

# Analyzing news paper articles

[History](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

To Save Money, Look to Nukes In this article Michael O’Hanlan presents, what he feels, is a more practical way of saving money and improving the economic condition of the United States: cutting back on the nuclear forces along with other things. The article states that now, when the financial state of the country is bad, it is a mistake on the part of the administration to increase spending on nuclear capabilities.

Furthermore, the article lays out ways in which spending on these capabilities can be cut without really having a negative impact on the security of the country, because these capabilities are a need as well.

Therefore, it is needed to stop and plan what exactly their policy should be and then adapt it into something that would be more economically practical, and not seek to equally modernize each leg in the nuclear triad.

In this respect, the article gives certain suggestions: the “ D5” submarine-launched ballistic missiles should not be produced and the fleet of nuclear-armed submarines should be decreased from fourteen to eight, keeping in mind that the reduction in number will not affect the potential or strength of this leg. Also, the present arsenal could be visibly reduced; consequently, money could be saved by closing down a few of the weapons-design labs. Moreover, spending can be reduced on missile defense, which is very superfluous.

About 30 to 35 billion US\$ can be saved over the next 10 years, the article states. These are good suggestions, albeit very tough, but politicians and the military have to realize that the country’s financial condition is going to become an actual security problem soon enough.

#### Humanitarian Aid for Rape Victims

In this editorial of the New York Times, President Obama’s executive order, <https://assignbuster.com/analyzing-news-paper-articles/>

and its rationale, is questioned. Even though this executive order puts an end to the rule that deprived groups from federal funding when and if they performed abortions or advised their patients with regard to the procedure, even if they did not use federal money to do this; however, the executive order did not undo the policy that places similar restrictions and bans on groups that use foreign aid money for abortions. Oddly enough, this rule applies even in current day war zones like Congo where rape is used as a weapon in the conflict, and even in cases of rape, even though such a policy is not ordered by any law.

The article asserts that the 1973 Helms amendment, which restricts using foreign aid money to be used for abortion as a method of family planning, does not really include victims of rape or incest. It is, of course, clear that giving the option of abortion to women who have been raped is clearly not a method of family planning.

What is more, this actually imposes a cruel and unusual punishment on the rape victim amounting to cruelty. This also amounts to violation of Article 3 of the Geneva Convention which gives the victims of armed conflicts the right to complete and unbiased medical treatment, such a medical treatment, in the case of a rape victim, should, and does, include abortion. Lastly, it is pointed out that though this step has been taken to assuage the anti-abortionists, however, even the most radical antiabortion bills cite saving the woman's life, incest, and rape as exceptions to the rule.