

Clinton's Cuba Policy Confusing

The men who have served as President of the United States, are judged on many different things. In the modern era, presidents are judged not only how they handle the problems of their own country, but how they deal with the world around them.



SCOTT GULBRANSEN

Straight From the Gully

ba's economy is in utter ruins. The U.S. is not to blame for Cuba's internal problems. After the fall of the Soviet Union, Cubans no longer had anyone to pay their bills. Without Soviet aid, Cuban industry came to a halt and the economy sagged. Communist expansion was suddenly dead and Cuban

soldiers were pulled out of Africa, Afghanistan and no longer were helping revolutionary movements in Central America.

The Cold War had come to an end and most of the world's communist governments had fallen. It seemed as though the United States would relax its policy toward our closest communist foe and embrace Castro and hope for change. The United States had done the same with all of the former Soviet republics as well as other nations of the former Eastern block. Why continue to isolate Cuba?

Former President George Bush had said on numerous occasions, regarding China, that isolating them would only further complications. So the U.S. embraced countries like Kuwait, China and Vietnam—countries with worse human rights violations than Cuba—and worked to help them become more democratic.

Instead of increasing diplomatic contact with Castro, the U.S. under Bill Clinton has stepped up efforts to isolate him. Since he has been in office, Clinton has tightened the economic embargo against Cuba and reduced the amount of visits and cash gifts Cuban-Americans can

As we can see with the latest developments in Cuba, Bill Clinton has not realized foreign policy can make or break a president.

Clinton's policy on Cuba can be summed up in one word—confusing. The president and his advisors condemned Cuban President Fidel Castro for not allowing rafters to leave the island nation by describing his efforts to stop them as human rights violations. Suddenly, when Castro opened the flood gates and told his people they could leave if they want to, Clinton told the world a mass exodus of Cubans to the United States would not be tolerated.

Now the U.S. is faced with an immigration crisis of biblical proportions. Thousands of Cubans are being rescued at sea and taken to a temporary camp at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Many Cuban refugees refer to the camp at Guantanamo as a "concentration camp". This so called "concentration camp" is costing American taxpayers \$22 million a month.

The simple fact is that Cu-



send to their relatives.

It has become apparent that Clinton does not view the Cuban situation as a national issue. Instead, he views it as a domestic political issue. Clinton took 19% of the Cuban vote in 1992's election. An astounding number because a majority of Cuban-Americans are Republicans. For Clinton to capture 19% was a remarkable feat.

It is clear that Clinton is making this strong stand on Cuba to appease those Cubans that helped him get elected. Instead of concerning himself with the future of Cuba, Clinton is trying to please the interest groups he so staunchly criticized during the presidential campaign of 1992. The interest group that has so effectively influenced Clinton is the ultra-conservative Cuban American National Foundation.

Its leader, right-wing businessman Jorge Mas Canosa, has placed strong pressure on Clinton to not let up on economic sanctions against Castro.

It seems as though several of the Cuban interest groups in the U.S. have lost focus on the real issue. Instead of trying to free their country, many Cuban-Americans are bent on pursuing Castro. These groups are so bitter that Castro took their property and possessions during the revolution in the late 1950's, that they forget what the true goal is.

The truth is that Bill Clinton cares nothing about Cubans or Cuba. His policies concerning Cuba are based on his own self-interests. He has managed to go against every policy that has worked in dealing with former

communist countries struggling to become democratic. Instead of trying to help democracy grow in Cuba, Clinton worries more about getting re-elected.

Who suffers from this type of Mickey Mouse policy? The people of Cuba of course. They are the ones who will go without food and the other necessities of life.

In the meantime, Castro grows old and shows no sign of ill health. The charisma and pure energy that brought him to power still keeps him atop Cuba. Castro has outlasted nine U.S. presidents—Bill Clinton will be the tenth.

—Scott Gulbransen is the Opinion Editor at The Rebel Yell.

Name-Calling in the War of Ideas

In the somewhat superficial world of the media, we love to place labels on things. We place labels on individuals, acts, and political movements, whether deserved or not—and individuals themselves pick up on these labels - because we like simple explanations for everything. This we say, is only human.



DONOVAN STELTZNER

In the realm of politics, the name-calling (another term for labeling) becomes vicious and vindictive, and oh, yes, very personal and sometimes destructive, to say the least. Conservatives, some say, are fascist, racist, bigoted, and homophobic proliferers. Liberals, on the other hand, care.

You might ask why I focus on the names liberals call conservatives. But I say that it is no ancient Chinese secret that liberals dominate the mainstream media by a ratio of at least four to one. And, in my opinion, they are the most colorful of name callers. Also, I am, personally, a pro-life, pro-business, Christian Black conservative Republican. To label myself is my own business—so long as I know what these labels mean and represent.

It brings to my cold, uncaring, fascist heart great sorrow that the vast majority of those who use labels hardly know what they



mean.

I ask you, what is a racist? Simply, it is a person who believes in the superiority of this or her own race above all others. It is not someone who disagrees with Jesse Jackson or the Congressional Black Caucus on the basis of ideas, as radio personality Rush Limbaugh does on divers occasions. I myself will do that plenty of times throughout this semester. Am I a racist against my own? Hardly. Can people of color be racist? Not according to some liberals.

What's a homophobe? Is it a person with strong moral conviction grounded in the Bible who believes that homosexuality is against the plan of creation and

the plan of God and therefore wrong, as I do, or is it someone who attacks, kills, maims, or just plain disrespects the civil rights of persons who claim to be gay? Or is it someone who is not included in tone of the two above categories who believes firmly that homosexual sex is medically dangerous?

What is a fascist, anyway? Have you seen one? Are they easy to identify? Do they don Italian accents, brown shirts, and a goosetstep?

Tell me, what is a sexist? Do they open doors for ladies? Do they believe men are the superior race?

There is an inherent difference between the sexes, both in

physiology and psychology, and there are roles within society that are better served by one or the other. I am vehemently pro-life. A membership card for the NOW (The National Organization of Women) in my wallet is certainly on my list of desires, right below dysentery and that flesh-eating virus from Britain.

Yet, I would read the works of Christina Hoff Sommers any day over anything that Gloria Steinem ever wrote. I would not mind voting for Christine Todd Whitman, the new Republican governor of New Jersey, if she ever ran for the presidency. I would rather die than vote for Ann Richards, the hopefully soon-to-be former Democratic governor of

Texas. I like strong women—Margaret Thatcher comes to mind—but I don't care much for the ideas of the co-president.

In the war of ideas and points of view, it is all too easy to label and to name-call. It is much easier to injure than to inquire and debate. It is much easier for Bill Clinton to infer that Limbaugh was a racist than to confront the issue at hand, as he did at a Washington press dinner. It is much easier for some member of the gay community to cry homophobia than to answer a genuine argument. It is also much easier to murder an abortionist than to confront him on the sin of abortion in a civil and respectful manner. In a society clamoring for quick fixes and easy solutions to complex problems, it is no surprise that we have resorted to such depravity. We cannot possibly try to fit points of view into boxes labeled 'sexist,' 'racist' or 'homophobic'. The complexity of human thought forbids such notions, since labels hardly account for all variations in all directions. Everything here is a matter of degrees.

The reason why most people do not care for certain ideas has nothing to do with who invented them. It has to do with whether or not they view such ideas as good, positive, and wholesome. Unfortunately, the name-callers have forgotten not to take criticism of their own ideas too personally.

—Donovan Steltzner is an opinion columnist at The Rebel Yell.