



"I do not agree with what you have to say, but I'll defend to the death your right to say it." - Voltaire

The Cell Phone Epidemic By: Ryan Schultes

In this day and age, it is quite common to overhear a conversation an individual is having with some unknown person on their cell phone. In some cases, it is rather amusing for someone like me to just sit back and listen to the conversation for a few moments and draw up conclusions as to the content of that particular conversation. For those few people who know me, I do not have a cell phone; however, I did own one once upon a summer's eve. Since then, I have boycotted all cell phones for many reasons. However, I must admit that the primary reason for not owning a cell phone is to enjoy the life that surrounds me at the present time. Not with the reality of someone who's either miles away, in a different state, or I dare say, a different continent. The disturbing reality of the current addiction to the cell phone here at St. Andrews has reached flood stage.

There is nothing more distracting than to be in a class and having the professor explain some particular aspect of a reading or homework assignment that was previously misunderstood or not understood at all and then BAM!, there goes the familiar annoying ring of some sorry excuse for a ring tone breaking the harmony of the in-class environment. The professor stutters, the students sigh and present looks of disbelief towards the student whose cell phone has just gone off while others quickly check to make sure they themselves have turned their cell phones off. The student is embarrassed, the professor makes a reminding remark for all students to please have all cell phones either turned off or set to vibrate during the duration of the class. Then the class struggles to reacquire the previous harmony which was just butchered like the latest road kill.

In addition to the in-class disturbance, it is quite disturbing for me to walk across the causewalk and run a staggering toll of how many students are walking and talking on their cell phones at the same time while remaining completely oblivious to their immediate surroundings. The other day, I conducted an experiment to see just how in-tuned to the "here and the now" some students are while on their cell phones. I walked straight into a path of a student who was engaged in a conversation with her cell phone. I immediately began to act as if I were picking my nose and flinging boogers in her direction. To my astonishment, she didn't even notice the possibilities of snot born projectiles headed her way or the fact that there is some guy walking straight

towards her constantly digging into his nose. This realization frightened me. If I could stand in the direct path of someone on a cell phone, finger in nose, and not even get as much as a nasty look from them, something is wrong.

Therefore, I must ask, is it absolutely necessary to be glued to a cell phone, talking to whomever, about God knows what, while all the beauty of life surrounding you passes by? I will concede that cell phones are handy for emergencies and are a very convenient commodity for our fast paced world. However, is it absolutely imperative to talk to your buddy on the other side of campus, to mom and dad after each and every meal, or to your boy or girl friend every hour on the hour? I would like to think otherwise, yet the actions of these cell phone addicts have me in doubt. So, I say in the interest of the life that surrounds you in the "here and the now", put down the phone and open your eyes and take notice of life.



(Student texting on her cell phone. Picture courtesy of Lyndsey McCall)

Questioning "Mr. Bush's War" and the Armed Forces By: Emily Thigpen

Listen up, especially those who hold a particularly nasty grudge against "Mr. Bush's war" and the military! There is an email circulating around the Internet entitled "Senator Glenn's comments". Despite the dull heading, there is some incredibly startling information packed inside that just might convince you to change your opinions about President Bush and how he is handling the war in Iraq.

The email opens with an astonishing comparison of violence between Iraq and America. It states that "there were 39 combat-related killings in Iraq in January." At the same time, there were 35 murders in Detroit, Michigan. In just one American city, we have as many casualties as a war-torn country on the other side of the world. Remarkable, isn't it? But that's not all.

Many people complain about how President Bush should never have started the war in Iraq. But should we be so quick to criticize him? This e-mail asks us to consider a few facts before we make any judgments.

First of all, President Franklin Delanore Roosevelt led the United States into World War II.

"Germany never attacked us."

Japan bombed Pearl Harbor in 1941, not Germany, yet we attacked Germany first.

Does that make any sense to anybody?

Even more astonishing are the casualty figures. The e-mail says that from 1941 to 1945, we lost the lives 450,000 American soldiers, "an average of 112,500 per year." However, the carnage did not end there.

After finishing World War II, President Harry Truman launched another war in Korea. In just three years, "55,000 [American] lives were lost . . . an average of 18,334 per year." Those soldiers had no business being there in the first place.

"North Korea never attacked us."

The American war tradition was revived in 1962, when President John F. Kennedy started the Vietnam "conflict."

"Vietnam never attacked us." (I don't know about you, but I'm starting to sense a pattern here.)

After President Kennedy's assassination, Lyndon Johnson took over and "turned Vietnam into a quagmire". In 10 years, we lost 58,000 American soldiers, "an

average of 5,800 per year".

Now we come to President Bill Clinton, probably the worst out of all the war-happy presidents. He declared war on Bosnia without the consent of France, or even the United Nations.

"Bosnia never attacked us."

We ought to be furious with Bill Clinton instead of George Bush, because he is the reason why 9/11 was allowed to happen. According to the e-mail, "he was offered Osama bin Laden's head on a platter THREE TIMES by Sudan and did nothing", yet "Osama has attacked us on multiple occasions".

It's no wonder that we consider President George Bush to be "war happy"! Looking back on the actions of our past presidents, we can only see how eager they were to ship U.S. soldiers off to a country that never offended us at all, and blast them to pieces! This is the reason why America is considered to be a nation of aggression.

In President Bush, however, there is hope that our violent reputation will be altered. In almost two terms, he has "liberated two countries, crushed the Taliban, crippled al-Qaida, put nuclear inspectors in Libya, Iran, and North Korea WITHOUT FIRING A SHOT, and captured a terrorist who slaughtered 300,000 of his own people".

I'd say he's accomplished quite a lot of good in the world in a little more than five years, don't you think?

Here's something for you Democrats to consider if you are whining about if this war will ever end:

It took longer for "Janet Reno to take the Branch Davidian Compound", about 51 days, than for American troops to take over Iraq.

It took longer for "Hillary Clinton to find the Rose Law Firm billing records" than for American troops to search for evidence of chemical weaponry in Iraq.

It took longer for "Ted Kennedy to call the police after his Oldsmobile sank at Chappaquiddick" than for the "3rd Infantry Division and the Marines to destroy the Medina Republican Guard".

And finally, the most humiliating comparison of all:

It took longer to count the votes in Florida than it took to take over Iraq! How can anybody read these facts and complain about how the war is going? President Bush is doing GREAT! Before I let you wander off and read the other articles in this newspaper, there

(Continued on page 10)