

Ticket fails to connect with beliefs

Democratic ticket proves to be inconsistent with the ideology of the majority of American people.

Look at the clutter distorting this year's election. It comes from all kinds of sources: the Democratic party, the media, Michael Moore, George Soros, MoveOn.org and the myriad of 527s that have recently materialized. Because of these groups, this election has



Scott Hurff

OLD GOLD & BLACK COLUMNIST

become cluttered with trivia meant to detract from the facts and the true issues at hand. If we're not careful, we will become distracted by this false bravado and make the wrong decision for this country.

Here is what is at stake in 2004: the false pairing between the Kerry-Edwards ticket and the values of mainstream America. In terms of issues, the facts become clear.

Seventy-eight percent of Americans believe that children should be allowed to pray in school. The Kerry-Edwards ticket disagrees.

Seventy-three percent of Americans believe that U.S. interests overshadow that of international organizations. The Kerry-Edwards ticket disagrees.

Eighty-seven percent of Americans believe that there should be a work requirement for welfare eligibility. The Kerry-Edwards ticket disagrees.

Seventy-two percent of Americans believe that government should assist faith-based initiatives, which in turn are more effective in helping the poor. The Kerry-Edwards ticket disagrees.

How, then, is the Kerry-Edwards ticket "right for America?"

These four issues extend further into the big picture. The majority of Americans - 77 percent - identify most strongly with center-right values. Seventeen percent identify with the values set forth by the Kerry-Edwards ticket.

Why, then, is this election so close? The answer is obvious: we're being distracted. We're being misled - not by the president as MoveOn.org would have one believe - but by the Kerry-Edwards coalition itself.

America requires security to continue thriving as a world superpower. How then, can one trust a man that is a declared "internationalist" asserts that a "global test" must be passed before we take any action? If one would take time to inspect his voting record, Kerry voted to cut the FBI, cut the intelligence budget and opposed efforts to instate a terrorist death penalty.

Here is a noticeable and stunning disconnect between mainstream America and Kerry-Edwards. This ticket's current position is that no judge should be confirmed for the Supreme Court if that individual were to be guided by any sort of Judeo-Christian values. This issue will have quite a significant impact on this country if we make the wrong decision in November. If elected, the Kerry-Edwards ticket will fail to nominate those judges that are concerned with core American values.

We cannot let our country crumble. We cannot allow the pillars - the values of the Constitution and our Bill of Rights - to collapse under the weight of a blind liberalism. Remember this as you cast your absentee ballots.

Sources for this column include the Pew Research Center, the Gallup Poll and Public Opinion Strategies.

Scott Hurff is a junior business major.

Kerry is the clear victor in debate

Though major networks abstain from taking sides, Kerry won debate.

Often hear that the media has a liberal bias. Though journalists are well educated and informed and having a broad world-view does tend to lead to liberalism, for the most part I believe that news

McKenzie Clark

GUEST COLUMNIST

people do their best to be impartial when reporting the news.

Bias or not, I was disappointed after the Sept. 30 debate when the media would not declare John Kerry the winner.

I couldn't understand it, were they blind?

It wasn't just Fox News, but then again, their candidate had done so poorly, it was probably better that they just went off and hid in a corner.

But where was CNN or NBC? Kerry nailed Bush, and it was about time.

Kerry was everything Bush was not: articulate, focused and informed. In a word - presidential.

Kerry quickly shut down the Bush campaign's accusations of flip-flopping, coming out strong by articulating his consistent position on the war.

Kerry even successfully attacked Bush on the way the war has been handled.

He accused Bush of failure at coalition building, saying that the United States has borne the burden of "90 percent of the casualties and 90 percent of the cost."

In response to this, the president cried out, "You forgot Poland!"

Though Kerry at one point did fail at one point to mention Poland as a member of the "coalition of the willing," the fact that Poland is one of the top four members of the coalition, while only providing 2,400 troops to the effort, does not negate Kerry's point of the United States

Kerry showed a greater command of the Iraq situation than the president and offered new solutions to the problems. The only defense Bush could come up with was to say that Kerry's questioning of his abilities and approach in Iraq was undermining troop morale and international relations.

dominating the effort.

While Kerry looked calm and collected, calmly writing notes in response to Bush's comments, Bush looked confused.

His squinty brow betrayed discomfort and anger as Kerry nailed point after point.

Bush looked like a petulant child, not the sort of person I want with control of the world's largest nuclear arsenal.

Another classic moment was when Bush stared out at the camera for about 10 second, at a loss for words.

This may have been a good strategy on Bush's part; however,

his words often do get him in trouble, and articulation was another area where Kerry proved to be superior.

While Bush stumbled and stuttered when speaking, Kerry smoothly used words that contained more than three syllables.

Kerry showed a greater command of the Iraq situation than the president and offered new solutions to the problems.

The only defense Bush could come up with was to say that Kerry's questioning of his abilities and approach in Iraq was undermining troop morale and international relations.

I would think, though, that the troops would be happier having the problems in Iraq dealt with than never mentioned, and after the Bush Administration, our international support can only go up.

I can only hope that Kerry continues to do a good job in the debates by showing consistent contrast with the president in both style and substance.

If he does this, I have no doubt that Kerry will convince even more Americans he is the better candidate and easily win the White House.

McKenzie Clark is a sophomore.



Warfare must be used only out of absolute necessity

War is a devastating drain on society, not a political strategy.

The purpose of waging war is so that we may live in peace. Our lives do not derive meaning from bloodshed and conflict, but rather from achieving our goals and

peaceful coexistence is not possible.

One case is when another party brings war to us, such as at Pearl Harbor.

In the face of a belligerent enemy, peace is not an option.

A second case is when another party makes life intolerable, such as the Revolutionary War.

When we are reduced to servitude to unchosen masters, it is better to die as free men than to live as slaves.

War is rarely justified, and it is often less wise. The costs of war are horrific.

Billions of dollars of goods that would have been used for productive purposes are instead used to make implements of death.

Capital, that marvelous thing that raises our wages and standard of living, is burned in

the conflagration.

Most tragically of all, the cost of war is measured in human lives, including innocent civilians.

Unfortunately, mainstream politicians do not treat the choice of going to war as the weighty decision it is.

Rather than resorting to violence only for the noblest purposes, they have sanctioned the use of force wherever "American interests" may benefit.

Worse still, both major parties now support the doctrine of preemptive war, ensuring that peace will exist only as a temporary and fragile thing in this millennium.

Although the position of our leaders is deplorable, it is not surprising. War is the health of the state. With a fearful

Unfortunately, mainstream politicians do not treat the choice of going to war as the weighty decision it is. Rather than resorting to violence only for the noblest purposes, they have sanctioned the use of force wherever "American interests" may benefit.

electorate, politicians are able to roll back pesky economic and civil liberties that limit their power.

In times of crisis, the federal government metastasizes and never returns to its pre-crisis size.

Also, war lets politicians play the hero; history classes regard

wartime monsters as some of America's greatest presidents.

The War on Terror continues an unbroken chain of American aggression dating back a century.

As an open-ended war on an abstract concept, it is a license for perpetual conflict. Any political opponent of the United States may be branded a "terrorist regime."

We have long ago lost sight of the true terrorist: Osama bin Laden.

We have also lost sight of the end goal of peace.

As the major party debates continue, the voice of peace is silenced.

What we don't hear is libertarian nominee Michael Badnarik promising to withdraw American troops from the 150 countries where they are

stationed around the globe.

Badnarik is also calling on the United States to stop the intervention in local governments that has made America the target of terrorist groups.

While libertarians would fight to the last human being defending our nation, they would not spill a drop of blood nor spend a single dollar on unprovoked aggression.

When the mainstream has abandoned lovers of peace, lovers of peace should abandon the mainstream.

When the major parties offer us a choice between war and more war, we should choose neither. We should choose libertarian.

Jacob Lyles is a senior mathematics and economics major.



Jacob Lyles

OLD GOLD & BLACK COLUMNIST

advancing the human race. War is only justified when