Senior Jon Kolanowski, a political science major, writes "The Write Wing" for the Daily News. His views do not necessarily represent those of the newspaper.
Ahhh, a new semester. Welcome back to broken, hilly sidewalks and streets, unnecessarily high-priced 17th edition hard-bound books, cramped cafeteria food, leg cramp drop-add lines, and finally, to the Bursar's Office, which will have no problem accepting your personal check. (For half of your life savings, I might add.) Yes, that one place only people like us could love so well. Ball State.

And, welcome to "The write wing," where it all will make sense, or rather, where I point out that it probably doesn't. I'm not going to spend a semester debating with the ACLU over whether or not students' constitutional rights are being infringed upon when they are not allowed to say the "f-word" near criminal justice classes. And, I'm certainly not going to argue with psychology professors that their time would be much better spent in the classroom teaching than putting any pointless thought that came to mind in the editorial section. If I do, call me out on it. Rather, I would like to break from the norm and get students, at this premier teaching institution, to challenge the tougher issues. Spring semester, for many, including myself, brings graduation. It also brings with it the dreaded, but all-important job search. One topic that often seems to come into play is affirmative action. For some it may sound like salvation, but to others it may as well be a four-letter word. Affirmative action, for those of you who don't know, is the process by which an organization or business strives to recruit more women and minorities for certain positions, so that their numbers will be more representative of the population. Sounds OK, right? Not always.

Women and minorities have traditionally had problems breaking into the white, male-dominated work force because of discriminatory practices. That, I agree, is unfair. Discrimination for characteristics, unrelated to job performance, should never be tolerated. So along comes affirmative action, which sets goals for hiring. With it, we can solve this problem by placing everything in a nice, neat box. Women make up 50 percent of the population, therefore women should get 50 percent of the jobs. (The formula for arriving at actual percentages is much more complicated, but you get the picture.)

What happens if there aren't enough women and minorities to fill these positions? That is precisely what is happening. When it comes to the hiring of faculty here at Ball State, they engage in extensive advertising. If we can't find anyone to apply (the type of people we want, that is) we will look harder until we find someone. Meanwhile, John Smith, a white man, is well-qualified and waiting work, is still waiting. Don't get me wrong. If a woman/minority applicant is found, they still must be qualified in order to be hired.

What is wrong with affirmative action is that it places people into groups. By labeling people as whites, blacks, female and males during the hiring process, we are only perpetuating the problem we seek to end. We engage in preferential hiring of those with certain characteristics, and the original roles are reversed. We fail to see people as individuals, as they should be, but rather as a member of a category. Corporations often set quotas for women and minority hiring so they can keep the government and special interest groups off their backs. But are the most qualified always getting hired? Not always. The quotas were instated for political and financial reasons, not to ensure fairness. It is all political.

If a man and a woman are up for a position and the woman receives the position merely for affirmative action reasons, are we not saying that the woman, in this situation, is more important than the man? Is there still not an unemployed person? What does a woman halfway across the United States, who actually was discriminated against, care if more women are hired? She still isn't as important.

Affirmative action proposes a blanket solution, for a problem that needs to be handled on an individual basis. Our emphasis should be more focused towards those who are actually breaking the law, rather than assuming everyone will.
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Serious issues must be confronted

Welcome back. Week two. Before going into a new topic, I need to reiterate a point that I made. Affirmative action is an example of bad policy because it places people into groups and any such policy with this criteria is inherently flawed. Some of you feel that I am not able to think objectively on this subject, strictly because I am a white male. Rather prejudicial, don’t you think?

Moving on, I want to discuss basic 20th century liberal thought that has been slowly creeping into our lives since the days of FDR’s “New Deal.” Let’s look at a few of the issues.

Dr. Joycelyn Elders:
(President Bill Clinton’s famed ex-Surgeon General) I give her the title of “Miss Liberalism 1990s,” which earns her her own category in my critique. She is no longer our top doctor, but her opinions are still up for discussion.

(1) Legalizing drugs will lower the crime rate. I agree, because using drugs will no longer be a crime. We could lower the crime rate by no longer making rape a crime, but that would be ridiculous, wouldn’t it? Less violence by legalizing drugs? I’ll quote A.M. Rosenthal from the New York Times here. “By this logic, armed robbery should be legalized. Then nobody would get hurt.” Besides all this, let’s not forget the massive exodus of new drug addicts into our streets. Who’s going to treat these people? Our federal government? Who’s going to pay for it? You and me. Watch and see. It will all be legalized under the “Right to Privacy.” We can’t tell you what to do with your body. Shoot up, dude.

(2) Masturbation should be taught in public schools. This subject is much more serious than it sounds. In this day and age, we are constantly confronted with a school system that seems increasingly intent on teaching the youth of America “what to think” and not “how to think.” Let’s have Paul Reuben (a.k.a. Pee-Wee Herman) appointed as Education Secretary.

(3) “America needs to get over its love affair with the fetus.” This subject will be discussed in the next category, but first I must point out that our now embarrassed president cannot sever his ties with Elders’ views. Clinton appointed her as the head of the Arkansas Board of Health when he was governor. They go way back. Clinton appointing Elders is comparable to someone running into a skunk. You can take a bath, but you just can’t get rid of the stink.

Abortion:
This issue will never die. Long after the initial litigants in the Roe v. Wade case are in the ground, people will be debating this issue. This topic is constantly appearing in our editorial section, and I find it extremely amusing that pro-life advocates always seem to make religious beliefs the basis of their arguments. Why quote scripture to people that might not even be Christian? To non-Christians, you might as well be quoting from a geometry book. Try this approach: Why are pro-choice supporters so afraid to make people accept responsibility for their actions? You knew the possible outcome of your action: pregnancy. Why aren’t you prepared to accept the consequences? Keep in mind that I’m leaving rape and incest victims out of this discussion. We always hear, “It’s my body. It’s my right to privacy.”

Question: if you were so concerned about your body, wouldn’t you have taken the necessary precautions to protect it from pregnancy? Or we could take it a step further like other western liberal democracies. We could have government-subsidized abortions. Then everyone could pay for these “mistakes.” We constantly hear that without abortion, we would have thousands of children born into poverty. If you had a choice, would you choose poverty or not being born? Think about it.

I just hit the tip of the iceberg here, and there is much more to discuss. However, I think it is high time we started thinking about what liberal values are doing to this country. Maybe we already have. The votes are in, and the 104th Congress has a “contract with America.”
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Big Bird should leave public nest

Week three — this week we will continue where we left off in our discussion of 20th century liberal thought.

Public broadcasting:
A popular topic of late is Newt Gingrich’s plan of looking into the removal of funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It has been labeled as an outlet for liberal thought. Would you bite the hand that feeds you? Want an example?

How about Walter Cronkite’s PBS program “Christianity Reborn: Prayer and Politics,” which arguably was an assault on Christianity. WARNING! Christians: You’re under attack, and you’re paying for it. You could find me a conservative program, and I still won’t support public funding of television.

One of the main points of the argument rests on “Sesame Street” and Barney the Purple Dinosaur. Some argue that this is good quality programming and should be spared from the chopping block. Others argue that Barney and Big Bird would do just fine being privately financed. I agree. If enough people think that they are vitally important, these programs will have no problem getting funding.

Karen Price from New Orleans, La., wrote a letter to the editor in support of these programs in the Monday edition of USA Today.

“We don’t want our children watching a half hour of commercials for every hour of Sesame Street. We want to raise decent human beings, not knee-jerk consumers,” she said.

It’s an interesting approach. However, I suggest you don’t take your children to any department stores, otherwise they might come across the thousands of Barney dolls, Barney tapes, Barney lunch boxes, Barney shirts, Barney shoes, etc. on display. I’ll let you in on a secret. It’s too late for commercialization of Barney and Big Bird. We’re already airing what amounts to be hour-long commercials, and once again, you’re paying for it. I haven’t been able to find out where all of the toy profits are going. Maybe we can use them as a return on our investment by paying off the national deficit.

Price went on to say that the government allocations were “measly funds,” anyway. OK, I guess $235 million in 1993 and $284 million in 1994 is nothing to most people, but to me, it sounds like a half billion dollars. Removal of funding may shut down rural stations. So, in the public interest, we could fund these stations directly, thereby eliminating the CPB. So, once again I say, if half a billion isn’t a lot of money, supporters will have no problem raising the paltry sum. I think its about time Big Bird left the nest and learned how to fly.

Unfunded mandates:
This is another hot topic with the 104th Congress. For those of you who don’t know, unfunded mandates are regulations imposed upon the states by Congress that have no financial backing. The latest example is Attorney General Janet Reno, the Waco kid, recently sued Illinois, California and Pennsylvania for not complying with federal regulations to make voter registration available through license branches. Reno argues that we could make voting available to as many as 70 million new voters through motor/voter registration.

California stipulates that it will comply with this mandate as soon as the federal government comes up with the $35 million needed to install this program.

I stipulate that the whole idea is ridiculous and a waste of money to begin with. I, personally, along with millions of others, have never had a problem registering and then voting. Should we make it even easier for people who have been traditionally too lazy to register under the normal system? What do you think the chances are of these people being politically knowledgeable to the extent that they can make an informed decision? It’s not probable.

Taxes:
This subject is currently on President Bill Clinton’s agenda, as he is trying to become the patriarch of the middle class. Rather, I think he should become the friend of the American economy in general. First of all, we could eliminate the capital gains tax. Any tax that punishes you for making investments is ridiculous, not to mention anti-productive. My parents are currently trying to sell our home but are faced with a big government pay-off when the sale finally goes through. Why should you pay for improving your residence? Furthermore, why should you pay for investing in your economy, such as in stocks and real estate?

The federal income tax is another example of how our government keeps you from improving yourself. The higher your level of income, the higher the rate of tax you will be forced to pay. So, in effect, we are sending the message that it is not good to make more. If you work harder, the government will just take more from you.

If we cut these two taxes, however, we would bankrupt the federal government (like it already isn’t). How do we combat this problem? Bill Archer, Texas, who will probably receive Dan Rostenkowski’s chairmanship of the House Ways and Means Committee, has brought up the idea of a broad-based consumption tax. The tax would be placed on imports but excluded from exports in an effort to help American business. Under this system, the rich would still pay more because they would buy more. But under this system, money would be freed for investments that would spur the economy, produce jobs and, yes, even make more money for our federal government.
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Column #4: Common sense source of opinions

Common sense source of opinions

Week four: First off, I want to discuss the "opinions" of "The write wing." It is only "The write wing," not the right wing. I haven't, as of yet, declared myself as conservative, or as being a supporter of the Republican Party. Rather, I like to take what I call a common-sense approach. Keeping that in mind, you must realize that it is impossible to identify with either party.

Being a student, I am not afforded such luxuries as a research budget or a salary, or tens of hours per week to track down hot topics. So, as you can see, "The write wing" is opinion, rather than "work," as some have suggested.

Arriving at my opinions is not a complicated process. I look for a controversial topic, read some background material (OPAC, ERIC or NABS will do) and then proceed to the editorial section of several newspapers. I read all opinions conservative and liberal alike. These "viewpoints" come from congressmen, other columnists and readers, such as yourself. Once I have seen all sides of the issue, the column is then written. My views are presented to stimulate discourse on the subject, not to "blast the campus."

I have taken heat recently for being a "conservative fat."

Joycelyn Elders and masturbation

I never quoted Joycelyn Elders as saying: She wants to teach children "how to" masturbate, as some seem to think. Also, I was completely aware of the statistics. I left them out because they didn't apply to my argument. The point I was making was that Elders wants this act advocated as being "normal."

Christianity, as well as some other religions, regard it as a sin. It is also a fact that a majority of teens engage in premarital sex. Do we send the message to students that this action is "normal" as well? Certainly not. I wouldn't want the school system to advocate that these actions were wrong either. Why? Because, in either instance, our educational institutions would be teaching morals. I also don't approve of school prayer. A moment of silence for reflection? Sure. The argument for labeling me as a member of the "radical right wing" just went out the window.

Abortion

I was misquoted as saying: "Babies, small humans, are consequences and should be accepted like a punishment."

Babies represent the gift of life. They should never be viewed as a punishment, a word I never used. Pregnancy is the consequence. Enough said.

Legalization of drugs

I also never mentioned the word marijuana, yet it kept showing up in one of the letters to the editors like a bad dream. I'm sure our local chapter of the Hemp Coalition was happy to see that. However, I'm sorry I used the broader term, "drugs." I find it hard to believe that the ideological position (liberalism) that created the welfare state could conceivably idea this idea as worth any consideration. How can you be concerned with someone's welfare, and at the same time allow them to take drugs? This, oddly enough, would remove them further from the society that is so interested in their well-being. Strange bedfellows, don't you think?

Also, what is everyone's fixation with throwing alcohol into this argument? Alcohol does create many problems. So why on earth would we want to add to this dilemma by legalizing drugs? Weird logic.

Big Bird and Barney revisited

Last week, I advocated the removal of funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. For those of you who don't know, the name itself is a total illusion. It is not public at all. It is a private company! What does this mean for all of us?

The federal government gave the CPB $284 million last year. The CPB's total reported budget was $340.6 million of which the federal government's contri-
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Clinton's done OK, considering ...

Week Five. What has been going on in the federal government this week? President Bill Clinton has distributed his budget proposal for the fiscal year 1996, and it's a whopper.

... and in the "left corner" weighing in at 1.6 trillion dollars, with a gain of 196.7 billion — Bill's budget. (The "right corner" will be announced in April).

Deficit spending:
Clinton has been on a trend of reducing the public deficit over the past few years, but next year his budget proposals may take a turn for the worse. And he was doing so good. Next year, disbursements on the federal deficit will total $257 billion or approximately, 16 percent of the proposed budget. At this rate, I don't think the president will "have the deficit," like he promised by the end of 1996. Clinton blames next year's increase on a tax cut for the middle class. I see us as paying for it now in taxes or later in federal deficit interest outlays.

Social welfare
Our social welfare system will continue to grow under the president's arrangement. Next year, our "welfare state" will consume 58 percent of the available budget. Fifty-eight percent! What I mean by "available" is the money left over after paying interest on the public debt. My motive for not including these funds is because they were already committed before the budget was drawn up. This 58 percent chunk isn't going toward college student loans, public schools or the national defense. It goes to Health and Human Services, low-income housing, food stamps and supplemental programs for women, children and infants. I never realized how poverty-stricken we were.

Recently, feminists challenged Clinton and members of congress to live on welfare for a week. I challenge a lot of these recipients to go out and get jobs. It is possible to be single, have children and work a job. Each year, thousands of college students work full time to pay for their schooling and still find time to make it to class. Amazing? No, it's called hard work. Our nation was founded on the work ethic, yet it seems that this principle is being thrown by the wayside in favor of policies that appeal to mediocrity. I'm not implying that everyone on welfare programs is lazy. Rather, I think it is time that we draw the line between those who are truly unable to work and those who are simply unwilling to work.

Powermarketing administration:
Here, I find something that I like. Clinton is currently looking into privatizing the federal dam system of the South and the West. This proposal would adversely affect constituencies in 34 states (Indiana not being one of them), and manage to save the federal government $2.9 billion by the year 2000. Various groups vehemently oppose the measure and are using the phrase, "increased utility rates" as their war cry. Gee, much as I would like to continue subsidizing your low utility bill, I don't think so. If privatizing federal dams causes utility bills to skyrocket, I'm sure the free market will come to that realization and produce lower-cost alternatives.

The line-item veto:
Finally, the savior to the American pocketbook has descended from the heavens to seemingly free us from the clutches of the ever-sinister "Pork Barrel." On Monday, the motion passed the House by a vote of 291-134. Seventy-one democrats joined 223 republicans in affirmation of the bill. It does have a short-coming, though. The line-item veto will not apply to Medicare and Social Security programs. Too bad. This is the government's fattest area and really could stand to take some cuts. This proposal is not out of the woods yet, either.

The word is still out on the Senate. Who leads the opposition? Why, none other than the king of pork himself, Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia. Byrd, the former Appropriations Committee chairman was notorious for "slipping language" into appropriations bills that secured entitlements for his home state. This pork enabled him to obtain his seventh term in office last year and also granted him the prestige of adding to our federal deficit. A line-item veto would effectively neutralize such maneuvers in the future.

Another obstacle to the passage of the bill is growing opposition within the GOP. Adversaries are not sure whether they want to give Clinton this power.

This is a real good example of hypocrisy within our government. If the Republican party was willing to give it to Bush, they should be willing to give it to Clinton. Finally, others argue that this would be an excessive shift in the balance of power to the president. I contend that it is a shift in power back to the executive branch. The legislature has been progressively robbing the presidency of power during the last 20 or 30 years, and the veto power will do more good in reducing the public debt than any other single factor.

Overall, I think Clinton is doing the best that he can considering the circumstances. You cannot make cuts in Social Security and other related programs and expect to remain popular with the American public. However, the line-item veto may be able to assist him in trimming any unnecessary "fat" off of other areas and thereby continue his policy of reducing the deficit.
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Foster may be best-case scenario

Week six. Last week we discussed Bill Clinton's budget proposal for 1996, and this time around we will start off by analyzing his latest maneuver: the appointment of a new surgeon general to substitute the ousted Joycelyn Elders.

“Elders-lite” or “Sugar-coated Elders”

The preceding are a couple of labels put upon Dr. Henry Foster, a 38-year obstetrician and gynecologist, and Clinton’s next pick for surgeon general. Foster is recognized by critics as primarily holding the same basic views as Elders, but in contrast to her, he was supposed to be more easily received by the American public.

Foster presently serves on the Tennessee board of Planned Parenthood and became nationally recognized for his “I have a future” program he first initiated in Nashville. It attempts to persuade teens to put off sexual relations and childbearing. These credentials, combined with a successful 38-year career, appear to be the qualifications of a doctor that is worthy of consideration for appointment to this office.

Problems? Foster’s problems started when it was discovered that, as an obstetrician, he has performed abortions.

When questioned, Foster replied, at first, that the number was “fewer than a dozen.” He further stated that these abortions were mostly performed in cases of rape, incest and danger to the mother’s life. Of course, “danger to the mother’s life” can be broadly interpreted. Even so, the act of abortion was not illegal.

The National Right to Life committee then produced a brief that quoted Foster when he testified as a member of the Ethics Advisory Board of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1978. Testimony showed that he had performed “700 amniocentesis genetic tests and therapeutic abortions.” Foster denies this. The Clinton administration agrees and is going to stick by Foster. Vice president Al Gore says: “We are not going to let the extremists defeat this man.”

Foster’s “I have a future” program did advocate teen responsibility by putting off sexual relations, but also contradicted itself by handing out condoms. (Not quite as amusing as Elders’ condom tree.) Critics also have jumped on this point, but I feel it is a minor inconsistency at best. Foster’s program also stresses avoiding teen pregnancy. So the message is: Don’t have sex, but if you do, be responsible. Of course, everyone isn’t going to agree with this view, but it is the most practical.

Just this past week, it became apparent that Foster really wasn’t telling the truth. He has now admitted to performing 39 abortions over the 38-year span. It also has been revealed that Foster performed several sterilizations of severely retarded women in the 1970s. Although this practice is now looked down upon, at the time, he was not alone in performing this procedure. Once again, everything was legal.

Who are the losers in this situation? Some argue that Clinton is now “attached at the hips” with Foster, and cannot afford another political defeat. I tend to believe he is in a win-win situation, which I’ll get to in a minute. Foster, definitely, is a potential loser: Has he really misled the public in stating how many abortions he has performed, or was he instructed to answer that way by White House staff desiring to cover up its mistake of not being informed?

Furthermore, I view the Republican party as an ultimate loser, whether Foster is approved by the Senate or not. The Christian right, arguably, played an instrumental part in the 1994 November GOP victories, and now they are calling in their favors. Not only do they want the Foster nomination turned down, but Ralph Reed, the executive director for the Christian Coalition, said they will not support the 1996 Republican ticket, unless both candidates oppose abortion rights. Public opinion polls show abortion rights as approved by most Americans. So what do the Senate Republicans, who want to avoid a fight on this issue (one they would probably lose, if they agree with their supporters) do? Do they agree with their supporters and alienate a majority of the public, or do they do the opposite and lose their most ardent backers? They can’t win. We are dangerously close to polarizing the American public on a single issue.

What about Clinton in the win-win situation? If the Senate turns down the nomination, the Republicans will have gone against public opinion, which will, no doubt, help the Democrats in the 1996 elections. (A loss in the short run for Clinton, but a victory in the long run.) If Foster is nominated, Clinton will have made the Republican party back down, thus securing for himself a political victory, which he desperately needs.

The real and only questions should be whether Foster is qualified and if he can be truthful. We only need to know if he was instructed to answer in the way he did by the White House. Foster is obviously qualified as a doctor. This should not be made to be an all-out brawl over abortion rights. I, as a pro-life advocate, find abortion wrong. But I also see the appointment of Foster as a best-case scenario. No matter who Clinton chooses, they will, at any rate, support abortion rights. Will an attorney general who hasn’t performed abortions make the situation any different? The act of abortion will still be legal. Foster’s program pushes for responsibility by teens, which, if followed, could reduce the amount of abortions.

Furthermore, the position of attorney general is only advisory. Should we really be wasting time on debating this issue when more important issues are at hand?
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Second half of 'Contract' not so easy

Week seven. Last week we discussed the impending appointment of Dr. Henry Foster to the office of surgeon general. He has faded from the limelight, temporarily. So this week I'll move on to the 104th Congress, namely the House of Representatives. The House Republican Party is currently midway through its 100-day "Contract with America," and has passed an unprecedented 16 separate pieces of legislation in only about seven weeks. Will the "contract" become a reality? Most experts predict approximately 50 percent of the goals will come to fruition.

The House has already passed its own version of the balanced budget amendment. However, speed really wasn't needed on this one. It usually takes seven years for an amendment to become a part of our Constitution. The House has already passed its line-item veto bill, which will likely have a rough go-at it in the Senate. The House also replaced President Bill Clinton's crime prevention and police hiring programs by sending $10 billion in block grants to county and state governments. Who better to decide upon proper crime prevention than the localities that actually deal with it? The federal government still has its FBI, but leave the police to state control. I can hear Bob Dole bellowing faintly in the distance: "Tenth Amendment! Tenth Amendment!"

What's coming up on the agenda? I, personally, am amused by this next one. The House is looking into reforming the legal system by placing limits on punitive damages. Now, when you spill "hot" coffee on yourself at McDonald's, you may only be entitled to $50,000. (Coffee burns equal new Mercedes.) Why can't we all be this lucky?

Moving onward, we arrive at welfare reform. I'm betting the farm that this House action will be included with the 50 percent of bills that don't become law. The GOP wants to replace many existing programs, such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children, with large block grants to the states. This money can be divided up as the states see fit.

Opponents say this reform will come about at the cost of our nation's needy children. Do they honestly believe that states are going to let their people starve? The states' individual programs will be tailored to fit their own needs, rather than national standards.

One section of the welfare reform calls for removing aid from unwed teenage mothers. Some Catholic groups are arguing that this move will promote the use of abortion. Once again, Republicans are in a catch-22 situation. Do they further their agenda or alienate their religious supporters? However, it still needs to be stressed that parents need to be responsible for their children, not the government. Abortion prevents this action from taking place by giving both fathers and mothers a way out of this unwelcome "expense." The respect for human life would be brought to a new low. Imagine a young, unwed couple making this decision:

"We would have the child, but because of the cost we won't."

Indiana's plan for welfare reform is a step in the right direction. Hopefully, other states will follow its lead. AFDC recipients will soon have to sign an agreement asserting that they will accept "any reasonable job offer" as a condition of receiving assistance. However, once again, we are faced with ambiguous policy-making. Just what is a "reasonable job offer?" I can see loopholes already.

Speaking of Indiana, state legislators are proposing a bill that would tack 20 years onto a criminal sentence when a gun is used in the commission of a violent crime against a person. Here, we are presented with another proposal that was created with perfectly good intentions, but for all practical purposes will be worthless in achieving its goals.

Objective: We can deter criminals from using firearms by doing out greater sentences for certain crimes. In this way, we can lower the amount of serious injuries and deaths resulting from these offenses.

Problem: This bill assumes that criminals know beforehand that they are going to be caught and that they will weigh possible sentences when choosing a weapon. If an offender has prior knowledge that he is going to be convicted for committing a crime, chances are he probably won't carry out his plans. Violent offenses are still violent no matter what the weapon. It doesn't matter whether it is done with a knife or a gun. Imagine a murder victim conversing with the assailant:

"Please don't shoot me. How about stabbing me with that knife? You'll save yourself 20 years in the slammer."

Finally, more support for the legalization of marijuana has surfaced. Democratic Congressman Barney Frank says that citizens should not face prosecution for smoking it. Frank says: "Adults should be allowed to beat themselves up a bit."

Stop the presses. Frank appears to be proposing a constitutional amendment. The legislative branch will no longer be required to provide for the general welfare of the American people. Go ahead and "beat yourselves up a bit."
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Week eight. Let's begin by returning to the GOP's supposed plan to "Abolish School Lunches." First off, the program, WIC, isn't just "school lunches." It is designed to serve women, infants and children. I'll continue to refer to it as such, however, because it's a catchy phrase everyone can identify with. White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, was cited by reporters as saying:

"It would really take food out of the mouths of millions of needy school children, toddlers, infants and mothers."

Democrats in Congress went even further by charging that the proposed cancellation of this program would literally starve hundreds of thousands of children. Call out the National Guard. People are going to be dying of hunger in our streets!

President Bill Clinton added:

"Here's a program that isn't broke, that's done a world of good for millions and millions of children of all races and backgrounds all across our country, and I think it would be a terrible mistake to put an end to it, to gut it, to undermine it."

The program isn't broke? Excuse me ..., the whole government isn't in financial dire straits? All of this talk of a balanced budget amendment and deficit spending must have been a nightmare. How do we establish if the "school lunch" plan is in trouble? I'll give you a hint. (It's a trick question). You can't. We can if programs such as Social Security are broke or not. It has its own tax. However, I don't get a paycheck stub that says:

"Congratulations, Mr. Kolanowski! You have just paid $5.67 in taxes for school lunches." In this situation, it is all federal money. Merely saying a program is "broke" is a matter of interpretation.

Furthermore, contrary to Democratic opinion, we will not be allowing children to starve. If you mention the words "children" and "infants" you are sure to hit a soft spot in the public's heart. This is evidenced by a current USA Today/CNN/Gallup Poll. Sixty-nine percent of people interviewed are staunch supporters of leaving the "school lunch" program alone.

The Daily News joined suit on this discussion, last week in an editorial:

"To pass this legislation would be totally ludicrous."

This is not surprising, though. The Democratic party has once again successfully manipulated the press and avoiding what some believe to be the true issue. The controversy in Congress shouldn't be over children. It's all power. Big government power vs. state rights. The same state government officials that would be in charge of implementing this program also have to face elections. If children in Indiana were dying of starvation, would we continue to vote our governors in? No, of course not. To say that children will starve is what is ludicrous.

What about the money? States will still receive huge amounts of money for this program, just not as much as under the current federal plan. Less money? Uh oh. Time to raise taxes, or children will be dying in the streets. Democrats have argued that this will be placing an undue burden on the state officials. Interesting. The majority of governors, who had strong feelings on the issue, approved of this proposal. Of governors surveyed, 19 are ardent backers of the motion. Ten are actively opposed, all of which are Democrats. Zell Miller, Georgia's governor, a Democrat oddly enough, let his feelings on this subject be known:

"Give us the money. We can use it more effectively and efficiently than any federal bureaucrat."

Somebody please snap crazy old Zell out of it. He isn't playing partisan politics. Miller is ignoring his party and thinking for himself. Amazing. The point he made is tantamount to the issue. "Efficiently." That is why the extra money won't be needed. The states will be implementing their own programs, which will equal less federal red tape and less administrative costs. Furthermore, the states will be able to keep a closer eye on the distribution of funds, and kick out anyone abusing the program, something the feds in Washington seem to have difficulty with. It all amounts to saving money, not starving schoolchildren. The American public needs to read between the lines on this issue, rather than falling for the "children and infants"ploy.

Finally, I want to comment on this "state rights" issue that everyone is so worked up over. This concern was strong with many of the framers of our constitution. Thomas Jefferson was just one such representative of this viewpoint. If "state rights" weren't important, we would have never needed the 14th Amendment to incorporate the bill of Rights. The rights that were reserved to the states were meant to stay that way unless our Constitution was amended (something the states are needed for), not whenever Congress felt the urge to give itself more power.

Senior Jon Kolanowski, a political science major, writes "The write wing" for the Daily News. His views do not necessarily represent those of the newspaper.
Men often forgotten in abortion issue

Week nine. This week I want to discuss what I feel is often forgotten in the abortion debate. What are the man’s rights concerning this issue?

If you wondered — “rights?” you are pretty close.

First, though, I must clear up a misconception by one of our readers. A sophomore is troubled by a migraine and I must help her out. The term “consequence” is not synonymous with “punishment,” nor is it even closely related in meaning. I explained my viewpoint in an earlier column, when another underclassman suffered from the same delusion, but it didn’t seem to suffice.

Webster defines “consequence” as: “Something produced by a cause or necessarily following from a set of conditions.”

Hence, pregnancy is “something necessarily following” from sexual intercourse. It does not matter whether birth control is 100 percent effective in deter­ring pregnancy. Having sex requires responsibility. Almost everyone will agree with that. This responsibility also includes being prepared for the possible outcomes, namely procreation. The point is: If you don’t think you can handle having children, maybe you shouldn’t be having sex. I agree that children should be carefully planned for. However, every unwanted fetus shouldn’t be wiped out of existence merely because the parents are unprepared. What kind of value are we putting on human life?

Then of course, we run into the question of whether a fetus is actually a human life, or actually when it becomes one. How can we definitely be sure when a fetus is human? We can’t. Pro-choice advocates contend that the abortion choice is a woman’s alone because it deals with a woman’s decision to control her own body. Then those “nasty, violent” pro-life advocates come along and want to deny her that option. I don’t believe that is the point. I don’t want to control any woman’s choice over how she treats her body. However, I, as well as other pro-lifers, contend that abortion is legalized murder. Acceptance of this premise would allow our government to intervene. Is it a question of legality or personal rights?

I admit, however, that it is likely that there will never be an agreement. However, I find it extremely amusing that this whole abortion controversy gives her a migraine, yet she cannot resist contributing her own beliefs to this argument. Everyone has an opinion.

I now turn my focus toward the man.

In our new enlightened era of political correctness, it would be unat­tractive to a male, especially a white one, to express his opinions about what rights he feels he is entitled to. He must be silent and feel “dirty” and made to repent for the injustices perpetrated by his ancestors. With this revelation, I now run the risk of being labeled a sexist. Oh well, I will speak as objectively as possible, and if that makes me a member of the “radical right wing,” so be it.

It is interesting to note how the man never seems to find his way into this debate. The pro-choice advocates like to portray all of America’s un-wed fathers as uncaring dead-beat dads who won’t contribute a dime to raising the child.

However, that just isn’t true. Especially since the Clinton administration is currently pursing a lot of these “losers.” I’m all for it. These so-called men only further the feminists’ abilities to stereotype all other males.

If a woman decides to have an abortion, the man cannot stop her. If the woman wants to have the baby, the man cannot stop her. Here is where it gets interesting. The man will be financially obligated by law to pay child support. It does not matter whether he pays or not.

(Senior Jon Kolanowski, a political science major, writes “The write wing” for the Daily News. His views do not necessarily represent those of the newspaper.)
Opinions should be let out in open

Week 10. (Not 11. Not too many of us wrote columns over Spring Break.) Or, should it be Day 67? How about hour 1806? Maybe next week, in my efforts to be "analytically retentive," I'll designate my "measurements of time" as minutes. Who really cares? Let's get to the good stuff. Last week I discussed the men's rights as they pertain to the abortion issue. This week, I'll start off the discourse with our own gift to journalism and columnism extraordinaire's critique of his fellow colleagues in... "Meta-Column II - Return to Professionalism." The truth is that the only "struggle" on Tuesday is trying to stay awake long enough to make it through yet another "meta-column." Maybe I should follow this exciting new trend and write my own "meta-column." No, maybe I shouldn't, because I would just be "copying someone."

Anyway, moving on. We need to learn to be very careful on how we make our assumptions. Kolanowski is a columnist, therefore he must write in a certain format in order for his column to read-worthy. I was not aware of that. Obviously one of us feels that way, however. My question is: If it is popular, why change it? One column is set up so that people are allowed to criticize what they disagree with in their letters to the editor. The articles are written to open up discussion between myself and my "loyal readers," not to bore you into submission. I think that must be the difference between a "token conservative writer" and a "left of Patricia Ireland wacko."

Keeping that in mind, I would like to comment on the little feud between a student and Professor B.J. Paschal. First off, you as students are not paying for our views. They come to you free of charge. Columnists do not receive a weekly paycheck. Therefore, the Daily News does not have a say in our choice of subject matter. Look at the bottom of this column.

"His views do not necessarily represent those of this paper."

They do not ask us to identify ourselves as left- or right-wingers before giving us this responsibility. That is one of the little perks that goes along with being a writer. We are not bound by party identifications (unless we choose to do so, which I have not). You can be conservative on one issue and liberal on the next, as long as you have a rationale for doing so. Example: I don't believe in abortion. However, I also don't believe in standardized school prayer, which I believe to be a violation of the First Amendment. No "token conservatism" here. I just don't fit the mold. We tell it like we see it. This is where, I believe, the student became confused.

And as far as Paschal, he does have a right to be heard. John Stuart Mill, a man renowned for his works on basic freedoms, would have put it like this:

"We have no more right to silence Paschal, than Paschal would to silence everyone else."

Letters should not be chosen, according to some "blackslisting system," for their liberal/conservative content, or for the frequency in which a person writes letters to the editor. Letters should be chosen, according to public interest, then other standards, which are up to the discretion of the editor. The worst debaters are often such as these. They are so close-minded, that they don't even want to hear what their opponents have to say. However, to be truly prepared when stating your case during an argument, you must first be aware of your adversary's mindset.

If what Paschal has to say is so far out in left field that it borders on the outrageous, the "conservative bent" readers of The Indianapolis Star will have no trouble discrediting his views. However, if he does have good points, accept them. Progress comes through discussion, not alienation. We need to stop confusing ourselves to just one point of view. Get the opinions out in the open.

We see a similar problem with the likes of such groups as the Ku Klux Klan. Everyone is so concerned with keeping them quiet. Why? By shutting them up, you only make them martyrs to their cause. As offensive as they may seem, they still have their right to freedom of speech. Let them speak their peace. And then see for yourself how truly ridiculous they are.

Exercise your own right to freedom of speech. Write a letter to the editor concerning your feelings about the abortion issue. Flood The Indianapolis Star with letters reeking of liberalism. The reason why writers such as Paschal are often printed is because they have chosen to participate. Don't complain unless you are willing to become involved yourself. So much for Week 10.

Senior Jon Kolanowski, a political science major, writes "The write wing" for the Daily News. His views do not necessarily represent those of the newspaper.
More thought should be put into statistics

Week 11. Last week, we all got a copy of “U. The National College Magazine,” with our Daily News. Browsing through the articles, I came upon their monthly survey question. U. is interested in finding out your view on the abortion issue. I loved the way they worded the question, because it points out a mistake that survey-makers are often guilty of.

“Do you consider yourself Pro-choice or Anti-abortion?”

Already, the survey has proven itself to be biased, and the survey giver has shown preference to one side of the issue, whether intended or not. The term “Anti” is used to illicit a negative response and needs to be avoided when wording survey questions. Suppose the wording of the question was:

“Do you consider yourself Pro-life or Anti-life?”

The end result? Those in the middle can be swayed one way or the other all according to how the question is phrased. So, next month, when the survey reports that an unusually large percentage of the college population supports abortion, don’t be surprised. Also, you shouldn’t be any more surprised when the pro-choice movement gets Congress on the line and tells them that “Generation X” is overwhelmingly supportive of their cause. That is the danger with quoting statistics as fact. It all relates to how they are accumulated, and whether you used enough of the correct factors in making your determination, X rarely, alone, causes Y.

We can find a recent example of such statistical manipulation here on campus. This week is Women’s Week, and our campus was graced by the presence of feminist activist Robin Morgan. I didn’t actually have the pleasure of listening to her speak (I was in class), but I owe thanks to our Daily News for keeping me up to par on the cutting edge of feminism.

“The assault on women has been made by this Congress and even by this administration, that has been forced to move right at the speed of lightning,” she said.

I’ll give an example of Morgan’s “verbal karate” that is offered to combat the “misbeliefs” the right is spreading about the welfare system.

“From 1969 to 1992, the average family size fell from 4.0 to 2.9.” Therefore, we can assume that women are not having more babies to get more welfare.

First of all, the birth rate has continued to drop since the ‘60s for reasons other than welfare mothers not wanting to get more money from our government. Family size has also dropped because they are often missing a vital member: the father. How can these even be called “family” statistics? If we had more “families,” (two parents required) welfare would not be as greatly needed.

What statistic should apply? How about that welfare programs have grown as a percentage of the GNP since 1969. Congress is not attacking women on welfare, as Morgan suggests, but the welfare system itself. Women should not feel picked on. The next step in tracking down the fathers who aren’t paying child support, thus also cutting the need for welfare.

Morgan said people of color are “disproportionately represented. The largest ethnic group on welfare is white.”

Here, Morgan tries to draw support from “people of color” by stating that the majority of welfare recipients are white and not black as the stereotype often goes. As it really matters, but the statistic required, in this instance, would state white welfare recipients as a percentage of the white population. There are millions more whites than blacks, so it would go to figure that there would be more whites on welfare. Color isn’t of significance, just as the sex of the recipient isn’t. What is important is how Morgan manipulates these statistics to rouse support from different groups for her issue: “Protect the welfare system.” However, both sides of the welfare debate engage in this tactic. Morgan just happened to present us with an example that any student can relate to.

If both sides are going to try and distort the issue, how do we arrive at a decision? First, go with the merits of such a proposal. Do you even support the idea of welfare? Who should be the beneficiaries? What are the alternatives?

This is the specific reason I have reservations about the new motor-voter registration policy. Voting is not equivalent to political participation. It is only part of it. First, you must become informed, otherwise you’ll fall prey to someone using Morgan’s type of logic.

Of course, you could always continue to watch your MTV (an authority on politics) featuring nightly visits from McBill and Treehugger Gore, and then go “Rock the Vote.” I still contend that an uninformed voter is worse than one that stays at home. Statistics have their place. However, our underlying beliefs are often more potent than any “verbal karate.”

Senior Jon Kolanowski, a political science major, writes “The write wing.” His views do not necessarily represent those of the newspaper.
Week 12. Megan's law is being challenged again. This time, it is in its home state, New Jersey. For those of you that are not in the know, Megan's law is New Jersey's requirement that convicted sex offenders, particularly those who have committed crimes involving children, be subject to public notification when they move into an area. Most states only, currently, require notification of local law enforcement agencies.

Megan's law is named after, and in remembrance of, Megan Kanka, a 7-year-old girl raped and killed last summer. What fired the public's discontent was the fact that the man currently charged with the crime, Jesse Timmendequas, was a two-time convicted sex offender, and that he lived directly across the street. The public never knew.

Libertarians argue that this law amounts to a modern-day scarlet letter for all to see. The individual will be branded for life. Has he not paid his debt to society? I agree, but only to a certain extent. I would be the last person to speak up in defense of a child molester, but some things need to be taken into account.

Child molesters, like other criminals, are required to pay their debt to society by serving time. True. Timmendequas spent time in prison for his previous two offenses. His debt to society being paid, he was freed. If we draw the line here, the libertarian argument is satisfied. If you don't believe the man has served enough time, make him stay in jail longer. Do not continue to punish him after his sentence has been completed. Identifying them only leaves them as open targets for vigilantism.

However, the problem doesn't stop there. We should be concentrating, rather, on what we are doing to reform these people. They are often just thrown in with the rest of the general prison population. (Ask Jeffrey Dahmer what happens in that situation. He was only in limited contact with other inmates.) Treatment for them is rare. Truth is, they often leave just as screwed up as when they came in.

If we believe a previously convicted sex offender is likely to commit one of these crimes again, why do we let him out? If doctors feel that an offender would not be able to control himself on the outside, and then release him just because his sentence has been served, they are just as guilty as the perpetrator himself if he strikes again. An essential part of being a functional member of society is the requirement that you live within its rules. If you can't, then you don't belong in that society.

Many people might perceive this as a denial of the offender's rights. However, it is all a balancing act. We must weigh the rights of that individual with those of the society. If he is never reformed, then he never gets out. If he is truly reformed, then he poses little or no threat. Notifying local authorities, instead of the general public, would suffice. Simply labeling someone is not the answer. Would you sit next to a kid of dynamite as long as you knew what it was?

As you might remember, I started off this semester with one of my more controversial topics: affirmative action. Since this is likely to become a pivotal topic in the 1996 elections, I want to make sure that the debate hasn't died in the first week. I began with the assumption that many corporations go far beyond mere affirmative action, and that they may even engage in quota behavior when it comes to hiring employees. People have questioned this theory. Why would predominantly white-owned and run businesses engage in such behavior?

The answer is hidden. A businessperson will go for employees who will be most beneficial to the company. (Some, will not. However, their discriminatory practices will only go to the detriment of their profit margins.) What other possible factors can serve to influence the hiring decision, then?

Enter our federal government. The government takes the stance that it has never advocated the use of quotas in hiring. Title seven of the Civil Rights Act makes no mention of hiring requirements to end discrimination. However, any company that contracts with the federal government must keep detailed and accurate records of its affirmative action program. The federal government is currently engaged in more contracts than any other organization. If you want that federal dollar, you may just use quotas to keep the feds happy. A company coming close to expected guidelines will not receive unwanted scrutiny. That, in a nutshell, was my theory.

That was just it. It was only a theory until I could come up with a situation that would solidify my assumptions. A few weeks ago, I was approached by a gentleman who had read my column, and he told me that he was willing to give me just such an example. He was so worried about exposure that I'm not allowed to even print his name, company, or what they produce. What I can tell you is that they are one of the United States' largest manufacturers. He quoted this from a recent meeting with management:

"We will be hiring summer college-student trainees in the office environment. The trainees will be female or minority males. Don't even recommend any white males."

He went on further to say that this was not just a local, but most likely a national, policy. There's your example. Who said discrimination against white males doesn't exist?
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Column #13: [Deleted] GOP making concessions on abortion issue

For those of you who as curious as to why there is not a column #13 printed here, I blame the computer. Column #13 was accidentally deleted and I was unable to retrieve it. A copy will become available when the entire semester is printed and bound sometime within the next month.

Topic Discussed: The column elaborated upon the concessions that the GOP is making in the way of funding for abortion. Congressman, who call themselves "pro-life", still support abortion in the case of rape or incest. I argued, that as repulsive as these acts may seem, that a life is still a life. The illegal act did not make the fetus any less alive. That, in a nutshell, is government hypocrisy in the face of public sentiment.
It's your turn to 'rock the write wing'

Week 14. For those of you who ever wondered why I number my weeks, it's because I'm graduating, and it's my way of keeping track. (I don't know, maybe it's a Paul Harvey kind of thing ... Page 2.) This week, however, be my last regular column, so it will be my attempt at putting some kind of closure on the message I've tried to get across. I'll try and hit a few of the highlights.

Affirmative action: Past racial discrimination is not proper justification for legalized discrimination in the present. Policies based on color only promote one thing: color. The individuals who do discriminate, and often those who suffer from that discrimination, aren't the ones being affected. Do I think homosexuals should be added to this university's affirmative action plan? No! I think the whole program should be scrapped. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964? Unconstitutional! Read the 14th Amendment. (Equal protection!)

Punishment: Everyone who is born has an inherent contract with society. As a member, you are entitled to certain liberties. Along with those rights go certain responsibilities. If you fail to live up to standards society requires of you, then forfeit those rights. What is our fascination with the constitutional rights of violent convicted criminals? After 27 appeals, I think it is safe to say that guilt has been established. Why are liberals so afraid of... "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth?" I find the irony humorous, however, when it is these same individuals who don't want tort reform. Why? Because a woman, who spils hot coffee in her lap, is entitled to sue the capitalist swine, who are responsible, for half a million dollars. (Note: Under our legal system, corporations are people, too. Wouldn't this be cruel and unusual punishment protected by our Eighth Amendment? Ha!)

Abortion: Here we have a practice legalized by an amendment (the ninth), that a fifth grader could write. The intentions of this one are anybody's guess. I really enjoy paying over one-fourth of my earnings to a government that likes to enact ambiguous legislation (clear as mud), just so that it doesn't have to deal with an issue. Pass the buck and take yours at the same time. What we have here are nine people making objectional legislation through judicial review. Why? Because abortion and other constitutionalized issues would have never made it through the amendment process.

Budget: If we didn't have the national budget deficit, and subsequently didn't have to pay the interest on this ungodly sum, Congress would be able to approve all of President Bill Clinton's budget. In addition, there would be enough left over to give every man, woman and child nearly a $400 tax return. Interestingly enough, it was a Democrat who put us in debt in the first place. Remember good old Franklin D. Roosevelt and his lovely New Deal? So how do we solve our budget crisis? We put another Democrat in office. For crying out loud!

Finally, for your pleasure, the first Write Wing Opinion Poll. You can reply in one of two ways: e-mail me. My address is: "00JLKOLANOWS." Or, you can bring your answers by the Daily News at West Quad Room 212. (Please sign your name to the survey. Answers will be kept confidential. Reply only once.) Circle one for each question.

Affirmative action: Dump it Leave it alone U/D
Death penalty: Fry'em Club Fed U/D
Abortion: Pro-life Pro-choice U/D
Henry Foster: Give him the job Send him home U/D
Future of Barney (the purple dinosaur): Extinct Jurassic Park U/D
Drug legalization: Give me a hit No way! U/D
Dr. Jocelyn Elders: Wax on, wax off Glad she's gone U/D
Bill Clinton: Moron "Big Mac" U/D
Al Gore: Good Guy Bad Guy Who the hell is he?
Rush Limbaugh: A god Just thinks he's God U/D
Motor-voter law: What a waste I've got a right to be lazy U/D

Now grade this column. Did "the Write Wing" challenge you to rethink your positions on the issues affecting America, or was it an "utterly worthless void" filled with conservatism?

"The write wing":
Excellent Good Average Below Average Failing

Remember, this is my last regular column. However, don't forget to tune in next week, when my honored guest will be B.J. Paschal. We're going head to head, baby! Don't miss it!
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Write wing, B.J. go head to head

Jon Kolanowski
The writer

B.J. Paschal
Professor of psychology
and letter writer

Term limits:
B.J.
I view term limits for the U.S. House and Senate as being unconstitutional. That is, it is an extra requirement for office. I believe those who framed and enacted the Constitution intended for the voters of congressional districts and states to decide the issue of how many terms a congressman serves.

Still, if Congress had gotten worse as the Republicans claimed prior to Nov. 8, one has to ask is that because voters were free to choose candidates who were subjected to a few simple requirements for office, and would make the requirements more restrictive make congressmen better legislators and more virtuous? The answers to both questions, I think, are no.

Since the Republicans have a comfortable majority in the U.S. House and since they have had their way with the Contract regardless of what the minority Democrats have done, how can Speaker Newt Gingrich expect the public to believe that the 227-204 defeat of term limits is “the fault of Democrats”?

J.K.
Here’s one proposal, that’s popular with the GOP: that I find myself at odds with. And, as long as we’re on the subject, we can include the 22nd Amendment. (No person shall be elected to more than two terms as president, and serve not more than two years of someone else’s term, in addition to that limit.)

The problem with proposals and laws, such as these, is that they take substantial power from the populace of the United States to choose their representatives.

Two things need to be considered, however. First of all, name recognition plays a big factor in elections. We shy away from admitting that people could be so ignorant as to do the issues injustice, that they would base their votes on a name. But, it happens. Truth is stranger than fiction. Akin to this is the practice of voting merely along party-lines (straight-ticket). With more and more congressmen taking a moderate stance, or switching parties overnight, betting on the party may not be the wisest choice.

Secondly, there are special perks that a congressman receives that make staying power all the more possible, such as franking privileges and accruing campaign funds.

Congressman McIntosh feels that these practices cannot be regulated; however, I tend to disagree. If you extend privileges, you can take them away.

Republican Congress’ first 100 days:
B.J.
Since I have already written two long pieces on this topic and since I credit Gingrich’s new breed with winning the public relations battle, I decided to write this statement from the point of view of conservatives I respect and by scholars not unsympathetic to the Republicans’ revamping of the federal government’s responsibilities. How do they evaluate the Contract?

Without enactment of the Contract With America, John Dihlilo and Donald Kett, who researched the aims of the Contract in a new study called “Fine Print,” say America will enter the next century with a federal government spending several trillion dollars annually.

If “every jot and title” of the Contract is approved, America will still enter the next century with several trillion dollars of federal government.

Conservative columnist and ABC News commentator George Will summed up the Contract thusly: “But so it goes with the ‘revolution’ which, although it involves changes that are substantial and largely admirable, will, even if fully consummated, result in a brave new world recognizably kin to the old one.”

Today Republicans in the House call their Contract agenda a “revolution,” perhaps because although it isn’t one, calling it one much like Eric the Red name one of his discoveries Greenland because it wasn’t a green land that is generating the energy necessary for even less-than-revolutionary change in our federalism. Sobeit!

J.K.
One cannot help but associate the first 100 days with the House Republicans’ “Contract With America.” A lot was covered, but because of space, I’ll hit my favorite highlights.

Balanced-Budget Amendment: Big mistake.
H.J. Res 1 lost by a vote of 65-35 in the Senate on March 2. The vote would have fulfilled in more Democrats if Social Security surpluses had not been tied to deficit calculations. Since when have Democrats become the protector of Social Security? The lecturing entitlements that currently feed off of the Social Security tax were of Democrat design.

This is nothing more than a ploy to attract the attention of older voters, who think they are being protected. A debt is a debt. No one is protected.

Crime: Block grants will replace the funding of the 1993 Anti-Crime bill. Let state and local governments decide where the money goes. Crimes occur locally, not in the capital building. (Then again, maybe I shouldn’t make that assumption.) H.R. 729 will limit death row appeals. Finally, maybe, it may no longer be more expensive to put someone to death than keep them for life in prison.

 Welfare: Payments have been converted into block grants for the states. We’re expecting more efficiency from state governments. The question is: Will we get it? The federal government sure hasn’t excelled in this area, so let’s try something new. The Democrat cry of “starving schoolchildren and infants” amounts to a worthless attempt to play on voters’ sensibilities.

Unfunded Mandates: Gone. Enough said.

Indiana’s 18-hour waiting period for abortion:
B.J.
Let us not be coy: the conservative, i the past and today, has placed restrictive roadblocks in the path of expansive interpretations of the meaning of abortion.

The 18-hour waiting period is just another unnecessary hoop for a woman to jump through.

Gov. Evan Bayh rightfully vetoed the 18-hour waiting period. But he did it because the bill did not exclude rape an incest.

It’s an unwritten rule today in the Republican-controlled General Assembly that only conservative men have the right to interpret the lives of Hoosier women regarding abortion, and I don’t see why a moderate or liberal woman can’t do the same. I find this totalitarian, boring, flat, one-note: it’s only a gimmick to help Republicans get elected.

J.K.
North Dakota — 24-hour wait. Georgia — 24-hour wait. Kansas — eight-hour wait. Pennsylvania has a 24-hour wait with required counseling that was upheld by the Supreme Court in Plame Parenthood vs. Casey. The court noted, however, that the states could not place an “undue burden” upon the woman in her choice to get an abortion. “Undue”, another ambiguous term. First of all, this has nothing to do with restricting a woman’s right to choose. Should a woman be entitled to know what circumstances could arise from having an abortion? The state has the prerogative to look after its citizens, and that includes notifying a woman of possible dangers, and giving her time to think them over. I don’t see how we come about with a specific time requirement, nonetheless. I don’t see a problem with it. It seems, now, that feminists, such as those that backed the proposed Freedom of Choice Act, are so wrapped up in women’s rights, that they care more about the woman’s right to choose than her life itself.

Senior Jon Kolanowski and B.J. Paschal agreed to do a “Head to head” column for the Daily News. The topics were picked by the editor ahead of time and neither writer saw the others responses. Their views do not necessarily represent those of the newspaper.
Affirmative Action
Example #1

Columnist does not completely understand policy

To the editor:

Before people attack affirmative action, they need to do their research and find out exactly what it is and who it helps.

Affirmative action is the government's answer to unfair hiring practices; specifically to combat discriminatory hiring practices of companies, agencies and governmental institutions.

If the writer of "The write wing" had done his research, he would have found that affirmative action, as a policy has failed. Affirmative action doesn't reach those individuals that really need a job and if you research Fortune 500 companies, top law firms, the top six accounting firms and any other major player in the American work force you will find very few women or minorities. Even if women or minorities are hired by these institutions, women only earn 70 cents to the dollar that men earn, and minorities, especially blacks, earn considerably less than that of white males. All of this information is based on people who have the same amount of education and qualifications.

Kolanowski, it is a proven fact that the group that has the most to lose in a society is the group that always cries foul. In every major institution in the United States, white males dominate positions of leadership and authority. This domination is not solely based on qualification, but on group membership.

Kolanowski, have you been out in the work force? Well I have, and companies and institutions have many ways of getting around affirmative action policies.

Kolanowski, how dare you even address the issue of faculty hiring, especially that of minorities and women. For years at this university, minorities have been asking for more faculty members of color. Do you know how many black or hispanic faculty members there are? The number is very low compared to the number of white faculty members. I doubt that you have had any experiences with affirmative action, and I doubt you will have as much of a struggle finding a job as will most minorities.

Kolanowski, several of your statements could be misinterpreted to mean women and minorities only get hired because of their gender and the color of their skin, not their qualifications.

Whether this is your intention or not, this perception always enters people's minds when the topic of affirmative action is raised. Until our society sees people as individuals and judge people on the content of their character and not on their gender or the color of their skin, then maybe a failed policy such as affirmative action won't be needed. There are two ways to view the American society, from an idealistic perspective or a realistic perspective. I'm a realist and the society that we live in is dominated by white males and as long as they feel challenged they will always cry foul.

Kolanowski, make sure you have yourself together. That means education, dress and a decent resume, because you are competing against your white male counterparts, women of all colors, and yes, men of all colors.

Until you can show me that affirmative action has succeeded in its mission, you don't have a leg to stand on.

Stop sending dividing, accusatory and blatantly wrong messages to people at our university, because it is perceptions like yours that foster a negative perception of minorities as a whole.

Don't worry about whether I will make it in the American society, because with or without affirmative action, I will accomplish all of my career goals just as many women and minorities have done before a failed policy like affirmative action existed. Unfortunately, I have to call your misleading piece, "The write wing," undeniably "The wrong wing."

Byron Lee Ottman
Senior
Affirmative Action
Example #2

White men not following through with promises

To the editor:
The following letter refers to Jon Kolanowski’s column “Affirmative action not for everyone.”

The right wing claims to have the market cornered on tackling tough issues particularly when it comes to standing firm against the powerless.

I was therefore not surprised to find Jon Kolanowski of the “The right wing” professing to want to tackle really tough issues and then identifying affirmative action to be such an issue. He argues that affirmative action doesn’t work very well and uses examples of women for whom the system has not worked. It is obvious, though, that the system is particularly frustrating to white men.

What Kolanowski evades is how the country would work without affirmative action, given the historical and current position of white men in American society. This is an authentically tough issue for the following reasons:

1) White men comprise 32 percent of the American population but currently hold 80 percent of congressional seats.
2) White men hold 90 percent of the CEO positions of the top Fortune 500 companies.
3) White men earn $1 for every 60 to 70 cents female or minority individuals earn, thereby dominating the wealth of this nation.
4) White men portray their extremely intense anger as the logical result of legislation which is biased against them. The anger is, however, clearly out of proportion to the amount of harm they experience as a group as evidenced by their overwhelmingly dominant position in society.
5) White men rarely acknowledge that their intense anger is in part the result of a chronically low tolerance to frustration which results from generations of privilege within a system of their own making.
6) White men contend that they could put aside their anger at having been “unfairly discriminated against” since the institution of affirmative action 30 years ago and become color and gender-blind immediately. As a group, they have no history of being able to do this voluntarily in the 200 years of existence of this country.
7) White men portray affirmative action as no longer necessary because women and minorities have available the white male dominated court system to air discriminatory complaints.
8) White men portray themselves as proponents of color blind policies, yet they have been primarily responsible for putting white men like Newt Gingrich and Jesse Helms into powerful decision-making positions. Helms actively opposed desegregation for 22 years and Gingrich’s behavior reflects disdain for women and minorities.

I have no doubt that abolishing affirmative action would be good for at least 32 percent of us.

As for the remaining 68 percent, relying on the fair-mindedness of white men has never worked. All evidence suggests that pretending otherwise would be foolish and self-destructive for women and minorities.

Holly Bast
graduate student
To the editor:

Since Unity Week is here and the ongoing debate over affirmative action has arisen, I'd like to explain why I think affirmative action and the events of this week are largely destructive to race relations. My views on this subject tend to follow those of Shelby Steele, a black conservative professor at San Jose State. He maintains that many of these forms of preferential treatment — which include affirmative action, black student unions, black homecoming dances and so on — are only efforts of entitlement rather than development.

Or, in other words, rather than insisting on non-separatist activities and race-free decisions of opportunity, we, guilty white America, go for the quick racial fix by giving a handout and saying, "Sure, take this job or have your special activities."

Given the ever-present danger of being labeled a racist (one that I now run the risk of), appeasement and preference is an easier path than insisting on strict equality and high shared standards, such as earning what you get.

Of course, such ease in giving in to black demands for preferential treatment should send a warning flag that all is not right with such policies. And, indeed, programs or policies that offer entitlements based on race, such as a business or college that hires an African American to improve its "racial image," are really acting out of irrational guilt — a self-centeredness evidenced in their preoccupation with their image of innocence. Such guilt-filled acts, devoid of a real concern for black development, do no one any good. As Steele points out, whites still end up as the patrons of blacks, still centered on themselves while trying to calm the guilt that many blacks use as a powerful tool to get what they want. In turn, while blacks may gain some power because of entitlements, the terrible cost is one of self-respect and esteem. Given the ever-present danger of being labeled a racist (one that I now run the risk of), appeasement and preference is an easier path than insisting on strict equality and high shared standards, such as earning what you get.

Real empowerment, the kind that Martin Luther King Jr. would have supported, means having power over yourself first and taking responsibility for your own actions, thoughts and feelings.

Given the racial oppression in our country's history, all of us, black and white, have our fears and guilt to deal with. Legal equality seems to exist in this country, although affirmative action and entitlements have
Free Speech
Example #1

Giving award to publisher would be contradictory

To the editor:

I read that Eugene S. Pulliam, publisher of The Indianapolis Star, will be honored by the Hoosier State Press Association by awarding him its First Freedom Award May 5. This prestigious award is given to a person who is committed to the cause of mankind’s right to freedom of expression.

My free speech right has been denied on the opinion page of The Indianapolis Star for 20 years because I’m a liberal who frequently disagrees. I’ve got a file full of letters to the editor on various topics that I’ve sent to The Star over the years. They have never published one of my letters!

There is only one plausible explanation: I’ve been put on their blacklist and my voice of opposition has been censored.

Does Gene Pulliam deserve to be honored for free expression when his own newspaper has a list of letter writers who are denied access to the opinion page?

The Indianapolis Star never hesitates to pontificate about what’s wrong with the Democratic Party, but it has consistently refused to print a letter from me.

The Indianapolis Star has earned an award for hypocrisy, but Pulliam will get an award for freedom of expression. It leaves an ache in my heart, a hole in my gut.

B.J. Paschal
professor of psychology
Free Speech
Example #2

Paper should not be discredited for right-wing views

To the editor:
"You have the right to free speech, but you do not have the right to be heard!" says Rush. I have to admit that I was slightly amused to learn in B.J. Paschal's complaint to the editor March 15 that none of his letters to The Indianapolis Star have ever been published.

I am glad to learn that The Indianapolis Star will be honored with the First Freedom Award. I think it also deserves an award for discernment. If only all newspapers were so discerning!

I rarely appreciate the Daily News. It features two left-of-Patricia Ireland wackos who pose as syndicated columnists, and the editorials are rarely of any worth. And I think conservative thought is not done justice by their token conservative writer, Jon Kolanowski. Does my opinion of the Daily News as an economic bad have any effect on its continuance? No!

Of course not. The Daily News keeps coming and coming. All students at this school automatically pay for this paper, even if they hate it.

I enjoy The Indianapolis Star for the editorials and the syndicated columnists. I like to hear what Mona Charen, George Will, Thomas Sowell, et al. have to say. I like The Indianapolis Star's conservative bent. Many people buy this paper, including me. Only those who willfully purchase The Indianapolis Star pay for its survival.

Now tell me, which is the newspaper that better lives under freedom? The paper that is voluntarily supported by its readers, of course. Any paper supported by the state erodes our freedom by its very existence!

There are papers other than The Indianapolis Star that are supported by their readers. I don't know how the Hoosier State Press Association chose The Indianapolis Star for its award, but I do know that it should not be disqualified because it doesn't provide a left-leaning college professor the right to be heard.

The arrogance of B.J. Paschal! He implies that in order to be freedom loving, a newspaper must publish at least one of his letters. I think it would be quite illiberal if a newspaper's worth were measured by its decision on whether or not to publish letters from any writer, even Paschal.

H. Douglas James
junior
Free Speech
Example #3

Knowledge not needed to write letter to editor

To the editor:

Anyone can express an opinion in Quad Talk if the editor and the editorial committee say OK, rightly so, without any degree of knowledge.

This was the case with H. Douglas James' March 17 letter.

It seems fair that a critic would first know something about the First Freedom Award before he would express an opinion, but this was not the case with James.

The simple truth is that Eugene S. Pulliam, who publishes both The Indianapolis Star and The Indianapolis News, is getting this award from the Hoosier State Press Association. The Star is not getting the award; it is Gene Pulliam who is being honored with this prestigious award because he, supposedly, is committed to the cause of mankind's right to freedom of expression. But I have challenged whether Pulliam should get the award (in a letter to The Indianapolis Star).

The Indianapolis Star called me after they received the same letter dated March 3 that the Daily News printed on March 15. The editor tried to call me during the week of March 5, but I was out of town. His assistant called me March 13 to tell me that they had made a mistake; that is, my name appeared on a "frequent-writer-list" by mistake. But this mistake was 20 years old! I was, in effect, on their blacklist and my voice was being censored.

I was promised that my name had been removed from "the list." Only time will tell.

Editor John Lyer's assistant also told me that their computer records showed that The Star had printed five of my letters in 20 years. But I still haven't been able to locate even one such letter. There are, however, a couple of plausible explanations but only time and more searching will provide the truth of my claim that not one of my letters had been printed. If a letter has appeared in an edition of The Star, I haven't seen it. And I can't locate one in the Ball State or Muncie libraries.

Even if The Star has printed five of my letters in some edition, it has still discriminated against me even if by mistake as they claim.

I have complained for years to The Star about my claim of discrimination, but they fell on deaf ears until I challenged whether Pulliam was entitled to an award that is antithetical to the practice of The Star, as I view it.

This challenge apparently got their attention and moved them to take corrective action.

Finally, James took a swipe at columnist Jon Kolanowski, but I've concluded thusly: What's good in Kolanowski's column is quite good, and what isn't is at least adroit and intelligent, which cannot be said for James' arrogant ignorance.

B.J. Paschal
professor of psychology
Abortion
Example #1

Columnist should take more time to form opinions

To the editor:

Like the majority of the radical right wing that Jon Kolanowski calls his own, it seems that before voicing an opinion on a 'serious issue' he opens up his head and puts in Twinkies instead of brains.

Addressing his first comment I would like to ask why is it that he quotes the New York Times' sarcasm and not facts supporting his statements. The idea that the streets would receive a 'massive exodus' of marijuana addicts is just preposterous. The actual physical condition of legislation on the public is as yet undetermined by professionals. On the contrary, the consensus has been that we would not see a large increase in. The government's position to allow someone to take substance, like alcohol for instance, is not the same as the government telling us to do it. The government isn't even condoning this type of activity. It doesn't support the use of alcohol, (as a matter of fact we have a 'sin' tax on it), the government just knows that, legal or illegal, people will do it. Things like drinking and smoking utilizes a substance that can be not only controlled but also used as a money-maker.

On his second 'serious issue', masturbation, I would like to say that somewhere in the 90th percentile of American males have masturbated and/or masturbate. Which brings me to my point, masturbation is normal. This is what they're teaching kids in school. This, my fellow sensible citizens, is not a 'how-to' guide to get all worked up about.

Kolanowski's column even goes on further to the most serious of serious issues, abortion. His argument is that pregnant mothers should 'accept the consequences.' He means the babies here folks.

Kolanowski can be quoted as saying that babies, small humans, are consequences and should be accepted like a punishment. He offers the position that most babies, given the choice, would choose to be born in poverty than to not be born at all. Well, I agree. But I also believe that if I were put into the position of not being born at all or being born into a poverty stricken family, who thought I was a punishment, I would choose the former.

I also don't think that pro-choiceers are 'afraid to make people take responsibility,' at least not from where I stand. I can't think of one pro-choiceer who actually supports abortion. Again, of course, we can go back to one of my first complaints in this response, and that is just because the government allows something doesn't mean it is forcing us to take part, or even for that matter, condoning such activity. We know full well that if abortions are illegal people will still get them somehow. This 'somehow' is the scary part.

I know it is very hard to get in front of our coiled up little world every week and blast the campus with your opinions, picture and all, but you must be very careful to ask yourself, 'Have I thought about this?' before you ask your readers to do so.

James Pavlik
sophomore
Abortion
Example #2

Not everyone is going to agree about abortion

To the editor:

Geez, this whole abortion/birth control debate is giving me a migraine! I'm not even going to get into who's right and who's wrong, because if there's one thing I know for certain, it's that there will never be an agreement on this issue — never. Period. There simply is no black and white, right or wrong answer for everyone. But I've got to say that something is really bothering me.

A few weeks ago, Jon Kolanowski asked why pro-choice supporters are so afraid to make people face the "consequences" of their actions. Then just weeks ago, a speaker from a pro-life group stated that the "risk" of getting pregnant forces people to be faithful to their spouses.

I hear these kinds of things over and over and it always enrages me. Why is it that so many pro-life supporters refer to children as "risks" and "consequences?" Did their parents take them to church functions and office parties when they were young and introduce them to people by saying, "...And this is little Billy, our punishment for having sex . . ."?

Children are not consequences to be dealt with, mistakes to be owned up to or risks to take. They are indeed human beings who should be carefully planned and cared for. Everyone doesn't have to agree on when a cell becomes a fetus or when a fetus becomes a child, but please! Kids have poor enough self-images as it is! Let's not make them feel guilty about their very existence!

I cannot and will not attempt to speak for others, but I can tell you that when I do decide to have children, it will be at a time in my life when I am good and ready for them. I will be able to provide for them both emotionally and financially so that they grow old knowing that they were not an accident, not a consequence or punishment. And as for the statements of the speaker from CALL, I found them downright frightening.

Threat of pregnancy binds people to their mates? Hello!? That is insulting! Here in reality, many of us are bound to our mates by love. And shocking as it may be to some, others have sex simply because they enjoy it. Regardless of what the speaker believes is right or wrong, people have sex. They have sex a lot. If there was no birth control, there would be so many screaming, crying, hungry children overpopulating the earth, we wouldn't even be able to hear ourselves thinking about morality. That's just common sense. Saying that using birth control is wrong because God intended us to procreate is like saying that curing cancer is wrong because God intended us to die.

I know there are some religions that don't believe in medical treatment, but for some reason Christian Scientists don't seem to make an issue by bombing hospitals, shooting doctors or cramming their beliefs down America's collective throat.

I attended a Catholic school when I was a child. Though I no longer consider myself a Catholic, ironically, I attribute one of my strongest beliefs to the words of a very respected priest who explained to me what separates humans from animals. God gave each and every one of us the ability to think and choose.

Dana N. Duffy
Sophomore
Couples should be ready for kids before having sex

To the editor:

Once again, I feel the need to respond to more of the fuzzy logic that appeared in Quad Talk. Dana Duffy shouldn't have been so quick to suggest that the pro-life movement sees children, especially those that are unplanned, as a punishment.

Children are a responsibility that result from sexual activity, in some cases even if so-called "protection" is used. The most effective protection to hold off pregnancy is for people to hold off from having sex until they want children. Even though raising children is rough, there are extremely few or even no parents who will tell you that there wasn't anything good about it.

At least Duffy was right in writing that children aren't mistakes and should be planned for. She doesn't see, however, that that is part of the pro-life belief system. Most people in the pro-life movement support abstinence instead of artificial contraception and birth control because abstinence is more effective for those who use it, and all forms of artificial birth can either fail even if used correctly, or, in the case of drug-based methods, have side effects.

If anyone feels that unplanned pregnancies are "accidents" or "mistakes," it's the pro-choice movement. This would be clear to everyone if they went down to watch clinic protests where escorts try to keep their clients from seeing phone numbers for adoption services or information on the stages of pregnancy or the results of the process of abortion. That doesn't sound very pro-choice to me. In fact, that's more pro-cash flow or cramming a pro-abortion point of view down the throats of the clients of abortion mills. I'm sure that many pro-abortion people supported the provision in the Clinton health care ban that would have set up federally-funded abortions on taxpayer money, much of which comes from people who consider abortion wrong. Who's cramming what down whose throat now?

The final point I have to make is that attacks against doctors and clinics are rare when compared to the total number of peaceful protests each year. People like Paul Hill aren't just quickly disavowed from the pro-life movement as an image move, but because we really believe that an unprompted assault against an abortionist is just as bad as killing an unborn child. Killing a doctor also won't stop women from going elsewhere.

Kevin Shea
Students for Life
Senior
Daughter thanks mother for giving her gift of life

To the editor:

Dear Mom,

I just wanted to thank you. Your life has been so difficult. When you finally got headed in the right direction by coming to Ball State, getting on the dean’s list, being involved in campus activities — that’s when the bomb dropped; you found out you were pregnant with me.

With no source of income, your parents’ high expectations of you and a year left in college, you still chose to give me life. Even when my daddy left you because of me, you stood up for me. Even when your close friends drove you and I to one of the death camps of America, you held out. I admire your strength.

Thank you for believing that I am not a mistake. Maybe you weren’t counting on me so soon, but thanks for not sentencing me to death because of your actions.

Maybe you and my daddy are guilty of premarital sex — but I am innocent! Perhaps you didn’t plan on me, but you aren’t in control of this world. There is someone much more powerful who did plan on me. No matter what kind of precautions you took, it would never been enough. Even though you didn’t want me, I was meant to be.

You know now that I have only one month left in here. I am deeply saddened. I am afraid that once I get involved with my own life and my own activities, I will soon forget or not care about the other children who are in their mothers’ womb. I am worried about them. Which ones will make it … and which won’t?

Our society says there is no black or white. I don’t get it. Do they really think slaughtering children can ever be right? Do they really think we are just “blobs of tissue?” Do they think we deserve to die if we happen to be conceived in the wrong womb? I just can’t understand how anyone could believe we don’t deserve a chance unless our mother chooses to give us a chance.

I hear people all the time talking about all the abused children in this world. People seem to think they can predict which children will be abused and which won’t. If there is a slight possibility a child will be abused or is unwanted by their natural parents, they think killing children in the womb can be justified.

What they don’t understand is the children who are aborted feel the vacuum that sucks them out of a woman’s uterus. The others feel the forceps that pull them apart limb by limb. There are 18,000 third trimester unborn children that get their brains sucked out every year. Some of these babies are even bigger than me. I can feel pain — imagine theirs. And America is worried about violence outside the womb? How absurd!

Mom, I know you were abused as a child. Do you think that you should never been born? Did you deserve to be mutilated and torn apart before birth just so you wouldn’t be abused later in life?

Aren’t you angry that your mother could have chosen to kill you legally in her womb on her due date, but the day of your birth if she killed you by the same procedure she would have been convicted of murder. This logic is deeply perverted.

Mom, thank you for choosing life for me. I know it’s not the easiest choice, but regardless of what some pro-death extremists would like us to believe, life is the right choice. I am one of the lucky ones.

With Love,

Your Daughter

Jennifer Zukowski

President, Students for Life
Abortion
Example #5

Pro-life leaders should condemn violent actions

To the editor:

This is not the first time I've refuted the words of Jennifer Zukowski, and it probably won't be the last. I have always respected the pro-life position but the failure of its leaders to strongly condemn violent tactics make the entire movement increasingly suspect.

Zukowski marches lockstep with those who evade and thereby condone the issue of violence against the already born for the purpose of making abortion unavailable to American women.

She contends that she had no idea what 13 police officers were expecting from a pro-life demonstration at Planned Parenthood when her group showed up on Saturday morning. It is unbelievable that Zukowski is unaware of what police and many others face in their dealings with "pro-life" demonstrators around the country.

In addition to nationally publicized murders, clinics and doctor's offices have been bombed, clinic workers have been assaulted and equipment destroyed. "Wanted" posters with pictures, addresses and home telephone numbers of doctors who perform abortions have been widely distributed (posters of both Gunn and Britton were widely distributed around Pensacola before their deaths).

Stalking doctors, including meeting them at airports as they come into town and following them around in multivar caravans, and death threats in person and by anonymous phone calls to clinic personnel, escorts and their families are but some of the violent tactics used against the already born by "pro-life" groups to advance their cause.

According to Zukowski, these are merely "misconceptions" by the American people.

Sorry. As distasteful as it is to deal with inconsistencies within your organization, a strong condemnation of these tactics would go a long way toward establishing some credibility for your cause.

Feigning ignorance and labeling documented violence a public "misconception" is both weak and deceptive. Evidence of peaceful demonstrations by Students for Life is nice but it's not enough.

Holly Bast
"The white, American male is the biggest minority group in the country. "Why should all of these different groups have their own weeks? What about a week for white people?"

These statements were said once when an acquaintance of mine was raving about Black History Month, which took place at my undergraduate alma mater each February.

When questioned further about his views he explained, "The white person doesn't get a chance anymore, everything is directed toward special groups. I don't know why we need special weeks and months for blacks or anybody else."

I've always thought that the answer lies all around us.

Two middle-aged men are painting a fence in Naperville, Ill., on a bright, sunny day. A college-aged couple walk by holding hands. The woman is an attractive blonde, the man is a young, black male. After they pass, one painter turns to the other, shakes his head and says, "What a waste."

In a college cafeteria, two white students are waiting in a lunch line. A group of young black women enter, talking loudly. One of the students turns to his friend and says, "I wish they would shut up once in a while."

At a Ku Klux Klan rally in Dubuque, Iowa, an 8-year-old child is filmed by a news crew. The young kid wears a shirt that says, "White power now." At the same rally, his mother is verbally harassed by a vicious crowd. She points and shouts, "You'll all be sorry someday. They'll take everything before they're through."

The scene is a U2 concert which features the rap group Public Enemy as an opening act. One suburban teenager turns to another during the set and says, "I didn't come tonight for black music."

In an office, a middle-aged white man is complaining to a co-worker because his son got shut out of a college class. "Yeah, they give those classes to the minorities first, then my kid can get in."

At a park on July 4, a young white man and his girlfriend stroll up to a concession stand and inquire about the availability of picnic grounds in the area. When told that all of the picnic spots are full, he hisses, "Guess you gotta get up early to beat the Mexicans and the blacks. They should all go back and leave us alone."

These situations described shouldn't be shocking to anyone except the woefully naive. As a white male, one is subjected to the views of open and closet racists constantly. There is always someone blaming the minorities for something.

One friend who rides Chicago buses frequently, stated that she wasn't scared of African Americans in the context of getting robbed or attacked or anything, but she said she felt wrong because, "being a middle-class white female, I think they look at me like I can't be trusted."

In response to this, I often like to play a game with friends that I call, "Turn the table of history." This game of thought is simple to play. Just substitute people of black skin into the line of history wherever whites are involved and vice versa.

In other words, black-skinned people would have settled in Europe and white-skinned people would have been found mainly in Africa. Black-skinned Europeans discover the New World and eventually hear that cheap labor is available in Africa. So they go to Africa and force the white-skinned people to be slaves.

The whites are in bondage until after the Civil War and struggle another 100 years before the Civil Rights movement even begins. Whites are forced to attend segregated schools, live in abject poverty, work for far less money, are subjected to hate groups and so forth.

In the late '50s and early '60s, low-income housing projects are built promising cheap, affordable housing. But funding is cut and the projects decay with the cities around them. There are no jobs or banks in the area and drugs are a main staple of the local economy.

You are constantly subjected to stereotypical views of yourself and women clutch their purses tighter when they see you coming their way. Along the way, prominent white civil rights leaders are assassinated, the government won't help the poor and the jails are filled with a disproportionate number of white men.

Then the question is asked: In the year 1995, who would you trust or believe?

For anyone who can't understand the point of a Unity Week or a Black History Month, that's OK Close your eyes and go back to sleep. And dream your sweet dreams of a white world.

You ignorant fools.
Affirmative action: we're finally seeing the light

Affirmative action may be an idea whose time has come and gone. The biggest challenge to it may come in California, where a ballot initiative in 1996 is expected to outlaw all preferences based on race or sex. A federal court case in Pennsylvania has already shot down Philadelphia's minority and female set-aside programs, and similar cases are being argued in several other states.

Perhaps more important, affirmative action is now considered an issue in the mainstream media, where it was once treated as a sacred cow. Even some liberals are saying that perhaps affirmative action has gone on "long enough" — a face-saving way of retreating without admitting that it was a bad idea in the first place, as some of us said a quarter of a century ago.

Defenders of affirmative action almost never want to talk about the facts as to what its actual consequences have been. They want to talk about its moral justification, its symbolic importance, its political necessity — anything except its actual consequences.

Nor is this peculiar to the United States. In countries around the world, extremely little evidence is offered to show that such programs are in fact beneficial. When I did an international survey of affirmative action programs for a book published in 1990, the consequences I found again and again were these:

1. The benefits of affirmative action went overwhelmingly to people who were already better off, while the poorer members of the same groups either did not gain ground or actually fell further behind.

2. Polarization between groups increased, erupting repeatedly into lethal violence in India, Nigeria and Sri Lanka.

3. Frauds became commonplace, whether by false claims of belonging to the group in question or by having a genuine member of such a group become a "front" for people who were not members, but who received government favors anyway.

4. Despite claims that these programs are "temporary" means to advance particular groups, such programs have not only persisted but expanded to include other groups, ultimately encompassing a majority of the country's whole population, as in India and the United States.

No wonder defenders of affirmative action do not want to talk about its consequences but only about its good intentions.

One of the reasons for the popularity of affirmative action has been that it has allowed white liberals to wear blacks like merit badges.

For example, when former NAACP Legal Defense Fund director Jack Greenberg defended affirmative action at a judicial conference some years ago, he stressed that he considered it symbolically important that he hire a black secretary when he became a professor at Columbia University. As he went on and on about this, I recalled that Milton Friedman had a black secretary when he was a student of his more than 30 years ago — and has another black secretary today. But never have I heard him mention the race of his secretary, either in public or in private.

Although I have had dinner with Rush Limbaugh three times, never have I heard him mention the race of his producer, who is black. I learned this much later, when his producer attended a reception given for me by Forbes magazine.

Edmund Burke, the 18th century godfather of modern conservatism, devoted a decade of his life to impeaching Warren Hastings, the British viceroy of India whom Burke accused of mistreating the Indians. When a relative of Burke's told him that the British people in India could not understand his crusade against Hastings, Burke replied that he intended to continue defending the Indians "whether the white people like it or not."

Adam Smith, father of laissez-faire economics two centuries ago, dismissed with contempt the idea that Africans enslaved in the United States were racially inferior. He suggested that they were superior to "the refuse from the jails of Europe" who owned them.

The worldwide battle that ultimately destroyed slavery all across the planet was launched in the late eighteenth century by William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton, some of the most conservative people in England. They would be called "the religious right" by today's standards.

Liberals make much of the fact that they were on the right side of the civil rights struggles of the 1950s and 1960s. Grant them that. But, historically, both racists and anti-racists have existed in many parts of the political spectrum. Liberals cannot continue indefinitely justifying their current policies by showing old newsreels of themselves marching at Selma.

Moreover, if they are going to take the credit for civil rights, let them also take the blame for the devastating impact of liberal policies on the family, on law enforcement, and on education. Above all, let the coming debate on affirmative action be about actual consequences, not about pious hopes or symbolic gestures.

Thomas Sowell is a syndicated columnist.
Christian
Associated Press Cartoon

"IF YOU DON'T MIND, I'D LIKE TO KEEP THE PEPPER SPRAY. I'VE HEARD THERE ARE CHRISTIANS IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD."
Blackville Middle School
Associated Press Release

Students want freedom to wear confederate garb

COLUMBIA, S.C. — Seven students suspended for wearing Confederate flag shirts have sued a school district, claiming they should be allowed to sport the rebel flag if others can wear Malcolm X shirts.

At least 15 students have been punished for wearing the shirts at Blackville Middle School, according to the class-action lawsuit filed Monday.

The plaintiffs contend the Barnwell County District 19 dress code, which prohibits “distasteful or disruptive” symbols on clothes, has been unfairly applied in violation of their free speech rights.

The suit claims that students were suspended for wearing shirts with the rebel flag saying “Flying high, ain’t coming down” while black students have been permitted to wear symbols of African-American pride, including Malcolm X T-shirts, that “may be offensive to white students.”
Those hotly discussed angry white men

JOHN LEO

First the Arabs did it, which was a bad thing. Then "angry white males" did it, which was widely regarded as an unexpected bonanza, at least among the chattering classes.

If the bombing had happened a decade ago, Timothy McVeigh and the other suspects would probably have been viewed as just a few marginal itinerant weirdos. But thanks to the now conventional race-and-gender categories of the left, they are viewable as unelectable but more or less official representatives of the entire low-melanin, high-testosterone set.

Very little is heard these days about the categories of non-angry white males (NAWM) or angry non-white males (ANWM) but the AWM category is hotly discussed. It is the one that links such obvious allies as George Will, Charles Manson, Newt Gingrich, John Sununu, Timothy McVeigh and your average Bosnian torturer.

Linked to the bombers

Use of this handy category means that opponents of racial quotas and preferences, not to mention all living conservative columnists, can now be plausibly linked to the Oklahoma bombers.

Sure enough. Columnist Carl Rowan made the connection between "angry white men" who are against affirmative action and AWMs who bomb buildings. The Wall Street Journal (in a Page 1 news story, no less) asked "Have angry white men gone too far?" (Obvious answer: Yes! First we revived Tony Bennett's career: then, as if that weren't bad enough, we all backed the bombing of federal buildings in the Midwest.)

Mary McGrory, normally the sanest of columnists, pushed the AWM button a couple of times.

The problem is that the chattering classes are trained to notice wickedness on the right but not on the left.

Ellen Willis, in the Village Voice, revealed she has had it with AWMs. "The Republicans' real contract with America," she wrote, "is to liberate its God-given, morally righteous sadism, whether expressed through guns or through epithets."

Can we all calm down now and discuss this?

First, it would be nice if we stopped cramming people into little race-and-gender boxes. A couple of years ago, I was on a nationally televised forum on the subject of rape. Both the panel and the entire audience were divided by gender — women on one side, men on the other. The visual statement being made by this arrangement was that rape is a gender issue, pitting all women against all men, and not a social issue alloying 100 percent of women and 99 percent of men against rapists.

The gender-boxing of white males creates a mythical sense of homogeneity among men of very different ethnicity, classes and interests. It also produces the distorted suggestion that only one bloc (white guys) opposes affirmative action. In reality, a large majority of Americans are against it.

A recent poll on affirmative action shows that 81 percent of white men, 77 percent to 79 percent of white women and almost half of non-whites oppose preferences.

Second, the anger and the culture of resentment aren't just problems of one race, one gender and one side of the political spectrum. They are everywhere. policing the whole culture. That's why President Clinton's comments, amended to include both right and left, were so on-target in denouncing "purveyors of hatred and division, the promoters of paranoia."

Traveling around the country these days you can indeed hear a lot of wild and ghoulish chitchat and race-baiting coming from the car radio. A lot of hateful messages on the Internet show signs of advanced mental disturbance too. Why should anyone spend two minutes explaining this stuff away as Jeffersonian democracy in action?

The embrace of anger

The problem is that the chattering classes are trained to notice wickedness on the right but not on the left. How many who denounced G. Gordon Liddy's advice on shooting federal officials also denounced, say, Sister Souljah's call for a week dedicated to the killing of white people, or Larry Kramer's call for a gay terrorist group modeled on the Irgun?

The embrace of anger and resentment pervades the whole spectrum. The Whitney Biennial art show of 1993 was built around nihilistic rage and not much else. "Rage + Women = Power", is a Ms. slogan, and a quote from Gloria Steinem, glorifying anger as a sign of freedom, is oddly featured in a magazine ad for a graduate school in New York. Everybody is an angry victim of some implacable force or other.

It's too bad Clinton's remarks get bogged down in partisanship and the debate over whether he meant to discredit Rush Limbaugh. His point was a good one: Are we just interested in fanning the flames of rage and resentment, and do we want decent civic discourse and an emphasis on reconciliation?

Universal Press Syndicate
Balancing Test: The rights of those in society who will be affected by an individual exercising his/her rights must be weighed against those of the individual. As the diagram shows, the rights of society weigh slightly more on the scale. To benefit from the protections society provides, the individual must give up some rights. (taxes, speed limits, drug laws, etc.) This test is presented in contrast to the libertarian ideology that puts the individual first. It is interesting to note that without society's protection, individual rights would not even be possible. There would be nothing to stop someone from taking away your greatest right: the one to life.

Society, like a person, has an interest in self-preservation!
Specificity Test (A modification of the clear and present danger test): Answer the following questions to determine whether an act of individual liberty needs to be constrained, when a member of society cries foul.

1. Was there an actual injury or was one possible?  
   (violence, property destruction, educational disruption, etc.)  
   Yes.....Go to 3.  
   No......Go to 2.

2. Is it a constantly repeated offense?  
   Yes.....Possible harassment. Can be regulated.  
   No......No further action.

3. Is it a matter of public interest?  
   (Schools, law enforcement, infringing on other’s rights, etc.)  
   Yes.....Go to 4.  
   No......No further action.  
   A good example would be two individuals arguing in public.  
   The possibility for violence could be very real, but until it 
   actually commences, thereby placing others in danger, there 
   is no public interest.

4. Is the act specific?  
   Yes.....Can be regulated.  
   If someone’s actions or words “specifically” call for putting citizens in 
   danger or creating a hostile atmosphere then the violation, should be 
   put to an end.  
   No......No further action.  
   Refer back to the Blackville Middle School example on page 34. Rebel flags and Malcolm X t-shirts do not call for 
   disruption. It all depends upon the person who sees it and 
   becomes offended. However, a shirt that sported the slogan 
   “down with blacks” or “whites suck” could be regulated. The 
   slogans are specific and could prove disruptive to the 
   classroom.
The Preamble Test: In determining the constitutionality of an action, the courts need look no further than the preamble of the constitution. Before deciding, take a good look at it. Are we "insuring domestic tranquility" or "promoting the general welfare?" If the liberties we are granting or taking away don’t seem to benefitting society, in accordance with the preamble, then they are probably unconstitutional. The problem occurs, however, when current public sentiment rules the constitutionality of issues. If that is the case, maybe our "guiding document" has become outdated, which is another debate altogether. (At any rate, I should note that this debate would not be necessary if the amendment process was utilized correctly.)

The Preamble to the Constitution

WE THE PEOPLE of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this CONSTITUTION for the United States of America.
Here is what the purpose of this thesis comes down to. What do the readers have to say about the operational definition (The Write Wing) of this model? A few responses were made in the replies to the survey distributed in the 14th column, and a few are taken from the editorial page.

The Write Wing: Good... you seem to have taken your job as a columnist seriously and have dealt with the issues rather than columnists in the past who have taken their role too lightly and have simply babbled on endlessly just to kill space.

Jon J. Martin

If anything, it reaffirmed my stances on issues. Generally, a no-brainer. Pretty fundamental issues that I have a strong opinion on. The only one I had any contention on was drug legalization. I really don’t know on that one. I am totally unaffected by the policy. I do not, nor have I taken any drug (other than alcohol (nicotine once)). I realize the harmful effects of drug intake, but the same is true with alcohol and tobacco. It could be easier to control the drug world, if it were regulated. But, the drugs still scare me nonetheless. Kids need to be kept away from them. The survey itself is extremely biased.

The Write Wing: C- Contrary views to your own were not covered accurately in my opinion. A shade below average. Average in the sense that everybody has an ax to grind. Below in that it went out of its way to be swayed sometimes.

David Eppley

I asked Mr. Eppley about the views that were not covered accurately. He could not produce any examples. However, I feel that his discontent arises from the fact that I did not discuss my opinions on sexual orientation, an issue I steered clear of in the paper. (A mistake that may have cost me some followers) Four days earlier, before I had talked to him and explained my views (He later apologized), Eppley wrote the following remark on Usenet News:

...assholes like Jon Colonblow (errata: Kolanowski) who mislabel information...

Dave Eppley
"An angry, white, homosexual male" who knows that he doesn’t have all the answers, unlike some of his conservative brothers and sisters...

I'll miss reading your editorials in the Daily News. Your editorials are the only ones worth reading! What's with those poor excuses for associated press writers? The editorials by the two regulars are terrible. Can they think of anything better to write about than racism or feminism? Every day I hear how white men are suppressing women and minorities, and I'm sick of it. If these people plan to make me more accepting by
preaching multiculturalism, they have blown it. I am very open minded and always have been, but it makes me very bitter when every day I hear that I am keeping minorities down. Multiculturalism makes all races bitter. So now, without you, the paper will be totally liberal, how sad. What they don’t know is that there are more of us conservatives out here than they think or are willing to admit.

-Loyal Republican and just all around swell guy,
Matt Rupert

(3 Weeks Into the Semester)
....His "work" is a joke....To read his column is to be flayed by a distinctly ideological, mordant wit....I’m concerned about what conservative liars are saying about so-called "liberal values." But others may be put off by Kolanowski’s awkward musings and disturbing flippancy. Quad Talk thrives on many voices, but "The Write Wing" contributes little to the discourse....It was stale, habitual and inert and this created a big, black hole for conservatism to fill with BS.

B.J Paschal
professor of psychology

....And I think conservative thought is not done justice by their (The Daily News) token conservative writer, Jon Kolanowski.

H. Douglas James

(Mid-term)
....Finally, James took a swipe at columnist Jon Kolanowski, but I’ve concluded thusly: What’s good in Kolanowski’s column is quite good, and what isn’t is at least adroit and intelligent, which cannot be said for James’ arrogant ignorance.

B.J Paschal
professor of psychology

It looks like I’ve affected, at least, someone’s opinion.
I have not changed any of my opinions based on your column, but I did enjoy seeing that somebody apparently heading for the professional news media shared many of my views.

Aaron J. Nall

I was not aware of that.

I just wanted to thank you for writing such informative, true articles for the Daily News this semester. I especially appreciate your pro-life viewpoint. The article you wrote about men and abortion offered some valuable insight which I believe many men do not take time to think about. I am so tired of both men and women telling me that abortion is just a woman's issue. Close to half the children aborted are male. That seems to make it a human issue. Anyway, thanks for standing up for what is right. I really appreciate it.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Zukowski
President, Students For Life

Last, but not least...

I'm sorry I did not read my E-mail messages in time to help with your project. I found your column very interesting toward the end of the semester, particularly. I am a liberal woman who is very offended by the current right wing agenda, but I have a respect for someone who makes an attempt to substantiate their opinions through reading and research. You certainly did that, particularly after the first few weeks. I found your writing to be honest and felt at times that you could be reasonable and compassionate, though I find most who hold your point of view to be the opposite. You did make me think and your development as an editorial writer was interesting to watch and encouraging. I wouldn't be surprised if you developed into a more liberal thinker with experience. You certainly have potential and have added to the quality of my experience at Ball State. Thank you and best of luck in the future.

Holly Bast

More liberal? Very unlikely. However, its good to see respect among adversaries. I think it is safe to say that I passed the objectivity test with Ms. Bast.

1 See column 9, appendix B.