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This is, they tell us over and over again, "The most important presidential election in our lifetime." And they may well be right. After all, we are fighting two wars and facing the biggest economic meltdown since the Great Depression of 1929. If that weren't enough, we have major social issues -- health, education, job creation, energy -- to deal with on the side. Not to mention an obligation to be a good citizen of the planet, as well.

We might be tempted to think, in the light of such agendas, that we need to hear from as many voices on every major subject as we can before we choose to commit ourselves to any of them. The decisions we make now might well mark this country for decades to come. So, spending a little more time on them in the course of a national election might be a good idea. After all, we spend millions of dollars and months of time on the process. You'd think we'd want as broad a discussion as we could get.

There are, after all, a diversity of political opinions -- as diverse as the country itself.

According to one presidential candidate, for instance, "The trade between the United States and Cuba should be the same as it is between the United States and China."

According to another, the death penalty should be replaced with life imprisonment and the country should require DNA testing prior to any federal executions.

One of them completely rejects the very idea of a missile defense shield.

Two of them have no position at all on the outsourcing of U.S. jobs.

One says quite clearly: "I oppose any law requiring registration of, or restricting the ownership, manufacture, or transfer or sale of firearms..."
or ammunition to law-abiding citizens."

Most of those ideas differ a bit from the standard stump speech of the major campaigns. In fact, they represent different political philosophies entirely.

The argument for raising the blockade against Cuba, for instance, comes from Ralph Nader, an Independent Party candidate. Independents argue that international division is a strategy used by Republicans to control people and maintain political power. We never debate Cuba at all anymore, however. We simply maintain the embargo. But neutral people may want to hear a discussion of how we ourselves can continue to use Guantanamo to hold and torture people illegally and call the Cubans a threat?

The argument for eliminating the death penalty comes from Cynthia McKinney of the Green Party in an era when more death penalty convictions are doubtful than sure and DNA tests exist that could conceivably correct many of them. Nevertheless, only the United States and 19 other nations of the world -- among them Afghanistan, China, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran, North Korea, Saudi Arabia and Yemen -- continue to adhere to the practice of capital punishment while we watch the national crime rates rise despite it.

The argument against building a missile defense shield in former Soviet states comes from Chuck Baldwin of the Constitution Party. He says we have no clear data that proves such weapons are necessary to the defense of the country -- no small question in a time of economic chaos.

The complete rejection of gun control legislation -- a subject always present in a presidential election but seldom fully debated or polled or submitted to public referendum -- comes from Bob Barr of the Libertarian Party.

And Barack Obama of the Democratic Party is neither clearly pro or con on the issue of whether or not the outsourcing of jobs to other countries is good for the United States. John McCain, Republican, on the other hand, sees outsourcing of U.S. jobs as economically desirable. How these distinctly different positions will affect the U.S. economy at a time of great economic uncertainty is both unclear and unstated.

While all these issues and multiple others fester in the heart of the society, (see 2008election.procon.org) few are raised to the level of public consciousness, let alone debate, because the third party candidates who espouse them seldom get the attention it takes to raise them. They get little or no newspaper coverage, almost no television interviews, limited public engagements -- even in the
university system -- and pathetically little in the public funding it takes to mount billboards, buy posters, hire staff, open election campaign headquarters and purchase TV time. And they never get to participate in publicly funded debates.

There are Internet sites available, of course. That's where I found these materials, for instance. But starting to count from myself on, I couldn't help but wonder how many of those sites are being read every day while the TV attack ads of the big spenders play quietly in the background?

Tell me again: Anyone can be president in the United States of America? Really? Well, if this election is any indicator, the truth is "not unless s/he can raise at least $300 million." But if the presidency is up for the highest bidder, what kind of presidency or plutocracy will we have in years to come?

These other candidates fulfill all the requirements required of a presidential candidacy. They even get their names on the ballot but they get little or none of the public money it takes to bring other serious issues to serious attention. Then the very quality of the election process itself begins to erode.

From where I stand, it looks as if we miss a lot of ideas because people can't afford to raise them. But as more and more situations in this country -- war, crime, finances, international relations and social infrastructure -- change the character of this country, the question becomes less can they afford to raise them as it is can we afford to go on missing them?

Very interesting article,
Submitted by katsommers on October 8, 2008 - 9:18am.

Very interesting article, however, Cynthia Mckinney is GREEN Party, not Constitution.
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Katsommers: Thanks for
Submitted by Dennis Coday on October 8, 2008 - 9:14pm.
Katsommers: Thanks for pointing out the mistake. It was the editor's mistake, not the author.

The funny thing is that we just ran an interview with McKinney in the paper: Meet the Candidate: Cynthia McKinney

Dennis Coday, NCR cafe management
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Thank You sister. You speak
Submitted by joer on October 7, 2008 - 3:45pm.

Thank You sister. You speak the truth again.

The media didn't give much air time to the fact that millions of Americans were calling and emailing their Congress people telling them NOT TO PASS THE 800 billion dollar give a way to the rich.

And when it failed to pass the first time and since it's proposal why didn't the Democrats present their own Plan of REAL ECONOMIC STIMULATION by presenting a proposal to give the giveaway to the people of he bottom of the economic scale instead of the TOP. Why buy worthless Paper and let the Corporations get away with stealing money from the American people by bankrupting our economy to line their billionaire pockets.

The said the bailout was equivalent to $4,000 dollars for every American in the country. Since ALL these American are paying the Tab why not do a blanket distribution of Treasury department checks through the IRS to every man woman and child in the country.

THAT WOULD REVERSE THE DOWNWARD SPIRAL. Instead of trickle down economics we could try some trickle up economics. Let the greedy Corporations Crash and Burn. The remainder who used sound practices could take advantages of the jump started economy.

Instead Retailers looking at a dismal Christmas season, they would be looking at record sales. The confidence in the economy would REALLY be boosted. It big economic systems failed smaller entrepreneurs could raise to the demand. The Consumer spending by such a stimulus package would increase jobs in manufacturing. A New Housing market would be established on a new base. County coffers would pickup on more taxes from increased Sales. The new jobs would input more money into the revived economy. And it would turn around. LET the Big Greedy Banker Boys bite the dust
and with the 800 billion distribution to the bottom of the economy the banks that retain their customers trust will grow in assets and the credit that runs the economy can come from them as they grow with the New Economic Growth.

It's not brain surgery. Why can The People see the answer that the Politians turn a blind eye too? The TOP scares them and then screws them. See what happen the day after we gave them almost 900 billions dollars. The market went down almost seven hundred dollars. The Rich did their Money Grab anyway. Even though we gave them what they wanted. They got their Cake and Ate it too. When will we see there IS NO END TO THIER GREED?

We should put a Stop Payment on that Blank Check for worthless Paper and turn around and inject the same money into the bottom of the economy if we REALLY WANT TO TURN THIS ECONOMY AROUND.

The more we discover how much we are Loved by God, the more we want to do God's Will
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I would say that Obama
Submitted by earthenvessel on October 7, 2008 - 2:05pm.

I would say that Obama started from nothing and is only in the running now because he has convinced so many people to contribute to his campaign with their little bits of money. He got where he is because of his message of hope and change. His campaign continues to move only because the millions of people who want him contribute their hard-earned money to it. He is there because there are enough of us who want him there. The third party candidates could do the same but there messages usually do not resonate with the majority of the people. One good idea from one candidate is not enough if their other ideas are considered far fetched. Obama's message resonates extremely well and that is why he is where he is today.
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