

Don't expect government to change

By PATRICK BRANNAN

The election of 1992 marked a change in public opinion. Many people were angry at the way politicians were behaving. A large number of incumbents were removed from Congress and Ross Perot ran for the presidency on a

platform calling for widespread reform throughout the federal government. Bill Clinton portrayed himself as more of an "outsider" than an "insider" during the election, but since then had shown that he was more of an "insider" all along. It now appears that many of the candidates

PP really devious

(Continued from Page 4)

someone is trying to establish morality by law. Then they get all their liberal comrades to rally to the cause.

If PP really managed to develop an effective curriculum, they would run themselves out of business. Here we have a piece of blatant corruption that can only be tolerated because of the political nature of the debate. What we have is a group of people who get a lot more than 30 pieces of silver, and use their contracts to further promote their own industry.

By telling children that sexuality is nothing to be taken seriously, simply to be "safe" (or "safer," they have now confessed), they knowingly and deliberately increase the demand for their contraceptives, and then further advance themselves by their abortuaries, which are bound for more business when the condoms prove that they are not safe at all.

What of AIDS, though? The tiny virus can get through condoms even if they do not break, according to numerous reports. And breakage is not uncommon. These are not facts that PP, which says it will provide "all the facts," apparently remembers. PP gets no money off these cases, but they are apparently not a concern. We have never cured a disease caused by a virus, and HIV mutates more quickly than most other viruses. Yet Planned Parenthood, under the guise of helping children, knowingly advances this disease, which will kill every victim.

Do I really think that the plan is this devious? Absolutely. PP is

a business, and a business with lots of political buttons it can press. Despite its abysmal failure rate on every angle, any interference is answered with the charge that the interfering party (often those horrible people we call parents, who might not want their children bombarded with this filth) doesn't care about the children.

Who makes the plans for this parenthood? Apparently PP does. They want to set up abortion counseling and condom handouts in public schools. What is parents object? What if they send specific instructions to the school to not provide such "services" to their children? Tough luck. Sanger's gang matters more than a child's parents do.

The defense for this is that the parents are acting out of ignorance and fear, so the enlightened "educators" must overrule them. The rebuttal to this is that PP has no love for the children, the parents do.

PP has quite a racket going, and is probably not a target for the allegedly liberal attack on special interest groups. If defense contractors were charged with assessing our military needs, there would be great public outcry (and it would be entirely just, too!). When companies are allowed to set their own standards, liberals say that this proves that business controls government.

Well, here's a business that's milking us, then using its contracts to line its own pockets. To call it blood money is probably too mild.

No wonder the group is often called "Planned Barrenhood."

Opinion

are abandoning their reform minded programs. But that is politics as usual for the United States.

Scandals and corruption are a running mate with government officials. In the past year or so we have heard about the House Bank scandal, sexual-harassment such as those charges filed against Senator Bob Packwood, the Iran-Contra affair, including pardons by President Bush at Christmas, just to name a few.

Waste runs rampant in the federal government, documented very well in *The Government Racket Washington Waste From A to Z*, a book by Martin L. Gross. A rising amount of federal jobs, civil service and appointees, add to the bureaucratic mess. Campaign promises that fall by the side of the road once the candidate is in office. All of this have become a part of life for us and

there is no hope that any of this will change in the near future.

Many of the newly elected Representatives and Senators, along with President Clinton, may have promised change, but as we all know campaign promises are regularly broken. They might have their hearts in the right place, but now as they enter office they're backing down. Many of the incoming representatives found pressure from the incumbents when they called for House reform as they campaigned for seats on many of the committees.

Although women's groups were angry over Anita Hill's treatment in the Clarence Thomas hearings, none of the four new female senators stepped forward to join the Senate Ethics Committee. That committee will be hearing the sexual-harassment charges of Sen. Bob Packwood in the near future. If the first few days of the 103rd Congress show how they're going to act throughout the session, we're in for another year of the same stuff.

Clinton talked about change throughout his campaign, but it looks as though it's going to be hard to accomplish. Clinton complained about special interest groups and lobbyists, yet some of his cabinet appointees are being helped by lobbyists for their confirmation hearings. Also, his pledge to cut the deficit is under fire as new figures emerge showing how high the deficit and debt continue to rise. Many of his campaign promises are falling by the side of the road as his bus rolls on into Washington. This is not unusual; need we forget George Bush and his "read my lips, no new taxes" promise. So do not expect drastic changes and reform any time soon.

All of the talk about reform is fine and good during the campaign. The real test comes when the person is in office. The need for reform is there; the call for reform is there; those that want reform are a minority in the government and until they are a majority, it's politics as usual in Washington.

Elvis left his stamp on music

(Continued from Page 4)

black music — just as white America was getting ready to listen. He was a young man acting like a rebel — just as young America was getting ready to revolt.

Of course that image has been changed, some would say twisted, by the post-mortem analyses of the drugged-out, hippie-hating, Nixon-praising Las Vegas monstrosity that he became. He built

hollow walls so he and his good buddies could spy on other buddies' bedroom activities. He developed an obsession with plain white panties. He died a soggy, sodden mass of misery.

But we choose to commemorate the younger Elvis, the one who could sing so tenderly or rock so harshly. The one who gave Cadillacs away to poor fans. The one who went off to do his duty for his country. The one who talked so lovingly about his

momma. Somehow a vestige of Elvis' innocence and plain country boy upbringing pokes through all the tarnish and corrosion. We commemorate that guy who sang bad songs and danced bad dances and made us all feel pretty damn good.

Elvis couldn't write music and he couldn't stand up to the intense pressures of idolization, but he survives as a young man who loved to rock. And he rocks with the best of them.

Letters to the editor policy

The Decree accepts only signed letters to the editors. Unsigned letters will not be printed. Letters need to be placed in the campus post office and marked "Decree" or placed in the Decree office in the Spruill building. Letters must be received by Friday of the week prior to the next issue in order to be printed in that issue. The Decree reserves the right to edit or reject letters for grammar, libel, or good taste.

