

**Hawks cont from p.4**

Back to the original question. Why is Bill Clinton considering sending 20,000 Americans to Bosnia? What makes intervention in Bosnia different from their former intervention in Vietnam? Are Bosnia and the former Yugoslavia vital to U.S. interests?

They did stop exporting Yugos because of the war. Is that enough of a reason to send 20,000 Americans into a dangerous battle zone over a conflict that lasted hundreds

of years?

The conflict isn't going to disappear simply because a few dog faces show up wearing silly blue helmets. Can 20,000 American troops (or should I say U.N. troops) stop a whole population, bent on the revenge for hundreds of years, from shooting and shelling each other (maybe we can look to Somalia to answer that question)?

Why is President Clinton so willing to send 20,000 troops into a fire storm without a realistic chance of solv-

**THE REBEL YELL**

ing this crisis? What would be the consequences of not sending troops?

By not sending troops, the world's only super power would admit they can do nothing to solve this conflict. Bill Clinton is a "do something" president. In his mind problems can only be solved with government intervention. Look at his solutions to health care, and the soon to be announced solutions to child care.

Bill Clinton needs to do something to make himself

and others feel good about themselves and their government. President "feel good" wants to solve the crisis. He cannot stand still and watch the blood shed in Bosnia without doing something, even with the knowledge that he can do nothing to solve the problem.

Sending troops to Bosnia may enhance the esteem of Bill Clinton and make certain people feel good in acting. How will the actors in this intervention feel?

Consider the feelings of

the young men and women waking up in field hospitals unable to feel their legs. The feelings of remorse as a soldier lies in a rain-filled ditch with his/her fallen comrade hit by a sniper's bullet. Even more important, think about how a young person feels the instant the lights go out and he/she takes that last breath. Think about how they feel. Is it good?

*James Yohe is a Rebel Yell columnist. His column appears every Thursday.*

**Liberal policies include class wars to health plan**

I have often heard President Bill Clinton describe his deficit reduction plan as being "fair." Clinton has also repeatedly made the point that his deficit reduction plan is the kind of sweeping "change" that he promised the American people during the campaign.

Liberals like President Clinton have a unique way of expressing their idea of "fairness." When liberals utter the word "fairness," that really means an all out assault against the wealthy citizens of this country who have worked very hard in achieving their success.

The Woodstock crowd that embraces the New Left philosophies of the 1960's now occupies the White House. They have used the politics of class warfare, pitting the rich against the middle class, in the hope of passing the president's plan.

The largest tax increase in the history of the United States is the central theme of President Clinton's deficit reduction plan. Under the president's plan, the increases in the marginal tax rates, which will affect families earning over \$180,000 a year, will become effective

as of Jan. 1, 1993.

It is bad enough that the most successful in our society must be punished with higher tax rates, but to make the higher tax rates retroactive to Jan. 1, 1993, when Bill Clinton was not even the president, is adding injury to insult.

Any thinking and engaged person must ask themselves this question: is it fair for the president to raise taxes retroactively to a date when he was not occupying the oval office? Is it also "fair" that 80 percent of the tax increases falls on the backs of the top one percent or wage earners? Is fairness also the guiding principle behind the administration's decision to make the so-called spending cuts effective not until 1997?

With any luck, by 1997 Bill Clinton will no longer be the president. So, fairness defined by liberals means tax increases to be retroactive to Jan. 1 of this year and the so-called spending cuts to be put off until 1997.

The president also enjoys talking about "change." What is different about politicians in Washington raising taxes? The exercise of raising taxes has become a normal practice for our political class in

Washington. And there is certainly nothing new about a president promising \$500 billion in deficit reduction.

We can all remember the fall of 1990 when President Bush told the nation that he came to an agreement with congressional Democratic leaders on reducing the budget deficit by \$500 billion over the next five years. It is safe to say that the 1990 budget deal was a failure. Not only did the 1990 plan fail to reduce the deficit, it sent the economy head long into a recession.

Democrats in 1993 have yet to learn a hard lesson: raising taxes does not reduce the deficit. The only sound way to increase government revenues is by lowering tax rates; something that was done by Ronald Reagan in 1981 and John F. Kennedy in 1963.

It is very interesting to see how the words "fair," and "change" can become so distorted when used by liberals like President Clinton.

*Lucio J. Parolisi is a political science major and President of the UNLV Young Republicans. His column appears occasionally in the Yell.*

**Student Spotlight**

*What do you think of the UNLV football program?*

Joe Kaufman  
Senior  
Biology



"Since our basketball program is dead in the water maybe it's time that we spent more time and money on the football program."

Aviva Morger  
Freshman  
Education



"Their not very good. Over the past years they could be better."

Doris Miller  
Sophomore  
Social Work



"I just haven't really gotten in to activities this past year. I just moved here recently."

Ryan Zeoller  
Senior  
Biology



"Well, have they played a game yet? If UNLV goes 5-0 I'll start paying attention...I'm just kind of indifferent to it right now."

**Letters to the Editor**

Opening day at "Death Valley". Clemson University, home of the Fighting Tigers who played host to our Rebels of UNLV. The hype all week was almost unbearable! I learned everything there is to know about Clemson; Coach Howard, "the rock", IPTAY (it's a long story,) and the years of tradition. I was also constantly reminded of the opening day

blowouts, part of the rich Clemson history.

Of the 17,000 students that attend Clemson, I think that 16,998 were in attendance (the other two will probably be lynched later this week). Everyone wore Clemson paraphernalia, painted their bodies and faces, and sang all of the "Alma Mater's" fight song...I was impressed!

Admire the cheers and roaring of the nearly 65,000 Clemson fans (and 25 UNLV supporters) our Rebels stood

proud. They fought valiantly against all odds and actually led the game on two separate occasions. If not for one or two bad breaks, I am confident that the Rebels would have prevailed.

The reason I'm telling you all of this is because of the true admiration and respect I have gained for UNLV football, its players, coaches and staff.

As 28 point underdogs, most teams would have been proud to avoid getting blown out of the stadium—not your

Rebels. Every player and coach truly believed in their hearts that they could win...they made me a believer too.

I hope that every student reading this will take the opportunity to support Rebel football—to support the student athletes of our university that represent us so proudly.

Frequently, I hear students discussing the lack of tradition on our campus. "We're too young a campus to have tradition," or "How can we compete with a school

like Clemson?" Well, your football team demonstrated their ability to compete with other student bodies in showing support for your university? Are you willing to join me and help to start some of these same traditions?

I sincerely hope so...they deserve it.

Joel S. Kostman

Student Body President