

Kwame's Corner

Can the Democrats Win in '92?

ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE

“YES”

KWAME MANLEY
columnist

There has been much talk around the country that incumbent President George Bush will undoubtedly remain in office for a second term. Some polls have even shown Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton, the labeled “most electable Democrat,” too far behind Bush to be a real challenger. Yet, despite a couple of polls or the assumptions of a few Americans, the Democrats have an excellent chance of winning the presidency in 1992.

As our country's problems continue to worsen, the Democrats have an opportunity both to address the issues and to emphasize the failures of the current administration. The Democrats are asking Americans, “Exactly what did the Bush Administration accomplish during the last four years?” Americans see that the overglorified Gulf War accomplished little. Our enemy, Saddam Hussein, is still in power, while millions of Kurdish refugees continue to fight for democracy.

Democrats are also questioning the poor economic situation in America. If Bush is doing so much about the recession, why are thousands of responsible, hard-working citizens still joining the 6.5 million unemployed in this country? Why are small businesses and large corporations alike being forced to lay off employees left and right? And why is the Republican leader not taking the Economic Recovery Plans proposed by the Democrats seriously?

In addition to our devastated economy, Americans have seen the social system deteriorate. Crime rates around the country have risen tremendously. Bush has not presented a feasible plan to suppress this epidemic. His so-called “War on Drugs” has done little to eradicate the drug problem in our country. And the “education president” has also failed to improve our educational system, although he promised to do so. We still lag far behind competitors in education.

Americans are realizing the failures of our present leader. We're tired of suffering. We're sick of worsening conditions. And we're fed up with broken promises.

This discontent was reflected in the New Hampshire primaries. The majority of these voters, according to an ABC News Poll, blamed the worsening of our country's problems on Bush. An unbelievable 47% of Republicans rejected their own party leader and either voted for Pat Buchanan or wrote in one of the Democratic candidates. Many of those Republicans said they would not vote for George Bush if he were nominated by the party.

The Democrats must continue to make the American people aware of Bush's failures and present real solutions to our country's problems. With this strategy and Bush's decreasing approval rating, the Democrats have an excellent chance of winning in November.

“NO”

JENNIFER TROUBLEFIELD
staff writer

With the presidential election of 1992 quickly approaching, our possible choices for a new, or the same old, leader of our country are becoming more and more visible. Although it is extremely difficult to be able to forecast the outcome of something as unpredictable as a presidential election, many facts enable us to eliminate extraneous possibilities. Therefore, I feel the Democrats cannot win the presidential election this November.

The Democrats are not able to win because of their weak campaign platform. Due to the fact that the United States is having domestic problems, such as the economic crisis, there appears to be an obvious strike against President Bush. As could be expected, the Democratic candidates are making the public aware of the obvious problems, but they fail to offer a solution to them. Unless one of the candidates can provide jobs for the unemployed or balance the budget, the attacks are worthless.

Although George Bush has done little in many areas, his ability to handle foreign affairs efficiently allows him to maintain a strong public appearance. In “hard times” most people are not willing to try something new unless there is an absolute guarantee of some type of personal benefit. To the people of our country, the Democratic candidates seem to be just ordinary people who have enough money and/or popularity to run for president.

Under the Republican party, George Bush has fought for peace, reform, and long-lasting democracy, which is the “American dream.” In his term, we have seen the Berlin Wall crumble, Germany unify, Kuwait become liberated as a result of the Persian Gulf War, and Russia's strong communist system separate into capitalist countries. At one time, these ideas were inconceivable for all, but now they are a life-long dream come true. For this reason, along with the fact that it has been 16 years since a Democrat has held the presidential seat, the public is not willing to elect any other than George Bush.

Since many of us are 18 or approaching that age, it is important that we become involved citizens. Know that it is OK to complain, but only if you are going to make yourself part of the solution. Politics is risky business and we as the public must be able to see through the propaganda techniques and find the reality of the candidates. This makes elections not just another conversational topic, but a way for us to independently make a difference.

Education & Freedom

JOSH LEVY
staff writer

Over the last few weeks, I have experienced firsthand a phenomenon which we all probably have (or will) experience during our “education” here at NCSSM—some sort of punitive action dealt out by a member of the Residential Life staff for violations absurdly minor compared with their subsequent punishments.

Before I continue, I would like it to be noted that this is in no way another example of the whining student valiantly defending the liberty of the free world by taking on the RAs—rather, the intent is actually antithetical to that farce. While the actions taken by the staff are very minor, the effects are somewhat more important on the scale of the entire educational system. But first the numbers.

During the last three weeks, three students were given levels for talking in the back staircase of their dorm, two students were given levels for leaving a mess in the lounge (and subsequently required to do *all* housekeeping the next night), a student was warned of a level two for climbing a tree, a student was given a warning for having unescorted guests on campus, and a student was given a level for missing check while sitting in his room during check. These were *only* the incidents I personally witnessed, and I am sure numerous similar incidents were reported.

The actual incidents which I noticed (and in some cases experienced) were disproportionately high considering the time period of only a few weeks. I would like to give the benefit of the doubt to the administrators and continue to believe that this type of activity is minimal.

However, before one jumps to the conclusion that the Residential Life staff is being unjustly vindictive, it is necessary to consider the motives behind the system enforced by the staff. The rules set up by SGA, Parent's Council, and RAs were set in place first and foremost with the interests of the parents and the legal protection of the school in mind. Immedi-

ately an obvious contradiction is detected in that the most important component of the system is left out—the student.

This contradiction gives light to a larger question which obviously needs to be addressed—the objective of education in general and the thought process. It appears to me that this school finds itself in an interesting paradox regarding this subject. It claims to take the best students from the state, students hungry for learning and not just knowledge, and actually places them in a sheltered system. Students find themselves caught in the conflict between intellectual freedom and the apparent lack of personal freedom. The goals of true education *cannot* be achieved under these conditions.

There appears to be only one solution to the paradox—to set up a system that makes true education its objective. Under such a system, students who truly desire to learn, and were truly prepared to live on their own, would be responsible to keep an acceptable standard of personal freedom. No one would force any parents to send their innocent 16-year olds to such a liberal institution. Only those willing to face reality for the sake of quality education would be considered. After all, in many parts of the world, a 16-year old often is independent, heads a family, and in many cases is even willing to give his life for the freedom of people. Surely we can offer our students something worthy of their capabilities.

For those skeptical of the success of such a system, I wholeheartedly agree with your skepticism. Once again, we discover that the true basis of today's education is money. We must remember that our fine institution is supported by the taxpayers of North Carolina, and is therefore subject to the whims of society's “morals” and pocketbooks. Perhaps, then, it is necessary to re-evaluate even the basis of our country's morals and standards of society. All the while that our country portrays a homogeneous moral world, we are falling further and further behind in education—the last bastion of free minds and true thinking.

