

Aggressively protecting American lives is not caving in on liberty

The tiresome argument goes something like this: It's wrong to sacrifice freedom for security. Or, as walking outrage Molly Ivins once put it, "(W)e can't make ourselves safer by making ourselves less free. All that happens when we make ourselves less free is that we're less free."

Only trouble is, people making that absolutist assertion don't really believe it.

They — most of them anyway — don't claim that anyone should be allowed to walk into the White House carrying a loaded pistol. They don't claim any of' body should be entitled to enrich uranium in a basement. They don't claim folks should be welcome to pack a switchblade in a carry-on

for a flight to Washington. Yet all those prohibitions limit freedom in one way or another. Or do they?



Steve Barrett
Commentary

What the Jenny-one-note critics don't seem to get is that security measures our nation has undertaken since 9/11 are in fact efforts to protect the most fundamental freedom: life itself.

Dead people cannot object if you are making overseas phone calls to al-Qaida; only live ones can. If we take the advice of Europe and some U.S. liberals and free the terrorism suspects at Guantanamo Bay, they're extremely liable to kill Americans. Their supposed "rights," then, will have trumped our right to life.

Not one of the liberties we hold dear — freedom of speech,

assembly, ownership of property — has any meaning once a mushroom cloud delivered by terrorists whose phone calls some court forbade the government to listen to starts forming a few miles from our homes.

Measures such as the Patriot Act and the monitoring of calls to overseas terrorists are not, as some would have us believe, a misguided attempt to "balance" freedom against security. They are simply acknowledgments that we must fiercely safeguard the most important freedom — life, named first among our unalienable rights in the Declaration of Independence — for the others to matter.

NOT SO GOOD

It has always seemed fishy to me, theologically and from real-world experience, to claim that people are basically good.

Kevin White's "basic goodness" would seem to be, oh, iffy.

Recently, he tried to rob a woman in Philadelphia, authorities say. She had no money, so he decided to take flesh, The Philadelphia Inquirer reported. He told her he intended to rape her and then kill her. He was allegedly keeping the first part of this bargain in an alley when a man and woman happened by and the victim broke free from his grasp, ignoring commands to pretend she was his girlfriend.

The initial victim as well as Anthony Burno and Kira Derrick — each a parent of two children — fled. They were not fast enough.

Police say White unleashed a hail of bullets, killing Mr. Burno and Miss Derrick on the spot and wounding the rape victim before

she took refuge in the apartment of a Good Samaritan who called for help.

So let's recap: If authorities are right, White not only raped a woman but had the unspeakable cruelty to tell her he planned to take her life once he finished. It's impossible for anybody who has not been in her position to imagine that woman's terror, but we ought to give it a try.

He then gunned down two people and seriously injured a third — none of whom was even challenging him; they were only fleeing for their lives.

My suspicion is that most people who think everybody is basically good have led sheltered lives.

'REAL' VS. 'REALITY'

Our nation has officially entered the Twilight Zone.

No, not just because Democrats are liable to seize Congress in November on the strength of the argument that the best way to fight al-Qaida is to leave Iraq, the key battleground *with* al-Qaida.

It's television. I was chatting with friends over some remarkably badly cooked steaks not long ago when the subject turned to a popular TV show. As they described its subject matter, which apparently includes a celebration of incest, I asked whether it was a "reality" show.

"Oh no," one of them assured me, "it's a real show."

By which he meant it's not a "reality" show. That's beyond perfect. To reach Steve Barrett, call (423) 757-6329 or e-mail sbarrett@timesfreepress.com.

Renaissance 'Georgia Girl' linked closely to history of Chattanooga

By S. KITTRELL RUSHING

Eliza Frances "Fanny" Andrews frequently proclaimed herself a "Georgia Girl," but her ties to Chattanooga and Hamilton County link to the earliest days of the city. Fanny's father, Georgia Circuit Judge Garnett Andrews, was one of the initial group of investors who hired surveyors to plot what became downtown Chattanooga. Fanny's older brother, Civil War Col. Garnett Andrews, was prominent among the city's 19th century lawyers and served as Chattanooga's mayor in the early 1890s. Col. Andrews' children were leaders of Chattanooga's early 20th century civic and business life. Fanny often visited her Chattanooga relatives, bicycling Lookout Mountain to explore and to gather specimens for her botany collections.

Fanny's life represents the changing role of Southern womanhood from the 19th to the 21st centuries. She was trained to take her place on what historian Christie Anne Farnham describes as the "pedestal of Southern chivalry," but the Civil War made Fanny's antebellum training obsolete and anachronistic. The war left the Andrews family destitute. Both parents died a few years after Lee's surrender, and Fanny and her brothers and sisters were forced to sell the family home and plantation to pay Reconstruction taxes and settle debts.

With the loss of the family's fortune, Fanny elected to support herself, something virtually unheard of for a young woman of her place and time. She wrote in her diary as the Southern Confederacy collapsed about her, "Marriage is incompatible with the career I have marked out for myself ..."

Shortly before her father's death, Fanny confided to her diary that though family finances were desperate, "I don't believe starvation itself could drive me to it (marriage). ... I can't, and I won't. I am afraid my pen has spoiled me: it has opened such a world to me, and I shudder at any kind of a marriage ..."

By the time of her death in 1931 in Rome, Ga., Fanny had written four novels, including a best-seller, more than three dozen scientific articles, two botany textbooks, and dozens of commentaries on topics ranging from politics to the environment. She traveled the world and made contributions to education, to science and to literature. She had been nominated for membership in the International Academy of Literature and Science, honored by her hometown of Washington, Ga., and by her adopted home of Rome.

Andrews kept a diary chronicling her life from the last days of the Civil War and the early years of Reconstruction. The first years of the diary she published in 1908 as "Wartime Journal of a Georgia Girl: 1864-1865." The last chapters of her diary lay untouched and virtually unknown for over a hundred years. The last part of the diary was discovered recently in the UTC Lupton Library archives, and subsequently published by the Uni-



This photo of Eliza Frances "Fanny" Andrews was taken in the mid-1870s, around the time her first novel was published.

versity of Tennessee Press as "Journal of a Georgia Woman, 1870-1872."

Until the discovery of her diary's final chapters, little was known of Fanny's life from 1865 to 1908. The publication of her 1870-1872 diary provides in Fanny's own words the beginning of a transition she described as maturing from "Phillip drunk to Phillip sober."

The sobering began in the late summer of 1870 when Fanny and younger sister Metta spent several weeks visiting their Cousin Lilla Ward in Newark, N.J. Cousin Lilla, the wife of a wealthy Newark industrialist, was the daughter of Fanny's mother's aunt.

The Wards epitomized to Fanny the "yankee shoppies" she, and Southerners of her class, so looked down upon. Fanny's diary entries make clear that she continued to resist the values of the Civil War's victors, but the impact on Fanny of her visit to Newark was lasting. For example, on Sept. 12, 1870, she wrote after touring the huge thread factory belonging to Cousin Lilla's next-door neighbor, George Clark:

"It was a very interesting visit — and heavens! how it opened my eyes! I will never turn up my nose again at a manufacturing of spool thread. Cotton planting is nothing to it. It is a really manly business to command such an establishment so that, and still more so, to understand all about it as Mr. Clark does — and still find time, with all that on his hands, to be one of the most cultivated and sensible gentlemen I ever met! What a fool I have been! I know now that cotton planting and soldiering are not the only occupations for gentlemen, and I have found out that rich manufacturers are not necessarily shoppies and upstarts. A spool of sewing thread seems a very insignificant thing but the process of making it is anything but insignificant. I'll never make a fool of myself again by feeling contempt for manufacturers."

Fanny's detailed account of her visit to the North revealed a maturing and growing awareness of her society. Fanny's

antebellum world collapsed. She lost her parents. Her community was in racial and political turmoil. The family fortune was gone. But Fanny made the passage from a dead world to a new.

Fanny removed herself from the pedestal which confined Southern women of her time. With intelligence and tenacity she built and sustained her own place of prestige and productivity.

Thirty years after her death James and Boyer in their now classic 3-volume *Notable American Women, 1607-1950*, named Fanny one of the notable American women in United States history; and in 2006, in ceremonies at Macon's Wesleyan College, Fanny Andrews was named one of Georgia's Outstanding Women.

One of the great names in the scholarship of the South's history and of the developing and changing role of women in the South, Anne Firor Scott, says simply of Fanny Andrews, "She was quite a gal."

Kittrell Rushing teaches in the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga Communication Department. His research and writing interests include 19th century journalism history and 19th century women's issues. He is working on a project to republish the memoirs of Fanny's father, Judge Garnett Andrews. This article originally appeared in Volume 6, No. 1 of the Chattanooga Regional Historical Journal.

LOCAL HISTORY

The Times Free Press is printing a series of condensed versions of articles that have appeared in the Chattanooga Regional Historical Journal, a semi-annual publication of the Chattanooga Area Historical Association. Each journal has features on the history of Chattanooga and surrounding areas. Back issues are available at the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Bicentennial Library. For information on the journal and association memberships, call LaVonne Jolley at (423) 886-2090. Web site: www.chattahistoricalassoc.com.

Dreher

Continued from Page F1

boundaries of Lancaster County, but through every human heart.

What sets hearts apart is how they deal with sins and tragedies. In his suicide note, Roberts said one reason he did what he did was out of anger at God for the death of his infant daughter in 1997. Wouldn't any parent wonder why God allowed that to happen? Roberts held onto his hatred, purifying it under pressure until it exploded in an act of infamy. That's one way to deal with anger.

Another is the Amish way. If Roberts' rage at God over the death of his baby girl was in some sense understandable, how much more comprehen-

sible would be the rage of those Amish mothers and fathers whose children perished by his hand? Had my child suffered and died that way, I cannot imagine what would have become of me, for all my pretenses of piety. And yet, the Amish do not rage. They do not return evil for evil. In fact, they embody peace and love beyond all human understanding.

In our time, religion makes the front pages usually in the ghastliest ways. In the name of God, the faithful fly planes into buildings, blow themselves up to murder the innocent, burn down rival houses of worship, insult and condemn and cry out to heaven for vengeance. The wicked Rev. Fred Phelps and his crazy brood of fundamentalist vipers even planned to protest at the Amish children's funeral, until Dallas-based radio talker

Mike Gallagher, bless him, gave them an hour of his program if they would only let those poor people bury their dead in peace.

But sometimes, faith helps ordinary men and women do the humanly impossible: to forgive, to love, to heal and to redeem. It makes no sense. It is the most sensible thing in the world. The Amish have turned this occasion of spectacular evil into a bright witness to hope. Despite everything, a light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it.

Rod Dreher is assistant editorial page editor of *The Dallas Morning News*. Readers may write to him at *The Dallas Morning News*, Communications Center, Dallas TX 75265; e-mail: rdreher@dallasnews.com.

McClatchy Newspapers

Griswold

Continued from Page F1

states and metropolitan areas. But immigration on average has accounted for only 30 percent of the change in individual state populations since 2000. The biggest driver, again, has been natural growth, which accounts for 40 percent of the growth of the typical state, with the remaining 30 percent driven by migration of Americans from one state to another.

A rising population is entirely consistent with a higher quality of life. Though our population today is four times larger than it was a century ago, we live much longer and better than we did in 1906. Life expectancy at birth has grown from 48 to 78 years, infant mortality rates have plunged, a host of deadly diseases have been conquered, and the air we breathe and the water we drink are far cleaner than when we were a less populous country. Our homes, too, are much bigger, and food is more plentiful than ever. There is no reason why these trends cannot continue as the population rises.

Even at 300 million, the United States is not "overpopulated." We remain a vast country with lots (and lots) of open space. One need only gaze out the window at 30,000 feet while flying cross-country to appreciate how

much of America remains rural or unpopulated. We could give every American household an acre of land and still fit all 300 million of us in the states of Illinois, Iowa and Missouri — with the rest of the country set aside as one giant national park.

Nor is the United States suffering a "population explosion." In fact, our nation's population growth has been slowing in recent decades. Since 1900, population has grown at an average annual rate of 1.31 percent.

But in the past 15 years, the growth rate has slowed to 1.16 percent, and since 2000 the rate has slipped to just below 1 percent. Immigrants help America maintain a steady rate of growth.

Population growth does not require bigger government and higher taxes, either. Paying for roads, schools and medical care are problems today not because we have too many people, but because the government is so heavily involved in providing those services. Notice we never worry about who will pay for the new houses, grocery stores, gas stations and shopping malls that accompany a growing population. The market supplies those goods and services, efficiently and abundantly, and we eagerly pay for what we get.

Market reforms in health care, education and transportation would do more to shift the burden away from taxpayers than any misguided efforts to

control population growth. And a growing population actually reduces the cost to each individual for national defense and interest on the public debt.

As it has in every previous era, an expanding population confers real blessings on our country. America is unique in the world for its combination of size and wealth. A rising population combined with high productivity per worker magnifies our weight in the global economy and our influence in the world. A larger population creates a larger domestic market, spurring innovation and dynamism, and honing U.S. producers to compete and prosper in the global economy. In contrast, Western Europe, Japan and Russia face the far more sobering prospect of a demographic implosion.

It would be a gigantic mistake for policymakers to seek to curb birth rates or immigration in a misguided effort to dampen our population growth. As long as America remains the land of the free, a growing population will mean more opportunity and more prosperity for those of us fortunate to count ourselves among the 300 million.

Daniel Griswold is director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute. Readers may write to him at the Cato Institute, 1000 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington DC 20001.

McClatchy Newspapers

Griscom

Continued from Page F1

One other issue delves more into personalities than policy.

Mr. Corker brought the Ford "political machine" into the fray with a reference to the Memphis congressman's family, which has been involved in local, state and national politics for several decades. Mr. Ford called foul, comparing his family's political dominance to that of former Tennessee Sen. Howard Baker, whose father served in Congress, and President Bush's family.

Mr. Ford served up a "political campaign family" connection of his own, tying Mr. Corker to his finance chairman, who is part of "Big Oil." Jimmy Haslam and his family own Pilot Oil Co., which operates a series of travel centers across the country. Mr. Corker counters that Pilot is a gasoline retailer, a leader in biodiesel and other alternative fuel sources.

Political families and their influence come in different forms and these relationships will continue to stir the political pot for the remaining 23 days.

Over the next several weeks as more political polls are conducted and dueling numbers released, signs from the campaigns will be a better barometer. When one



Harold Ford Jr.



Bob Corker

STAFF PHOTOS BY TIM BARBER

campaign decreases the negative ads and appears to be gliding into the election, that will be an indication of more confidence.

Until that time the Tennessee Senate race remains part of the group of seats that will determine whether Republicans or Democrats will hold control in the Senate.

FINAL THOUGHTS ON THE CHATTANOOGA DEBATE

A majority of those in attendance were students at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. A significant number of the questions posed to either Mr. Ford or Mr. Corker came from and were written by students. Why is

this important?

For all those who want to find some shred to criticize, there are much larger issues that matter more in the future.

To have college students, some who may be voting for the first time in a few weeks, making up the largest bloc in attendance for the debate offers an opportunity for this generation to understand the electoral process in the country. If out of that hour experience on a Tuesday night in October, a young person decides to seek public office or to become involved in shaping decisions, then it was time well spent.

To reach Tom Griscom, call (423) 757-6472 or e-mail tgriscom@timesfreepress.com.