

MAKE UP YOUR MIND

Powell should not run for president if he can't identify with either party

Colin Powell is no good for the Republican Party, and he has no business running for president. Ultimately, Powell would crucify the Republican Party.

If he runs as an independent, he takes votes away from the GOP, and Clinton wins.

If he runs as a Republican, he takes the party away from those who have begun changing America.

First of all, he is not a Republican. He said that he would not run for president with the Democratic Party because they already have a candidate (if that is what you would call Clinton) and because the Republican Party is the party of the future.

Great philosophical reasoning, General. You like the Republicans because the Democratic Party would be hard to break into with an incumbent, and they aren't as popular or trendy right now.

People like Paul Simon and Mario Cuomo say that Powell is a Democrat, and (I don't believe I am saying this) I believe them. Many Americans these days are calling Colin Powell a Rockefeller Republican.

I hate to get picky, but there's no such thing. The Rockefeller used to be Republicans before Barry Goldwater came onto the scene and took the party from them in 1964. Today, Jay Rockefeller serves in Congress as a Democrat.

Therefore, loosely translated, saying "Colin Powell is a Rockefeller Republican," is equivalent to saying, "Colin Powell is a Democrat." So why run in the Republican Party? Oh yeah, that's where the future is.

Many love Powell because he isn't a confirmed Republican. They love him because he is a "centrist."

I refer to it as being an "indecisivist." Isn't it bad enough that he can't figure out what party he likes more?

In 1992 people were already tossing Powell around as a possible presidential contender, and USA Weekend did an article on him.

His children said he was uncomfortable with the Republican party socially, but he agreed



LYDIA PERCIVAL
COLUMNIST

with the GOP on issues of defense. Reinforcing that, he has said lately that he likes the Republicans economically but is uncomfortable with their stance on social issues like abortion and gun control. Candidly, he said he did not fit comfortably in either party.

Being indecisive on whether you are a Republican or a Democrat is an interesting predicament for someone considering running for president on the Republican ticket.

My philosophy on "centrism" is that if you sit on the fence long enough, your rear will get sore. Powell has already semi-learned that lesson. A few weeks ago he said he wasn't comfortable with The Contract With America. He said it was too hard and too harsh, and he called conservatives "Neanderthals."

I don't think that helped him in the polls much, and after numerous alleged calls to conservatives like William Bennett asking how to come across more conservatively, Powell came out complimenting Gingrich and praising change.

Does this sound like any present politician you know of? It sounds a wee bit like a saxophone playing, french-fry eating guy we currently call "Mr. President."

A competition between Clinton and Powell would certainly be interesting.

We could see who could waffle more during the campaign. Many get angry when people criticize Colin Powell. They tell you that America needs his decisive leadership.

What decisive leadership? I remember hearing that Powell had to be talked into the Gulf War. He wanted to try economic sanctions for a year.

Many will retort that he was a great leader during the Gulf War. But he was basically a communications director, a messenger between President Bush and General Schwarzkopf.

Granted, he was the most important liaison of the Reagan-Bush years, but he was not the general leading the troops in battle. If you are a voter looking for another Eisenhower, go find "Stormin' Norman."

What else makes people think Powell is a decisive leader? He thought the O.J. Simpson trial was a tribute to our justice system. He makes great statements like "We must reform welfare." Ooooh! How exactly does he propose that we do that?

He hasn't said. He makes more statements like "We must heal race relations." Another brilliant observation, but how? In this sense, I reminds me of another 1992 presidential candidate. This one had big ears and said things like "Larry, you have to get under the hood and fix it."

Really helpful. At least Perot suggested the hood as a place to start. Powell has yet to do that much. I do not understand Powell-mania.

He hasn't done anything but write a book and ponder running for president for the past two years. Does it really take that long? We are only one year, one week and one day away from election day 1996. I wonder if he will have decided by then whether or not to run.

Powell has much to offer as a role model because many people admire him. If he runs for president in this modern era of politics, he stands to lose his role model status for nothing. Powell seems to be on the verge of running for president not because something deep within him believes in a philosophy that can help America, but because something deep within him wants to be president.

The last thing America needs is a man committed to no political principles, willing to do or say whatever the polls say he must, in order to be elected. No thanks, General, if that's the candidate America is looking for, we can just re-elect Clinton.

Lydia Percival is a senior journalism and political science major



STEWART
SQUEZADA
THE BATTALION '95

THE BATTALION

Established in 1893

Editorial Board

Rob Clark

Editor in Chief

Sterling Hayman

Managing Editor

Kyle Littlefield

Opinion Editor

Elizabeth Preston

Assistant Opinion Editor

Editorials appearing in The Battalion reflect the views of the editorial board. They do not necessarily reflect the opinions of other Battalion staff members, the Texas A&M student body, regents, administration, faculty or staff. Columns, guest columns, cartoons and letters express the opinions of the authors. Contact the opinion editor for information on submitting guest columns.

EDITORIAL

DO SOMETHING

The decision-making bodies of Texas A&M should start to focus on action.

Texas A&M student leaders and administrators have perfected one thing this semester — talking. Unfortunately, that's all that seems to be happening.

Forums, round table discussions and coffees have served as sounding boards for concerned students to express their opinions about multiculturalism, the general use fee and many other issues. Administrators have sought student input admirably before making important decisions.

However, far too often, these student groups and administrators focus too much on rhetoric and not enough on action.

When discussion is not developed into action, the University becomes mired in a bog of inaction.

The multiculturalism proposal, first introduced in 1993, has neither been approved nor rejected.

Two years of debate are essentially two years of inaction. The problem of on-

campus housing shortages looms on the horizon and only now is the University confronting it.

Countless important decisions approach, and the delays displayed by campus leaders in the name of informed policy-making does not bode well for the future.

This University is at a crossroads. The campus is facing real problems with increasing popularity and limited resources. Talking can only go so far; action is the only way to solve the many problems A&M faces.

Ample opportunities exist for students to voice their opinions, and these opportunities are welcome.

But what the campus needs now is definitive action. Administrators and students who are elected and appointed to act in the interest of the University should do so.

The forums and the chat sessions are nice but it's time to put the money where the mouth is. Do something.

Aggieland not representative of A&M

A&M yearbook contains issues that have no place in a keepsake item

Really, I shouldn't be too surprised.

I've been at Texas A&M for the lion's share of the 1990s and I've seen a lot of things not go the ole army way.

Flipping through the 1995 Aggieland last week I felt the way I have when the Aggie football team loses, the Faculty Senate passes any resolution or I read my yearly degree audit.

Many times in my five to six years at A&M, I have felt helplessness as little fringe issues have risen on campus into tarnishing and malicious images of our campus and student body.

Even now, when I get a whole half of a page per week to vent my frustrations, I feel like there are people who attend an entirely separate Texas A&M than the one I do.

Among those people I find the Aggieland staff and contributors.

I can picture it now, I'll be seventy-eight years old, my mind stricken by Alzheimer's disease and bitter to the bone.

I'll walk to bookshelf and pull out the 1995 Aggieland to recall fond memories of my time in school.

Being senile, I won't remember that I wasn't a racist, alcoholic or gay-basher, and so I'll close the book having one more thing to be bitter about.

The new Aggieland speaks to students who don't know or understand the unity here.

Of course, what I am referring to is the opening pages of last year's Aggieland. It does not lie; The problems do occur. It does not conceal the truth: It will be read. More importantly, though, it does not accurately represent Texas A&M.

Texas A&M is not attended exclusively by hate-mongers, homophobes and continuously drunken idiots.

A proportion of the brightest minds in the nation attend school here. Throughout most of the school year, the students are in



ALEX MILLER
COLUMNIST

accord with each other.

Our strength as a group is something many have long admired about Texas A&M, and it is not something we can dismiss on a whim.

The Aggieland staff may not have meant any harm, but like it or not, those premiere pages of the Aggieland will serve to define us all.

In the reader's glorious ignorance these the pages will introduce them inaccurately to this University.

Diana Hodges, Aggieland Editor, mentioned in the Bryan-College Station Eagle that in the 1940s and 1950s, pictures of students in white robes (presumably expressing the racist sentiments of the Ku Klux Klan) were shown in the Aggieland.

Also, pictures of the first women attendees at Texas A&M were placed in the shape of a question mark in the back of that year's Aggieland.

In the article Hodges said, "It's about time the yearbook had something more than propaganda."

My question to Hodges is, does the Aggieland staff not wish to hold itself to a higher standard?

Those examples of the past were obviously wrong, but they are no more 'propaganda' than the pages which taint this year's edition.

Most likely it is our fault as a student body to allow such a narrow group of individuals to represent us in what will ultimately be such a lasting publication of the

way things were.

The Aggieland has done such a fine job in the past that we all assumed it would continue the tradition.

I strongly urge those of you who are dismayed at the outcome of this yearbook to get involved.

Apply to work at the Aggieland. If it wasn't for the sad fact that I am finally graduating this year, I might do the same.

Ultimately, you must take the Aggieland as a characterization of yourself, being a Texas Aggie.

It speaks to those who don't know of the unity at A&M.

Those who don't understand what it means to wear an Aggie Ring and be a part of something larger than themselves.

To those of you who are pleased with the attention your causes have received through the Aggieland, I do not wish to censor you.

In addition, I may not even disagree with you, but

those issues do not portray an accurate or responsible picture of the integrity of this world class University, and they certainly do not deserve the marquis pages of our memories.

This Aggieland will not find its home among the memorabilia I claim from my time at Texas A&M.

I'll be drinking the proceeds of my yearbook refund at the Dixie Chicken, and yes, I will share with my minority and homosexual friends.

Alex Miller is a senior bioenvironmental science major

