

Celebrity politicians fail to please

Hollywood Actors



Jenna Johnk
The Clackamas Print

Some might say that the election of Schwarzenegger as governor of California was a bad omen for the political future of America.

The fact is this celebrity-turned-politician phenomenon has existed for years. This joining of Hollywood with D.C. most famously began with the election of Ronald Reagan as governor of California in the 1960s, then as president of the United States in 1980.

Reagan was an actor, starring in more than 50 films and was at one time the president of the Screen Actors Guild. Reagan was a popular president (popular enough to be shot) and had a relatively prosperous two-term presidency, except for the economic recession, the budget deficit and the normal controversies – abortion, prayer in schools, and women in government (not that we're familiar with any of these).

We can't forget Shirley Temple. The lovable child star

grew up to serve under four different presidents: Nixon, Ford, Reagan and Bush, Sr. (aka "Big Daddy Bush").

Apparently, Temple was very good at what she did. She was the U.S. delegate to the United Nations, the first female chief of protocol, the U.S. ambassador to the Republic of Ghana, an officer for the U.S. Foreign Affairs Department, and later the U.S. ambassador to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republics.

Hearing that Shirley Temple was so political shocked me, having known little about her. It seemed to prove that celebrities can rise above.

My blossoming respect for the idea of celebrities-turned-politicians is crushed in a look to some recent politics, such as Jesse "the Body" Ventura.

"The Body" was a Navy Seal who went wrestler. Apparently, he was a good wrestler. In 1998, though, he delved into politics, running for governor of Minnesota (at least it wasn't California this time) and winning.

In his one-term run, he showed off his manly attitude in the political arena instead of the wrestling arena. I couldn't tell you what he accomplished. Frankly, I don't think Minnesota could either. He did manage, however, to make even more

of a joke of America's politics than the rest of the government had already (i.e., Clinton).

But wait, it gets worse! In 2003, California (no surprise there) got a new governor. Schwarzenegger! What in the hell is wrong with that state?

Granted, I may be jumping to conclusions here, but honestly – why did it have to be the Terminator? What's next – Sylvester Stallone? (It should be. It's not like you can understand what either one of them is saying.)

What has he accomplished? Let's see: he guaranteed that the six-day euthanasia waiting period in animal shelters will remain intact, proclaimed September 11 "Patriot Day," opened California's first retail hydrogen fueling station, and a bunch of other little things.

He's created a lot of plans and made a lot of promises. So far, all he's really been able to do is piss off a lot of people, drop his ratings, wage a war against immigrants, and made enemies of the entire Democratic Party by referring to them as "girlie men."

This is all starting to sound like business as usual.



Political Actors

Filibuster needs to go 'nuclear'

Shannon Armstead
Commentary Editor

There is a little war going on in the Senate over the nomination of conservative judges to court and Democrats are doing all they can to keep it going for a long time.

The reason for the little war is a fickle technicality called a "filibuster."

First of all, let's examine the filibuster. The filibuster was born as a clever manipulation of what may be imperfect Senate rules. The rules say that members can speak on the Senate floor as long as they want, about any topic they want, in an attempt to allow debate. In 1841 a group of Senators perverted the rule into a weapon. Rather than lose their battle, the lawmakers took the floor with plans to keep speaking until the majority became fed up enough to give up. The lawmakers' efforts failed but the filibuster was created.

Over the years the filibuster has spoken of the filibuster with deep respect as if the framers had instated it as a check on majority power. In reality the filibuster was created by the members of the Senate itself and is not mentioned in the constitution.

Rules to limit the filibuster were first created in 1917 at the urging of President Wilson. The rule was known as a "cloture" and said that if two-thirds of the Senate voted to end the repetitive argumentation, it would end. In 1975 the Senate reduced the limit to a 60-vote majority, which is where it stands today, leaving the 55 Republican majority short by five

votes to end the current filibuster.

The Republicans' only option to end the filibuster is called the "nuclear option." The nuclear option would end the filibuster for the judicial confirmation process so that the rules would go back to the original "majority rules" instituted by the constitution.

The proposal to end filibustering wasn't offered by Republicans; it was introduced in 1995 by senior Democrats, including Sens. Joe Lieberman (D, Conn.) and Tom Harkin (D, Iowa). When it came to a vote, 19 Democrats, including leading blue-state senators Ted Kennedy and John Kerry, supported the measure. Unlike the attempts by Democrats to end all filibusters, the effort by Senate Republicans is limited to the judicial confirmation process.

Throughout our nation's 229-year history, the constitutional standard and Senate tradition for confirming judges has been majority rule. Senators should have the right to re-establish that tradition. Republican efforts to restore constitutional ideas using the "Byrd Option"—named for Sen. Robert Byrd (D, W. Va.), who pioneered the procedure when he served as Senate majority leader—should not come as such a shock to Senate Democrats who so stubbornly argued against filibusters under previous presidents.

Filibusters to thwart President Bush's nominations will only result in a long soliloquy that, if the Democrats have it their way, will continue until Republicans stop fighting. This pattern of avoiding the constitutional rights of the Senate majority to judge who will take the federal bench is a needless waste of time and energy and needs the "nuclear option."

Letters to the editor

Article against 'free-love' biased

I am writing in response to the "article" published in the May 4th edition of the *Clackamas Print* "Actions speak louder than 'free love.'" I believe the goal of the *Clackamas Print*, as quoted from *the Print*, is to "report the news in an honest, unbiased, and professional manner."

When did someone ranting about their hatred of a stereotype become news? The "hippies" you hate aren't hippies, but hypocrites, if they "preach high ideals" and don't follow through. There are some that believe in these same "high ideals" and actually try to practice them in their everyday lives. "Free love," as you call it, isn't the rampant promiscuity of the '60s, but respect for every person regardless of race, creed, or color. Using a campus-wide publication to display hatred towards another group of people makes it hard for the newspaper to maintain even a shred of integrity. Would it be acceptable to rant about disliking another group of students here at Clackamas based on racial stereotypes and biases? Who edits the Editor?

In closing, I would like to say that there are no more hippies, sir, just some dreamers, some druggies, and those who think differently than you. Please rectify this with a written retraction of the article or an open forum for any student to express their opinion or dislike of another student or group.

Emily Betts
CCC student

Editors note: The opinion piece in question appeared in the "commentary" section, was not run as a news story, and contained no libelous information that would warrant a retraction.

Chief scores with article against hippies

Preach it, brother Isaiah! Nothing is worse than those dirty, hypocritical hippies!!! Free love—nothing from them comes without some sort of cost! If you disagree on an opinion, I have noticed that these folks really jump down your throat and argue with you until they start repeating themselves and then some. I mean, I am open-minded and all, but there is a limit to my patience.

Peter Morrow
CCC Student

the CLACKAMAS Print

19600 S. Molalla Ave.
Oregon City, OR 97045
(503) 657-6958 ex. 2309

The Clackamas Print is a weekly student publication and is distributed every Wednesday except final week.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Isaiah Creel
NEWS EDITOR: James Tombe
COPY EDITOR: Ben Maras
COMMENTARY EDITOR: Shannon Armstead
FEATURE EDITOR: Karlin Johnson
SPORTS EDITOR: Mike McCormack
A&E EDITOR: Hilliary Ferguson
PHOTO EDITOR: Jeff Sorensen
AD MANAGER: Ben Holm

DESIGN EDITOR: Michael Cooper
STAFF WRITERS: Frank Jordan, Joe Piazzisi, Jadon Triplett, Katie Wilson, Laura Cameron, Krista Danielson, Mike Guidice, Kyle Slate, Elizabeth Tobey, Norma Martinez, CJ Ciaramella, Sam Krause, Jimi McDonnell, Jenna Johnk
PRODUCTION ASSISTANTS: Jesse Arguello, Joanne Bergstrom,

Norma Martinez, Jadon Triplett, Randy Thrall

PHOTOGRAPHERS: Brie Daykin
DEPARTMENT ADVISOR: Linda Vogt
DEPARTMENT ASSISTANT: Pat Lichen

GOALS: The Clackamas Print aims to report the news in an honest, unbiased, professional manner. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the student body, college administration, its faculty or *The Print*. E-mail comments to chiefed@clackamas.edu.