

IGNITE

[YOUR SILENCE
SPEAKS VOLUMES]



Mission Statement

Ignite is a non-partisan publication dedicated to promoting the free exchange of ideas in an environment where meaningful debate and ideological diversity are often lacking. We, its staff, seek to serve the Lindenwood community by infusing it with conservative, libertarian, and classical liberal thought. We adhere to the idea that rights are inherent to the human person, rather than granted by their government. By providing a public forum for healthy discourse within the community, *Ignite* promotes the ideas of liberty and personal responsibility. We invite the active participation of any student, regardless of political affiliation, to join us in cultivating political dialogue. We strive to inform, engage, and open the minds of our readers in doing so. Above all, our staff endeavors to *Ignite* the flame of liberty among the students of Lindenwood University.

IGNITE is not a publication of Lindenwood University. It is not supervised or managed by any employee of the University and does not necessarily reflect the views of the University. Lindenwood is not responsible for the content or opinions expressed herein.

Co-Editors in Chief
Emily Platt • James Kintz

Design Editor
Christopher Jewell

Issue Contributors
Rachel Brown • Matt Simpson
Angelo Stege • Josh Hedlund
Drew Carrier

These Truths: The point of a university is to exchange and expand ideas

This is the second printing of *Ignite*, and we're just as excited about putting out a political newspaper as we were when we first started. Our enthusiasm does not appear to be shared by some of our fellow students and professors, which is frankly kind of strange. We haven't pulled any punches. We haven't been at all deceptive. We have stated very clearly that we are a conservative/libertarian newspaper that wants to promote the ideas of a liberal democracy. However, we have made it equally clear that in spite of our political preferences, we have created a paper that is intended to be an open forum for political thought with the hope that it will generate dialogue.

Several professors and students have been upset about our very presence on campus, but the fact is all of the people that we have unintentionally upset have missed the point. We called this paper *Ignite* for a reason. We have seen first hand the apathy that plagues college campuses, and we want to talk about some issues that would require students to start caring about politics enough to discuss them. Once a student takes a stand, we want them to have a way to debate their stance to find out if their ideas hold up under opposition. This is why *Ignite* exists.

Although this newspaper promotes a certain ideology, we want to discuss issues that will be both informative and thought provoking, ideas that are often lacking on college campuses.

This is a problem. The purpose of a university is to exchange ideas and learn new ones. Too often universities end up being a one-sided dialogue when it comes to politics. This is something that we want to help Lindenwood avoid. We know that with this paper we can start discussion on these topics that are so important to our daily lives.

Some of the people that were particularly upset with the paper when it was first issued demanded to know where I stand on certain issues. I was accused of being close-minded and having a paper that was clearly partisan without any

opportunity to dissent. It is hard to understand how this could be if the reader understands what we are doing. I have friends of different political backgrounds, and it is these people with whom I enjoy talking the most. Through these discussions I learn more about my own position and am exposed to a new position. When this happens, we learn that politics are not black and white. It's usually in the different shades of gray that we find the answers we seek.

For whatever reason, people still say that I and this paper are one-sided. This is far from the truth. For those of you that are unsure, let me make this clear: I am not a Democrat. I am not a Republican. I am not a Libertarian. None of these parties encompass the political convictions that are important to me. Where do I stand? I "...hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness – That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed..."

I firmly believe that unless we understand this we will never see the change that we desperately need. But whether you agree or not isn't the point. The point is to get us all talking about these issues so that we can learn from each other and figure out how to come to some agreement on what direction in which this nation needs to go.

If these ideas are stifled and we cannot talk about the truths that were not just important, but vital to our founders, then we will never be able to apply them in this our modern day. Unless we start talking about these issues we will never come to a consensus. And if we can never come to a consensus, we will forever be a divided nation and will lose the precious hope and promise of Liberty contained within these truths.

**JAMES
KINTZ**
**Co-Editor-
in-Chief**



The Spark

Liberal students are conspicuously absent from intelligent on-campus debate



The political climate was less-than-sizzling on campus at the close of October 2008, just before the presidential election. Gripping though the election undoubtedly was, and excited though students couldn't help but be, the level of political debate during that historic week on campus was a let-down.

I heard a bit of banter once in a while, most of which catalyzed by the staff of this newspaper. The rest consisted of embarrassingly silent demagogue t-shirts and rote Obama cheers,

I see a smattering of vintage lefties in the Federal government, broken-record relics reeking of the 60's and 70's

fused with a complete ignorance of the issues at stake. I believe a sign reading "I love hockey moms" still hangs in a dorm window in Ayers. Hopefully, this is not the extent of our political savvy.

No matter what your opinion of Obama, and needless to say mine is not high, students had to be disappointed with the abject lack of intelligent political debate on campus.

"But liberals are everywhere!" you say. That may be true, but where are they when there's a heavy-hitting philosophical discussion to be had? Their silence speaks volumes.

I see them on the national stage as news anchors, authors, and activists. I see a smattering of vintage lefties in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, broken-record relics reeking of the 60's and 70's.

But if you haven't already noticed, liberals are conspicuously absent from the pages of this newspaper (save for the Marxist on Page 5). I'd like to point out that this ideological void is entirely their fault.

Yes, theirs. The liberal students.

This newspaper is what Lindenwood has been needing for some time now. Loosed from the chains of President Spellman's bizarre antics, we have now been granted a much more open administration, along with an opportunity to publicly voice our opinions, to embrace lively debate as only a university can.

Yet most of us are content to leave the banter up to a few.

In the first issue of Ignite, I challenged Lindenwood students to love us, or hate us. It's the least you can do. You might think that, as conservatives, we are completely opposed to the expression of divergent views. Never mind the fact that our mission statement calls our little project an "open forum."

Although we have never masqueraded as "balanced," I must point out that not all of us are conservatives. Actually, there's not one contemporary issue on which our entire staff

This is a challenge.
From me to you, the liberal

agrees. What we all have in common, however, is a desire to cultivate political dialogue.

While I'm not one for cat fights, I do enjoy a little healthy debate. That's why I was upset by the lack of interest most any liberal I approached had in regard to this newspaper. Of

course, several had already formed the opinion that we're a bunch of libertarian quacks, perhaps unworthy of their patronage.

This is a challenge. From me to you, the liberal. You must detest the sheer presence of this publication. I know you want to rip a few conservatives to shreds. This newspaper is your chance. We will print any pertinent letter to the editor that is devoid of vulgarities. You'll notice that the only letters we received were from

Political intelligence doesn't have to die at the classroom door.

conservatives critiquing conservatives. Is that all this campus has to offer?

I'll go out on a limb and say that it isn't. Lindenwood can do better. Political intelligence doesn't have to die at the classroom door.

I won't accept the idea that this student body is apathetic. You care about your world, the state of the nation, and especially your campus.

Show us. Help us prove that our generation can be awoken from its stupor. Refuse to sit by while we libertarians take all the political airtime. Challenge us. Write to us.

EMILY
PLATT
**Co-Editor-
in-Chief**



Letters to the Editors: Your Response



Dear Editors,

In a world where money is of no concern to anybody or anything, Barack Obama's definition of a utopian society would be ideal. However, we live in a world where money talks louder than words, and Barack Obama's views on education simply miss the mark. The author of the article regarding education costs does a good job of summarizing each candidate's position and even goes a step farther by including Bob Barr's views. However, he dismisses the stances of McCain and Barr, saying they do nothing to address the impotency of a four-year degree, while applauding Obama for advocating more vocational training.

Advocating more vocational training would do little to change the rising costs of college or put more value in a bachelor's degree. In fact, Barack Obama's education policy could in fact be detrimental and do little to address the impotency of a four-year degree. According to Obama's website, he will ensure that the first \$4,000 of college is free, cover the remaining two-thirds of tuition costs for all public university students, and make community college absolutely free, all at the simple cost of 100 hours of community service by the student.

While this sounds pleasant, the question begs to be asked, "Where does the money come from to fund this project?" Will the Federal Reserve print money out of thin air to cover the cost? Will we take money from Medicaid and Medicare? Social Security? The \$700 billion bailout?

The answer is simple. We cannot afford to expand the government anymore, and many of the aforementioned programs are starting to take up more space in the budget. The U.S. is tied with Switzerland in annual spending per student in public schools (\$11,000), yet ranks 15th in reading, 19th in math, and 14th in science. Under George W. Bush the Department of Education's budget increased almost 70%, poor legislation such as No Child Left Behind came about, and tests scores stayed stagnant. Both McCain and Obama speak of expanding on the powers of the Education Department. As much as we all want a solution to the rising costs of college and the education system as a whole, we cannot begin

to explore the different options we have as a nation (Charter Schools, private schools, vouchers) until we acknowledge that the public education system is at best mediocre and simply throwing money at the problem will not solve it.

Nick Sacco

Dear Editor,

I enjoyed Matt Simpson's thought-provoking article on government flood relief in the last edition of Ignite. However, I think it might have oversimplified the issue a bit. Here is a silly example to illustrate this:

I have a colony of anthropomorphic, Disney-like silkworms. They make very nice silk. Sadly, a recent rainstorm ruined their soil and has made them unproductive. It would cost me about \$5 to get them new soil, and the silk they produce would net me about \$500. If I enact a silkworm bailout, I will be encouraging my worms to make risky investments in moisture-prone areas. So, should I help my worms or not? I'd have to say yes, since the benefit of their production is vastly more valuable than the cost of helping them.

This overly simple, clear-cut example makes one point: there are possibly some conditions in which it would be more beneficial for governments to bail out individuals who have taken risks and lost. If there is a particularly lucrative waterfront business on which a whole town's economy is dependent, the cost of fixing flood damages would be insignificant compared to the tax revenue generated by that company.

Of course, you'd have to examine each case individually.

Josh Welker

Dear Editors,

First, I must applaud those of my student peers who decided to exercise their minds and positively engage the minds of others by creating *Ignite*. The first issue provided evidence that not only can young Americans think and express educated opinions, some of us actually want to.

The apathy of the current college generation was referenced more than once in the first issue of *Ignite*, and I wanted to discuss it. Is a lack of desire really

the problem with America's young adults today, or is it the wrong desires toward the wrong affairs? After all, in many male dorm rooms across campus students seem to be full of ambition and enthusiasm, but they are not discussing education, morals, or societal issues. The topics instead are Xbox 360 and the latest video game, or Hugh Hefner and the *Girls Next Door*. The apathy becomes an issue when students reach the classrooms, but even then, students are feeling strong desires of disdain and boredom stemming from their unwillingness to engage the subject.

Aristotle said that the worst evil any human could suffer is a poor education. Try to wrap your mind around that idea: the worst evil. Most Americans today do not even consider the effects a poor education has on one's life, and could think of many other evils they consider more terrible; maybe losing one's cell phone or not having cable. One could blame parents or poor teachers for their poor education in younger years, but come on; we are supposed to be adults now. The responsibility is on us to exercise our minds on meaningful topics that will increase our knowledge and make us aware of what activities are truly productive and necessary. One must learn to love learning. In other words, ambition and enthusiasm are desires we must cultivate when in the classroom or while reading a book, not while drinking at a bar or blogging on Facebook.

Sincerely,
Andy Hurla

IGNITE encourages the active participation of the Lindenwood Community in the cultivation of political dialogue. Letters to the Editors can be no longer than 250 words and will be printed at the discretion of the Editors. Letters should be directed to Ignitepublications@gmail.com.

Red Scare: (A Marxist rant in the libertarian newspaper)

**ANGELO
STEGE**

**Staff
Writer**


There are many varieties of Communism. Some are well known, famous or infamous. Others are more obscure, swept underneath the rug. Some versions of Marxism (the open, toler-

ant branches) are inconvenient to the totalitarians who lusted for consensus. Also, tolerant Marxism proved inconvenient for the right-wing, ever in need to stereotype and demonize the Reds.

As such, the 20th century mindset was dominated by a concept of Marxism that made up a minority of the thought. It did make, however, the majority of the violence. Now, though, most Marxists have adopted the neo-Marxist approach. Pragmatism, tolerance, openness, and flexibility mark this direction. Following is a list of what Neo-Marxism stands for, its platforms and policies

The Goals of Neo-Marxism

1. Universal access to basic human needs: healthcare, education (primary through college), food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, water, information technologies (internet, books, television..etc.)
2. Democratic control over the whole of society: media, business, government. Industry will be run by democratic institutions just as much as state, local, and Federal governments and agencies. All will have a direct vote, a voice in what we watch, how we work, and what our public policies will be
3. Equality between all sexes, races, colors, creeds, and sexualities
4. Shift in the focus of the criminal justice system from punishment to rehabilitation
5. Peace. Wars for glory, oil, money, power, racism, xenophobia, or bigotry would end. Defensive wars only
6. Cooperation over competition
7. Pooling of funds and resources on a national level to deal with national and global problems (Global warming, endemic poverty, natural disasters, etc...)
8. The end of income extremes. Billionaires and beggars would no longer exist



How horrifying are those plans, those plots! Surely we all value these goals. Surely we all want an end to starvation and poverty. Surely we all want our children to have the best education available. Surely we all want to live in peace and prosperity. At some point you have to wonder whether the ideals of the Communists are really as evil as the propaganda, as the "common knowledge" makes it out to be.

Do we Neo-Marxists believe that a totalitarian state should control our lives? Of course not! The government has a place in some sectors, coopera-

tives, non-profits, and local collectives could easily run the rest. Even if the government were to execute most of the functions listed above, it would be under a free, democratic, open system. For a time, though, the market will still operate as it does now. Only the hands in control will change.

All of the propositions in this article will be explained in-depth in successive articles. Until then, questions may be directed to the editor. Responses will be facilitated as speedily and comprehensively as possible.

Unhealthy Waste:

Does paying more for healthcare really improve health?

These days, debates over health care usually revolve around whether or not health care is a basic human right. While important, these debates tend to miss an important issue: does paying more money for health care actually improve your health? It seems obvious that medicine improves health; that's the point of seeing a doctor. However, evidence can do funny things

Evidence can do funny things to “obvious” truths

to “obvious” truths.

Researchers in health economics have long noticed a disturbing trend: on average, changes in medical spending don't seem to have any effect on health.

Reflect on that.

Increasing the amount of money you spend on medicine is just as likely to hurt as it is to help. This is surprising and counter intuitive, but the evidence is clear.

In an article titled “More Variation in the Use of Care, More Flat-of-the-Curve Medicine” in Health Affairs, Victor Fuchs reports that several studies show that differences in medical spending across the United States have no effect on the health of patients.

Simply telling you about some evidence probably won't convince you. What if each study made a common mistake? Did they take into account differences in wealth? While many studies report the same result, each is probably flawed in some way. Yet they all agree that medical spending and health are unrelated at current levels of spending. This is very unlikely unless they aren't actually related.

You are probably still unconvinced. Why wouldn't health care improve health? The experts were just as skeptical, so in 1974 the

federal government commissioned the RAND Corporation to perform an experiment to test this conclusion. In the RAND Health Insurance Experiment, 7700 people in six U.S. cities were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The first group received free medical care, while the second group had paid out of pocket for all of their medical costs. Members of both groups saw the same doctors for the three to five years they participated. Five measures of general health and 23 physiological measures were tested.

On average, members of the group who received free medicine consumed 30-40% more than the other group, measured in dollars. Yet the groups were identical according to the 28 recorded measures of health, with two exceptions.

First, people who had to pay for their medicine tended to have worse vision. This is hardly significant since it is possible to function despite weakened vision, and eyeglasses or contacts may not be worth the price.

Second, the group who received free medicine had healthier levels of blood pressure than the other group. Robin Hanson, an expert on health economics and professor at George Mason University, notes that, “Since this experiment looked at thirty measures in total then just by chance one of them should seem significant at the three percent level, explaining the blood pressure result.”

In other words, since so many measures were tested, one of them was bound to look significant. The higher level of medical spending had no noticeable effect on health.

Pause to take that in: a 30-40% difference in medical spending, yet no difference in health.

Perhaps you are still unconvinced. This might be true for the general public, but what about people with preexisting conditions or the poor? The same result held for differing levels of initial health and income; in fact, no identifiable segment of the population had better

results with free health care. The experiment was probably still flawed. Social science experiments rarely aren't. In particular, this experiment is only short term. A long term study would be more informative. Yet the experiment reinforces the body of evidence telling us that the level of medical spending and health are unrelated.

You may wonder how medicine could fail to

Increasing the amount of money you spend on medicine is just as likely to hurt as it is to help.

help. Doctors have incentives to over-treat their patients. They are getting paid for that invasive surgery they claim you need. Even the doctor who doesn't prescribe unnecessary treatments isn't perfect; doctors can and do make mistakes.

In addition, hospitals are filled with sick people. Many precautions are taken to prevent the spread of infection, but a slip up there is much more likely to spread disease than in everyday life. So there are some pitfalls of medicine which can outweigh the benefits.

The application to health policy is straightforward. We could cut a large chunk of our medical spending with negligible effects on the public's health. To do this, the RAND experiment suggests that we should make people pay out of pocket for most of their health care.

This may seem a bit hasty. Surely some of the cut medicine is beneficial. This is certainly true, but the government doesn't seem to know how to sort out the good from the bad. Instead of wasting resources on a crapshoot, why not use them for something more beneficial?

MATT
SIMPSON

**Staff
Writer**

Obama assembles his team for tumultuous times ahead

RACHEL
BROWN

**Staff
Writer**

Needless to say, people have been buzzing since Barack Obama won the presidential election on Nov 4, 2008. Since then, the American people have been anticipating the inauguration of the 44th President of the United States of America. Some look forward to Obama's presidency, while others anxiously watch from a distance. Regardless of one's stance on the issues, Barack Obama is the new President, and he has much to deal with now that he is in office. Thankfully, he won't be doing it alone. He'll have an army of advisors by his side, offering counsel in each area of their expertise. President Obama has already assembled this team of professionals, awaiting confirmation on his final choices.



Hillary Clinton is possibly the most well known member of the President's impending Cabinet. Having years of experience as First Lady and then as Senator of New York, Clinton will serve as Obama's Secretary of State.

Robert Gates has served under George W. Bush since 2006 as Secretary of Defense. This decision to retain Gates will allow for a smoother transition between presidents as well as a sense of continuity amidst two wars.

Timothy Geithner, current head of the Federal Reserve bank of New York, has been nominated as the President's Treasury Secretary. Obama's administration holds that Geithner's experience with finances and business will be vital in bringing Americans out of the recession.

5 of Obama's top advisors

Eric Holder, Obama's Attorney General, served under Janet Reno during former President Bill Clinton's administration. Known for his criticism of Guantanamo Bay and the Patriot Act, Holder brings years of legal experience to Obama's Cabinet

Rahm Emanuel, who served in the Illinois Senate, will be President Obama's Chief of Staff. He holds a significant amount of power, with the ability to decide who will be granted an audience with the President.

Amidst social, economic, and political turmoil, Obama will have much to face in his four years as President of the United States. With his informed and experienced members of his administration by his side, we can only hope for success in the White House. However, it's going to take a bit more than hope.

[THIS IS YOUR SPACE]

LOVE US? HATE US? WRITE US.
WRITE A LETTER TO THE EDITOR. IGNITEPUBLICATIONS@GMAIL.COM

The economy slumps as higher education forges ahead

**JOSH
HEDLUND**
Staff
Writer

As the economy declines, it becomes harder for college students to ignore. Most students do not trade stocks; few are trying to sell a house. But as the bad news spreads

from the financial markets to the rest of the economy, students are wondering what it means for their university - and for their futures.

Many students with loans are becoming concerned about paying them off. "I'm very worried," admitted senior Kevin O'Neal, who has a loan through Sallie Mae. "I'm scared that I won't be able to get a job and I'll be stuck with all this debt."

Colleges and universities across the nation are slipping into trouble. Some states are facing budget deficits, which puts pressure on funds that go to state schools. Others are forced to dip into their endowments. Colleges are rethinking plans for expansion.

Lindenwood, meanwhile, has no debt, and the administration is confident that the fundamentals of the university are strong. "It's definitely a factor that we're aware of, that we're addressing head-on," said Joseph Parisi, Dean of Day Admissions. "But the

nice thing about education is even when the economy's bad, people get a renewed sense about how important that education is."

Economics professor Anthony Clark agrees. "Education is typically insulated from recession," he said. "People who get laid off may return to school to learn new skills."

Parisi noted that Lindenwood is seeing an increase in applications, and outside contributions are remaining solid as well. "I've seen just as many in the last month as I've seen previously," Parisi said.

Dr. John Oldani, Vice-President of Student Development, anticipates no change to the current building plans. "We still have the student center on line," he said.

Student loans may become more expensive, but there is not an impending shortage. "We just got information from Sallie Mae that the interest rate is going to be increasing on those loans," said Lori Bode, Director of Financial Aid. "But we've had absolutely no trouble as far as funding for our students."

Students acquire alternative loans primarily through the private market. Sometimes this is necessary because they do not qualify for federal loans or

have reached the loan limit.

Earlier this year, servicing companies such as MOHELA and Nelnet had trouble buying packaged loans from banks because they didn't have enough capital. "There was concern because the banks needed to sell them in order to make more loans," explained Bode. "So the Department of Education agreed to purchase these loans from lenders."

Professor Clark could not easily judge the long-term effects of this move by the Department of Education. "Whenever you subsidize something, you get more of it than you would otherwise," he explained. "In education, this can be justified because of the external benefits of an educated society. But it can be possible to overdo it."

Lindenwood's focus on remaining debt-free gives it a foundational advantage over other universities. "Most schools are in debt up to their ears," said Parisi. "They're taking out loans to cover other loans, and unfortunately the students are the ones that ultimately suffer because they're raising their tuition rates."

"When it comes to hard times in the economy," Oldani said, "universities like Lindenwood set themselves apart from the big behemoth universities."



Social and Political Philosophy Minor

- ♦ Earn 300-level Credit While Getting a Minor
- ♦ Open To All Majors



Study the Foundations!

Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Blackstone, Mill, Marx, Rawls, Nash,
Feminist Theory, Multiculturalism, Communitarianism, and more.

CORE (12 hrs.):

PHL 214 Ethics or PHL 360;
PHL 305 Political Phil.; PHL 350 Phil. of Law;
PHL 390 Game Theory

ELECTIVES (6 hrs.):

Take 2 courses from any one of the following groups:

Business/Economic Emphasis

BA 211; BA 314; BA 318; BA 383; BA 415

Social Science Emphasis

ANT 317; ANT 324; PSY 334; SOC 320; SOC 324

Political Science Emphasis

PS 300; PS 311; PS 350; PS 360

History Emphasis

HIS 314; HIS 315; HIS/REL 329; HIS 330;
HIS 332; HIS 336; HIS 338;

LINDENWOOD

LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY ST. CHARLES, MISSOURI

philosophy@lindenwood.edu