

First draft
July 26, 1993

[REDACTED]
Jacksonville, FL 32211

August 1, 1993

Dear Citizen:

A few thoughts, questions and suggested answers:

1. Is there any explanation for the historically-unique parade of natural disasters suffered by America in recent years? (Yes.) Who is the source and cause of them? (God.) But aren't most of the victims plain, ordinary people living plain, ordinary lives? (Yes.) Why them? (Because they have the power to correct the misguided course that the country is on, and are not doing it. The rain falls on good and bad alike.)
2. On the day of writing this section, July 19, President Clinton announced his policy on gays in the military. In a departure from his prepared script, and from all that he had said up to the moment, he added: "Under this policy, a person can say 'I am a homosexual, but I am going to strictly adhere to the code of conduct'".

Before delving into the question of whether there is a source to which we can turn for guidance on this issue, let me put that inquiry in perspective by stating a general principle that applies to all issues, not merely that of gays in the military. That principle is: The touchy-touchy feelgood better angels of our nature must be balanced by the better angels of instantly unquestioning obedience to the ^Ultimate Authority. When my four children were ~~infants~~ ^{teenagers} and I explained why they were not to go near the stove, I didn't care at all if they were in touch with their feelings. I cared only that they said "Yes, sir" and obeyed me.

The fact that a gay may be a wonderful, caring, decent and really great person is completely irrelevant to the question of whether he or she may be allowed to serve in the military, which has only one role in life: when ordered into a war, battle, police action or whatever by the Commander In Chief, it is to kill as many of the enemy as quickly as possible with the minimum loss of life on our side - period. This is not the IRS, or HUD or HHS. This is a handful of people assigned the duty of protecting the lives and freedom of 250,000,000 Americans.

Anyone who has had military command should know that there is a very rational basis for keeping gays out of the services. There is no way you can equate sexual preference to race or gender. In any event, Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to provide such "Government and Regulation".

Further, if I am the rental agent for an apartment development, I can tell whether a person is black or female before they have said a word. I can learn that a person is gay only if he tells me, only if he blathers on with information about his personal life that not only do I have no interest in learning, but I also consider to be an invasion of my privacy. As Lewis Grizzard put it years ago: "I don't care if you make love to Nash Ramblers, as long as you're discreet about it."

Now, as to the source to which we should turn ^{FOR}~~to~~ guidance on the subject of gays in the military: the Good Book, or Bible (probably banned in your school library, the same one that has the Magic Johnson video tape on AIDS, the beauty that contains garbage I cannot imagine more than one percent of one percent of people being sick enough to say out loud, let alone discuss. We are going to have to work hard as parents to assure that the upcoming generation learns more about how to think, about the rules of logic, about concepts such as correlation and causality, about reading and writing, and less about how to put a condom on a banana, or how to ~~duplicate~~ ^{COPULATE} at age ten.).

If you are to understand the Bible as you should, you must appreciate the fact that it contains a hierarchy of truths; that is; some truths are more important than others, some can be understood only in light of others, some fit under others.

For example, in 1 Corinthians 7:7-9, Paul says (in my expanded paraphrase of his words) in writing to the early Christians: "I would that all of you could do as I am doing, to dedicate all of your selves and your lives to the Lord. I can't have a wife or family, traveling all around the Mediterranean as I do, being chased by the Thought Police and often having to run for my life. But as for you, it is better for you to marry than to burn."

That is the binary choice that each of us, regardless of any and all circumstances, is given: celibacy, or, if we can't handle that, marriage - period, end of story.

Among the truths that fit under this overriding, general edict are the words of Jesus in Matthew 19:11-12 which follow a section in which He covers various points about marriage: "All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given.

TP God is not at all discriminatory against sex between and among gays. There are dozens of verses and incidents in the Word that make it clear that fornication and adultery are just as much of an abomination to Him. Which leaves us with only the married state of a man and woman as the proper home for sex, according to this God whose very nature dictates that He must hate the sin regardless of any particulars about the sinner.

For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb; and there are some eunuchs, which were made

eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake."

Jesus was familiar with and used the literary devices of the Greek, Roman and Jewish traditions. In His use of the word "eunuch" in this section, He was clearly using it in a symbolic sense and not in the literal reference to a male who was castrated, usually so that he might serve in a harem. Two thousand years ago, He said that some men have no interest in marrying a woman because of a genetic condition ("confirmed" in July, 1993 by the NIH as one component in homosexuality), some because they have been seduced by other men, and some because they want to dedicate their lives to the Lord.

What He thinks of those who, for whatever reason, opt not for marriage, and then opt not for celibacy but for sex with partners of the same sex, is spelled out clearly in Romans 1:26-28 ("...for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another...". These three verses should be read in the context of verses 16-25) and the Revelation 21:8 and 22:11-15.

We are almost completely blind to the power of God. For example, I know that the following statements are clearly, unequivocally true: Regardless of the status of any marriage, God can turn it into one in which the husband and wife love each other and stay together forever. Regardless of circumstances, God can enable a person to be perfectly content in celibacy for any period of time.

3. In the July 1 Letter of Transmittal, I recounted what I told my daughter on March 13, her nineteenth birthday. "Most of Washington and the media are telling you that Hillary Clinton is your new role model. Don't buy that line. She wields zero power of her own. One hundred percent of her power comes not from her husband, but from the office that her husband occupies for a short time. If you are interested in politics and government, set your sights on being the President, not his wife. That's the role model that women should have - and will have sometime in your lifetime." OUT

No TP →

I finished my comments on the subject with: "But, honey, if you were to become President, the most important thing you'll ever do in your life is to have and raise your children. Do that first, then be President."

4. About a year ago, I told a few people at a ^{McD}McDonald's in Boynton Beach, Florida: "And what is it that they suppose I'll do if the President isn't on the Evening News sometime? Do they think I'll toss and turn all night, worrying about him?"

→ 'Oh, Lordy, how come the President wasn't on TV tonight? Is he sick and they're afraid to tell us? Is it something serious? What will we do if it is that? O, woe is us!'"

Based on the reaction of the people at my table and at others, they felt exactly the same way about this excessive preoccupation with the President. On July 17, on "Capital Gang", Mona Charen made a good point about our obsession with the office as demonstrated in the Flood of the Century. It is as if the people will be lost if the President doesn't show up in person. ~~And~~ will he have to view personally every disaster before he releases any emergency funds?

Folks, it's a job. And Harry Truman probably had it right when he said that there had to be something wrong with someone who actually wanted to be President: that is, in terms of actually wanting to assume such awesome responsibilities, loss of privacy and never-ending demands on one's time and attention. But of course it is only people who are complete and confident within themselves such as a Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower or Ronald Reagan who have such a balanced viewpoint. From Jack Kennedy onwards it would appear that we have specialized ^{me}Presidents who would just have died if they hadn't attained the office - which is probably one of the reasons we have had such a miserable record in the last thirty years.

Fortunately, technology is coming to the rescue, along with many other helps. As Tom Wicker said many months ago, we are probably moving into an era of one-term Presidents because after four years of overexposure on television and in the celebrity-driven ~~written~~ media, the body politic is just plain sick and tired of these people by the time the next election comes around.

Another factor in this trend was commented on by President Clinton on July 21 when he pointed out that he is the first President who has tried to free the gays, to have their lifestyle treated by the law and by society exactly the same as that of what has been accepted for many thousands of years as a family, to equate personal sexual habits to the color of one's skin - a classical apples-and-oranges bit of logic that is typical of Washington.

He said: "Is that a sign of weakness? It may be a sign of madness, sir, but it is not a sign of weakness." Those whom the gods would dethrone, they first make angry. Fortunately for

"UP (THERE IS ONE IMPORTANT ASPECT IN WHICH I KNOW HOW IT IS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE POWERLESS - POWERLESS WHITE OR POWERLESS BLACK. I HAVE BEEN LOCKED UP, FOR NO VALID REASON, ONLY BECAUSE I AM FIGHTING THE POWERFUL. I HAVE BEEN RAILROADED BY A JUDGE AND A PUBLIC DEFENDER WHO PUT THEMSELVES ABOVE THE LAW IN ORDER TO DO THE BIDDING OF THE POWERFUL. I HAVE BEEN HOMELESS. I HAVE LIVED IN A HOMELESS SHALTER. I HAVE OFTEN GONE WITH LITTLE OR NO FOOD, WITH LITTLE OR NO SLEEP, AND ALL BECAUSE EVERY SEGMENT OF SOCIETY HAS PROTECTED ONE INTERNATIONAL CONGLOMERATE Bill Clinton, though, Jesus sees him as he can and will be in the future, not merely as he is now. RATHER THAN TREAT ONE CITIZEN JUSTLY.)

As he is now? In my twenty years with IBM, I ran across many Bill Clintons; smooth, slick salesmen who were very successful until they ^{OFTEN} truth and the facts caught up with them - at which point they were promoted, having proved that they had the right stuff for management.

5. There is another bit of classical apples-and-oranges logic that is pervasive in this nation. Many years ago, the Supreme Court decided, in the Griswold case, that the government could not prohibit a couple from using contraceptives, based on their right to privacy in their bedroom. Okay so far.

Now let me posit another situation to which many of the Inner Priests would apply exactly the same reasoning, with the same results. But what I will posit is not a theoretical situation. In the past seventeen years I have lived in a wide variety of circumstances, some of them unendurable to someone who had the life I had before then, unless he had the Lord with him every step of the way. My familiarity with some of the victims of our social engineering is not based merely on a quick visit or book knowledge only.

In one of these situations, which involved living with a large group of strangers, I got to know one young girl who had an abortion and many other trials of life. She had started going to her high-school nurse for advice on her sex life because she thought her parents had old-fashioned, old-fogey ideas about sex. When, despite her intensive sex education program and private tutoring, she became pregnant, that same school nurse made arrangements for her to go to Planned Parenthood, which saw to it that she got her abortion.

This is George Orwell's "Big Brother". This is the government putting itself "in loco parentis", "in the place of the parent". This is the kind of involvement that smacks of Nazi Germany or Stalinist Russia, an arrogant assumption that if parents are not perfect, government must step in.

It is also apples-and-oranges with the Griswold decision. That school nurse is paid by my and your tax dollars. At the time, Planned Parenthood had some funding from the government and it is partially funded today by my and your tax dollars because it has complete exemption from taxes. There is no "privacy" involved here.

The Casey decision gave lip service to Roe vs. Wade and its standing on privacy, but the "undue burden" test was a brilliant way to shift the foundations of the right to liberty, where they belong and should remain.

6. There was an interesting aspect to the commentary on the floods in the Midwest that relates to other subjects in this letter, including gays, taxes and abortion. Apparently we have a nation of federal, state and local employees, and members of the media, that ~~has~~^{have} been intimidated in to the belief~~y~~ that, into whatever else, one must never mention God, as in "an act of God", a term ~~well~~^{well} established in the laws and decisions in the field of insurance. They phony "wall of separation between church and state" has really done its job.

There are probably no more than a handful of people in Congress who would have the courage to say that any nation blessed as we have been - that promotes and helps to pay for the destruction of 1.6 million embryonic lives each year; moves to establish a union of homosexual with a bisexual as the legal and moral equivalent of a husband and a wife; ignores "the general welfare" in order to please anybody; puts itself above the law on the arrogant assumption that the people - whom they consider to be stupid - can do nothing about it; and concentrates on incumbency above all else - can expect nothing from God as long as it continues on this self-absorbed arrogant and ungodly path.

7. But, to conclude on a more positive note, there is hope for the future. Take, for example, the procession of people who would have died ~~if~~ they hadn't attained the Presidency. There is someone who is the very antithesis of these men: Mario Cuomo.

After electrifying a convention and a nation with his speech in 1984, Mario elected to not even run for President in 1988 and 1992. Why? As many Mario-watchers have commented, he would rather be right than be President. I'm certain that's accurate: the Presidency may need Mario, but he doesn't need it. There are many things much more important to him than that office.

In addition, I believe Mario indicated the most influential consideration when he said in 1992 that the only sensible way to assume the office was to have a mandate to carry out a specific program. It is possible that no one could have gotten such a mandate in 1988 or 1992 what with all of the traumatic events of recent years, including the abrupt ending of the Cold War.

This is an exciting time to be alive. I'm certain that we are on the verge of moving into "a whole new world". I don't know how, or when. But I'm certain that it's close, and that it's worth waiting and fighting for.

Insert

I am astounded to hear the cool, calculating and intellectual discussion about abortion that is now taking place, some of it by United States Senators, that is exactly analogous to what I would have heard in 1850 about the property rights of the landed gentry, in which it would have been impossible to detect any recognition that a slave was also a person, a human being.

From all that can be observed, there is absolutely no awareness of or consideration for the embryonic life that is clearly involved. It is as though none of these ^{people} ~~inner circle~~ has ever seen or appreciated or understood "A Miracle Of Life", by Nova of PBS. That can't be.

In addition, we have the astounding proposition that a constitutional right is not a right, is illusory, unless the government gives a citizen the money to pay for the exercise of that right. I wrote "Message To Congress ^{to abortion}" about a year ago. It argues for the right, by arguing for the codification of a version of the Casey decision.

How about my right to free speech? All 535 members of Congress should have a copy of "Message", but I have been able to afford only about 35 copies for Congress. How is it fair if someone can promote an opposing viewpoint, a competing idea, with 535 copies, radio and television ads, and interviews in the press and on television? Isn't this disparity a violation of my First Amendment rights? Wasn't it intended that a free press would compensate for this disparity?

July 23, 1993