

Bush for President



Caught in the 'Spyder' web
Jason Snyder
editor-in-chief

After the gauntlet of presidential debates that George W. Bush and Al Gore scratched and clawed their way through, we are still right where we started. It's a horse race. Finally America will witness a presidential election that isn't decided before voting booths are even open. It's going to go down to the wire.

Given history, the election should have been over six months ago, before either candidate was officially named as their party's representative. It's America's perception that our economy is in its best state in history. When that happens, the party that takes credit for the economy usually maintains ownership of the White House. So why isn't Democratic candidate Al Gore running away with it?

Because, historically there has never been another Bill Clinton. Sure, he takes credit for the economic state of our country now, and sure he is still fairly popular among most Americans for the job he has done. But as well as the people like him...they surely don't want his legacy of deception in the White House to continue. The undecided voters might want to keep the economy, but they don't want to keep that legacy. And the only person (besides Hillary in New York) that can keep the thoughts of that legacy in memory would be Clinton's Vice President, Al Gore.

It sounds like an unfortunate situation for Gore, but he has brought it upon himself. He has turned what has been the "Clinton administration" the last eight years into the "Clinton/Gore administration." Well fine...if you want credit for the economy, then you can have some credit for the Clinton legacy as well. Or should I say, the "Clinton/Gore" legacy.

But the main reason Al Gore isn't running away with an election he should have dominated is because of the emergence of George W. Bush. Gore has met his match. And for that, America has an election to take seriously.

In case you don't know the differences yet, it's as easy as this. Clinton legacy aside...Al Gore will tax more and spend money on federal government - Bush will tax the same and give part of our country's surplus back to the people that have paid Clinton/Gore's taxes the past eight years.

Al Gore is for using the U.S. military to build nations - Bush is for bringing home some of the U.S. men and women and asking for help from nations who are closer to the problem. Al Gore apparently is for fixing the Texas environment, given that has been his only argument as to how to fix pollution in the U.S. Bush is for fixing the country's schools and education.

Al Gore swears "I am my own man," yet has been carried by Clinton's success for eight years now - Bush has dared to challenge the success of Clinton, asking if we really are better than we were eight years ago.

Finally, Al Gore is a smooth talker - Bush mixes up syllables. So if you want a smooth talker that can talk his way out of any problem he gets us in...vote Gore. If you want someone who leads by action and is willing to listen to Democrats and Republicans to get things done for America...vote Bush.

This isn't an election about the success of the Democrats the last eight years. It's about the potential success of all Americans for the rest of their years.

Snyder's column appears every three weeks.



Tell us what you think!

Send a letter to the Editor! Send all letters to: behrcoll2@aol.com

Have an opinion? Tell someone who cares...

If there was one adjective that you could use to describe the human race, what would it be? I know several people who would use the adjective 'selfish' as their favorite. Others would use 'good,' still others would opt for 'destructive,' 'insensitive,' 'creative,' or even 'intelligent.' But in a sense, all these adjectives are just a tiny aspect of the human race - we are a complex species, because of our ability to think and to reason.

Except, until, you decide to enter a typical week in a college student's life. Sleep, drink, class, sleep, drink, drink, sleep, class, and sleep during class. Not a hard concept at all for this human.

But too many students take to this pattern of life when they find it. It involves very little or no concentration on where life is going for them - and this lifestyle might work for awhile, but then you start returning to what I call the "blank slate syndrome." As we have worked so hard in secondary schooling to earn an acceptance letter to a college of our choice, our success results in a return to the blank slate.

Unfortunately, this will result in



Return to Reality
Becky Weindorf
assistant editor

mindless and stupid comments or answers to a relatively easy question. The other night on Jay Leno, a woman was being asked who were the candidates for the Presidency, and she said - I kid you not - "Well, um, there's Bush, yea! George Bush and..." and she laughed nervously. This woman did not know who Bush's opponent was. And several students on campus have no idea who Joe Lieberman and Dick Cheney are. (YES, they are the potential vice-presidential candidates. You're welcome.)

Let's look at this: the presidency is a part of the government that gets the most airtime from the media across the globe. We are citizens of the United States and obviously have plenty of opinions on how high our tuition is and how we should get more aid from the state, and yet we don't

'The Hot Debate of The Week' Harmful or helpful?

Should President Bill Clinton step out and help Al Gore campaign?

Regardless of any under the desk scandals, Clinton has every reason to support Gore in his campaign for the presidency. Eight years ago, Gore was hand-picked by Clinton to be his loyal comrade—his vice president. Clinton trusted Gore with an integral job: Gore in return supported and campaigned for Clinton.

As with any president, a certain bond of loyalty is formed between him and his vice president. This bond should carry on throughout the presidency and beyond—no matter who is in office.

In a political stance, the current president would obviously want his political party to reign through the next four years. Since Supreme Court justices are to be appointed soon, it only makes sense that Clinton would want a Democratic president in office to assure that his ideals are carried out. Therefore, in order to continue Clinton's legacy (ignore the cigar), it is only right that he campaigns for Gore.

It's unlikely that these two, as with any president/vice president pair, will never speak or have any type of political social relationship after January. Their bond will continue for a lifetime, so it's only right that they help each other out in their political endeavors.

Every week, two editors from the staff will debate a topic that is hot. Students, faculty and staff are encouraged to email suggestions for the hot topic. Send ideas to behrcoll2@aol.com

There's chaos in the Middle East. There's terrorist acts on U.S. naval ships. There's a stock market that is falling apart. And we have the nerve to ask if President Bill Clinton should be campaigning for Al Gore?

Never has it been, and never should it be, the job of our current U.S. president to get involved with the campaigning hoopla of presidential elections. It's a four-year term. Not a three and a half year term with a half year partying with balloons and confetti. Clinton said what he had to say at the Democratic Convention earlier this year. We know where he stands, so let him continue doing his job.

If Al Gore is going to get elected, it should be based on Al Gore, not Bill Clinton's biased opinion of him. Clinton should be free to share his thoughts on who he thinks will do a better job if asked, but going around the country, campaigning for a presidential candidate is not part of the job description.

There are more important things going on in America right now than Al Gore's campaign strategy.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Stop watching what you say

Dear Editor,

Things are getting out of hand. I am so tired of the complaining I have seen in the past 4 years from various people in support of gay/alternative/same sex/whatever you wanna call it relationships. Now, I am in no way saying that people who are not heterosexual (I will just sum up all the various preferences with that) have less right than anybody else. What I am saying is that you do not have more rights than anybody else.

I totally agree with Katie Galley when she said "not everything written (or unwritten) is directed toward you." If Abbey Atkinson (the student who wrote "Pointing out ignorance in the *Beacon* last week) feels that "Dick and Jane" trivialized and "invalidated" her relationship, then I feel sorry for her. Why does she even feel that her relationship needs validation by the *Beacon*? I can't wait until the article last week about the marriage proposal in class comes under fire. I am sure "non-traditional" couples will feel that their relationships are underreported in the homophobic *Beacon*.

I hope that this campus does not crumble under the pressure by minority groups to be extremely politically correct. It is not possible to write articles (and impossible to write editorials) that are 100% acceptable by everyone. Seriously, when a New York architect complains about a news report identifying "the architect" of a shooting spree, things are out of control. If you look to be offended, I promise you will be offended every time. Proof of this is in the many stories I read of books being banned and plays being cancelled at schools because someone abstracted an element of the work so much that he/she became offended.

I am not saying that minority groups have not, or are not still, oppressed in some way. Obviously, abusive and offensive terms are unacceptable in public life. The problem is where the line is drawn. Minority groups refuse to draw that line, and call the majority "ignorant" or oppressive when they attempt to draw the line. I don't think using the phrase "slaving over a hot stove" is an attempt to trivialize or understate the conditions slaves endured. Maybe Eminem's lyrics offend you (if you have not liked what I have said so far, then they definitely offend you), but do not say that by buying his CD (which I bought the first day it came out & loved) means that I support violence against gays or women, or even that I find it hilarious that Christopher Reeves and Sonny Bono were in accidents. There is already a "Parental Discretion Advised: Explicit Lyrics" sticker on the CD. I will bet that soon there will be "Insensitive Lyrics" stickers on CDs.

Some of you may not feel what I am saying is acceptable. But do you know what, that is fine with me. Unlike some people, I do not have to be accepted by people to feel self-worth. Nobody has to agree that what I am saying is correct, nobody has to validate this article for me to feel proud, nobody has to even care. I wouldn't even feel bad if you all feel I am a hypocrite because I am complaining about complaining....

Bob Stidick
MIS, 07

Parenting, Humvees and porn

"Get the switch, boy!" was a phrase I heard often during my formative years growing up in inner city Detroit. Unfortunately, inner city Detroit didn't have many trees, so the switch was usually a tire iron or the left front fender off our '78 Chrysler Cordoba.

Granted, the preceding paragraph is complete and utter bull, but I did manage to meet the business end of the "Board of Education" a number of times. Yes, I was paddled as a child, but only as the most severe form of punishment. Paddling is now considered poor child rearing, or even child abuse if you find the right judge. Am I now a violence prone maniac who likes stealing Humvees, then running down old women and orphans? No. I think I'm a fairly normal 21-year old college kid (despite what my roommates will tell you). The point of all this rambling about my childhood (I won't even get into how the entire football team wanted to kick my butt) is that a lot of the horrible sex and violence today's children are being exposed to could be stopped with an easy preventative measure: parenting.

Yes, there have always been and always will be thousands of reasons parenting cannot prevent a child from encountering inappropriate sex and violence: "The television is much more cost-effective as a baby-sitter than hiring



Untitled 21
Ben Kundman
editorial columnist

a real one." "Little Jimmy wanted the new *Super Duper Blood-Sucking Space Ghoul Nympho Whores From Mars* video game so bad for Christmas, he cried for three days straight." "Doom"ll help the boy prepare for the day when the Reds come and try to take over." "The gardener and I needed to discuss, uh, carnations in the motel across town, so we left Little Jimmy alone at home with 559,322 channels of television to entertain him."

Granted there are parents who work full time, who cannot monitor every second of their child's life. The chairman of the FCC, William Kennard, was quoted as saying television programming "at best has no educational value and at worst is filled with immature locker-room humor and cartoon violence." Why does TV suck so bad these days from a morality standpoint? Because people are watching it. If a parent's excuse is "Little Jimmy goes to Bobby-Sue's house, and I don't know what he's doing over there," why not ask Bobby-

know who the hell we are voting for when we step behind the voting curtain.

Coincidence? I think not.

This is a result of a wrinkle in our thinking: we complain, complain, complain, but do we even bother to take the initiative and have a say in what goes on that affects our life?

Let's wake up out of our stupors, people. There is a world out there that is functioning without us, and if we don't use our voices, then we're going to be left in the dust when it really counts - when you have to start paying taxes, for example (I already do). When you have a huge college loan to pay off and a mere \$20,000 a year, you'll see that the money only stretches so far for the monthly loan payments plus utilities, groceries, insurance, and other little necessities that "pop up" out of nowhere once in a while. All these things are affected when people speak up for what they want. Opinions can be the fuel behind the SUV of change - it just takes someone to pump in the gas to make it work.

Weindorf's column appears every three weeks.

Sue's parents if Bobby-Sue has 559,322 channels of television in her room?

A topic related to the preceding discussion of morality, poor programming, and *Super Duper Blood-Sucking Space Ghoul Nympho Whores From Mars* is the discussion of freedom of the internet, or more particularly, internet porn. Now, myself being a fan of the women of the internet...I mean, those sick freaks who look at internet porn, have every right in the world to look at whatever disgusting thing it is that gets their goat. I, esteemed columnist of the *Behrend Beacon*, propose a simple solution to this problem: a new domain. Anything defined as porn (yes, this is a broad definition, but we all know the difference between Michelangelo's David and some girl with a horse) gets a .por domain. That way, when Little Jimmy is looking up, say "latex" as part of his report on the history of rubber, he doesn't hit 9 million sites with... well, latex.

Until my infinite wisdom is realized and a .por or a similar domain is instituted, I propose a simple solution to Little Jimmy looking at pornography: computer in the family room, hide the power cables when you leave, and try and hide the Playboys a little better. We all knew to look under the mattress.

Kundman's column appears every three weeks