

Casualties of War in Iraq 4,744 Afghan 2196 as of Nov. 18, 2010



Texas' Oldest Hispanic Owned Newspaper

El Editor

Celebrating 35 Years of Publishing

"El Respeto al Derecho Ajeno es la Paz"
Lic Benito Juarez

VOL. XXXIV No. 4 Week of Nov. 18 thru Nov. 24, 2010 www.eleditor.com Lubbock/West Texas Region

'Deportaciones injustas' Border Women Hunger Strike

Luis Guerra juró que no tenía nada que ver con ningún asesinato, que quien lo haya señalado como responsable se equivocó. No obstante, fue encerrado en la cárcel de Rikers Island durante más de un año antes de que se retiraran los cargos.

en inglés), comentó Guerra, de 21 años, quien está tratando de obtener un título universitario mientras espera saber sobre su futuro. Las autoridades de la ciudad "cometieron un error, y ahora estoy pagando por su equivocación", señaló.

bador que agentes locales cooperen con el ICE en la identificación de inmigrantes ilegales.

After sending a letter to The First Lady Michelle Obama yesterday, the 11 women enduring a hunger strike reach day 9 today.

According to La Mujer Obrera, the website that is closely documenting this landmark protest, the women will be outside the White House in Washington, D.C. today from 2 to 5 p.m.

"As women, we know we have and are exercising the right to determine our own destiny and work towards the meaningful development of our communities to improve the quality of life of our chil-

mediate action to 1) Organize a national summit to identify public-private initiatives in support of border women's efforts to restore their communities from the damaging effects of international trade and immigration policies, and the current "war on drugs" and for the eventual implementation of the Southwest Border Regional Commission. 2) Provide urgently



La agencia federal es atacada frecuentemente por sus prácticas, con críticos citando asuntos como la transferencia de detenidos a lugares alejados de familiares y amigos, y a gente en el sistema que tiene acceso limitado a recursos jurídicos que podrían permitirles permanecer en el país.

The protest is to "call on federal decision-makers focused on short-sighted border security initiatives to establish immediate and long-term strategies to support community-led development of the nation's poorest region," according to http://lamujerobreraweb.wordpress.com.



de Guerra estaban en el país ilegalmente, traído desde México cuando era niño. Terminó en un centro federal de detención de inmigración en Texas antes de permitírsele regresar a Manhattan; ahora está esperando para saber si será enviado a una nación en la que no ha estado desde que tenía 9 años.

mayor cuidado en a los quin entrega al ICE, señalan los críticos.

La ciudad está secundando eso a lo tener

These 11 women have first-hand accounts of the violence in the Ciudad Juárez/El Paso border.

needed economic sustainability support for women and their organizations whose development achievements and future plans are now in jeopardy

Women's conditions on the border are urgent, and we are demanding justice and equity now. It's not just about La Mujer Obrera in El Paso, Texas. This is a struggle by women on the border, and our fight to a better future for our community.

Obama, Hispanic caucus push for DREAM Act passage before year's end Election That Will Be Held In 720 Days

President Obama and members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC) are pushing Congress to pass the DREAM Act before adjourning.

On comprehensive immigration reform, the president pushed CHC members to work to restore the bipartisan coalition backing comprehensive immigration reform."

leagues not only to strengthen security at the nation's borders, but also to restore responsibility and accountability to what everyone agrees is a broken immigration system," the White House said.

On the face of it, it's a silly thing to be talking about. The next presidential election won't be held for another 720 days.

percent. What few can deny is that she has a following. Her new reality show on the TLC network, "Sarah Palin's Alaska," premiered last night and drew nearly five million viewers, the highest rated launch of a new program in TLC history.

Things can and will, change by election day 2012. The numbers for Palin and Obama may look nothing like they are now. (Just think about what the political landscape looked like two years ago, after Obama's election. A lifetime ago.)



ing a college degree or through military service," the White House said.

season's pressures past, Congressional Republicans would work with their Democratic col-

and now the president and I have had an opportunity to discuss the lame-duck strategy."

And while this comparison may seem a bit facile, for Democrats to say — and they do, over and over again — that they would LOVE to run against Palin in 2012, it might be worth remembering that they said the same thing about Ronald Reagan going into 1980. And we all know how that turned out.

And while this comparison may seem a bit facile, for Democrats to say — and they do, over and over again — that they would LOVE to run against Palin in 2012, it might be worth remembering that they said the same thing about Ronald Reagan going into 1980. And we all know how that turned out.

And while this comparison may seem a bit facile, for Democrats to say — and they do, over and over again — that they would LOVE to run against Palin in 2012, it might be worth remembering that they said the same thing about Ronald Reagan going into 1980. And we all know how that turned out.

Commentaries - Opiniones

National Review: Eleven Reasons 2010 Is Not A Rerun

Next year in Washington is not going to be a replay of 1995. The analogy is on everyone's mind in the Capitol. Many Republicans worry that President Obama will win the public-relations war against Speaker-to-be John Boehner as handsly as Bill Clinton bested Newt Gingrich. They should relax.

The parallels are obvious. Both times, a young Democrat had succeeded George Bush in the presidency and then worked with a Democratic Congress to push a liberal agenda. In the next election Republicans ran against big government and won elections up and down the ballot, picking up governorships and seats in the Senate, the House, and state legislatures. Pollster Kristen Solis points out that much of the data from the 2010 election looks nearly identical to the numbers from 1994. In both elections, for example, roughly 25 percent of independents chose Republican congressional candidates.

Republicans don't want what happened after the last Republican takeover to recur. During the winter of 1995-96, the new Republican Congress battled with Clinton over the budget—a battle that reached its climax in partial shutdowns of the government. The public sided with Clinton. His approval rose while Gingrich's plummeted. The conservative campaign to limit the size and scope of the federal government never really recovered from this defeat. Within a few years congressional Republicans were beginning to run for governorships and lieutenant governorships rather than reform, and George W. Bush was advancing a "compassionate conservatism" as a way of distinguishing himself from the Gingrichs.

But there are several differences between 2011 and 1995 that should work in favor of Republicans.

First, Republicans have a larger House majority. In 1995, Republicans had the smallest majority of any Congress since the 1950s. Conservatives were a majority of the House, but not a majority of the House. Holding the conference together on votes was a constant challenge. Budgets would be too tight for party moderates and too loose for conservative liberals.

Second, Republicans will have Republicans have the largest majority they have had since the 1940s. For the first time in the modern history of conservatism, the House has an outright conservative majority. Michael Barone says that House Republicans are in the sweet spot. They have enough members that Boehner can't lose them Congress out of tough votes, but not so many that they have no cohesion.

Second, Republicans did not take the Senate, as they did in 1995. As a result, the party will be less likely to hold them responsible for governing the country. When House Republicans passed legislation that could not pass a Republican Senate, conservative voters demonstrated and the party looked incompetent. Neither effect will be as pronounced if a Democratic Senate kills House-passed conservative legislation. Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell, meanwhile, will have an easier time keeping his conference together in the minority. Getting Rand Paul to sign off on a McConnell agenda would be a lot harder, as it would have been for Speaker Harry Reid. Finally, there are veto jugs with President Obama, they will necessarily involve legislation that had significant Democratic support.

Third, the fact that Republicans came up short in the Senate elections will probably temper their triumphalism. At the start of 1995, a lot of conservatives believed that history was on their side and would roll over anyone standing in their way. They thought Clinton was a sure loss. The Republican takeover was vividly described as a "revolution." This time Republicans are well aware that Obama could win reelection and that Republicans could lose House seats in 2012.

Fourth, there have been three 1995. Republicans have learned the lesson that you can't govern from the Hill. That year, Republicans tried to restrain the growth of Medicare. The decision to take on a popular entitlement was the most important reason Clinton won the budget battle. Republicans will not try anything nearly as ambitious this time. Either they will make a deal with Obama—which would require him to make the first move—or they will explain that real reform cannot come until Republicans get reinforcements in Washington.

Boehner was surely aware that his election-night announcement that "the president gets the credit" would be his most widely quoted remark.

Fifth, the new Republican majority is more seasoned. The last Republican House before 1995 adjourned in 1955. Almost none of the Republicans who took Congress in 1995 had ever been in the majority. Most

of them had not even contemplated being in the majority until the 1994 campaign. The new majority includes many congressmen who were in the old majority until January 2007. They know the ropes—and do not want to be on the job training. There won't be as much need for on-the-job training.

Sixth, the new Republican majority is less factionalized than the old one. The moderate contingent was much larger in 1995, though it was declining even then. Journalists said that Gingrich would have a hard time managing the new conservative members of Congress—the "revolutionaries"—just as they are now saying that Boehner will have his hands full with the new congressmen from the Tea Parties. But House Republicans have been operationally in sync with the Tea Parties since the start of the Obama presidency, strongly opposing both the stimulus and Obamacare and almost unanimously opposing cap-and-trade and card check as well.

Seventh, Obama isn't Clinton. The former president started his political career in a relatively conservative state. During his governorship, Arkansas gave its electoral votes to Republican presidential candidates three times. Clinton also ran the Democratic Leadership Council, which sought to pull the party rightward. Obama has had much less experience of appealing to conservative and moderate voters. He did it in the general election of 2008 only under exceptional circumstances and with a very short record.

It's not clear that he is interested in "triangulating" between liberal Democrats and Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

Most analysts trace the beginning of Clinton's comeback to the Oklahoma City bombing, when he was able to become the country's foremost anti-terrorist candidate. Republicans, much less that he is capable of it. Keep in mind that at this point in his presidency Clinton had already led in his reelection votes to win a high-profile right over Obama. Obama has done nothing similar.

welfare reform in 1996, a few of his supporters resigned, but he was so on-guard that Obama cannot be so sure that MoveOn.org, MSNBC, etc. will stay in its corner if the triangulates. His freedom of action is more circumscribed.

Ninth, Boehner isn't Gingrich. The new Republican leader is sometimes emotional—he teared up repeatedly during his election-night press conference—but he is not grandiose. He is, by all accounts, old-fashioned in 1995 he was "moving the planet." Boehner has learned from the experience of Gingrich and Tom DeLay that he is better off keeping a low profile. No congressman can win media cycles day after day going up against a president on television. Boehner knows it. Boehner isn't an 'all-out' idea as Gingrich was, but he won't make as many mistakes either.

Tenth, McConnell isn't Bob Dole. McConnell is smarter and more interested in policy, and he understands people to his right. Most important, perhaps, he isn't running for president. Dole was running for president, and one of his principal rivals, Phil Gramm, was also in the Senate. Dole had to win the Senate, pretend to be the movement conservative he was not, and negotiate with a president he was trying to replace. McConnell doesn't have any of these burdens.

Eleventh, the public seems more concerned about federal spending than it was in 1995. Back then, the deficit was seen as a symbol of the irresponsibility of the ruling class in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

Republicans' memories of 1995 are a little distorted. They overstate the electoral fallout of their defeat in the budget showdown. Clinton would have won reelection in 1996 even if there had been no budget battle. The deficit in Washington, D.C. Now it is seen as an imminent threat to the country's future. That won't make cutting spending easy, but it should make it less politically dangerous.

A decision for all students

The California Supreme Court's decision is a powerful statement in support of education for all. The unanimous ruling rejected the efforts to turn the law that benefits all students, regardless of legal status, into a debate over immigration.

AB540, passed in 2001, allows students who complete three years of high school in California to enroll in public colleges and universities paying in-state tuition. The difference in rates between in-state and out-of-state tuition can range between \$5,000-\$23,000 a year depending on the school, a figure that in many cases is the deciding factor to continue studies or not.

The lawsuit challenging AB540 argued that undocumented students were being given benefits that were being denied to U.S. citizens, which would be a violation of federal law. In reality, the California law offers the same opportunity to young people who are citizens as long as they attended a California high school regardless of whether their parents reside in another state, as well as those who move to other states to study and then return.

The reality is that more students who are citizens and legal residents are benefiting from the law than those who are undocumented. This fact seems to be lost on the plaintiffs, who list among their ranks the legal expert, Kris Kobach, who helped design Arizona's immigration law.

Their goal was to target the undocumented and set their interests up against those of citizens—using false arguments—and thus create resentment against the "foreigner." The intention was to try to build a case that the presence of the undocumented meant a loss of opportunities for citizens. This is completely untrue and, in this instance, it was fortunately rejected by both conservative and liberal judges.

California chooses to treat equally all young people who study and graduate from its high schools. States that invest in a student's basic public education have the right to allow that student to continue his/her academic path.

This is a wise investment that should be emulated instead of eliminated in every state in the union.

El Editor
Lubbock's most effective advertising tool available for just pennies per day!

For All Your Advertising Needs
Call Us
806-763-3841

DREAM Act: la otra promesa

La deportación de Jessica Coloti, una estudiante indocumentada de Georgia, fue diferida por un año, pero la joven podría ser deportada cuando se gradúe de Ciencias Políticas de la Universidad Estatal Kennesaw. La semana pasada fue hallada culpable de manejar sin licencia. Jessica, traída por sus padres a Estados Unidos cuando tenía 11 años, se considera "una estadounidense sin papeles".

No contó vía telefónica que su sentencia no entraría en vigor hasta que los tribunales escuchen la apelación presentada por su abogado.

Entre estos trámites legales pulula la sombra de la deportación que podría enfrentarla al graduarse. Pero rápidamente agrega que "algo positivo, como el DREAM Act o la reforma migratoria, tiene que suceder".

Cuando el Congreso reanuda esta semana su corta sesión pos electoral, la atención de miles de jóvenes indocumentados como Jessica, y de grupos pro inmigrantes se centra en presionar al Legislativo para que apruebe el proyecto DREAM Act antes del cierre del Congreso 111. La ley concede una vía de legalización a jóvenes que completen cuando menos dos años de universidad o se inscriban en el servicio militar.

En la lucha política de su vida por ser reelecto en Nevada, el líder de la mayoría demócrata del Senado, Harry Reid, prometió llevar la medida al pleno senatorial independientemente de los resultados electorales. Reid ganó gracias al voto latino. En su favor pesa que ya trató este año de incorporar el DREAM Act, sin éxito, al plan de gastos del Departamento de Defensa. Ningún republicano votó a favor de proceder con el debate.

Asimismo, se reporta que la presidenta de la Cámara Baja, Nancy Pelosi, quiere llevar el DREAM Act a debate antes de que los republicanos asuman el control cameral en enero.

Si es así, ya era hora. La Cámara Baja no ha considerado ninguna medida de alivio migratorio en los pasados años. Siempre se dijo que abordaría una reforma si el Senado accediera primero. El asunto se mantuvo a raya por temor de afectar a demócratas en distritos moderados o conservadores.

De todos modos, muchos perdieron el 2 de noviembre.

"Las promesas se deben tomar en serio y es tiempo de que todos estos líderes políticos tomen acción y hagan un trabajo justo para todos", afirmó Coloti.

Un nuevo sondeo de Lake Research Partners para America's Voice encontró que 66% de los estadounidenses apoya el DREAM Act: 81% de demócratas, 57% de republicanos y 60% de independientes.

La pregunta es si esos demócratas moderados y conservadores requeridos para avanzar el DREAM Act con la menor cantidad posible de republicanos deciden despedirse haciendo algún bien a 800 mil jóvenes que sólo quieren aportar su talento académico o servir militarmente. Jóvenes que no llegaron aquí por voluntad propia.

Los demócratas pueden demostrar el espinazo que no han tenido en los pasados años avanzando algo que sienta las bases para una eventual reforma migratoria y evidenciar resultados para los votantes hispanos que los han apoyado en las buenas y en las malas.

Los republicanos, por su parte, podrían comenzar a sacudirse la imagen de antimigrantes o mantener el discurso ofensivo que no conduce a nada. El congresista republicano electo de Florida, David Rivera, dijo en el programa Al Punto, de Jorge Ramos, que "hay que bajar el tono y la retórica y enfocarnos en resultados para nuestra comunidad". Entre esos resultados mencionó el DREAM Act para ayudar a regularizar por sus logros educativos o su servicio militar a quienes "por ninguna culpa de ellos" vinieron aquí sin documentos. Que sus colegas coincidan está por verse.

También está por verse si el debate migratorio puede superar el punto muerto de las mutuas acusaciones de "antimigrantes" o de "oportunistas políticos". Jessica Coloti, cientos de miles como ella, nuestra economía y nuestro servicio militar lo agradecerán.

El Editor
is a weekly bilingual newspaper published by Amigo Publications in Lubbock and Midland/Odessa Texas. El Editor has been published on a weekly basis since 1977. Our physical address for overnight delivery is 1802 Ave. M in Lubbock, TX 79401. El Editor is available on the internet at <http://www.eleditor.com> and is distributed throughout West Texas in retail outlets. Opinions expressed in El Editor are those of the individual writer and not necessarily those of the publisher or the advertisers. Advertising information available by emailing us at advertising@sbcglobal.net or by calling us at 806-763-3841. Opinions and commentaries are welcome and can be sent to the same email address. All opinions and letters to the editor must contain the writer's name, address and phone number but name can be withheld at the writer's request. Address and telephone number will not be published.

Publisher Bidal Aguero
Olga Rijoias Agüero-Business Manager
Circulation: Jimmy Rijoias & friends

TO ADVERTISE CALL
806-763-3841
Olga Aguero eleditorsales@sbcglobal.net

