

THE REBEL YELL

4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154
(702) 895-3479 office
(702) 895-1515 fax

Erin Niemeyer
Editor-in-Chief

Claudia Salas
News Editor

Jeremy Martin
Sports Editor

Trevor Hayes
Opinion Editor

April Partridge
Features Editor

Jennifer Evans
Arts & Entertainment
Editor

Tammi Brunner
Office Manager

**Ruchirawan
Phonphongrat**
Advertising Manager

Advertising Staff
Cassandra Kegley
Shawn Takiguchi

William Pucherl
Production Manager

Production Staff
Danny Kim

Photography Staff
Gregg Benson
Orif Borowsky
Christine Nino

Mary Hausch
Faculty Advisor

Karla Kirk
Business Manager

Staff Writers
Ray Brewer
Angie Cecchini
Lisa Gentile
Eric Gruzen
Brian Kuchar
Michael Melissa
Mike Proctor
Michael Saunders
Jason Sheehan
Heather Subran
S.T. Sutherland
Pauline Villapando

Letters to the editor should be typed and be fewer than 300 words. Each letter must include name, address and telephone number. Writers affiliated with UNLV must include class and major, or faculty/staff position. Letters are subject to editing for length and clarity.

UNLV students high on intention

By S.T. Sutherland
Staff Opinion Writer

If UNLV students could choose the next president of the United States, Hillary "Rottweiler" Clinton would be pleased to know that she and Slick Willie wouldn't be home-buying until the year 2000.

In a recent informal poll conducted on campus, 75 percent of students surveyed said they plan to vote to re-elect President Bill Clinton.

Sixty percent of randomly selected students labeled themselves Democrat while 38 percent called themselves proud Republicans. Two percent are Independent.

Registered voters in the group totaled 90 percent, 80 percent of whom said they plan to vote.

The group represented a cross-section of the campus population, including freshmen through graduate students, males and females, in a variety of course work.

When asked about their voting

intentions, most students approached were ready and willing to offer their opinions.

Students appear to care about who will lead the country, which is surprising since college-aged voters traditionally neglect to go to the polls.

There's still hope. If the number of students surveyed who said they intend to vote in the Nov. 5 presidential election actually follow through and cast their ballots, we may have an impact. But time will tell.

Most who expressed a preference for Clinton cited his views on issues as a major reason for their decision.

"(Clinton) has the best interests of the American people in mind," said graduate student Jenny Hass. Whether he does or doesn't is a subject for endless debate.

One may cite Clinton's intent to create equality for gays in the military as a good example of Clinton's concern for Americans. But detractors may point to the compromises

Clinton made following the military furor and say that he fell short. Some say gays in the service are no better off now than they were before, still taking the same risks without the same protections.

Many believe Clinton had the right idea to bring equality for a group of Americans into a situation where it didn't exist before. It still doesn't, but nice try, Bill. Try again, if you get the chance.

Perhaps one of the best reasons to vote for Mr. Clinton is that another four years would be his last four years.

He wouldn't have to worry about any action he may take providing political rivals the ammunition to torpedo another election. He will be free to say, "Damn the torpedoes."

Without the possibility of facing yet another election, Clinton will be a more brave leader. Presidents who have had eight-year terms are often the ones who bring the most lasting change to our country.

Freshman Quinn Shroyer said Republican presidential nominee Bob Dole doesn't have what it takes to be president. "Dole is too quiet, not as qualified. Clinton has done a good job so far."

Quinn is right. Dole has been a sideline party man throughout his political career, the proverbial wallflower. Now he wants to dance?

UNLV students seem to share Quinn's analysis of Dole. The 25 percent Dole faction unanimously stated that they are straight-ticket voters.

One freshman thought that Dole could bring fresh ideas to the White House. Freshman. Thought. Hmmm?

One student said she would vote for Clinton simply because he's the lesser of two evils. A lot of voters seem to share her sentiments.

Still, we must pick a side and cast our votes. An 80 percent turnout from college-aged adults can and will make a difference. Don't waste time complaining. Stand up and be counted!

Roth was wrong on President Clinton

By Katherine Keller
Guest columnist

Editor's note:

The following piece was submitted in response to staff opinion writer Jason Roth's "President Clinton: Not the best choice," which appeared in the Oct. 1 issue of The Rebel Yell.

Mr. Roth's misinformed rant has roused me from my dogmatic slumber.

"He (Limbaugh) speaks strongly against the whiny liberals who rant about free speech and infringement on their rights. Republicans, like Limbaugh, speak their minds and address the issues head on."

Yes, when Limbaugh launches one of his poorly informed diatribes, he's "addressing the issues," but when someone of a liberal persuasion speaks his/her mind and addresses the issues, it's whining?

I loved this statement: "The Republican platform is better than the Democratic Platform." An unsupported statement like that isn't worth a pitcher of warm spit.

Later on you say, "But don't morals mean anything in this country?" Whose morals, Mr. Roth? Don't assume that all Americans have, share, or respect your morality.

You accuse Clinton of talking out of both sides of his mouth. Don't all politicians do this? George Bush got reamed left and right for it. I'm sure I could find instances where your beloved Bob Dole has done the same thing.

"To get elected, many politicians say what they think the voters want to hear. Voters shouldn't neglect his obvious deceitful nature." So, the President and Dole are doing the same thing and only Clinton is deceitful? Do the words "double standard" ring a bell?

In the next few paragraphs you make a mistake which I admit I have also made. An allegation of a crime is not proof that the accused committed a crime. Just because some associates of his have gotten into serious trouble doesn't mean

that the president is guilty of the same crimes.

In paragraph five, you begin with Whitewater, and then jump to retrieving files. (Since when is retrieving files a crime?) Also, your argument does not contain a logical link between Whitewater and the crime of file retrieval, and is thus a non-sequitur.

How do you know that Bill has not been faithful to Hillary? In reference to Dick Morris's resignation due to allegations of sexual misconduct, again, guilt by association is fallacy.

"The media portrays the Republican Party as the rich man's party...This is incorrect." Check your demographics.

"In fact, Republicans have a better feel for true American ideals and care about the downtrodden in our society by supporting issues which do not compromise America's values." Who determines which set of American ideals are the "true" ones and which ideals are America's?

How much do the Republicans care about the downtrodden in our society? They've tried to cut college funding and refused to pass legislation which would create a minimum wage sufficient to support a person and they blocked Clinton's health care plan which would have allowed the 38.1 million working poor access to health care. Condemning millions of people to poverty, ignorance, and chronic illness are not the ideals and values of this American.

Regarding religious issues, such as prayer in school, you can start praying on campus any time you want. Have you missed all of the religious people from the Nation of Islam, the Hare Krishnas and various fundamentalist Christians who come to campus? What's wrong, and unconstitutional is for the state or any office thereof to force religion on a person. Not everyone believes in or worships the Jewish/Christian God. Why should any state sponsored activity force this "God" on them?

"I feel, without a doubt, killing

babies is wrong and sexual promiscuity in all its forms is wrong." Well, I feel, without a doubt, that telling me how to use my reproductive organs, thus robbing me of choice, is wrong.

Also, when you rant and rave about "God's laws" regarding abortion and homosexuality you insult every non Jew or Christian. The laws of Native American Deities, Ahura Mazda and Lord Vishnu among countless others are also laws of divine origin.

Where in the Christian holy writings does it say people of the same sex are expressly forbidden to have sex with each other?

You call Clinton a draft dodger, I may call it political protest or self preservation. The conflict in Vietnam was stupid, vainglorious and supported despotic dictatorships. You seem to feel that military experience is some sort of prerequisite for excellence in presidential service and in formulating foreign policy. Did Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln or Ronald Reagan have military service? No.

Your paragraph about the environment shows muddled thinking. "The earth has survived catastrophes for millions of years, so a little Styrofoam" argument is not only irrelevant to the earth's having survived (natural) catastrophes, it oversimplifies and trivializes the very real problems of ozone depletion and pollution.

The hunk of rock we call the earth will survive until the sun expands into a red-giant, 240 million years from now. This is no guarantee there will life on earth until then. The total depletion of the earth's protective ozone shield would not be like any other catastrophe, because it would be a man-made catastrophe.

Read the official U.S. government studies about the amount of pesticides in our nation's water supply. Read about the effects of pollution on humans and animals, read about cosmic radiation. Read the September issue of *Discover* magazine, which describes, the effects of pesticide and industrial

pollution on mammals (humans included) world wide. These problems are not trivial.

You blame the president because not all his proposed reforms became law. He tried. Congress refused to pass his proposed laws.

"Republicans don't want to cut everything, just the Democratic Party's waste." The Republican Party has never supported wasteful spending? "Star Wars" anybody? How about cutting Republican waste, such as farm subsidies for tobacco growers, or monies spent on lobbying foreign nations, to convince them to buy American cigarettes. ("Our government knows cigarettes are bad for you — buy them!) How can anyone take actions promoting the interests of the tobacco industry and call themselves ethical?

In one of your sentences you left out a phrase: "The Republican platform is more genuine, sincere, and in tune with the American people (who are fundamentalist Christians, than Clinton's 'slick' ways.)" In the original form, a sentence like that would almost make one believe that Bob Dole farts talcum powder.

The marijuana issue is dead. Face it. Many of the baby boomers inhaled. Is Clinton inhaling now? That's the issue. Clinton has spent millions of dollars combating drugs and gangs. According to 60 Minutes, Bob Dole has lobbied the Chinese government to buy American cigarettes. Clinton may or may not have inhaled, but Dole's a pusher.

You state that Clinton is not the voice of the student movement. Bob Dole, the man who has tried to derail reforms such as Americorps, the man whose party wants to declare loans to students "taxable" income, the man whose economic policies will contribute to the further shrinkage of the middle class is even less a voice for the students.

Katherine Keller is a Senior English major