

Where, oh where, has my Liddy Dole gone?

Marginalized candidate can still beat George W. Bush if she capitalizes on her talents



BEVERLY MIRELES

Lizabeth Dole is now the Republican's equivalent of a party favor and has been dismissed as such.

Thanks to George Bush's relentless fundraising and constant media hype, Dole's numbers have dropped from 15 to 7 percent.

She has consistently beaten Al Gore in partisan polls, but in the GOP straw polls, she cannot seem to get past the emroller that is Bush.

Her pursuit of the nomination is now dependent on the hope that Bush will make a misstep.

That most Republicans think of her as the obvious No. 2 in a Bush-Dole ticket is severely diminished the role she wants to play.

Poor Liddy Dole. Has she gotten pushed aside or what? Moldy bread gets more attention than this woman does.

Like many professional women, Dole has been confronted with the secret maxims of gender politics — a qualified woman can win the nomination, but only if there is not a man available to fill the post.

She is quickly learning that being the most accepted female candidate does not mean being the victorious candidate.

Breeding has trained her to grin and bear this hard truth, Southern belle-style. However, if she continues to act in such a reserved way, she'll be grinning and bearing it all the way back to the Waggoner Apartments.

Her only chance now is to get out there and show a thing or two to prove gender should not be the only calling card of her candidacy.

There are three main factors in the race for the nomination — money, temperament

and experience. Dole needs to reaffirm her positions on these three things in order to weaken Bush's stranglehold on the lead.

• **Money:** It is the necessary evil of every candidate.

Dole has raised about \$3.6 million, not a bad figure. However, Bush has at least \$37 million bankrolled.

In order to use her obvious monetary disadvantage against Bush, she could campaign against "buying" the presidency.

Americans, though thoroughly jaded when it comes to money in politics, would resent the thought that Bush, who has over 10 times what the other Republican candidates have, deserves the presidency.

And the public should resent this.

"Moldy bread gets more attention than this woman does."

Bush may be the poster boy for big money, but he certainly isn't the image of strong leadership.

Dole can remind them of this.

• **Temperament:** Dole needs to drop the "preparedness is second to godliness" act.

Spontaneity may not be her strongest point, but by allowing the robotic image she has gained to take hold, she's harming her candidacy.

Being thoughtful does not have to get in the way of Dole's image.

People want prepared presidents but not timid ones.

Unfortunately for Dole, the need for intense preparation can be misconstrued as the inability to make important decisions.

If she can shake the automaton image, then she definitely is on her way to showcasing her experience.

• **Experience:** This is Dole's true ace — she is more qualified than Bush and Sen. John McCain.

After serving as president to the Red Cross and holding two cabinet posts, her record tops both McCain and Bush in public service.

As Red Cross president, she had to make informed decisions at a fairly quick pace. Bush's governorship can hardly boast the same experience. Texas governors are typically weak.

She desperately needs to show she is the most qualified for the nomination. Those veiled barbs of hers will not do the trick.

They will only remind voters of the "Little Miss Perfect" moniker that *New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd has already saddled Dole with.

Liddy Dole has the chance to win the Republican nomination for president, if she has the good sense to use her advantages.

If Dole sticks to the issues and reinforces the notion that the other Republicans running do not have a strong issue to stand on, she has a good chance to make a jump in the polls.

For the Republicans who haven't caught Bush fever, she might be exactly what the ticket calls for.

For those who already have bought into Bush lock, stock and barrel, Dole is patient.

She will be waiting and ready for when he stumbles.

Beverly Mireles is a junior microbiology major.



JEFF SMITH/THE BATTALION

Wealthy nations must consider welfare of less affluent countries

EAST LANSING, Mich. (UPI) — According to a recent report by the United Nations Development Program, the increasing globalization of world economies is widening the economic disparity between the world's most developed and least developed nations.

The report warns the increasing inequality of wealth between nations is rapidly bringing about a "dangerous polarization" of rich and poor nations and questions global economic practices that seem to value profits more than people.

The essential argument seems to be that with the growing globalization of national economies, any nation that is not sufficiently developed, economically or politically to compete in the newly important global market will be either excluded from or exploited by that market.

So, any developing country that can contribute to global production or is politically able and economically promising enough to merit foreign investment has a good chance to participate in the global market.

Any that cannot or are not, which happens to be the majority of developing nations, face two choices — either be excluded from the global market and wallow in eternal poverty and underdevelopment or be exploited by developed nations for natural resources and sweatshop labor.

Not surprisingly, the report names the United States as one of the primary beneficiaries of, and dominant forces in, the growing global economy.

This means America, as long as we accept the truth of the report's assertions, is one of the chief beneficiaries of the plight of underdeveloped and unstable nations.

That ugly conclusion brings several interesting questions to mind.

First, in a global economy, does the affluence of one nation really come at the expense of another?

And if it is true that unchecked globalization will plunge the world's underdeveloped nations further into poverty and plight, then is the United States or any other globally successful nation obligated to assist the unsuccessful nations or limit their own success to limit the damage it inflicts?

America's economic prosperity is widely heralded, and a large part of our overall success is undoubtedly due to our economic and cultural dominance of the world — our success, in effect, in the global market.

Our affluence as a nation, then, is closely related to the affluence of other less capable or less fortunate nations.



It is not clear, though, whether our success directly brings about the failure of others. This is less a case of direct exploitation and more a case of the perils of capitalist economics.

For all its efficiency in the distribution of goods and services, and its enormous potential to generate wealth and prosperity, capitalism neither is, nor never has been, the most equitable or humane of economic theories.

This new problem that has arisen with the advent of globalization is really the already encountered question of where we should draw the line between survival of the fittest and a humanitarian concern for those less fortunate.

Some sort of safety net is un-

doubtedly, needed when dealing with free-market economics.

We learned that lesson relatively early in our history as a nation.

We have been attempting ever since to strike a balance between unchecked competition and concern for the welfare of the economically unsuccessful or underprivileged.

Among those attempts were our antitrust laws at the beginning of the century.

In breaking up the concentration of market power, we succeeded in spreading the wealth around a bit and improving the overall American standard of life.

But it seems as if we've now moved from establishing monopolies in the domestic sphere to attempting to establish them internationally.

That seems to be the most compelling point made by the U.N. report — the United States and other globally successful nations might be squeezing the more underdeveloped nations out of the market.

The problem with that is easy to see when we're talking about domestic monopolies — our own people are harmed. It becomes less clear, though, when the debate moves to the subject of the economic welfare of other people.

Especially when any sort of comparable solution would likely harm American prosperity.

But it is likely that the American railroad barons and steel tycoons of the early part of the century were also adamantly opposed to any sort of antitrust action and anyone outside their perspective could recognize how self-centered and unreasonable their position was.

Now that America is the baron of the global market, will we be able to recognize our self-centeredness and do the right thing?

Michael Kirkland is a columnist for The State News at Michigan State University.

More fees should be optional

With fall registration looming, I have been flipping through the fall registration schedule, and noticed it lists 17 separate fees — Seventeen.



MARC GRETHER

Some of these fees are necessary. But others are just plain stupid.

Three fees in particular stand out: the on-campus cable fee, the health center fee and the Rec Center fee.

Though many students may not be aware of it, all on-campus students pay for cable television access in their rooms. Yes, even those without televisions. Even those who live in dorms, or residence halls without air conditioners.

It is odd that this world-class university forces students to pay for completely non-academic services, which they may not even be able to use, but won't pay for such basic services as air conditioning. Granted, students in non-air dorms choose to live there. But not all students would choose to have cable.

This fee is one of the many that does not show up on a fee statement. Rather, it is now just part of the rent for your room.

The fee arrived a few years back when a group of students decided their cable bills were too high and wanted help from everybody else in paying for them. Somehow, they convinced enough other people to go along with their coercive plan, and now, all on-campus students are stuck with their legacy.

The health center and Rec Center fees are two more fees forced on students. However, neither of these two facilities are used by everyone. Even if everyone did want to pay for them, we should not be forced to pay for them?

I have been very lucky. In my four years on this campus, I have never once had to use the health center's facilities. However, if the health center fee were optional, I still would have paid it because I realize what a risk I would be taking without access to good health services.

But why am I forced to pay? And what about other students who have full-time jobs with insurance benefits or belong to a family insurance plan.

Why are they forced to pay twice? No one should be forced to pay for something they do not want or need.

The Student Rec Center is one of the newest, most well-used buildings on campus. It is full of wonderful exercise equipment, excellent swimming and diving

facilities and an amazing rock wall.

But why should a disabled person be forced to pay \$50 a semester for it? They may not be able to benefit from it.

For that matter, why should a lazy person be forced to pay a Rec Center fee? They will definitely not benefit from a Rec Center they choose not to use.

The career center fee is an example of a good fee. For starters, the fee is optional. The career center stays in business because people want it, people need it and those people are willing to pay for it.

Even some mandatory fees are good fees. The computer access and library fees help provide services all Aggies need.

Most other good fees (lab, physical activity and distance education) are only assessed to students taking specific courses. These fees are needed because some classes cost more than others. It makes sense that those taking the classes pay for them.

Attendance at a university is not required.

Nonetheless, stupid, coercive, collectivist fees should not be forced on students once they get here.

Marc Grether is a mathematics graduate student.

MAIL CALL

Unidentified men question student

Last night while I was walking to Hurricane Harry's from my car, my girlfriend and I were approached by three plain clothed men in an unmarked car.

These men jumped out of the car and proceeded to ask to see my identification. I promptly refused to show them my ID until I had identification of who these men were. The man in charge told me the ID on his belt was good enough for me and did not show me his identification.

The ID he spoke of was a badge of some sort, but they did not show me any type of photo ID. The men would not let me go

until I showed them my drivers license, and they asked me, "Do you know the penalty for drinking and driving?"

I told them I did but asked how this charge referred to me, because I had not consumed any alcohol the entire evening. Apparently, these men had seen me take a drink out of my water bottle that I keep in my car, and they thought I was consuming alcohol.

My girlfriend offered to get the bottle from my car to show the so-called officers. But she was told very rudely to stay out of the conversation because the officers were not speaking to her.

I want to make college kids aware of their rights. A badge is not a form of identification, and plain clothed officers must show you a photo ID if they wish to

question you. Badges can be purchased at K-mart for \$4 plus tax. I want the students of Texas A&M to know their rights and to be aware of these men.

Scott McCrosky Class of '98

The Battalion encourages letters to the editor. Letters must be 300 words or less and include the author's name, class and phone number.

The opinion editor reserves the right to edit letters for length, style, and accuracy. Letters may be submitted in person at 013 Reed McDonald with a valid student ID. Letters may also be mailed to:

The Battalion - Mail Call
013 Reed McDonald
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX
77843-1111

Campus Mail: 1111
Fax: (409) 845-2647
Email: battletters@hotmail.com