

Friday • October 24, 1997

# Fighting for the wrong cause

Men, women of United States' armed forces should play no part in United Nations



**DONNY FERGUSON**  
*columnist*

April 1775. American minutemen stand firm on the battlefields of Lexington and Concord, prepared to sacrifice their lives in defense of freedom against a tyrannical British monarchy.

August, 1995 - Conroe, Texas Army Specialist Michael New refuses to wear United Nations insignia, stating he has taken an oath to defend the United States, not the United Nations. Ever since brave American volunteers stood up to the world's most powerful military force on a quiet spring morning over two centuries ago, the United States armed forces have upheld a tradition of excellence and bravery.

However, the rights of American soldiers and the sovereignty of our military is in jeopardy at the meddling hands of the United Nations.

October 24 will mark "United Nations Day," the 50th anniversary of the international organization's creation. Originally conceived as a global peacekeeping force to counter the worldwide nuclear threat of the Cold War, the UN has taken on the role of "planetary police," shipping American soldiers thousands of miles away into domestic squabbles in far away war zones such as Bosnia.

The UN should recognize that American soldiers have taken an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States from enemies foreign and domestic. They have no obligation to serve the United Nations. The UN's control of American soldiers had gone largely unchallenged until a brave Army Specialist, Michael New of Conroe, deployed to Macedonia to make the UN presence known, refused to wear a UN arm band or helmet. "I'm enlisted in the US Army; I am not a UN soldier," New said, "I have taken an oath to the UN; I have taken an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States..."

New is right. Just as it was immoral to force American colonists to pay taxes and serve a king who violated their sovereignty and refused them representation, it is immoral to force a soldier to fight and die for a foreign nation for which they pledge no allegiance.

Colonel Ronald D. Ray (USMC, Ret.), former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and legal counsel to New told *The New American*, "He has been the victim of a bait-and-switch. He was recruited to serve the Red, White and Blue, not the United Nations

flag." Colonel Ray also pointed out, "As a US soldier, New would be entitled to a protected status as a POW; as a UN soldier, if he were captured he would be a 'UN hostage.'" Not only are American soldiers' lives in danger while on UN "missions," if they are captured, they are not afforded the same protections they would have under US command.

Probably the best known case of inhumane treatment of UN hostages is Lieutenant Colonel Rich Higgins, abducted and hanged by Hezbollah terrorists while on another one of the UN's "peacekeeping missions" in Lebanon. Colonel Ray recalls "the position of our State Department was that they would seek the release of 'all of the hostages' without making a special effort to secure the release of this American officer. He wasn't an American POW; he was simply another UN hostage, and this redefinition of his status proved fatal."

Efforts to reform the UN and relieve the United States of its massive financial support have been met by stiff opposition from Democrats and liberal Republicans. Congressman Ron Paul's (Rep., 14-Texas) amendment to House resolution 1757, the FY 1997-1998 State Department budget, included provisions for the United States' withdrawal from the UN and insured no more American soldiers would lose their lives for a foreign body to which they do not pledge allegiance.

Local congressman Kevin Brady voted against the UN reform amendment and it was defeated. In politics-as-usual style, Democrats and liberal Republicans together to fight reform of the United Nations and succeeded in preserving UN command over American soldiers.

The brave men and women of America's armed forces have no obligation to serve the United Nations. Their duty is to protect and defend the United States of America, not to cater to the political whims of a multinational body.

Unfortunately, they must serve a Congress who will not relieve them of their immoral obligation to a foreign body and a Commander-In-Chief who once said he is "in great sympathy with those who are not willing to fight, kill and maybe die for their country," and finds himself, "loathing the military."

Hopefully, Democrats and liberal Republicans in Congress, Kevin Brady included, will follow Michael New's lead and recognize the rights of America's armed forces.

*Donny Ferguson is a junior political science major.*



# Clinton, Giuliani face disagreement over line-item veto

These days President Clinton is being attacked on all sides. Besides the campaign finance issue, the Paula Jones ordeal, and losing a daughter to the world of higher education, Clinton has also been backing away at bills with his newest toy, the line item veto.



**STEPHEN LLANO**  
*columnist*

Touted by Republicans as part of some kind of WWF tag team for the constitution, the line item veto amendment was right up there next to its partner, the balanced budget amendment, which failed in the Senate earlier this year.

Today, the line item veto is not an amendment, therefore, a challenge to the legality of the President playing cut and paste with Congressional bills was obviously forthcoming the first it was used.

It wasn't the immediacy of the challenge, but where it came from that should spark some surprise. Mayor Rudolph Giuliani of New York City filed a suit challenging the constitutionality of this provision of the President's powers just last week. Apparently, Giuliani is protesting the veto of a provision that would have kept New York from having to return \$2.6 billion dollars in Medicaid funding.

"The president's use of the line item veto in this instance is detrimental to the efforts of the city and its health care partners — the city's public and voluntary hospitals and their employees — to

provide maximum health care benefits to needy individuals," Giuliani said.

Obviously, Giuliani is a little upset about losing all that money. But the reaction should upset Americans as to what we have lost as a nation.

The line item veto in and of itself is an important consideration — giving this sort of power to one man over the content of bills is a scary proposition. Pressure from the people, who are, of course, so well informed on exactly what goes on in the Capitol, pushed this power right out of Congress, where the people's true representatives are, into the lap of the Imperial Presidency.

Rejoicing that the President will save them from the evils of pork barrel politics, many voters are going to be shocked when their district represented by a "good" politician feels the effects of

this power.

Pork barrel is bad, unless it's in my district. Just ask Giuliani or any of the others who helped him file the suit.

On a deeper level, the distress call is clear. Americans have lost the concept of local government almost completely.

The climate on television, the radio or in the newspaper reflects this — Problem X is a severe problem, and those lazy good for nothings in Washington better do something to solve problem X or we'll vote them out.

Unfortunately, this view circumvents the legitimate aim of government in the first place — to serve and protect the people.

Cities, counties, and states are maybe not the best funded solutions, granted. But the effort and energy of cooperation on a local level can solve such

pervasive issues such as crime.

Neighborhood watch programs are a great example of city cooperation on a very local level.

It may not be quick or easy, but at least it's not contributing to a bankrupt imperial concept of government.

Washington D.C. is the worst place Americans can look to solve problems that face them.

Continually giving new and exciting broad powers to one person isn't a solution — it is destroying the best solution we could possibly have. As for Giuliani, even if he wins or loses, until Americans rediscover city, county and state government, we may as well give the President a blank check.

*Stephen Llano is a senior history major.*



## MAIL CALL

### Misidentification stirs radio static

In response to John Burton's Oct. 23 "Broadcast news" column:

As former vice-president and current volunteer for KEOS, I would like to respond to your article concerning KEOS' relationship to KANM Cable Radio. First of all, KANM operates at consistently erroneous in citing KAMU as the station opposing KEOS.

KANM is a student organization which operates at 99.9 fm cable, and should be the station cited in our article. Also, there is no such local program called "Blues on the Move," produced by KEOS - that program is produced by KPFT Pacifica Radio out of Houston.

KEOS is not the arch rival to KANM. As a participant with both stations at the time that KEOS was undergoing the FCC licensing/application process during 1992-1994, I can assure you that it was in fact KANM that pulled its support from the creation of an on-air alternative, non-commercial station for B/CS.

At the time, the DJs of KANM

refused to participate because they wanted exclusive student control of the new station, a position contrary to the mission of KEOS as a community-driven, all inclusive radio station.

KANM expressly wanted to exclude anyone who was not an A&M student, and when they saw that KEOS was open to all volunteers in the community, KANM as an organization refused to have any formal participation with the creation and development of KEOS.

Informally, however, many DJs have participated concurrently with both stations since KEOS went on the air in 1995. KEOS has long been open to a more formal arrangement with KANM to include student DJs on the airwaves. But the management of KANM has consistently been adverse to any such arrangement.

In the meantime, KEOS has grown substantially with student volunteerism, programs which target a student audience, and outreach towards the local student population, in addition to its outreach to the general public. KEOS has invited multiple student groups to advertise their events on the station.

Currently, KEOS has more high school and college students on the air than any other broadcasting station in the vicinity.

It is a complete misunderstanding of the FCC licensing process to assert that KEOS could have taken "the license and ran." KANM is not named anywhere on the application to the FCC, and could therefore have no authority over the actual license to Brazos

Educational Radio as a non-profit organization which created KEOS Community Radio.

Additionally, KANM has shown repeated ambivalence towards any efforts at communications with KEOS. Thank you for your consideration.

*Heidi Halstead*  
 KEOS volunteer  
 Class of '92

### Senate addresses co-enrollment

Wed., Oct. 22, the Student Senate passed Senate Resolution 97 (F) 7 concerning Blinn Co-Enrollment. This resolution states that the Student Senate is not in favor of any change to the Co-Enrollment policy. The policy as stated in Ruled 2.3.2 of the Student Rules (1997-98) manual reads:

Undergraduate students enrolled at Texas A&M who wish to take a course or courses concurrently at another institution for degree credit at Texas A&M must receive the prior approval of their dean.

The Student Senate unanimously passed this resolution Wednesday night in response to Faculty Senate discussion of a new Co-Enrollment policy. Faculty Senate has not taken any action regarding Co-Enrollment at this point, but in the best interest of the students, Student Senate voted to take an early stance.

We appreciate the work of The Battalion, and understand that mistakes are made. We want all of

the students to know that our position stands in their favor, not to change the current Co-Enrollment policy. Any student interested can obtain a copy of S.R. 97 (F) 7 Blinn Co-Enrollment Resolution available on the Senate Web page located at [http://www.tamu.edu/student\\_senate](http://www.tamu.edu/student_senate). In addition, if you have an opinion on this or any issue, committee membership is open to any student.

Information concerning meeting times and dates are also available on the Web. Any further concerns can be addressed by calling the Student Government Office at 845-3051, ask for Alice.

*Alice Gonzalez*  
 Speaker, Student Senate  
 Class of '99

### All Aggies should respect The Battalion

Leave Mandy Cater alone. As a journalist, she was just doing her job. Almost every response to the Bonfire pots articles last Friday have been a personal attack on her. Frankly, her article served its purpose, and it obviously evoked a lot of emotion.

It is true that many of the people complaining about the "bad" pots do not participate in the tremendous work that Bonfire requires.

It is also probably true that no one would have even known about the pots if it weren't for the Batt. Remember that the Batt is a newspaper. Cater helped to uncover an intriguing story. No one can deny that. Not if they're reading the article.

The Bonfire workers seem to think that the pots are their own business; that the profanities should have never been uncovered in the first place. Well they were, and now everyone knows about them. The "bad" pots were vulgar, disrespectful, and undeniably crude. It created a bad image, and everyone knows.

Everyone should remember to respect the Bonfire workers at A&M. They are hard-working and dedicated to what they do.

All Aggies get to reap the benefits of their work; all Aggies should be proud of the Bonfire and its workers.

Now the flip side...Everyone should remember to respect the Batt workers at A&M. They are hard-working and dedicated to what they do.

All Aggies get to reap the benefits of their work; All Aggies should be proud of the Batt and its workers.

Mandy Cater deserves at least that much.

*Daniel Hayman*

### Professor speaks concerning Bonfire

As a professor who has been at Texas A&M for 30 years, I can assure the "vocal minority" at the bonfire cutting site that the language portrayed on some of the hard hats and T-shirts is not acceptable in the "real world" of educated, professional people, nor is it a tradition, and hopefully, never will be.

While a student at this university, I worked summers and holidays in the oil field, and never was exposed to that degree of

moral turpitude.

I have heard this sort of filth on a C.B. spoken by some, certainly not all, of the long distance truckers on the interstate highways. This could partly be attributed to their lack of education and the environment in which they were reared.

What I am seeing in the students who are advocating and participating in this display of pornographic language is a desensitization from being exposed to language and activities of this nature in various ways.

They seem to have literally lost all semblance of a conscience and the ability to discern what is right and acceptable from that which is pathetically immature and degenerate.

I am saddened that these same students will soon be wearing an Aggie ring and receiving a degree that will set them apart as a graduate of Texas A&M University.

One might expect this sort of behavior from a young teenager who is seeking peer approval and experimenting with various things for "shock" value.

This should not be found in a university student who should be serious about being a contributing and valued member of the community where they will someday live.

I agree with the sentiments of one of the students: "Get a life!" "A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both" (Wisdom Literature).

*Larry D. Claborn*  
 Texas A&M professor