



# The JOURNAL

---

A Summit Ministries Publication

---

And to this, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now our salvation is nearer than when we first believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand. Therefore let us cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. Let us walk properly, as in the day, not in revelry and drunkenness, not in lewdness and lust, not in strife and envy. But on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to fulfill its lusts. –Romans, 13:11-14

## From The President's Desk

Summit Ministries constantly looks for materials to assist our graduates not only survive, but triumph on our Secular Humanist campuses.

Paul Craig Roberts identifies the relationship between our universities 'politically correct' ??? and those of previous ideologies. He is right on target. His article appeared in *The Washington Times* (September 29, 2000).

"Tyranny is creeping up on us. If you don't believe it, consider the most prominent hallmarks of the Nazi and communist regimes, which sought to supplant democracy in the 20th century.

"In National Socialist Germany and the Soviet Union, there were no First Amendment rights. No one could voice an opinion contrary to the politically correct views enforced by the Gestapo and the KGB. Media and education were used to instill politically correct thinking and bring denunciation upon anyone who departed from politically correct thinking.

"This is precisely the situation that exists today in the vast majority of American colleges and universities. Verbal and facial expressions that are contrary to political correctness result in sensitivity training (a form of brainwashing) or expulsion for the offender, who may have

done nothing more than laugh. If the source of mirth is an ethnic joke, a blonde joke or a hilarious claim by a multiculturalist, the hapless offender discovers that his constitutional protections do not exist.

"In Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, there were victim groups that were championed and oppressor groups that were suppressed. In Germany, the 'victims' were Aryans, who were said to be under the financial hegemony of Jews. In the Soviet Union, the hegemonic group was the bourgeoisie, who allegedly held sway over an oppressed proletariat. In both countries, victims were permitted to exercise violent language and actions against oppressors.

"In the United States today, white heterosexual able-bodied males constitute the hegemonic group. Everyone else is a member of a victim group.

"In Germany and the Soviet Union, the abstract and imaginary group roles of oppressor and victim were given a frightful reality by ideologues. Race and class categories became the basis for discrimination and new legal systems that favored victims' groups with preferences.

"On American campuses, multi-cultural ideology has revived the concepts of race and class oppression, and added new ones based on gender and sexual orientation. Men oppress women, and heterosexuals oppress homosexuals.

"According to multiculturalists, our culture and values reflect nothing but the arbitrary domination of society by white heterosexual males. University of Pennsylvania professor Alan Kors says that, thanks to multiculturalism, 'half a century after the defeat of Nazism, we distinguish by blood and we equate blood with culture.' We now think like Nazis and explain our society and culture in terms of race (and gender) hegemony.

"Tyrannical states attack the family. Both the Nazis and communists are infamous for state intrusions in family affairs. In the United States, similar bureaucratic and political intrusions come from family courts. Most Americans are unaware of the existence of these relatively new 'courts.' Howard University Professor Stephen Baskerville is the leading authority on these courts. He says family courts are 'the most dangerous institutions posing a threat to constitutional rights in our society. The only parallels are the ideological-bureaucratic dictatorships of the last century.'

"Family courts claim immunity from the Constitution and from scrutiny by federal courts. Mr. Baskerville describes them as follows: 'Their proceedings are secret and unrecorded. Their orders are enforced by bureaucratic police who do not wear uniforms and whose sole responsibility is to conduct surveillance over families and private lives. As such, these police are akin to secret police. By the very nature of their jurisdiction, these courts and police are the most intrusive and invasive arm of government, and yet they are accountable to virtually no one. Such an institution is intolerable in a free society.'

"Recently a family court judge ordered the parents of a 7-year-old boy in Berne, N.Y., to put their child on Ritalin, a behavior-control drug. The alternative was to be found guilty of 'educational neglect,' an offense that would open the possibility of their child being seized by Child Protective Services – a Hillary Clinton 'village' institution straight from the pages of the Gestapo. The child suffered serious side effects from the drug, but parents no longer have the right to decide what is best for their children.

"Tyrannical states assault the individual in the inner recesses of his consciousness. He is not permitted to think certain thoughts or to express a prohibited thought privately to anyone.

"Recently, Janice Barton encountered a Spanish-speaking couple while leaving a restaurant in Manistee, Mich. She turned to her mother and said, 'I wish these [ethnic slur] would learn to speak English.' An off-duty deputy sheriff over-heard the private remark, followed the woman to her car and noted her tag number. Janice Barton was sentenced to 45 days in jail for her thought crime.

"This couldn't happen in a free country."

## **Month In Review**

Q "Theology teaches us what ends are desirable and what means are lawful, while Politics, teaches what means are effective."

– C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*

Q "I bless the Lord: O Lord my God, how great you are! You are robed with honor and with majesty and light! You stretched out the starry curtain of the heavens, and hollowed out the surface of the earth to form the seas. The clouds are his chariots. He rides upon the wings of the wind. The angels are his messengers—his servants of fire!

"You bound the world together so that it would never fall apart. You clothed the earth with floods of waters covering up the mountains. You spoke, and at the sound of your shout the water collected into its vast ocean beds, and mountains rose and valleys sank to the levels you decreed. And then you set a boundary for the seas, so that they would never again cover the earth.

"He placed springs in the valleys, and streams that gush from the mountains. They give water for all the animals to drink. There the wild donkeys quench their thirst, and the birds nest beside the streams and sing among the branches of the trees. He sends rain upon the mountains and fills the earth with fruit. The tender grass grows up at his command to feed the

cattle, and there are fruit trees, vegetables and grain for man to cultivate, and wine to make him glad, and olive oil as lotion for his skin, and bread to give him strength. The Lord planted the cedars of Lebanon. They are tall and flourishing. There the birds make their nests, the storks in the firs. High in the mountains are pastures for the wild goats, and rock-badgers burrow in among the rocks and find protection there.

"He assigned the moon to mark the months, and the sun to mark the days. He sends the night and darkness, when all the forest folk come out. Then the young lions roar for their food, but they are dependent on the Lord. At dawn they slink back into their dens to rest, and men go off to work until the evening shadows fall again. O Lord, what a variety you have made! And in wisdom you have made them all! The earth is full of your riches." – Psalms 104:1-24

Q "The Future is, of all things, the thing least like eternity. It is the most completely temporal part of time—for the Past is frozen and no longer flows, and the Present is all lit up with eternal rays. . . Hence nearly all vices are rooted the Future. Gratitude looks to the Past and love to the Present; fear, avarice, lust and ambition look ahead.

". . . With the present . . . there, and there alone, all duty, all grace, all knowledge, and all pleasure dwell."

– C. S. Lewis, *Screwtape Letters*

Q "The efficacy of prayer is, at any rate, no *more* of a problem than the efficacy of *all* human acts. i.e., if you say 'It is useless to pray because Providence already knows what is best and will certainly do it,' then why is it not equally useless (and for the same reason) to try to alter the course of events in any way whatever?"

– C. S. Lewis, *Letters of C. S. Lewis*

Q "Waco, Texas – Baylor University has fired the head of a think tank who is a noted advocate of the 'intelligent design' theory, which says scientific evidence shows that nature is so complex that it must result from a higher power.

"Controversy flared at the Baptist school last April when the faculty senate asked Baylor to shut the Michael Polanyi Center directed by William A. Dembski because it legitimized creationism. Baylor asked scholars from other campuses to investigate. Their report affirmed

the center's academic work but called for a faculty advisory committee.

"Dr. Dembski then praised Baylor for resisting 'intolerant assaults on freedom of thought' from 'dogmatic opponents of design.' University officials asked him to recant his remarks. He refused and was removed by university president Robert Sloan. A spokesman said Dr. Dembski had 'compromised his ability to serve' and lacked a 'collegial' manner.

"Dr. Dembski, an Eastern Orthodox layman with doctorates from the University of Chicago in mathematics and the University of Illinois in philosophy, remains an associate professor at Baylor's Institute for Faith and Learning. He is the author of several books including *Intelligent Design: The Bridge Between Science & Theology* (InterVarsity Press) and *The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance Through Small Probabilities* (Cambridge University Press)."

– *The Dallas Morning News*, November 11, 2000, p. 3G

Q "During my 33 years teaching, I've encountered similar experiences, I've encountered similar experiences. I've aired my criticisms to black students, often getting the response, 'Some white students do the same thing.' I've typically responded by saying: 'A white student goofing off might have a father who's a doctor, lawyer or CEO who can make a phone call to get him a job. Who does your father know?'

"McWhorter doesn't argue there is no longer any racial discrimination in the United States, but racial discrimination is not the major problem for blacks today. Instead, it's self-sabotage – and he's right. Let's look at it. A black illegitimacy rate hovering around 70 percent is devastating but it's not caused by whites. Black people have the nation's highest victimization rates for murder, assault, rape and other violent crimes, but it's not whites who are culpable.

"Black students have the nation's lowest academic achievement. That can't be blamed on racism because academic achievement is the lowest in cities where the mayor, superintendent of schools, and most principals and teachers are black, such as Washington, D.C., Philadelphia and Detroit. Academic achievement is also the lowest where the most money is spent on education. Washington, D.C., ranks second in spending and ranks 49th in achievement.

"John H. McWhorter's 'Losing the Race' draws attention to serious problems that black Americans must confront. I, for one, have confidence that if black youngsters spent as much time and effort studying math and English as some of them spend playing basketball, they'd produce the same excellence in math and English. The fact racism kept blacks out of college

and professional basketball and football years ago doesn't stop us from today's domination. And the reason isn't affirmative action, it's excellence."

– Walter E. Williams, *The Gazette*, November 15, 2000, p. M7

Q "An incurable sexually transmitted virus is quietly spreading through the U.S. population, but government officials disagree as to the danger it poses and how it should be handled.

"On one side is Rep. Tom Coburn, Oklahoma Republican and an obstetrician, who speaks bluntly about the human papilloma virus (HPV), calling it 'a very insidious disease.'

"He has been fighting for more than a year to make HPV a reportable disease like AIDS is now and to put warnings on condom packages saying that they offer little or no protection against HPV.

"On the other side is the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG), Planned Parenthood Federation of America and the Society of Gynecologic Oncologists, whose combined protests succeeded in stripping Dr. Coburn's proposed legislation from one bill.

"Dr. Coburn's new version no longer calls for mandatory HPV reporting. But it does call for 'medically accurate' condom labels and more public education on the disease. These requests have been added to another bill to be taken up by Congress.

"HPV is arguably the most common sexually transmitted disease in the United States, with an estimated 24 million active cases and 5.5 million new cases each year.

"Most people contract a strain of HPV that is suppressed by the immune system with no medical intervention.

"Other HPV strains cause troublesome genital warts. An even smaller number of HPV strains lead to cervical cancer, which kills around 4,800 women a year – more than the number of women who die of AIDS.

"Public ignorance about HPV is high. Internet sites buzz with questions about 'those bumps,' and doctors say most women are stunned to learn that their abnormal Pap smears are caused by a sexually transmitted virus.

"'Yes, yes – they don't know what it is,' said Dr. Alan Ross, who often diagnoses HPV in the college students he sees at the Women's Health Care Center in Bethesda.

"In February, the Kaiser Family Foundation asked 1,006 people to name all the sexually transmitted diseases they knew. Eighty-five percent listed AIDS, but only 11 percent listed 'genital warts' and 2 percent said 'HPV.'

"Dr. Coburn sees HPV as another AIDS crisis – an emerging epidemic caused by an incurable virus that is easily spread, linked to deadly cancer and largely impervious to condoms – the biggest weapon in the nation's sexually transmitted disease-fighting arsenal.

"'The scientific facts are irrefutable. Condoms don't protect you against HPV or they offer such limited protection that you will most probably get it anyway,' said Dr. Coburn.

"If women could read on a condom label, 'This does not protect you from the leading cause of cervical cancer in this country,' they might 'rethink their thoughts about sexual intercourse,' he said.

"Dr. Coburn has support from doctors like Dr. Curtis C. Stine of the Medical Institute in Austin, Texas, and Dr. Hal Wallis, a obstetrician from Red Oak, Texas.

"Both doctors urge their patients to use condoms as general protection against some sexually transmitted diseases, but warn that condoms don't protect well against HPV and other diseases that are spread by skin-to-skin contact.

"'The only completely safe way [to avoid HPV] is sexual abstinence until marriage, marry an uninfected partner and sexual fidelity within marriage. That's the bottom line,' said Dr. Stine." – *The Washington Times*, November 7, 2000, p. A2

Q "A doctor friend of mine called last week. He shared with me that his day consisted of telling four women they had an incurable sexually transmitted disease. His next comment hit me: 'I spend hours in surgery treating incurable STDs and they want me to throw a piece of latex at my 17-year-old and say it's safe?'

"Ironically, on the same day, with fanfare and subsequent media fawning, the megabucks Kaiser Family Foundation released a report titled 'Sex Education in America: A View from Inside the Nation's Classrooms.' The report claims kids, parents and educators all want more sex education for teens – more contraceptive education, that is.

"Buried among numbers not high-lighted in Kaiser's press release or subsequent, uncritical media reports are some bothersome realities. When it comes to sex education, many parents

don't know what is being taught in the classroom and many want their child to receive more than a latex condom and an 'anything goes' message.

"A full 45 percent of parents in the Kaiser report said their schools still do not tell them what is actually being taught in their child's sex-education class. This stands to reason since 61 percent of schools don't even bother to have a parent night to discuss what they're teaching.

"Ninety-four percent of parents want schools to address the pressure to have sex and the emotional consequences of becoming sexually active. Most parents also opt for some modesty, believing boys and girls should be taught sex ed separately. Many said they were not confident their values were being represented in sex-ed classes. They are right to suspect a subversion of their family's values. Consider Kaiser's sneaky survey questions: 'Do you know that you can get birth control and emergency contraception without your parent's permission or knowledge?'

"The Kaiser survey also deliberately attempted to skew the contraceptives vs. abstinence debate. The survey described abstinence education as teaching teens sex was 'something to fear and avoid,' while contraceptive-based education portrayed sex as 'normal and healthy.' The question might have been answered differently if the choice was 'cherished, respected and saved' vs. 'take the condom and do as you please.'

"Unfortunately, the Kaiser survey isn't about what kids, parents or even educators want. It is about Kaiser and their social engineer friends measuring how well they have indoctrinated America's youth with a pro-condom message. What they're not measuring is their role in the tragic consequences: an epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases, a trail of sexual exploitation and broken hearts, none of which any condom can stop.

"If Kaiser really wants to help families, they would do better to repudiate the disastrous sexual revolution and held publicize the growing abstinence movement. In the past 15 years, the abstinence movement has seen more than 2.5 million teens make the commitments to save sex for marriage and have seen a significant decrease in teen pregnancies, but if our culture keeps throwing latex at our kids, my doctor friend can count on delivering bad news to an ever-growing number of patients."

—Amy Stephens, *The Washington Times*, November 1, 2000, p. A 16

Q "What kind of people are the top 1 percent? The Census Bureau does not give us a direct statistical answer; the closest it offers is fascinating information about the top 5 percent. In 1998, the latter group included nearly 3.6 million families who earned more than \$145,199. Here is a quick portrait of these 'rich' families, and how they got that way:



"Ninety-six percent were married.

"Ninety-five percent received some of their income from saving and investing.

□

"Ninety-three percent were still collecting salaries; on average, more than 2.1 family members worked.

"Seventy-one percent had at least a bachelor's degree; 36 percent had advanced degrees.

"Sixty-four percent were over age 45; the average age was above 49.

"There is little reason to suppose that the top 1 percent is much different from the top 5 percent: That is, they are unusually hard-working, well-educated married people who are getting older and have taken care to save and invest. The top 1 percent does, of course, include quite a few famous entertainers, athletes, CEOs, politicians (e.g. the Clintons), and journalists. Al Hunt and his wife, Judy Woodruff, are surely among the top 1 percent, as are many other hardworking and talented two-earner families. Al Gore's solo income of \$240,930 in 1999 was only slightly below the top 1 percent. But few members of the top 1 percent are famous, since the group includes more than a million households.

"Why are these people so wealthy? The Census Bureau provides detailed information about five income groups, ranging from the top 20 percent to the bottom 20 percent, and these statistics suggest three main reasons why some families earn more than others, and why some make it to the top 1 percent.

"First, *families with two workers earn more than those with no workers*. In 1999, median income among family heads who worked full-time all year was \$58,502. Among families with two earners, median income was \$74,711—enough to put half of all two-earner families in the highest fifth of the income distribution. Among families in which the household head worked part-time for less than half the year, by contrast, median income was only \$32,821. But that was not nearly low enough to be counted among the lowest fifth (those earning less than \$21,600). Among families in the lowest fifth, 47 percent had no family member who worked at all during the year, and another 28 percent had members who worked only part-time and/or part-year. Those in the top fifth work many more hours than those in the bottom fifth.

"Second, *young, inexperienced employees earn much less than they will after a couple of decades of raises and promotions*. In 1999, median income was only \$24,031 for household heads younger than 25, but \$65,303 for those aged 45 to 54. Above age 75, income drops back to \$28,638. All the inflamed rhetoric about rich and poor is mainly about the same people at different stages in their lives. A Brookings Institution book, *Who Bears the Lifetime*

*Tax Burden?*, by Don Fullerton and Diane Lim Rogers, reports that ‘13.8 percent of the annually poor are lifetime rich and 2.6 percent of the annually rich are lifetime poor.’ Life is a moving picture; annual income is merely a snapshot.

"Third, *people who invest many years and dollars in a college education eventually earn more than high-school dropouts*. Median income was \$23,668 among those over age 25 with less than a ninth-grade education, \$42,995 among high-school graduates, and \$100,000 for those with a doctoral degree. Yet age trumps even education. Median income among male college graduates younger than 25 was only \$24,498 in March 1999—while high-school grads aged 45 to 54 were earning \$38,340."

—Alan Reynolds, *National Review*, November 6, 2000, p. 46, 47

Q "Recent campaign appearances at churches by President Clinton and Vice President Al Gore have crossed the line prohibiting political activity by churches and could threaten the institutions' tax-exempt status, critics from both ends of the political spectrum say.

"‘This is an abuse, and a deliberate abuse, of the churches' duty to remain independent – they must remain independent of political elements,’ said Don Alexander, the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service under Presidents Nixon and Ford. He is now a lawyer in Washington.

"Americans United For the Separation of Church and State, a group that has been highly critical of Republican ties to the Christian Coalition, filed a complaint this week with the IRS, saying the Democrats are abusing their ties with black churches.

"‘We want them to stop doing the wrong thing,’ Americans United director Barry W. Lynn said. ‘This has never been a campaign designed to get churches stripped of their tax exemptions.’

"Richard Lessner, executive director of American Renewal, the lobbying arm of the Family Research Council, said he is glad to see Democrats receiving some attention. For years, he noted, the political left criticized Republicans for their ties with conservative churches.

"Mr. Lessner and Mr. Lynn are longtime adversaries over the issue of religion and politics.

"‘I don't have a constitutional problem with a political figure speaking to a religious group, but there are limits on what they can do – they can't appeal for donations, they can't appeal for votes,’ Mr Lessner said. ‘I think the president may have crossed that line.’

Mr. Clinton appeared Sunday at the Alfred Street Baptist Church in Alexandria, appealing to the congregation to turn out for Sen. Chuck S. Robb of Virginia and for Mr. Gore. Mr. Gore, meanwhile, appeared at the Greater Grace Temple of the Apostolic Faith in Detroit, appealing for votes in the hotly contested battleground of Michigan."

– *The Washington Times*, November 11, 2000, p. A11

Q "A military man who has to tell his wife and family that he has been fired from the service is not likely to forget the experience. But having to tell them that he has been selected out by a review board because his unit had too many white males to suit the Pentagon's affirmative-action program made Frank Christian furious after a Selective Early Retirement Board (SERB) decided in July 1992 that his services – and those of 1,031 other lieutenant colonels who are white males – no longer were required by the U.S. Army. 'All of us were hurt and felt something was wrong, either with us or the way this was done,' Christian tells *Insight*. Now the U.S. Claims Court has agreed.

"Also in 1992, a board at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, selected 610 male colonels for early retirement. No female colonels were selected out. A class-action lawsuit followed, with 83 of the colonels contending that the use of affirmative-action policies in their dismissals violated their right to equal protection. Their case was settled by the government out of court for \$10 million.

"A similar class-action lawsuit, *Berkley vs. U.S.*, was filed in 1998 to protect the rights of 1,595 other officers. It is still before the courts.

"Christian says that the practice of getting rid of white males so that the ratio of female and minority groups will meet politically correct quotas is not the only reason for falling morale. 'We're also overworking the forces and giving them inappropriate roles. The purpose of the armed forces is to win wars,' he tells *Insight*."

–*Insight*, November 27, 2000, p. 18

Q "Married people enjoy more physical, emotional and financial benefits than single, divorced or widowed people, according to Linda J. Waite and Maggie Gallaghe, authors of *The Case for Marriage*. Among the perks:

**"Physical Benefits of Marriage**

- "Longer lives and fewer health problems, especially for husbands.
- "Low levels of risky behavior (smoking, drinking, drug use)
- "High levels of sexual activity and highest levels of sexual satisfaction.

### "**Emotional Benefits of Marriage**

- Low levels of depression, anxiety and other forms of psychological distress.
- Low levels of suicide.
- Added 'sense of meaning' to life.

### "**Financial Benefits of Marriage**

- High earnings for husbands, compared with bachelors; this 'marriage premium' increases the longer a man is married. Household expenses only slightly higher than a single-person household.
- High levels of wealth among wives, compared with nonmarried women.
- High levels of overall assets, including savings; the net worth of the average married couple is more than twice that of any other households."

– *Insight*, November 27, 2000, p. 28

Q "We incessantly hear, in loud bravado from Al Gore, and in more muted tones from the opposition, that Washington is so healthy financially we're regularly paying down the once-escalating national debt.

"Vice President Gore recently roared that the debt will be gone, finished, paid off, finito, by 2012, just a whiff of time in fiscal measurement. In September, from his Rose Garden perch, President Clinton boasted that hundreds of billions have been erased from the national debt this year. This is supposedly the third year in a row we have been paying down the massive albatross, one that lies heavily over our financial heads to the tune of \$84,000 for every family of four.

"Is the paydown all true? Of course not. This is merely another chapter in the newly minted mathematical hyperbole that has infected the body politic.

"As political lies fly like leaves in a windy autumn, there is, however, one stalwart outpost of truth in Washington. It is the Bureau of the Public Debt, a division of the Treasury Department. But why would they tell us victimized citizens the truth? Why such contrarian thought?

"The answer is that they, not the politicians, control the numbers that influence international finance, the stock market, and the central bankers here and abroad, if they lied, our currency would be damaged, our good faith and credit so much verbiage. Politicians can and do lie regularly, but somewhere, sometime, the buck must stop. It is at the Bureau of the Public Debt.

"What do they say? I can give you an inside view because I deal with them regularly. On the forth workday of the month, the BPD issues the latest true numbers on the national debt on a single sheet that any citizen can obtain by calling them. Or you can check it out on the Web at [www.publicdebt.treas.gov](http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov).

"You'll be surprised by the truth.

"In 1998, the administration crowed it had a surplus of \$70 billion and was paying down the debt. I called the Bureau and asked if that was correct. They said they couldn't get involved in politics, but. . .

" 'In 1998, we had a negative \$113 billion for that year. The national debt went *up* (emphasis mine) \$113 billion from \$5.413 trillion to \$5.53 trillion.'

"What about 1999, an even grander year, when the administration announced there was a surplus of \$123 billion?

"Again, I called and received a copy of the 1999 national debt, covering the end of the fiscal year, Sept. 30, 1999.

"Did the national debt go down as promised?

"Apparently, it went in the only direction it seems destined for.

"It rose to \$5.656 trillion, an increase of \$130 billion. Some paydown.

"Fiscal 2000 ostensibly set the record in surpluses, some \$237 billion. But once again, the national debt went up. Not an enormous amount in Washington terms, just some dozen billion, but up nevertheless.

"What about the future? Now, this is classic. The president's own 2001 budget has a chart showing the projected future of the national debt. According to the administration itself, it will reach \$6.8 trillion by 2012, the year Vice President Gore says it will be fully paid off. What's going on here? What's the gimmick that allows them to fool me and thee?

"It's a simple case of two sets of books. The national debt is split into two parts, the 'external' debt consisting of bonds held outside, from simple folks to giant financial institutions from Manhattan to Tokyo. This is called the 'marketable' debt.

"The second part is the 'internal,' non-marketable debt which holds bonds representing the people's money – excess trust fund taxes, mainly from Social Security. It is a kind of second income tax and makes up 80 percent of the so-called 'surplus.' That money has been spent by the government in the general fund, then deposited as IOUs. Both debts, external and internal, carry approximately the same interest, averaging about 6 percent.

"Over the last few years, the marketable debt is being paid down, a few percent at a time. But the money to pay it down comes from a raid on the trust funds. That internal debt, which someday will have to be redeemed, has meanwhile gone up almost twice as much as the external one has come down.

"The purveyors of this gimmick say paying off the outside debt is more important. Supposedly it is going to save us interest. Nonsense. The internal debt alone will cost us extra interest of some \$240 billion a year by 2012, money that has to come out of the annual budget – and just enough to kill any grandiose spending.

"The reduction in the marketable debt was supposed to accomplish the miracle of lower interest rates. However, it turns out the Treasury is a relatively small player in the daily traffic in government bonds. The result? While we've been paying down the marketable debt (while the other half has gone up more), the interest rate has not gone down. Instead, it has gone up, from 4.5 to some 6 percent."

–Martin Gross, *The Washington Times*, November 2, 2000, p. A 21

Q "Understanding the way things unfold at the *New York Times* takes the subtlety of a Kremlinologist, and with the heavy-handed '60s enthusiast Pinch Sulzberger in charge, the paper is unlikely to return to its classical liberal roots anytime soon. . . . Indeed, of all the orthodoxies the paper has so aggressively promoted over the years, from its casting of single parenthood as a triumph of diversity to its insistence in the face of ready data and common sense that AIDS is everyone's disease, none has enjoyed quite the degree of special handling as the feminists' drive to remake humanity.

"Over the years, the *Times* readers have so come to take this bias for granted that even the most daring leaps in its logic and the grossest disregard of fairness tend to pass unnoticed. Underlying it all has been the pretense that radical feminist groups, notably the National Organization for Women. . . actually speak for all women. A quick check of Lexis-Nexis

reveals that over the past decade, NOW has been cited in 802 articles while, as a quick contrast, the conservative Independent Women's Forum has been mentioned a mere seven times. . .

"Among the small percentage of women whose views NOW actually represents are the overwhelming majority of those who write and edit at the paper itself; women, that is, who are militantly pro-choice and for whom career is an all consuming priority. . . The worldview they represent can now be found in every corner of the paper, evident not merely in the almost uniformly flattering news stories about Hillary Clinton or the seriousness accorded the likes of a Susan Sarandon, but in a sports department that has made a prominently placed photo of a female Little League player an annual rite of spring."

–Harry Stein, *The Washington Times*, October 31, 2000, p. A2

Q "A gay-rights group is criticizing an \$8.35 million donation by the wife of Steve Case, America Online chairman, to the high school she attended. The school is run by a church that opposes homosexual activity and runs ads saying gays can become heterosexual.

"The Washington-based Human Rights Campaign wants Jean Case to reconsider her gift to Westminster Academy because of ties with the Rev. D. James Kennedy's Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church.

"The school is 'inexorably linked to teachings that say gay and lesbian Americans are not worthy of dignity, respect and full citizenship,' Human Rights Campaign director Elizabeth Birch wrote the Cases, 'Your gift will only create an assembly line of hate and intolerance.'"

–*The Colorado Springs Gazette*, November 11, 2000

Q "Jane Fonda took advantage of Internal Revenue Service rules to personally bankroll a tax-exempt \$11.7 million campaign to inject the abortion issue into battle-ground states.

"A group called Pro Choice Vote filed its papers with the IRS on Sept. 12—just seven weeks before the election—with a promise to 'educate the public about the issue of choice in the elections.'

"The group had a single donor – Miss Fonda – who gave \$11.7 million in two checks dated Sept. 15 and Sept. 26.

"The organization used her money to make large donations to abortion-choice groups in several battleground states such as Missouri, Pennsylvania and Minnesota, as well as in New York and California. It also aired its own radio ads and produced Internet video segments featuring actresses Whoopi Goldberg and Sarah Jessica Parker.

"In one ad, Miss Goldberg implores voters to 'get up off that couch, honey, and get into that voting booth' because Supreme Court justices appointed by the next president 'will determine whether or not a woman's right to choose is safe.'

"Miss Fonda said she funded the effort because 'I wanted to do more to help voters understand reproductive rights and related issues so that they could make informed decisions when they go to the polls.'

"Miss Fonda and her husband, television mogul Ted Turner, have been active in population issues for years. Miss Fonda has spearheaded a campaign to eliminate teen-age pregnancies. In 1997, Mr. Turner announced a \$1 billion gift to support U.N. population control efforts.

"Pro Choice Vote was formed under a special IRS classification for political groups that has existed for years but only recently gained popularity. This summer, Congress voted to force the groups to disclose donations and expenses.

"The groups don't have to pay taxes on the donations they collect or abide by federal limits on political fund raising and spending. Unlike charities, however, contributors to these groups cannot take tax deductions.

"More than 10,000 tax-exempt organizations nationwide registered to engage in political activity. An Associated Press computer analysis of the first-ever IRS filings found that, through late October, the groups had raised \$97.3 million and spent \$132.6 million since July 1."

– *The Washington Times*, November 4, 2000, p. A3