

# OPINIONS

## Blue Banner Editorial Speak, the campus will listen

Much of our time spent at UNCA comes with a lot of complaint about what the university does wrong. Things are far from perfect, but imperfections only give us room for improvements.

For example, a story ran in *The Blue Banner* last spring semester about new emergency phones placed around campus. This story contained a quote from a student who was concerned about having to use a pay phone from building to building on campus.

She wanted to be able to call her roommate and let her know she'd be staying late in a building on campus. The student expressed a desire for courtesy phones to replace pay phones in each building, especially for short phone calls that barely cost the 35 cents it takes to use the pay phone.

After returning this fall, we found courtesy phones placed in buildings around campus.

We don't know sure if the student's quote spawned this action, but this should show that even the smallest of comments can make a difference.

Students, stop whining and complaining about things and write an editorial to *The Blue Banner*. Or when a *Banner* reporter asks for an opinion on a story for the newspaper, give one.

You never know when something you say might make an impact on campus.

Surprisingly enough, people do read the newspaper. Important people want to hear constructive criticism and suggestions for the improvement of the university.

With that in mind, we would like to make another suggestion.

At night, the areas around Founders Hall and Mills Hall seem to get darker and darker.

With all the construction going on, there are plenty of scary, hiding places between the parking lot and the tiny sidewalk that connects the residential halls to the parking lot.

Additional lighting would benefit that area. Even if it made student fees go up, surely safety is worth the small increase in price.

## Trust in Bush, or consider a reform

Grant Millin  
Columnist

Even if briefly, consider for a moment the crucial implications of a new term to replace George W. Bush and his direct sponsor's idea of homeland security and war on terrorism.

I hope readers will consider Reform National Security, a concept of security based in an idea conceived by Jane Addams in her 1932 Nobel Peace Prize address.

Addams said, "The good we secure for ourselves is precarious and uncertain...until such good is secured for all, and incorporated into our common good."

It's the Marshall Plan and Crusade for Peace outlook on foreign policy and the fundamental idea behind Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal policies for the home front - normal stuff used when modern America is in crisis.

But, radical changes are occurring, and we need a framework for opposing radical, counter-intuitive approaches to real problems in America and the world we live in.

Imagine we have a wall of issues that remain unaddressed - a rotten social contract, a broken electoral system, a terrible economic outlook and an existing environmental disaster.

Yet, Bush is almost totally vilified by the crisis. Can we then assume the war on terrorism and a Soviet-style department of homeland security is the only Bush policy? Richard B. Cheney hinted at something more in a collateral damage conference at the Cato Institute June 23, 1998. Cheney said, "The good Lord didn't see fit to put oil and gas only where there are democratically-elected regimes friendly to the United States."

If you think George W. Bush and

his direct sponsors are saving the world from evil and are creating strong foundations for America's complete systems security requirements, please, get into the facts.

Start with books like "War on Freedom" and Zbigniew K. Brzezinski's "The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geoeconomic Imperatives."

If only half of the indicators in these books are true, we are in serious trouble.

But, the first step is to admit we have a problem. Then, we must commit to a new dialectic - Reform National Security.

I suggest re-examining history since the Monica Lewinsky scandal, the Rehnquist Court's radical ruling on Bush vs. Gore and Sept. 11, 2001.

There really isn't a strong multi-lateral analysis of this era dominated by a focus on markets and crucial environmental issues.

I might suggest going to www.senate.gov and searching for Senate Bill S. 1867. It calls for a national commission on terrorist attacks on the United States. One might even consider calling or writing Washington to support the measure.

If we really, really trust Bush with our lives, we need not bother. But, if we believe normal everyday American life is good and believe in our views about what America needs to be doing (the normal intentions of genuine conservatives and progressives alike), then we need to push at the Washington politicians one last time to do a thorough job with the Sept. 11 commission.

The Bush Administration fears this commission. Therefore, it becomes especially important for all of us. But, for many of the victim families of Sept. 11 and concerned citizens who want accountability from the massive, highly autonomous, super powerful, super influ-

ential and outrageously expensive corporate-public national security institution, the official story on Sept. 11 issues doesn't fly. Instead, the story acts as one of the most extensive frauds ever set upon humanity and thrown against the spirit of God.

The preamble to the Bill of Rights provides yet another reason why we can and should consider Reform National Security.

"The people" at the time of adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added, and as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution."

First, in a democracy, you always want the system authority enforced under the control of the people, not controlled by a self-appointed power set. We have always had a terror threat.

To drop democracy (however cheesy it's become) for what Bush and his direct supporters have in mind for us is suicide.

Donald Rumsfeld once said, "We have a choice, either change the way we live, which is unacceptable, or to change the way that they live. We choose the latter."

Don, are you referring to global

dysfunction of the international radical right-wing dream facing the threat of democracy and genuine peace ideas?

This story points to how right-wing, private organizations, like the Project for the New American Century, actually shape military and foreign affairs outcomes much more so than the peace movement, human rights activists and environmentalists ever could.

This "vast right-wing conspiracy" changes faces and nomenclature, but they keep conditions radicalized. Consider picking up a conservative phrase like Reform National Security and making it your own. Let's produce a better plan and safer and more democratic way of life.

As John F. Kennedy once wrote "We are not afraid to entrust the American people with unpleasant facts, foreign ideas, alien philosophies and competitive values. For nation that is afraid to let its people judge the truth and falsehood in an open market is a nation that afraid of its people."

Nothing in the Opinions section necessarily reflects the opinion of the entire *The Blue Banner* staff, advisor, or the university faculty, administration or staff. Unsigned editorials reflect the opinion of a majority of *The Blue Banner* editorial board.

*The Blue Banner* welcomes submissions of letters and articles for publication. Letters should not exceed 300 words. Letters for publication should also contain the author's signature, classification, major or other relationship with UNCA. Sorry, we will not accept submissions of anonymous letters to the editor.

The deadline for letters is noon on Tuesday. If you have a submission, you may send it to *The Blue Banner*, Karpén 244, One University Heights, Asheville N.C. 28804 or to banner@unca.edu. Please include your name, contact information, classification and major/position.

### The Fall Blue Banner 2002 Staff

Rachel Crumpler  
Editor-in-Chief

Ed Fickle  
News Editor

Hollie Childers  
Sports Editor

Whitney Setser  
Copy Editor

Emily Moe  
Business Manager

Elizabeth Moe  
Managing Editor

Mark West  
Faculty Advisor

Stuart Gaines  
Features Editor

J.P. Ammons  
Photo Editor

Jason McGill  
Circulation Manager

C. J. Eland  
Online Editor

Ben Stewart  
Assistant Online Editor

To contact *The Blue Banner* editorial staff, call 251-6586 or e-mail banner@unca.edu

In an age of increasing environmental urgency comes the need to recognize the ecological impact of our homes, schools and businesses. Although UNCA is a small university on the global scale, there are actions and behaviors to address in order to understand our relationship to the natural world around us. The Paw Print is such a depiction of UNCA and its impact on natural resources, air and water quality and global climate change. The facts included in the Print are not intended to take an alarmist view of UNCA's ecological impact, rather to inform faculty staff and students about the state of the university and provide opportunities to adapt. For any questions about the information provided in the Print, please, e-mail solar@bulldog.unca.edu.

### The Paw Print

No. 1

appraising UNCA's environmental footprint one factoid at a time

UNCA and Transportation

UNCA commuter students drive 29,000 miles to school and home every school day.

Together with faculty, staff, and residential students, UNCA drives an average of 34,000 miles every day. That's equivalent to driving from Asheville to San Francisco 14 times.

For the whole year, UNCA drives over 10,000,000 miles and uses around 450,000 gallons of gasoline. That would fill 30,000 kegs and if you stacked them:

10,000 feet

Mt McKinley Mt Everest 30,000 kegs