

The election as extension of capitalistic ways

by Adam Levenstein
Collegian Staff



The presidential campaigns in the United States are in full swing. Already the mud-slinging has begun; Republican Bob Dole complains about Democrat incumbent Bill Clinton, and Clinton whines about Dole, usually the issues are the same ("Clinton is soft on drugs!" "No, Dole is soft on drugs!").

What are the real issues behind the elections? Of course, "common sense" would dictate that the budget deficit, taxes, and crime would be the main issues. This is, after all, what is stressed in the media. Both candidates seem to stress their stance on the issues as well (reduce the deficit, taxes, and crime).

Yet if you look at the situation from a scientific point of view, the main issue behind every presidential campaign has been the same—profits.

This may sound ridiculous; after all, what does the Presidency have to do with profits? The United States is a capitalist country; there can be no doubt about this. As is the case in any capitalist country,

there are two main classes; the working class and the employing class. The working class works and the employing class makes money, or profit, from the products or services of the workers.

The government of the United States is a capitalist government. By this I mean that the government is not a working-class government; rather, it is a government that is made up of and represents the interests of the employing or "upper" class.

The vast majority of the elected officials are candidates either of the Democratic or Republican parties; both of which have loyalty towards those with the most money. This includes the Presidency.

This drive for profits is far from national. Every time the United States sends troops to foreign soil, every time the U.S. government wishes to help "develop" a "Third-World" country, profits are at the heart of its efforts.

U.S. Secretary of Commerce Ronald Brown, who was killed while flying with a plane full of U.S. business representatives, was in Yugoslavia for precisely this purpose.

When looking at politics from this perspective, neither of the two major parties seem to be much different. Both agree that building big business is good; during Sunday's Presidential debate Clinton boasted about the growth of several car makers under his administration.

Some might say that the growth of the big companies benefits the working class, because it creates more jobs. However, a quick glance at the economic situation

eliminates this fallacy. During the past few years, corporate "downsizing," or the reduction of the work force, has been dominant in industry. Another glance at the records shows that while the laying off of tens of thousands of workers has taken place, the capitalists have gotten richer!

The "official" unemployment rate for the United States is currently 5.1 percent, down from 6 percent a few years ago. Often a reduction in this rate is used as "evidence" of economic achievement by the government.

This figure, however, only applies to those who have lost their jobs in the last six months; how nice. One can only guess the total number of people who don't have jobs in this country.

Another example would be Mexico. A capitalist country, Mexico's economy has collapsed over the past five years. The poverty there has become unthinkable. Since the depression began, the number of Forbes-recognized Mexican billionaires has increased from one to eight.

When you get right down to it, the working class and the employing class have nothing in common.

What does this have to do with the presidential campaign?

As I noted above, both major parties—as well as a number of the "third" parties (Libertarian, Reform, Green)—represent the interests of the upper class. There are few truly working-class parties.

One such party, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), is running candidates in opposition to the big business parties of war and racism.

James Harris, a meatpacker from Atlanta, is the SWP candidate for President. He is joined by Laura Garza who was a steelworker before becoming a full-time staff writer for *The Militant* newspaper.

The purpose of the SWP campaign is not to get elected; the problem is bigger than that. Instead, the solution lies in trying to create a system based on human need rather than corporate profit. This requires a united, educated working class. By campaigning for working class politics and against capitalism, the SWP and the Young Socialists hope to attract people to socialism and to build the socialist movement.

Clinton's failure to fight drugs

by John Rossomando
Collegian Staff

What sort of credibility on the issue of drugs can we give an administration that has abandoned the drug war until recently.

During Bill Clinton's first three years in office the drug war fell from the top priority it had been in the Reagan and Bush White Houses. The new Administration gutted the Office of the Drug Czar as well as virtually every other Federal Drug Enforcement Agency.

President Clinton was so worried about the Drug epidemic that he slashed the Drug Czar's staff from 146 down to 25. Even the Office of White House Communications had more employees than the Drug Czar.

John Walters former acting Director of the Office of National Drug Policy testified before Congress in October 1994 that the Clinton Administration planned to cut 625 federal drug enforcement positions from agencies ranging from the FBI to the Coast Guard.

The Clinton Administration seemed more content with spending money on drug education than enforcing our nation's drug laws. *The Dallas Star-Tribune* reported in February 1993, "The White House National Security Council has dropped the drug war from one of three top priorities to No. 29 on a list of 29."



Even members of the President's own party were concerned with the Administration's lack of an effective drug policy. Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY) was quoted by the *Washington Times*, "I've

been in Congress for over two decades, and I have never, never, never seen a president who cares less about that issue."

The saying goes that the apple does not fall far from the tree. Several Clinton staffers failed their background security checks because they had used drugs within the previous five years or more.

In the Bush or Reagan White Houses any hint of previous drug abuse was not even tolerated. For example when it came to light that Douglas Ginsburg, a Reagan appointee to the Supreme Court had experimented with marijuana in the 1970's all hell broke loose. The media had a field day with it and Ginsburg's name was withdrawn by the President.

The Director of White House Administration, Patsy Thomasson told the *Washington Times*, "Eleven White House staffers are in a special drug testing program because of concerns about recent drug use." The *Washington Times* also reported on April 4, 1995, "Of about 1000 FBI background checks of White House personnel, more than 500 revealed

derogatory information that would have prevented the people from obtaining security clearances at the FBI, Department of Defense or CIA. . . The FBI found cases of drug convictions."

The cavalier attitude of the highest office in the land toward internal drug abuse is extremely disturbing. How can we afford to turn a blind eye on drug abuse in the President's own backyard.

The Clinton administration's lack of Drug enforcement has taken its toll in the form of higher numbers of drug users.

The Department of Health and Human Services released an alarming report concerning the dramatic rise in the abuse of illegal drugs that has coincided with the Clinton Administration.

In 1992 the rate of drug use among youth between the ages of 12-17 had fallen to 5.3 percent, an all time low. By 1995 the rate had doubled to 10.9 percent, an increase of 106 percent!

The report also indicated that usage of marijuana had increased by more than double from 1992. Cocaine usage leaped

by an astounding 166 percent between 1994 and 1995 compared to a sharp decline prior to 1994. The usage of hallucinogens such as LSD and PCP, among young Americans shot up by 54 percent between 1994 and 1995. There has never been an Administration as tough on crime and drugs as the current one. Keep up the good work Bill!

The Clinton drug policy has been entirely irresponsible and its results have been disastrous.

The previous two Republican Administrations had successfully curtailed the percentage of Americans who actively used drugs.

I do see some merit in Clinton's emphasis on education and action to discourage usage of illegal drugs, but this alone will not succeed. In fact this strategy has been an utter failure.

The President's election year conversion to old style drug interdiction can only be explained as pure politics. If the President were truly committed to fighting the drug

continued page 4

Dan Ester's World

by Dan Ester
Guest Columnist

I was sitting in the Wintergreen Cafe when I came to a very disturbing realization. I was wiping the corner of my mouth with one of those brown paper Natural Napkins, when it became obvious to me the napkin must be made from 100% recycled toilet paper. Of course I'm joking (hopefully!), and I must commend Food & Housing on their attempt to protect the environment by using recycled paper napkins (that are abrasive enough to sand diamonds).

What I don't understand is why must student clubs and organizations order food for on-campus events from Food & Housing? Does it really matter if clubs get their food from Pizza Hut (for half the price) or from the Wintergreen Cafe (for half the taste)? I guess it's not that I mind the food they serve, it's the fact that I practically need to take out a loan if I want a meal that will satisfy more than a pigeon!

If it weren't for the very nice people that work there, I'm sure I'd organize a global boycott against Food & Housing and all their affiliates. The staff is always friendly, even when their boss has just sent someone to the flogging chamber for being 0.23 seconds late.

But now I've gone off on a tangent (no, I don't mean sin/cos, in case there are math people reading this. Oops—I'm a math person).

Speaking of math, I went to a Math Club meeting on Tuesday, Oct. 1. It was a member drive picnic, and yes, I went for free burgers and weenies (no, it wasn't really free—Math Club paid Food & Housing \$42,839.56 for the food. But it was free for for me, and that's all that matters!).

As I was saying, I went for the free grub, and I was quite nervous at first. What do people do in Math Club? Would we sit around and see who has the biggest calculator? Would we have manual computation races?

I was very relieved to find that none of those things occurred. Instead, I had a great time talking with my friends, and I totally enjoyed the most expensive burgers in the known universe. I had such a great time, in fact, that I signed up!

What will I do in the future as a Math Club member? I really don't have the slightest clue.

I guess that was another tangent. The real purpose of this article is not to promote Math Club or run Food &

Housing into the ground (even though that would be GREAT fun!), but instead, I'm here to review the second of the *Mathematics Seminar Series* which was September 26. Dr. Pamela Botts of Behrend College was the speaker, and the topic was "Spatial Pattern, Habitat Characteristics, and Temporal Changes in Chironomid Assemblages in Wetlands on Presque Isle." It took nearly five minutes to announce the topic!

Botts has been at Behrend for seven semesters. She has a Ph.D. in Biology which she earned at the University of S. Florida.

Her current research involves very small organisms (always a dangerous word to attempt to say in public) and how they are affected by the changes at Presque Isle. Botts explained that, for this research, you must find the right organism.

I wonder if the researchers have a cigarette after they find the right organism? And my question is, isn't ANY organism good? Isn't the WRONG organism better than NONE??

ANYWAY, these organisms look like small flies and are called chironomid midges. They are related to gnats and mosquitoes, and Botts insists they don't bite (but I'm sure that's what all the unsuspecting bugbite victims are told before they're lured into this sort of research).

The chironomid midges must find an alternative habitat if their present location becomes unsuitable. I wonder how you tell if the habitat is alternative? Is there

new-age music playing? Are there people wearing grundy, pseudo wanna-be hippie clothing? Are there men dancing together wearing leather chaps and a G-string while *It's Raining Men* blares from the speakers??

All jokes aside, Botts' presentation was quite enjoyable! She has a very refreshing sense of humor, and I didn't notice anyone in the audience falling into a sedated stupor. And this time, they didn't run out of free cookies (Mathematical Seduction).

Now, for those of you who would rather shave yourself with a chain saw than attend a mathematics/biology seminar, you missed a good presentation!

Don't miss the next in the series, tentatively scheduled for Thursday, October 10, 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. in the Reed Lecture Hall. The guest speaker will be Dr. Michael DiSanti of NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center.

Free cookies will be served, so we can all enjoy delicious cookies while Food & Housing rapes us. Sorry, Food & Housing, but no one needs to be an Organismic Researcher to be able to afford your food!

Dan Ester is a senior MTHBD major. He is a member of the National Gold Key Honor Society, president of Trigon, and now a member of the Math Club. Please send comments or hate-email to dde104@email.psu.edu.

Food & Housing, you DO have a sense of humor, don't you?!? I was just kidding, HONEST!! Please don't spit in my food!!!



Clinton up on education

by Kevin Schoolcraft
Collegian Staff

Chalk one up for Clinton and thumbs down on Dole. No, this is not some left wing liberal propaganda, but it is what many universities are probably saying after the new appropriation was signed by President Clinton. The new appropriation sets education as a main priority.

According to the *New York Times*, this new bill gives education "\$28.8 billion total for programs, 3.6 billion more than 1996. That money includes 7.6 billion for college aid, a \$1.3 billion increase from fiscal 1996. There is also an appropriation of \$262 million, or 40 percent more than last year's amount of \$188 million, for bilingual and immigrant education programs."

A question that has many college Republicans asking is, would this bill have passed if Dole were still the GOP leader? According to Leon E. Panetta, the White House Chief of Staff, "It is pretty clear that when Bob Dole did leave, we were able to make some very successful efforts, working with the new leadership on the Senate side as well as the House in trying to get the welfare reform bill done, get the Kennedy Kassenbaum done, and now this large appropriations agreement enacted along with immigration reform."

This new appropriation shows insight to where we are moving with education in



this country. This bill alone, not only allows more minorities to obtain an education, but it also insures the students presently attending college, that they will continue their educational careers.

The upcoming election will decide which president will lead us into the next century.

Therefore, it is up to us to be well informed about issues that will affect our lives, while at the same time ignoring the manipulative political ploys of special interest groups like Philip Morris, that cloud our perception. It is up to us all, to look at every television commercial, magazine advertisement and newspaper article with an objective and critical analysis. If we fail to use such a method in judgment of the information that we receive, then we become nothing more than servants marching to the beat of someone else's drum.

