

Elect Hillary Clinton Now

By Musafir

All male politicians, I have come to know, have proven themselves to be corrupt, child molesters and homosexuals. Therefore, it's time to give a chance to women politicians. So, why not elect a woman president? After all, the buck should start right there.

Our male politicians in Washington have traditionally been selected by the lobbyists and special interest groups. They are not elected. The male politicians have disgraced our system by indulging in partisan politics and neglecting their constitutional responsibilities. Their loyalty is towards their employers and not to the constituents they are supposed to serve.

I think a woman *can* be a successful president because women have been good leaders in other countries for years. Scanning the globe, we find numerous countries with current or past female heads of state: Chile, Iceland, India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Argentina, Nicaragua, Ireland, Israel, Switzerland, Pakistan, Panama, Finland, England, Germany, Indonesia and the Philippines, among others. They all have done as good a job or better than their male counterparts. Unlike the male leaders, I have found the women leaders to be more compassionate, dutiful and approachable. Women leaders are authentic, passionate in intention, fair in serving all of society.

Going back in history, Queen Elizabeth I of England defeated the Spanish Armada in 1588 making England a world power, a vibrant commercial force, and a place of intellectual accomplishment. Catherine the Great of Russia (1729) supported progressive ideas, such as reforms in law, education, and provincial and municipal administration. Tzu-hsi's of China (1835) suppressed the anti-West Boxer Rebellion and began a policy of appeasement, allowing reforms and the modernization of the government. There are numerous more examples of powerful and effective women leaders who changed the destiny of the nations they led.

Coming back to America, our constitution guarantees that all mankind is created equal. A woman is a part of mankind. They do a job just as well as men because they are just as smart as men. Women are equal to men, and should have the same opportunities as men. Women follow rules and are fair too. Women can make good choices and effectively deliver speeches. Golda Meir, Margaret Thatcher and Indira Gandhi have proven the above points.

Let's give the women a try. The men aren't doing a very good job.

Elect the Most Qualified Candidate

By Bala Prasad

Where would we be if we voted for our leaders based strictly on intangibles, such as race, gender, or religion? Would we be admitting that we care more about the package than what is in it? As Americans tasked with the privilege and important responsibility of choosing the leader of the free world, we must think and act responsibly. That means we must set aside our personal preferences, as well as our personal prejudices, and choose the person that is right for the job – someone with impeccable credentials both in terms of experience and background. If that person is a woman, so be it. If that person is a man, so be it.

Some may argue that voting for a woman based on her gender has its own value. Proponents of this type of “presidential affirmative action” will no doubt suggest that a female commander-in-chief might reflect the diversity or progressiveness of our great country, as well as break barriers for millions of women. U.S. Senator Diane Feinstein said that when she became mayor of San Francisco, she appointed a woman treasurer, a woman head of the airport, and a woman city attorney for just such a reason, and that “all of a sudden, the nature and complexion of the city” began to change. While this may be true, the presidency of the United States is not a position that should be used as a symbol or gesture. There should be one requirement of the person voted into office: that he or she is the most qualified person we have. When you are talking about the most powerful position in the country and perhaps the world, it is no time for pie in the sky pursuit of ideals.

I for one would like to believe that women are not foolish enough to vote for a candidate that would reflect poorly on their gender. Geraldine Ferraro, a less accomplished and less qualified woman, didn't court the female vote as effectively as Clinton does. I suspect that is because women – who are often harder on other women than their male counterparts – have a vested interest in supporting a candidate that would be a good spokesperson or model for the female gender. But Clinton could be different. Ferraro, an obscure congresswoman, was defined by her sex. Clinton – like Margaret Thatcher – is viewed as a politician first, a woman second. As John F. Kennedy rose above being an Irish Roman Catholic, Clinton has the potential to become more than just a female candidate. At the end of the day, if we vote for her, we owe it to ourselves and the country to vote for her because she is qualified – not because she is a woman.