

Democrats using wrong comparisons

By KEN LEONARD

Why don't we hear the comparisons?

Last year, an unpopular former governor of Pennsylvania gave up a 30-point lead and lost to Harris Wofford in a Senate election. Former Attorney General Richard Thornburgh handled his campaign about as badly as a human being could, forcing half of his campaign staff to resign in frustration. But the press and many liberals said that the campaign was an indicator for the Presi-

Novels differ in world view

(Continued from Page 2)

dragon friend. Fenna doesn't want sexuality to enter Maggie's life, but Maggie realizes that she must now leave Fenna behind because she wants to become a woman.

None of these women know how to ask the other for help, so each suffers and pretends.

Maitland does bring the three together one night when Rachel and Phoebe both suddenly decide they need each other and are making their ways through the darkened house to find the other. At that moment, Maggie breaks from Fenna and he throws her through the skylight in her room. The resulting explosion creates an atmosphere in which the women can admit that they love and need each other. They don't say it, but they admit it.

But Maitland's book is no fantasy in which the sham, the tumor, the fears go away. Rachel publishes her paper; Phoebe prepares for surgery; Maggie searches for a friend her own age. This is a book about finding your own way, and only part of that way can be someone else's. Maitland suggests that late 20th century western culture is an amalgam of need and desire, of fantasy and science, of affection and indifference.

Fiction is art, not life, but we read novels in order to find a way of living our lives. This search is the function of art. Stableford's novel is a cheap way out; he implies that evil can be both explained and turned into good without much harm. Maitland's three women, on the other hand, portray an intense need for communion as a way of fighting off the evil.

And in that communion we can find our meaning.

dential race, and they thought it meant that President Bush was in serious danger of losing the election.

What about Great Britain? Prime Minister John Major called for elections, and won a solid majority for the Conservative Party in Parliament. The election was close, but his party held on to the majority that ruled the 1980's. Great Britain is historically a pretty good indicator of how the U.S. will go.

The two standout leaders of the 80's, British PM Margaret Thatcher and President Ronald Reagan, were elected at almost the same time, with Thatcher's Conservative Party taking the majority first. In their decade, they crushed the Left worldwide.

Which party do you think used the following campaign plan? They promised to raise taxes on the top ten percent income brackets in order to pay more government money for health care. If you said the Labour Party, you're right. They promised to redistrib-

Opinion

ute wealth more than they already do by further expanding the socialist system that Thatcher and Major have been hard at work dismantling. They also said that socialism is not just an economic plan, it is a value system.

The British people rejected those values.

John Major is not the most popular Prime Minister they have ever had in Britain by any means. In most surveys, he scores lower than Margaret Thatcher did toward the end of her career. Certainly, he wasn't elected because he was able to motivate people to get excited about his own ability.

Even if the major media don't mention it much, we can be sure that the White House is relieved at this result. Such an election — in which the people decisively rejected socialism's values — bodes well for the Republican

Party, which encourages individual initiative rather than socialism.

I pity the Democrats. Not only do they have two of the dregs of U.S. politics to nominate, they now see that socialism is not nearly as popular as they thought. Labour's Neil Kinnock pandered to the middle class about as much as humanly possible, and promised to punish the rich to the full extent of his ability. But he lost.

Many Republicans aren't thrilled with George Bush. Many people who don't claim a party are not thrilled with President Bush. But socialism, as we have seen, is disliked, and both Democratic candidates (if you credit Jerry Brown as still being one) promise a good deal of expansion in the socialist program.

Perhaps it's time they gave up the doctrine that has lost Neil Kinnock so many elections. It didn't work for Walter Mondale or Michael Dukakis (remember them?), and yet the Democrats try to make up more socialist

programs to give us. I think that it's about time to change the symbol of the Democrats from a donkey to a mule.

Nothing else can properly demonstrate the stubborn tenacity with which they stick to a failed idea. Socialism was defeated in the USSR, Nicaragua, and most of Eastern Europe. The Socialist Party in France is in danger of losing control. The Socialists in Israel are afraid of the upcoming elections. Maybe the Democrats should wake up and join the rest of the world. People like to consider their own property their own, not the government's.

Perhaps the media doesn't want to admit that their liberal model of the world is false. It's more pleasant for them to imagine that Harris Wofford is a good forecast of the nation at large. But the election in Britain has more to do with the ideology than did the race in Pennsylvania.

Expect a bleak year for socialism. That's the comparison.

Insider graduates with a challenge

(Continued from Page 2)

Item one — Resident Directors. A bit of advice to Steve, "Don't fall into the Wesleyan trap. Be who you are. For there are persuading forces amidst Student Life who through propaganda will turn you into what you are not, an enemy." Insider wants to save you from this trap.

Current R.D.'s on the south end of campus have been done a grave injustice. They have been mistaken for people who actually can handle a responsible job. Grow up, you two. Transferring of messages is absurd; beavers aren't supposed to talk. Act like the role model you're supposed to be.

Maybe Student Life was thinking of their pocketbooks when they hired people so young, who would work for cheaper wages but are less competent. Hello, McFly! Hello! Think about our future and not your bank accounts. Where the student comes first, phooey! You guys are out for personal gain at the expense of the students. We don't want you.

Item two — South Hall. Why even bother? If you stick a bunch of students together who want to party, they're going to. Stick them

in the dorms with upperclassmen who are positive influences. *Wake up!* Abolish South Hall as a freshman dorm. We are losing a lot of good students.

Item three — Did you know that it's a federal offense to read other people's mail? You could lose your job for that. Even if you ran the bookstore or were the Dean of Academics, you would lose your job. Who do you think you are — Insider knows who you are. Kinda scary, huh?

Item four — If freshmen can play sports, why can't they rush a frat? My bet is it would increase retention. Get them involved and they will stay. I thought that's what you wanted.

Item five — Course offerings. Are the courses scheduled to suit the students or the faculty? For example, Political Science (JPP). Why is it even in the catalog as a major if you cannot take the required courses to graduate in four years because of lack of course offerings? Does adjunct or full-time professor mean anything to you?

Item six — Changes on campus. Sure, we have pretty message boards and scenery. That's all fine and dandy, but what about the real needs? Go ahead and raise tuition to get cable in all the

rooms; where is the money to buy resources for our library? Are we here to watch television or study? Priorities.

Item seven — Life at Wesleyan. For the past two years Insider has provided you with student concerns and you have struggled to find out my identity so you might hang me from Cye's tree (if you know where that is). What have you done besides give the campus a facelift and have us pay for it?

Granted, Mr. Sparks has done one hell of a job with this campus. Insider overheard one professor talking about a lack of Wesleyan community. Well, he's exactly right. There is none. Nobody that I can think of is proud of this school. It is totally beyond me why you people will not get off your butts and do something about it? I can't understand it. *Is* this a haven for rejects? I would hope not, for the Insider resides at this institution and Insider is no reject. Wesleyan ... the land of individuals. I beg of you to correct this matter.

So there it is, the final Insider article. I have given my all to help the students in their fight for academic and personal freedom. What have I accomplished? Basically nothing. Maybe I pissed a

few people off, but that's about it. Kinda sad when you think about it. Take off your blinders and see Wesleyan for what it is, a money pit of acquaintances and inadequacies.

Remember when Old Yeller died? Everybody cried. I now weep for the future of this college! Life is like bungi jump — throw your butt off the bridge and see what happens. You either bounce back to jump again or you impale yourself on the jagged rocks below.

It's like my grandmother told me when I was younger — change is good, it makes life blossom; if you don't want your finger bit, don't poke it at a possum. Granny was about 99 when she told me that. In a weird way, it makes sense, but then again, it doesn't mean a thing. It's all in how you look at it.

Final words. When the train comes in, Wesleyan never rides. Who did put the bop in the bop shoo bop shoo bop? Insider put the ram in the ramma lamma ding dong. The sphinx has a power which can never be broken.

May the Schwartz be with you. So as Insider rides off into the sunset with his six pack and a box of stogies, remember that we don't got the right one, baby!