

Crime in America

by James Mullen

Perhaps the biggest question in the minds of many Americans and particularly many Congressmen is "What is to become of the President, now that Congress is scheduled to hear testimony as to whether or not impeachment should be attempted?" Well I have my own opinion on this. But beyond this, and somewhat related, is the question "What is to become of the Presidency?"

With Watergate, ITT, the Milk Industry, and plumbing talk, along with tapes that do not talk, has come a close scrutiny of the highest office. There has also, in my opinion, come a siege upon that office. This siege, though, is not based upon its merits; rather it is based upon the fall from popularity of the President.

There are many who are not too happy with Nixon at this point and they therefore support attempts to limit his powers and make him more responsible to the people. But is this good and can future Presidents operate under these limitations? Or will history show that Congress's limiting of the Presidential powers as they held Nixon over a barrel to be a poor move?

One move by Congress that I feel the test of time will reveal as being poor, is the War Powers Bill. This bill presents an instance in which Congress should have been more careful. In this bill Congress has limited the President to only 60 days in which he is allowed to employ U.S. troops without approval. In effect, the U.S. would have to decide within 60 days whether or not to virtually declare war. Had such a procedure been in effect when we first entered Vietnam, we might well have wound up fighting Red China. Why do I say this? Because after 60 days, if Congress had decided that the U.S. should stay in, and after considering what the times and events surrounding our initial involvement were, I believe that involvement could easily become unlimited. Why? With Congress now determining

our involvement and supporting it, all limits have disappeared.

Whereas once the President waged war and Congress supported it providing a check and balance, now Congress wages war and supports it, unchecked. There is also another aspect to this problem; now with war as unpopular as it is, Congress might hesitate to use U.S. troops at all. This might severely weaken all commitments the U.S. has to other nations.

Another proposal being discussed in Congress is a one or two year presidential term. This I feel will also hurt any future President greatly. It would in effect hold the President liable to every whim and fancy of the people. I once heard it said by our own Dr. H.W. Aurand, that history shows that there has never been an effective President who was very popular during his time in office. What I am saying here is that, with a one year term system, history shows that a good President would not last. You might doubt this argument, but a close look back in time should prove it. An alternative mentioned by Congress is limiting a President to only one four-year term. On this proposal I take a more neutral view, as I can see both benefit and detriment balancing each other.

Finally I would like to express my feelings on the proposed public funding of campaigning for the highest office. I can say that I am in favor of this point. I can see where a lot of work would be involved, and I can see good cause to question its constitutionality, but I do believe it would be a way to bring about fairer elections. Candidates would have to once again run on their merits rather than the best or most expensive advertising. No longer will there be books on "selling the President." My last point is that such funding will cause balanced campaigns with the deciding factors being past performance and the issues, and not money.

What has been given is my opinion; I would be happy to discuss and exchange opinions with anyone.

QUIBLING

by Deborah Berger

There are certain days each year when people all over the world engage in a special kind of record-breaking. These special records we break are sometimes of an absolutely revolting nature. However, those of us who are scientifically minded can calculate the probability that each person who attempts to break a revolting record will succeed. This is easily accomplished with this mathematical Theorem; $P(EP) = Y(RPM)X7N+C$, where $P(EP)$ is the Probability of Each Person; Y is the Year in Question (in our case, 1974); RPM is Revolutions incited per Minute; N is the Number of persons in the sample; and C is a constant, the sum of the words per sentence in the first five pages of Toynbee's *A Study of History*.

The key word here, of course, is Revolution, for we are considering the annual record-breaking amount of New Year's Resolutions attempted by various sociological aggregates. These phenomena are sometimes referred to as Resolutions, but this is a misnomer, for obvious reasons. No one does any resolving; what we engage in is revolting. This excludes, of course, persons who protest employers' decisions to "crack down," by resorting to Counter-Revolution, and drugstore clerks, who react to the new wave of aspirin sales by inciting Over-Counter-Revolutions.

There are rumors that students of Highacres are also joining this trend towards self-improvement. When asked the organization's musical plans for the coming year, one HCC member replied, "Well, (of chorus), we will try to bar the measure proposing to take whole steps to tone a new musical scale, called the 'S scale.' We resolve to escalate our efforts, without half a rest." This notion has caused discord among even Well-Tempered musicians.

continued page seven