

Confident Clinton poised for success

by Elizabeth Aralica

In his inaugural address President George Bush said he would heal our nation of its ills. It has been four years since that momentous declaration and our country is still in turmoil.

On the Oct. 7 show of "Larry King Live," Bush freely admitted he didn't "have the facts" when entreated about Bill Clinton's 1969 trip to Moscow. Yet he engaged in pure speculation and make-believe associations charging Clinton with promoting the KGB at Moscow in 1969 and avoiding his patriotic duty in a time of war.

In actuality, however, Clinton journeyed to the Soviet Union for an educational expedition. Our "education president" should have understood that.

Senators have questioned this overly eager pursuit for reelection since Bush has resorted to personal attacks in the form of false innuendos and flashy rhetoric.

Moreover, Bush is not the one to accuse others of past events because he will not support our allies in the present. For example, he will sign Congressional bills to ban incoming Serbian forces, which is very commendable, but he refuses to implement actual physical forces to stop the Serbian savagery.

My verdict is that Bush and his administration are dwindling and there is nothing he can do about it except surren-

der his position to someone more capable.

As an intelligent voter, one should study the complete person, also taking motives into account. When Clinton resisted the draft, he was acting out of a sense of justice and his God-given right to choose, not to mention his Constitutional right to speak abroad.

I think his loyalty to principle displays a certain integrity and definite courage in the face of so much pressure.

Likewise, Clinton is open-minded, yet not so open that he advocates immorality. Take for example his support for "choice," rather than abortion per se. Here Clinton realistically grants that events such as these will occur.

There is one significant difference between Bush and Clinton. The former is presently groping for the presidential position and in turn utilizes tactics which go beyond the normal political routines.

And although Clinton is guilty of his own share of charismatic arrogance as well as uncompromising ambitions, overall he has proven to the voting constituency that he can fulfill the task of president. It is largely an issue of "the lesser of two (or three) evils."

Finally, Clinton exudes an aura of composure and confidence, displaying a clear understanding of the issues confronting the Presidency and the nation. If anything, I find that to be an indication of success.



Pro-nuke, pro-life— Bush is my man

by Mallory Rohach

President George Bush, the Republican candidate running for re-election, brings the only light of hope to our country.

Bush, who is often called the morality president, is pro-life. Because I have not yet found myself faced with the economic problems of the United States I have chosen a presidential candidate who agrees with my moral values. Abortion kills children plain and simple. Bush believes this and I sincerely hope his influence can save the life of even one child.

The other point I like about Bush is his feelings concerning nuclear testing. His support of nuclear testing is vital to the existence of the country's power. The earth is running low on natural resources. Nuclear power is the substitute for natural power sources. Also, in order to control the tyrants, i.e. Saddam, the country needs to stay on top and ahead in the field of nuclear weapons and defense systems.

These two issues are the focal point of my presidential selection. I believe that Bush, as a whole, is the best choice for the nation's next political leader.

Letters to the Editor

Students need to become more knowledgeable about activity fees

Is the figure of 16 percent for student activity fees correct? If 16 percent of tuition for undergraduates taking seven or more credits constitutes activity fees, then the fee allocation has changed since the previous year. Two conflicting activity fee distributions for the previous year were obtained from Student Government and the controller's office. One fee breakdown showed 25 percent of tuition earmarked as activity fees. If the 16 percent figure is accurate, why and how has the allocation of tuition changed?

If the figure of 20 percent or 25 percent is accurate, then an undergraduate who took 17 credits paid an activity fee for

athletics that was four times greater than the health fee. He paid an activity fee for Student Government and the student union that was five times greater than the health fee. Thus, \$236 from the semester's tuition was designated as activity fees.

It seems strange that students were very concerned about the well-publicized and scrutinized \$20 health fee, but seemed unconcerned about the \$236.00 worth of activity fees. Before last week's article in *The Rebel Yell*, many students did not even realize they pay the fees. Perhaps this was due to the way the fees were assessed. The conspicuous health fee was plopped on top of the tuition and the activity fees were embedded within the tuition. Perhaps the reason was that students voted for the new health fee, but did not vote on the long standing activity fees.

It is time that activity fees received serious consideration.

Regardless of whether activity fees comprise 25 percent or a smaller proportion of tuition, students pay a substantial amount in activity fees and need to know where their money goes. Ignorance can be expensive. Once knowledgeable about activity fees, students will be able to assess the adequacy of the current fee allocation and distribution. They will be able to determine whether or not it meets the need of the majority of students.

Changes may be in order. For example, the activity fee is currently collected on a per credit rather than a per student basis. This means that a student taking 20 credits pays twice as much in activity fees as someone taking ten credits. Since the student taking twice as many credits probably doesn't receive twice the benefits, a different method of collection may be in order.

When students become more knowledgeable about activity fees and express their ideas and opinions, the allocation and distribution of the fees can be adjusted and the needs and interests of the student better accommodated.

Patricia Wade
graduate student
educational psychology

Panel's recommendation wrong

Recently, a panel of UNLV students recommended William Shields instead of Shelley Berkley for university regent. The panel's recommendation was wrong.

The race for university regent between Berkley and Shields is of critical importance

to UNLV students. Berkley, the incumbent, is the best candidate. She is an effective regent who is in touch with students and understands the issues that concern them. She is a graduate of UNLV and has actively supported the university for 20 years.

I served as student body president of UNLV from 1989 to 1991. I worked with Berkley both before and after she became a regent. She always offered her help when it came to resolving any issue of concern to students. More importantly, her help was always effective.

It would be an outrage to lose a regent that has fought so hard for this university. Keep Berkley as university regent, where she has the greatest capability to continue to support the students of UNLV.

Joe Bunin

Coming Thursday: Letters from Bush, Clinton