

said there is "almost a conspiracy of silence" by both political parties on the deficits. The reason, he said, is simply politics.

In the meantime, Bush and Clinton offer fiscal tricks and vague promises.

ers

discriminatory attitude flies in the face of the great value and importance church leaders place on youth, especially at general conference time. Like Primary, Scouting, Aaronic priesthood, family home evening, missionary service, etc.

BYU is an integral part of the developmental process of LDS youth. BYU has always been more than just an educational institution; it is a place where LDS young adults go for socialization, character development, courtship, marriage, advanced religious training, etc. We recognize that the greatness of the church lies in the fact that the Lord is at the helm, not men. BYU is a part of that vineyard that belongs to the Lord, not to men.

When our churches and temples reach capacity, do we turn members away? I suggest that Rex E. Lee and others get down on their knees and find a way for every "qualified and worthy" person to attend BYU. And while they're at it, they better find a way to make restitution to those who have been "turned away." I believe the Lord during his earthly ministry, experienced rejection and being "turned away." I believe He knows how it feels, and is not "well-pleased" with some narrow-sighted, self-serving persons who are supposed to be his servants.

Michael Gene Warren
Provo

Help wanted

Editor:

My class is working on a major project for social studies. I would appreciate your assistance. I would like to receive a picture postcard from your readers. I need information about the climate, cultural activities, recreational activities, and special points of interest and events of your area.

Will combat duty reduce harassment?

Few things are more formidable than a fully-mobilized bureaucracy. In the matter of women in the military, we see a bureaucracy in full battle array, vigorously waging a two-front war against common sense.

Gender jacobins in Congress, in tandem with feminist pressure groups and a feminist fifth column in the military, are seeking to bring about a "basic cultural change" in the armed forces. Specifically, they want to revise military indoctrination and disciplinary practices to include re-education about the evils of sexual harassment. The proximate justification for this is the Tailhook scandal, in which 26 women were forced to run a groping gauntlet of leering, drunken naval aviators in Las Vegas.

During the past week various congressional committees have heard testimony about sexual harassment in the military; the media has been awash in stories of military women who have been harassed or who are bravely confronting "sexist" attitudes among their male comrades. USA Today reported that one woman, Army Specialist Alexis Martinez Colon, was driven to suicide by a non-commissioned officer whose behavior had created a "hostile workplace."

Susan H. Mather, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Public Health at the Veterans Administration, announced on September 14 that the VA will begin group therapy sessions for women who suffer the lingering effects of sexual harassment in the military. According to Mather, harassment victims suffer post-traumatic stress disorders not unlike that associated with



At Home and Abroad

combat: "There's an inability to build intimate-type relations, to trust people, flash-backs of the actual trauma ..." and so on.

Gracious. How can we mend these wounded feelings? Why, by sending women into combat, of course. Rep. Les Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has said that the ban on women in combat must be lifted before the military's "sexist attitudes" can be expunged.

Admiral Frank Kelso has told Congress that many young female naval officers believe that the combat ban creates a "climate of inequality" that leads to sexual harassment. Kelso's opinion may differ, and if so he is well advised to stifle it. Aspin and Congresswoman Beverly Byron have announced that "sensitivity" to feminist issues is now a criterion for promotion; "insensitivity" may well be cause for dismissal.

So anxious are Aspin, Byron and other

crusading egalitarians (Colorado Congresswoman Pat Schroeder is among that number) to turn the military into a social laboratory that they take leave of rudimentary reason. If exposure to sexist behavior can drive military women into therapy or suicide, should we be willing to send women into combat? Feminist dogma dictates that one male employer — like a lascivious NCO — can create a "hostile work environment." But an entire division of male chauvinists cannot begin to approximate the horrors of "work environments" like Bastogne or Pork Chop Hill.

In the wake of Tailhook, the Navy implemented a "sensitivity" regimen for 500,000 personnel, seeking to extirpate sexual harassment. But the Navy survival course, like those offered by the other branches of the military, is designed to desensitize personnel to the suffering of female POWs. The news that both American female POWs in the Gulf War were sexually molested by their captors — news that was suppressed for a year — provoked not even a fraction of the indignation that was generated by Tailhook. This bespeaks a curious set of priorities.

The dilettante socialists who treat the military as just another "male-dominated" institution in need of gender integration are, quite frankly, skirting treason. The military is not a playpen for social engineers. It exists to deter — and, if necessary, to kill — foreign enemies of our way of life. It will be a fatal irony if our military is destroyed by domestic adversaries.

Dan Quayle should lock up his 'auto-pen'

WASHINGTON — Letters Vice President Dan Quayle wrote as a senator have twice come back to haunt him. Both times the vice president deflected the blame by claiming they were signed by young staf-



written by an intern and signed by an automatic pen.

Automatic pen or not, Barbara Budgin is angry that Quayle would give his senatorial blessing to Goot's cause. Budgin