

Sonia  
HOLLIMON

# The dating charade

## To send the right signals, know yourself

To anyone who is currently in love: Pay attention. For those of you who aren't in love, just got dumped or are looking for that special someone: Take notes.



Falling in love is a big charade. (Recall that Charades is a game where you try to guess what the other person is doing while they pretend to do something else,

and in the end you discover that you were never even close to understanding what they were trying to do at all.)

That's about as accurate as most relationships get. One day you turn and look at your significant other only to discover that one of those alien lizards from "V" has appeared in his or her place. You know, human on the outside, reptile on the inside. Kind of like a cold-blooded Pop-Tart.

From what I can tell from my newly out-of-love friends, there seem

“*If men are from Mars and women are from Venus, I must be spending too much time on Earth, because I tend to be confused by the behaviors of both.*”

to be four main reasons relationships end: (4) Cheating, (3) The “me, me, me” syndrome, (2) Lack of trust due to lying ... and the number one answer? Survey Says! (1) Miscommunication.

If men are from Mars and women are from Venus, I must be spending too much time on Earth, because I tend to be confused by the behaviors of both.

For example, let's talk about self-esteem in the sexes.... Hmm, looks like there's just about zero. There are just a bunch of overcompensating men dating women with poor body images. Next stop — dysfunction junction.

When will men realize that the ability to drink a six-pack in 10 minutes and drive a sports car way too fast is not going to make their penises any bigger? When will women realize that a double-D chest and Jennifer Aniston's haircut are not going to save them when their mid-life crisis husband leaves them for Jennifer Aniston's younger sister? I know I'm not the only one who has seen “First Wives Club.”

I, of course, have made my relationship mistakes, but that's another column. Besides, I no longer need a relationship. I plan to get a puppy.

The point is, once we discover

what we want from ourselves, it will be much easier to let others know what we need from them. It's important to remember that another human being cannot fulfill all of your needs, and that plastic surgery will not solve all of your problems — so quit watching “Baywatch” this minute.

The caring and support that we receive from our family, friends and lovers is there to enhance our lives. It's not a crutch for us to collapse upon whenever things get scary.

Once you know and love that face in the mirror, and love the person behind it, losing that relationship that you thought would last forever won't be as devastating, as long as you don't lose who you are. Because if you don't know who you are, you can't tell anybody else what you need, and you'll be playing charades for a heck of a long time.

And I hate party games.

Hollimon is a senior broadcasting major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.

Anthony  
NGUYEN

# Three's a crowd

## Two-party system keeps chaos under control

I was sitting in the newsroom of the Daily Nebraskan on Friday night (and you should come down and visit this mecca of mid-80s computer technology) furiously typing away at

the grimy keyboard to get my column finished. I had started writing about some article I had read earlier in the week on happiness, when someone came in

with information on the Libertarian Party. This person began asking an editor here whether she or anyone at the DN knew anything about the Libertarians.

In case some of you out there haven't been keeping up-to-date on the political scene in America (and we all can attest to being knowledgeable about politics, right?), the Libertarian Party in essence favors not a smaller government, but basically no government. According to their web page and literature, the Libertarian Party “advocates a minimalist government,” and aims “to challenge the cult of the omnipotent state and defend the rights of the individual.”

In other words, we elect someone to office so they can make sure that the government doesn't do anything.

Libertarians, along with other “third-party” parties like the Reform Party, have been arguing for years to be recognized as legitimate, wide-reaching parties like the Republicans and Democrats.

I support these “grass roots”-type movements for their zeal and enthusiasm, but overall I'm not in favor of the notion of having additional political parties at the Democrat/Republican level.

Although it might not seem apparent today (with the voter apathy and distaste and all), America has been progressing through this century

“*Although it might not seem apparent today (with the voter apathy and distaste and all), America has been progressing through this century on the strength of a two-party representative democracy.*”

on the strength of a two-party representative democracy. To want more national parties with clout can only harm the United States.

Surely not, you might say, since more parties mean more ideas will get out and more people will be able to participate in the political process without feeling pigeon-holed into accepting party planks that they don't agree with (for instance pro-choice Republicans or anti-entitlement Democrats). True, that's what would seem to come out of having more parties. But that's a misconception.

Having more parties would mean more choices, but it would also bring the burden of specialist parties which have only one particular agenda. I don't think America is ready, nor willing, to have coalition governments like some of our European and Asian allies.

Imagine this scenario: At some point in the future, second-tier parties have risen to the status of the Republicans and Democrats. America now has the Green Party (environmental concerns), the Dance Party (those who couldn't let go of MTV), the Progressive Party (government-reform minded), the Hawk Party (ultra-nationalist party), the Light of the Universe Party (pacifists), and the Daily Nebraskan Party (with Steve W. as its figurehead), along with Reps and Dems.

The president for this hypothetical future is a Republican. Republicans only control 22 percent of both the

House and Senate, and the Democrats likewise control a similar amount of seats. The president wants to pass some legislation declaring the Cornhusker defensive line as the last bastion against enemy aggression (so sue me — I'm a die-hard fan).

The president's party as mentioned doesn't have a majority in either chamber, so to get the majority needed for passage, she'd have to pull together enough support from the other parties. Through tough negotiation, the president pulls together just enough support from 45 percent of the Congress. Forty-nine percent of Congress has voted against this legislation. Well, the Dance Party has 6 percent of the seats in Congress. Can you see how this scenario plays out? In order to get this legislation to go through, the president has to cut a deal with the Dance Party, whose sole motives are to bring back MTV's “Real World” and make it part of the family-values programming block on network television, and make MTV News a legitimate news source like the DN (remember, this is a hypothetical future). The Dance Party couldn't care less about defense, the environment, taxes, etc. because they “want (their) MTV.” Eventually, the president agrees, because she's a die-hard Husker fan.

Even though the line-item veto has been passed into law, the president cannot eliminate too many items from legislation, because she

could lose support from her tenuous “coalition.” This situation might seem far-fetched, but it really happens today.

In Europe, the parliaments are composed of a number of parties, all forming coalitions in order to keep the base of power in their end of the field. Although parliamentary procedures are different than our congressional procedures, the situation would be analogous. A party with only 15 percent national support could wield a “big stick” if scenarios ever arose in which a majority of support could not be had immediately. The Green party, for instance, can hold some clout in Germany.

At least with our two-party style government, we can be sure that the only other opposition has a broad appeal. But to introduce third-parties into politics can only serve to confuse and strain the political scene. Rather than having a true attempt at broad appeal, we might end up with a collection of parties for a particular cause or movement. So what do I see as the future of third-parties in America? I see them as helping to bring often-ignored issues into the open — issues that we might not otherwise readily address because of the rhetoric from the Republicans and Democrats. I see them as infusing some of their ideas into the Republican and Democratic parties (forced evolution you might call it) as the two Goliaths of the political scene square off against each other. And I see them making the Democrats and Republicans examine their own platforms, as these two parties struggle for inclusion, not exclusion, benefitting us, the people. But I don't see third-parties on the horizon as the new Republican and Democratic national parties.

Nguyen is a senior biochemistry and philosophy major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.