

Why I Won't Vote Bush!

By Debra Denise Bass

For the past quarter of a century, Republicans have dominated the presidency, and the deficit is now over 12 digits, unemployment is rampant, health care is inadequate, and our economic condition is pathetic. The Democrats blame the Republicans and the Republicans, in turn, blame the Democrats. They are supposed to be running a country but they are behaving like school children. It's time we took control and settled the argument.

I am registered as a Democrat and I will admit that Congress has not been as productive as it could have been, but let's not forget who's supposed to be running this country. Bush and his supporters contend Congress is to blame for all of our nation's problems. And he is still whining about the line-item veto which he claims to be the answer to all of our woes.

Give me a break. He and his predecessor, Ronald Reagan, have had 12 years, count them, to instigate their programs and effect a positive change. And they have met with minimal results. They, in turn, attribute their limited success to the Democratic Congress—the new evil empire according to the Republicans (although others see a convenient scapegoat). Well, Congress is still in tact and will most likely reign through the next four years.

Therefore, my question is: If Bush can't accomplish anything with Congress as is, what in the world makes him think he will have a chance after November? How can we elect someone who practically admits he can't function his job duties adequately with a Democratic Congress? Typically, if co-workers can't get along and put aside their differences, it is the boss's job to separate them. We, the American people, are the bosses in this democracy, and we have an obligation to fulfill and a

crucial decision to make. Voting for Bush is not the solution.

My favorite Bush excuse for breaking his famous read-my-lips promise is the Congress-made-me-do-it excuse. I don't know about you, but I would prefer a president who can actually take control. Not someone who is allowing foreign business to expand and run rampant over America. Not someone who can't be trusted. And not someone who can't handle Congress (I won't bother to mention the Quayle factor).

On Nov. 3, we will launch into a new presidency and hopefully a new president. If you have an opinion, please vote. It's not a raffle, they don't just pick a name from a hat. Even if extreme bad taste leads you to vote for Bush, do it. Let the democratic process work its magic.

Vote!

Why I Won't Vote Clinton

by Gregg Thaddeus Schultz

UNLV loves Bill Clinton. He represents a "vision for change," he is a "beacon of hope." At the Democratic Convention, this contemporary Robin Hood promised: "Jobs. Education. Health care... We will put our people first again." And here in Las Vegas and all over the country, we cheered.

Yet after considering his plan, my question is: who are the people Clinton intends to put first? Not me. And probably not you. Clinton talks about protecting the "middle class," but don't be fooled; he's not talking about you. You may be one of the 60 percent of Americans who consider themselves middle class, but the Census Bureau reports that only 35 percent of the population is.

Who will Clinton tax? The answer is the third of the population earning more than middle-class income, and ladies and gentlemen, if you are going to college, this more than likely means you. If it doesn't, then

consider your motivations for coming to college. Did you come here to move up in society, or will you forgo the big salary to ensure that all Americans get a piece of your pie?

That is what Clinton is about, plain and simple: giving everyone a piece of the pie, whether they deserve it or not. It sounds so fair, yet the American people aren't considering what this means. I don't want my paycheck to put someone else through college. Bush helps those who help themselves, while Clinton invents these far-fetched programs that have the flavor of borderline socialism. Do you honestly think Clinton's programs will be far-reaching enough to affect you? He wants to help those in the lower income group, which is comprised of only 17 percent of the population. That means that all that tax money from the so-called "cultural elite" (translation: you and me) won't be going to me, or anyone I even know.

The fact is, Clinton's appeal lies almost solely in the idea of change. Yet in a two-party system, you won't get

change without compromise, something with which the Democrats aren't too familiar. They've created the gridlock in Congress, and now they want the American people to believe its President George Bush's fault. Well, Bush doesn't pass laws; the Legislature does. Ask yourselves who controls the most famous check-bouncing, do-nothing Congress in history, and ask yourself if you want that kind of "leadership" in the White House. I know my answer.

During the Democratic Convention, the Presidential nominee said, "It can be a year of inspiration and of hope. And it will be a year of concern...and of sober reassessment of our nation's purpose..." Sound familiar? Well the candidate wasn't Bill Clinton; it was Jimmy Carter, and the year was 1976. And the people cheered. My message to you is you shouldn't buy into Clinton's cult of change. Unlike the vast majority during the Democratic administration, you haven't suffered through the Republican decade. You got rich from it.

Alternative choices can be found in minority candidates

by Robert Paxton

Over the course of this presidential campaign I have frequently encountered people who wished there was another choice. People are not satisfied with the performance of President Bush over the last four years, they don't trust Governor Clinton, and they feel betrayed (or amused) by Mr. Perot. So many people over the last few weeks have said that they don't feel good about voting for any of these three candidates; but that they would vote for the pro-

verbial "lesser of the evils."

There is another choice. In fact, in Nevada there are at least three other "viable" candidates. Andre Marrou, "Bo" Gritz, and Howard Phillips are all on the ballots of numerous states. And yet the major media have all but ignored them.

Andre Marrou, the candidate for the Libertarian Party, should have at least been invited to the presidential debates, by virtue of getting on all 50 ballots.

But it is conceivable that either Bo Gritz or Howard Phillips could be elected even

without being on all of the ballots. The electoral college system makes that possible.

All three candidates have presented clear programs to deal with the budget deficit and the national debt. They are speaking to the issues much more clearly than the three major candidates. All three have been guests on AM talk-radio shows in which they have explained and discussed their positions, their programs and proposed solutions to our government's problems, and their reasons for running.

Furthermore, they are not

running alone. The Libertarian Party has candidates running for other state and local offices around the country.

Howard Phillips, candidate for the Independent American Party of Nevada, has organized a coalition of various parties around the nation who all are working toward the same goals. They, too, have candidates vying for other offices.

Our constitutional system was not intended to be a strict two-party system. Yet the system has been perverted and rigged to restrict our choices to either the Republican or the

Democratic candidate. Perhaps it's time for a real change.

The bottom line is, if the "major" candidates are not speaking to you for you, one these "other" candidates very well might be. It is our responsibility as American citizens to make wise, informed, and responsible decisions when we go to the polls on Nov. 3.

—Robert Paxton is a graduate student in the MFA playwriting program

Letters to the Editor

Students lowest on UNLV's totem pole

Dear Editor,

It felt strange standing for five minutes in front of the English department secretary as she ignored me to chat with a friend. She finally noticed me when I began to blatantly check my limbs for transparency. Why did I have to wait? I was the only student around, and I stood directly in front of her desk. To top it off, my question took less than a minute to answer.

Last week, I made the accusation that students are lowest on the priority list for most departments on campus. I would like to elaborate on the subject.

University titles, by order of importance, are arranged: staff, administra-

tor, faculty, and finally student. In my lowly student opinion, this is completely backward, but I think I know why it is like this. The folks at the high end of the ladder (staff and administrators) have forgotten where their checks come from. I do believe the checks come from taxes and tuition. Who pays tuition? Students. Who should be at the top of the ladder? Students.

I work retail, so customers pay my check. If I treated customers like students are treated at this school, I would have been fired long ago. Don't get me wrong. I don't believe customers are always right and neither are students. I also feel respect should be earned, but let me say that, initially, the almighty dollar should buy a lot of respect as well as patience.

If the system changed a bit, and students were actually made to feel as important as they are, I would venture to

bet that the students would also change. They might enjoy classes more. They might have more respect for their professors. They might attend events. They might even develop a respect, devotion, and love for UNLV. With that, this university might finally become one of the best schools in the country, instead of a tired "rising star."

One last item. I like UNLV, and I defend her whenever necessary. The friends I've made and professors I've had are priceless, but I am a concerned student because I want to be educated in the best way possible, and I believe that it can happen here. I've always wondered if Dr. Maxson's appearances in the student union are a facade of concern for student opinion or the real thing.

Robert J. Williams
English major

Thanks Marcy, for having fortitude

Dear Editor,

I understand that for quite a while, the Greeks have had a monopoly on the Homecoming Queen process. So, I found it refreshing to see an independent candidate win this year.

The students benefitted greatly from this, because it was proven that Homecoming is not an exclusive event, but rather an event that any student can participate in, regardless of their affiliation.

Thank you Marcy Bruno for having the courage and fortitude to attempt, and succeed, at what was once considered an "impossible endeavor."

Glenn Bidari
Senior

