known as Proposal 2, in 2006. The people voted to amend the state constitution to render affirmative action illegal in public employment, public education, or public contracting purposes, except in actions mandated by federal law or necessary for institutions to receive federal funding. Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote for the Court that there is "no authority for the Judiciary power to set aside state laws" committing voters to their preferences. Justice Antonin Scalia's concurring opinion unpacks the very question that opponents to affirmative action have wanted to know from the beginning. First, he questions whether the Equal Protection Clause forbids what its text requires, and that answer can be found in his opinion in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003): "the Constitution forbids government discrimination on the basis of race, and state-provided education is no exception."

Michigan joins a growing number of states to end affirmative action through state legislation and voter approval: California, with Proposition 209 in 1996 (though this might change with the newly proposed Senate Constitutional Amendment of 2014); Washington, through its Initiative 200 in 1998 that set to "achieve diversity [with] consideration of individual

for postal service, it is now outdated. According to the United States Postal Service (USPS) website, the company suffered a net loss of $5 billion in 2013, making this its seventh consecutive year suffering a net loss. During Benjamin Franklin's time as the first Postmaster General, the Postal Service was highly a profitable system that facilitated communication and commerce. Over time, however, postal services became less of a priority to citizens and to the government. Immediate communication via the Internet has made the Post Office and its services increasingly irrelevant. While businesses continually improve to meet increasing demand in a techno

improve their services to meet consumer demands to turn a profit. If this does not happen, however, maybe one day the term “Post Office” will only be seen in history books.

Legal Rights of Animals: Inadequately Addressed

By Reema Riaz, Junior, Political Science Major

In theory we like to believe that we afford animals sufficient rights in their treatment. After all, most of us would agree that animals ought to be treated humanely and protected from unnecessary abuses. Despite agreement on these values, there is widespread acknowledgement that animal abuse continues unabatedly.

The current legal status of animals contributes to the irony of how we think animals should be treated. Animals, simply put, do not possess any rights under existing legal doctrines like that of “animal welfarism.” Although laws do prevent inhumane treatment, these laws do not afford animals rights in ways we normally use those words. Current law aimed at protecting animals merely regards only animal welfare rather than animal rights. Under such prevailing legal doctrine of “animal welfarism,” we are required to determine what humane treatment vs. unnecessary suffering is. This allows

Unauthorized immigration presents economic and social difficulties for the nation. States have indicated that the costs of educating students who do not speak English fluently are up to 40 percent higher than the costs incurred for native-born students. In the healthcare industry, the cost of uncompensated care is rising as unauthorized immigrants use those services at an increasing rate. The taxes paid by undocumented aliens are insufficient to cover the costs for federal and state resources being used. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has found that the tax income from unauthorized immigrants far from offsets their costs. The CBO is responsible for economic forecasting and fiscal policy analysis, scorekeeping, cost projections, and an Annual Report on the Federal Budget. Their studies have even claimed that federal aid programs cannot make up the financial gap formed from lack of taxation and resource costs.

The cost of living across the United States has risen considerably in the last twenty years, thus the monetary shortfall has exponentially increased as well. In 2000, counties that share a border with Mexico incurred almost $190 million in costs for providing uncompensated care to unauthorized immigrants and those costs are increasing rapidly. As the cost of living rises and no accurate illegal immigration numbers can be sustained, clarification on this national issue must be implemented through a theory known as Collaborative Regulation.

Collaborative regulation is a joint effort recognizing federal immigration policy and state interests with respect to the issue. Congress would encourage and define proper state participation while retaining ultimate legislative authority through an approval process. Collaborative regulation encourages express authorization, but some deem this regulation possibility inefficient because it forces states to wait for congressional approval before implementing a plan. However, the current process forces states to wait years while their immigration laws are challenged in court. While state interests are valid, there are legitimate concerns about completely leaving immigration regulation in state hands as it may interfere with national foreign policy.

Foreign affairs preemption represents the Court recognized need for a single national voice when dealing with other nations. To avoid the potential foreign relation conflicts, the federal government should focus on collaborating with states, accommodating the need for a uniform federal policy while also addressing problems specific to particular states and regions. Most federal programs already contain some degree of state involvement. For example, even national defense incorporates the state national guards. Immigration regulation should be no different.

As individuals from around the world make strides for a better life in the United States, we can no longer allow them to remain present in the country illegally. The negative outcome and associated problems will outgrow the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness that exists in this country. A larger state role is crucial to effective immigration policies across the United States.

Gene Patenting

Leili Zamini, Junior, Chemistry Major

While it has been established that laws of nature, physical phenomena, and abstract ideas are not patentable, many claim that isolated genes extracted by scientists are also not inherently different from our natural occurring genes. With the rise in genomic biotechnology and the demand for research involving the use of isolated genes, requests for patents on our human genome have gained much attention since the Supreme Court ruling in *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* in 1980. This case set the precedent allowing companies to seek patents on genetically modified

organisms, or living things. However, the modification of organisms can mean many things in the biological world.

Before the recent Supreme Court ruling in *Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* (2013), a scientist with the knowledge to purify and isolate a gene sequence could patent the gene because isolated genes were thought to be inherently unique and unobtainable without the scientist's application. The ability to patent isolated, naturally occurring segments of the human genome is illogical because the process used to isolate genes does not fall under the guidelines of a unique invention or method. Also, the discovery of the exact location of naturally occurring genes that all humans share is not enough evidence to allow such genes to fall under patentable entities.

Patents on isolated genes have led to adverse health effects and have added unnecessary roadblocks to patients seeking information about their own genes. In addition, due to the restricted access to patented materials, scientists have grown discouraged and unmotivated to find new inventions and methods on already patented naturally occurring genes, which damage society even more. The *Myriad* case demonstrates this.

Given the broad language on what Congress can and cannot patent, is it alarming that segments of the human genome shared by all *Homo sapiens* have also been granted patents since 1980? Have the guidelines been stretched too far? If so, then where should the government draw the line?

The distinction between unique inventions involving genetically modified organisms and the application of scientific knowledge to isolate and purify naturally occurring genes was settled thirty-three years after the *Diamond* ruling. The court decision in *Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* made in June 2013 ruled that isolated genes with no unique modifications did not fall under the criteria of patentable entities. While this decision was a huge disappointment for many biotech industries, it relieved much of the financial constraint many researchers faced by having to purchase patented, isolated genes for the purposes of research.

The *Myriad* case proved that patenting genes with no inherent modifications resulted in troublesome issues. First, patented genes restricted public access to critical health care services. Second, researchers were faced with financial constraints while conducting experiments on already patented genes. And last, patented genes raised an ethical question of whether segments of the human genome should really be owned by any individual or genomic company. *Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* posed these three issues.

Myriad Genetics, a genetic company in Utah, filed a p

mammalian eggs could also be issued patents because such embryos are not naturally occurring. Some have questioned whether allowing embryos to count as patentable entities could one day