

# Haiti Crisis—Criticism and Congratulations

## President Clinton's intervention well overdue



**NICHOLE DAVIS**

If there was ever a truly humanitarian effort, Haiti is it.

Over the last few months, we've seen the pictures and heard the stories of people afraid of Haiti's oppressive military regime. We've heard the stories of people being beaten for no reason, women being raped, and children being slaughtered. We've seen the bloody pictures of people dying in the streets. We've seen a nearby country turned upside down.

That wasn't enough. The deaths arose sympathy but did not enrage. The oppression struck democratic heartstrings but warranted no action.

According to an ABC news poll taken before President Clinton's speech, 73% of the American public did not support invading Haiti, and 60% of the American public felt there was no vital American interest at stake.

Yet again, Americans are hypocrites. We teach our children to value the sanctity of human life, yet when we see that an oppressive military regime slaughtered its own people in our backyard we want to do nothing.

A few short years ago we risked thousands of lives in a war for "humanitarian concerns" half-way around the world. We sent our young men and women to fight an army better equipped than Haiti's, better funded than Haiti's, and much larger than Haiti's. Haiti has a combined police and military force of 7,000. They have no navy and no air force. A large loss of American life is not in question.

In Operation Desert Storm, we did not save 21,000 refugees from the sea and another 14,000 living on a base in Guantanamo, which have already cost us \$200 million. We did not see pictures of refugees crowding the borders waiting for passage to the United States. We did not hear about 300,000 people in hiding who will probably be the next wave of refugees. Kuwaitis wanted their land back; Haitians just want relief.

Have we become so desensitized to violence and need that the horrific scenes of oppression we've seen, the images our president painted, don't matter to us?

Or is it that Haiti, a poor, predominantly black country, has already lost all of its wealth leaving no reason for us to care?

Newspaper writers around the country have pointed to the Black Caucus as the party responsible for persuading the president to take a stronger stance in Haiti. Yet, these same reporters now report that the caucus is evenly split on how to handle the Haitian crisis. A spokesman for Rep. Kweisi Mfume (D-MD.) said "The caucus is united on restoring democracy to Haiti but is divided over how to do it. A few members are still undecided, but right now it's an even split."

A house divided cannot stand, nei-

ther can it persuade. The Haitian crisis is not an issue of blacks trying focus on black issues, which don't affect the majority. All of us are paying to take care of refugees from Haiti. The real issue is the sanctity of all lives not just Americans. Are we saying by our inde-

decisiveness that American lives are more valuable than Haitian ones? I hope not. The Haiti situation should prove one thing. America does not enter war, unless we have something to gain. We claimed that Desert Storm was about humanitarian concerns, but it wasn't. Saddam Hussein was committing acts as vicious as those of the ruling Haitian regime, and the actions were far removed from the American consciousness. Still, we deployed troops. If human rights were such a battle cry, the sheer brutality of the Haitian regime would motivate us to stop the ruling party. It has not.

After Desert Storm, America received millions of dollars to rebuild Kuwait. This won't happen in Haiti.

We can say that the real issue is the potential loss of human life, it's not. We can say it is that we do not want another Vietnam on our hands, it's not. The problem is that there is nothing to gain, and American lives are too valuable to help others in return for nothing. Our president told us that, in Haiti, "We have a case in which the country in question is nearby, in which our own interests are plain, in which the mission is achievable and limited, and in which other nations of the world stand with us."

Even the arguments of our president were not enough to sway the American public. USA Today polled 371 people after they watched President Clinton's September 15th speech. Sixty-seven percent of the American public said that human rights abuses would be enough to send in U.S. troops, but after Clinton's speech, 53 percent of Americans supported sending in troops. That's a 14 percent difference. If human rights abuses are enough of a reason to send in troops, why was there any doubt about the need for troops in Haiti? Do the raping of women and the murdering of children and priests not qualify as human rights abuses?

Once again, I must say that if there was ever a truly humanitarian effort, Haiti is it.

—Nichole Davis is an opinion columnist at The Rebel Yell.

## President Carter's journey a huge waste of time



**DONOVAN STELTZNER**

I hate Carter's guts. This morning, which just happened to be Monday, we made peace with Haiti. No invasion. No CNN live coverage. My life's plan is forever ruined. My "timely" column instantly became paper-shredder fodder.

PAPER SHREDDER: (Belch!) However, being the creative soul that I am, I have thus come up with the Three-Reasons-Why-We-Should-Not-Have-Invaded-Haiti-Anyway. At least my editor will smile upon me . . . and I will get paid Money, of which, of course, the latter is far more important.

CLINTON: The blood and the gore! Human rights violations everywhere! Havoc in the streets! We must invade that country and restore democracy!

ADVISOR: Uh . . . ahem . . . Mr. President. That's Los Angeles.

Yes, I made it up. But, then again, I'm an objective journalist. I'm allowed that privilege. Especially when I just feel like

of course, a new fad comes to play here: KID: You want to trade an Idi Amin and a Stalin for an Aristide? Are you out of your mind?

ME: I'm not going to answer that.

The Second-Reason-Why-We-Should-Never-Have-Invaded-

Haiti-Anyway is that I don't like unfair fights. Let's look at THEM versus US.

THEY have M-1s. WE have M-16s. THEY have Jeeps. WE have tanks. THEY have no planes. WE have planes. THEY have General Cedras. WE have General Shali . . . Shalikas . . . oh, never mind. THEY have no organized army. WE have not only an army, but we have Arnold Schwarzenegger, the Jack-In-The-Box Bacteriological Warfare Department (MOTTO: "If you liked us in the U.S., you'll love us in Haiti."), mystery meat from Taco Bell, buttered popcorn and breast implants. It's kind of like placing Julio Cesar Chavez in the boxing ring with, say, Dan Quayle ("No, Danny, you CANNOT use your golf clubs!").

QUAYLE (after the fight): Good thing it wasn't a spelling bee!

Here's what we do to even the score. Support a war between Haiti and the Dominican Republic. We would then funnel Haiti weapons through the CIA. Haiti becomes so cocky that it decides to invade, of all places, Kuwait. Then we can start a war. Justified? Don't ask me.

The Third-Reason-Why-We-Should-Not-Have-Invaded-Haiti-Anyway is even more profound than the other two. One of these days, Bill Clinton will tour Port-au-Prince, and, to his dismay—alas—there are no McDonald's! Oh, joy. The Chief Executive will go hungry. Come to think of it, the President is starting to resemble Rush Limbaugh, and a little bit of fasting could do him some good. Unless, of course, some hapless sap of a franchisee was at least smart enough to move away from Los Angeles.

CLINTON: Hi! Boy am I glad to see . . .

FRANCHISEE: Go Away! Scram! You're a liability to my re-election effort in Congress!

Did I say this was in Haiti or in L.A.? I'm sorry; I must have gotten things a little mixed up.

Just remember, Mr. Clinton, wars are always good for re-election bids. Just ask Mr. Bush. And if you ever decide to invade Haiti after all and if you ever need just a little bit of help, I do work for Jack-In-The-Box.

CARTER: Donovan, how kind of you to invite me out to lunch.

ME: Mr. President, the honor is mine. Bon appetit.

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



it. Especially if I don't use this privilege to lampoon my editor's parentage, which I did have in mind, but I like Money. But that is neither here nor there. I must continue on my quest.

The First-Reason-Why-We-Should-Never-Hav-Invaded-Haiti-Anyway is simple. Jean-Bertrand Aristide is the guy who the Haitians Have Never Seen Blink. I have not either—and neither has anyone else. The guy is on so many drugs it would not surprise me that he sleeps like a fish.

(It has been reported that Clinton actually saw Aristide blink. However, the next day, it was reported that he did not really witness Aristide blink, but that one of his aides informed the president of this most historic event. The White House has since denied everything. But I digress.)

Unfortunately, Aristide has been accused of killing people. Not good. Even the despots that are there now kill people. But at least they can open and close their eyes. Not that killing people is an asset. But I think that to trade just plain killers for a killer on some serious drugs is not a particularly good trade. Unless,

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

## Security

continued from 4

specific improvements. And much to the chagrin of UNLV students, the campus police are not willing to help with UNLV's safety problem.

Police Chief Hollenbeck has told Boixo and several others that UNLV is already safe. Why should funds be spent to improve safety at UNLV? It appears that UNLV's police feel improvement is not needed. That is shocking since you would think the police would want students to feel safe.

The campus police squad is willing to come and speak to student organizations about safety as long as you pay their fee. That's right. If you want to improve your safety and learn spe-

cific safety techniques, our fine UNLV boys and girls in blue will charge you a small fee to come out and teach you how to be safety conscience. So, in essence, you must pay an additional fee to feel safe on your campus.

What's wrong with this picture?

The UNLV police should waive their fee for all student organizations. To charge for their services is unconscionable. Students are already short on cash after paying tuition and ridiculous prices for books, so they shouldn't have to pay the university police to come out and speak to them on safety issues.

UNLV has grown incredibly over the past 10 years. In those 10 years, the world has changed as well. We live in a society where murder and rape have become

an everyday occurrence. This increase in crime has also spilled onto college campuses across America. It is time for UNLV and its campus police force to pull their head out of the sand and set a course for the future.

UNLV students do not feel safe. It is the responsibility of the university police to make each and everyone of UNLV's 20,000 students feel safe. We pay our fees and we expect nothing less than a concerted effort at improving the safety of our campus.

If Chief Hollenbeck and the rest of the university police do not comply, maybe we should show them the door.

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

## Transfer

continued from 4

money that we need."

Belangersaid past scholarship recipients have hurt transfer students' chances. "A lot of donors like to see and meet the students they are giving money to," she said. "There have been quite a few instances where students have refused to go to ceremonies that donors were holding. So, donors begin to specify who can receive their scholarship and when that happens it rarely benefits transfer students." It isn't very hard to attend a ceremony—especially one where you are going to be given money.

Luckily, they can still receive scholarships from outside agencies and their academic depart-

ments. But, those shouldn't be their only options. Transfer students should be on an even playing field with other students.

Today's transfer students are tomorrow's alumni—potential scholarship donors. And they will remember that they were ignored when they needed scholarships. The university should want its alumni—its future scholarship donors - to look back and feel they were treated fairly.

—Christopher Mitchell is an opinion columnist at The Rebel Yell.