V, 12.6% from Form IV, 12.6% from Form III, 11% from Form II, and 11.8% from Form I. Of the poll-takers, 33.3% were Republicans, 32.1% were Democrats, 32.9% were Independents, and 1.6% were Libertarians. 77.2% of the respondents participated in the school mock election, 25.2% voted in the actual election, and 17.1% did not vote.

Of the people who voted (212), 56.6% voted for Hillary Clinton, 32.5% for Donald Trump, 9.4% for Gary Johnson, and 0.5% for Jill Stein. These results were comparable to the school mock election conducted by Dr. Buckley's American Politics and Policy classes. The school election, with 413 ballots cast, 52.3% went to Clinton, 29.8% to Trump, 13.6% to Johnson, and 2.7% to Stein.

On the political airwaves, there has been talk of Trump voters experiencing “buyer’s remorse.” With the excitement dying down from the election, many think that Trump voters now regret their choice. Though this may be true in some instances across the country, it is certainly not true at Belmont Hill. The Donald Trump voters of Belmont Hill were much more enthusiastic about their candidate than Clinton supporters. When asked “Are you satisfied or unsatisfied with your vote,” 92.8% of Trump voters were satisfied. Clinton lagged behind these numbers with only 83.9% satisfaction.

These numbers coming from Belmont Hill reflect the major problem the Clinton campaign faced: voters simply didn’t like Hillary. On the day of the election, Secretary Clinton’s RealClearPolitics poll of polls had her at a mere 41.8% favorability rating. Of her voters at Belmont Hill, only 61.9% had a positive view of her and a whopping 18.6% viewed her unfavorably. Contrastingly, 82.6% of BH Trump voters thought positively about their candidate. Though 59.4% of the subjects looked upon Trump unfavorably, his supporters were certainly more behind him than Hillary.

Interestingly enough, the two things that united Clinton voters at Belmont Hill were their love of President Barack Obama and their hatred for President Trump. 93.4% of Clinton voters viewed President Obama favorably. 92.4% viewed President Trump unfavorably. Though these Clinton voters liked the outgoing Democratic president, it seems as though many still chose between the lesser of two evils. That choice yielded a Clinton vote. However, these numbers are sure to have shifted, as President Trump has started his presidency with a whirlwind of controversy.

One of the major problems that came up after the election was that Americans were living in political bubbles. They were only reading news that slanted towards their own persuasions and distrusted other sources that countered their positions. Belmont Hill, sadly, is no exception to this partisan media rift. Democrats at Belmont Hill favor the left leaning New York Times with 77.2% having a positive view of it, but the BH Dems hate the right leaning Fox News with 77.2% viewing it unfavorably. Republicans at Belmont Hill like Fox News quite a bit, with 58.5% viewing it positively. However, they dislike the left news channel MSNBC with 41.5% viewing it unfavorably (43.9% are neutral).

This biased news consumption can lead to deeper partisan divides, as each side hears an echo chamber in their news. Such partisanship opens people up to animosity. 70.7% of Belmont Hill Republicans view the Democratic Party negatively. Conversely, 73.4% of Belmont Hill Democrats view the GOP unfavorably.

The 2016 election has divided America and Belmont Hill. It is up to everyone to mend that divide. Explore different ideas, sources, and, most of all, talk to (not yell at) people. Coming together as a nation is that simple. And we’ve done it before. So why not now?
B  Were you surprised by the results?

C  How did you perceive the reaction at Belmont Hill in the days after the election?

D  All in all, do you think things in the nation are generally headed in the right direction, or do you feel things are off on the wrong track?