

Peace prize should award based on action



Zach Vicars

There already has been too much ado about this year's controversial pick for the Nobel Peace Prize. Journalists, commentators, professors and pastors have been quick to either come to the defense of President Obama or decry him as a figure completely unworthy of the prize.

I'm afraid, however, that the American public has missed the point. They've failed to see what must be learned from this anomaly in popular history so that the ultimate goal, peace, may be spread throughout the world.

So much of the focus has been on Obama: Does he deserve this award

or doesn't he? Is he a peacemaker or isn't he?

But we must come to understand that Obama is not at the center of this issue. He didn't ask for this prize, he didn't put together a billion-dollar campaign to run for it, and he certainly didn't get to cast a vote.

The political body that lies at the epicenter of this story is the Nobel Institute, and specifically the five men and women who gave Obama the award. As a free-thinker and a proponent of peace, it is not President Obama who upsets me but the group that awarded him. I do not take issue with the Nobel Institute because of their political persuasion but because of their haphazard use of resources and international fame that come with the Nobel Peace Prize.

Alfred Nobel originally developed these prizes as a sort of apology after inventing high-explosive dynamite for the purposes of industry and progress. Nobel watched in horror as, in his own lifetime, nations used

his invention as an instrument of war. In response, Nobel left a large sum of money to be given to "those who, during the preceding year, shall have conferred the greatest benefit on mankind" according to nobelprize.org. Nobel hoped to shine a light on the humanitarian and scientific contributions of citizens of the world, thereby making amends for the destruction his discoveries had inadvertently caused.

Those entrusted with the Nobel estate have, unfortunately, turned the man's profound ambitions into a stage for global propaganda. Time and time again the peace prize has been given to those who control the political current, regardless of their merit as peacemakers. Imposters of peace like the deceptive former secretary of state Henry Kissinger and the hypocritical slideshow maker Al Gore were awarded while inspiring figures like the venerable civil-rights leader Mahatma Gandhi and the courageous Holocaust resistor Irena Sendler are ignored.

And just within the last month, Obama has been awarded for what? Winning a historical election ... maybe?

Sadly, our charming president has done very little to further peace in the world. Guantanamo Bay still holds prisoners without a trial, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan show no real progress, and we are nowhere near peace in the Middle East.

And yet the Institute, representing the global community, awards the president the Nobel Peace Prize. This endowment not only insults the other worthy candidates for the prize, such as Chinese dissident Hu Jia, but it also positively reinforces inaction. The entire world has witnessed Obama win the most prestigious of awards by doing nothing of consequence. This greatly impoverishes the cause for peace.

The global community will never see an end to the genocide in Darfur, the bombings in Palestine or the cultural disintegration in Tibet by the charisma of a political leader.

The proliferation of peace requires action. It demands commitment. The forces of oppression and hatred will not relent without great resistance, without civil disobedience, without the undaunted courage of men and women. It is the dogged and fearless effort of individuals, exemplified by the likes of Nelson Mandela, Mother Teresa and Martin Luther King, Jr. that must again be acknowledged and awarded by the Nobel Peace Prize if the prize is to have any positive effect. As citizens of the world we must implicitly reject the awarding of a peace prize based on potential, even if that prize is given to a popular figure. Instead, we must demand action and courage from our peacemakers if we hope to see any measure of peace in our day.

Zach Vicars is a sophomore philosophy, religion and linguistics major from St. Charles, Mo.

Institute develops revenue for Truman



Tyler Retherford

The University's budget crisis might be generating a little less clamor this semester, but that doesn't mean people aren't working toward a wide array of solutions. The giant "Bright Minds Bright Futures" fundraising campaign banner is the most obvious sign of this continued effort to fund the University, but there is a far more interesting and long-term step toward alleviating the financial strain: the Truman Institute.

The Institute, under the direction of Kevin Minch, is still in its infancy, but is helping the University by supporting programs that work toward its three goals: to increase enrollment, develop the Truman "brand" and generate revenue. This organization certainly is not going to solve the budget crisis by itself, but it is a more sustainable, all-encompassing approach to improving the economic prospects of the University.

One of the matters complicating the funding decrease is a drop in enrollment. The objectives of directly boosting enrollment and developing the Truman "brand" work toward this end. I only know Truman exists because a representative came to my high school, and I went to hear his pitch so I could get out of class.

I'm sure I'm not the only one who gets asked where Truman is every time I tell someone where I'm going to school. For some schools, like Mizzou, sports teams are going to generate buzz and alert prospective students to their existence, and Missouri University of Science and Technology's programs are specific and well-known enough to draw engineering students, but Truman seems to have a great deal of trouble getting its name out there.

Programs like Joseph Baldwin Academy help promote Truman by exposing high school students to the Truman campus. Drury University in my hometown of Springfield has

a very similar program designed to draw in prospective students. One of the programs being developed with which the Truman Institute is partnering is a "medical high school" summer program designed to be a pre-college experience for high school students interested in careers in medicine.

Revenue generation isn't the only objective of the Truman Institute, but it is a necessary one to support their programs. Ideally the Institute will be assisting a great number of programs once it is fully developed. Currently it has received 75 ideas for projects consistent with the Institute's mission, and University faculty members and staff suggested most of them.

The Truman Institute is not the solution to the budget problems we are

facing, and it isn't exactly a radically innovative operation. Schools across the country have similar organizations. However, this approach to developing a wider recognition of Truman and increased enrollment is a much more sustainable solution than simply relying on support from wealthy alumni and

state funding. Most of the ideas for programs the Institute is supporting are coming from faculty, and students are perfectly capable of producing creative ways to develop recruitment strategies, cut costs and generate revenue.

Truman students and faculty are amazing at organizing clubs, community events and bringing diverse groups together to accomplish their goals, and this shouldn't end at working for the existing student body. The Truman Institute is a great example of how many smaller initiatives can work together to greatly improve the University, but it doesn't have to be the only way. Just because frequent e-mails, Facebook groups and open meetings about the budget crisis have stopped doesn't mean we shouldn't still be looking for creative solutions, or at the very least considering lending a hand or becoming involved in the existing organizations and programs working to help alleviate the problem.

Tyler Retherford is a junior anthropology major from Springfield, Mo.

AROUND THE QUAD

What are you doing to prepare for winter in Kirksville?



"I bought a 3-in-1 coat meant for skiing in the Appalachians."

*Kirsten Self
freshman*



"I'm preparing to wear many layers of clothing."

*Josh Heubel
freshman*



"I plan on putting chains on my bike."

*Ben Sanders
junior*



"I'm gonna buy winter gear, shoes and an alpaca hat."

*Grace Coughlin
junior*

GlobeMed helps create lasting change for disadvantaged



Shawn Shinneman

You don't have to completely dedicate yourself to fighting extreme poverty to make a difference. It is important, however, to support the individuals who are giving their lives to work toward providing basic human rights — sufficient food, shelter and clean water — for all.

GlobeMed, a national organization aimed at advancing the movement for global health equity, is in the middle of a campaign entitled "Imagine 2030." Money generated from the campaign will be going directly to GlobeMed projects that aim to create lasting change in developing countries.

It seems almost every program aimed at helping poverty in developing countries tries to guilt trip us. These kinds of ads are all too predictable. They often splice together pictures of sick and/or starving kids to a slow, sad song. Although this tactic might work on some people, it makes many more feel helpless

and overwhelmed.

The Imagine 2030 campaign takes a different approach. GlobeMed is challenging us to think, not about what the world has been or what it is today, but rather what it could be. Instead of feeling guilty and helpless, they challenge us to think positively. The people at GlobeMed know they are making a difference. They know their sustainable programs are setting the table for a new era of human equality. But they need us to believe. They need our help.

Therein lies the problem. We must change the way we view poverty in developing countries.

It's easy to donate to an adopt-a-kid program and feel you are doing your part, but these programs have a roof to the positive outcomes they can generate — us. That is not to dismiss anyone sponsoring a child in a developing country. They certainly are impacting that child's life in a substantial way, but there are organizations in place that are creating lasting change, and it is important for us to support these organizations.

GlobeMed pairs its chapters with grass roots organizations around the world. The Truman chapter is paired with a birthing center in Larnage, Haiti, called Maison de Naissance (House of Birth). Larnage is home to the highest infant and maternal

mortality rates in the Western Hemisphere. Truman's GlobeMed aims to fund two market clinics that service an area of 100,000 Haitian mothers and children, providing modern care that is otherwise unavailable to them.

Imagine 2030 is a Facebook campaign through the application "Causes." By 3 p.m. on Nov. 6, the cause with the most donations will receive an extra \$50,000 from Causes. This is the goal GlobeMed has set, and that goal is still very much within reach.

Go to Imagine2030.com to take part in the movement. A \$10 donation goes a long way toward creating a world we can all be more proud of. If you feel empowered to give more, consider spreading your donations out so as to work toward that \$50,000 prize.

Take a second to rethink what our world could look like. Imagine healthy babies and healthy mothers in Haiti. Imagine a thriving South America. Imagine Africa, free from the chains of disease and malnourishment. Imagine people of all cultures walking in solidarity. Imagine equality.

Imagine 2030.

Shawn Shinneman is a junior communication major from St. Joseph, Mo.

Pageant evolutions leave women's role in the past



Brenna McDermott

World peace is apparently one step closer. The Miss California USA pageant is "revolutionizing" the pageant world by doing away with sashes and getting rid of the matching swimsuits, according to a press release dated Oct. 15.

"We're taking a new look at a traditional idea and energizing it for 2010. We're bringing it into a new decade," executive director of Miss California USA Keith Lewis said in the release.

So instead of a beauty pageant, the Miss California USA pageant is becoming a fashion show.

I don't want to come off as one of those feminists who inherently hate beauty pageants and everything they stand for. I want to be reasonable and level-headed about this archaic tradition. But this change seems less of a forward movement and more like a lateral move. "There really is no better opportunity for today's ambitious young women" is partly true — as long as you are skinny and hot, it really is a good opportunity.

Take the Miss Missouri USA pageant. Every contestant, whether they win or lose, receives a \$36,000 scholarship to Lindenwood University, an opportunity any smart woman would take.

But then I read the fine print of the pageant rules: "As a contestant, you will be judged in three equal categories consisting of Personal Interview, Swimsuit, and Evening Wear."

The way each contestant looks in a swimming suit is as important

as what each contestant has to say. And the way you look in a swimming suit and an ugly prom gown is almost doubly as important as each contestant's thoughts.

I'm losing my levelheadedness.

According to the Miss Universe Web site, "The titleholders of the Miss Universe Organization personify the combination of beauty and intelligence that defines the 21st Century." Sure, if you are talking about the 21st century of sex tape scandals and photo-shopping models' waists so their necks look thicker. I was hoping they were heading toward the 21st century where women receive equal pay and are appreciated for what they have to say and what they believe more than how hot they are.

My research has changed my mind a little bit about my hatred for pageants. Behind the superficial fakiness of the beauty portion, the winners really do a lot of good for

the world. Tami Farrell, 2003 Miss Teen USA winner, helped raise more than \$21 million in one year for various charities and became a spokesperson for the American Heart Association and Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

But no one knows about all the benefits of competing in a pageant, and no one will ever appreciate all the hard work the winners put into charity and advocacy work when contestants are first and foremost judged on how they look in a bikini. How does Condoleezza Rice look in a bathing suit? How did Mother Theresa look in a floor length glitter gown? There was a time when women were viewed simply as something to look at — housewives, mistresses or models. Women weren't expected to do anything but sit there, keep their girlish figures and look good for their husbands. I'd like to think I live in a world where a successful, smart woman is valued for the

work she does and the difference she makes, more than the way her butt looks in a bikini.

If pageants really want to move into the new century and the new decade, a fundamental change needs to be made in the beauty pageant system. Although I might have wanted to do away with the entire system, I do see the good pageants do for today's young women. They provide scholarships and teach contestants to give back, but they also are sending out a message that, although getting an education and helping others is important, being hot is much more important. The longer pageants hold on to these old-fashioned expectations, the longer women will be viewed as nothing more than swimsuit models.

Brenna McDermott is a junior communication major from St. Louis, Mo.