

September 2003



# The JOURNAL

---

A Summit Ministries Publication

---

But whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in Me to stumble, it is better for him that a heavy millstone be hung around his neck, and that he be drowned in the depth of the sea.

Matthew 18:6

## From The President's Desk

The Episcopalian Church voted on August 5, 2003 to place a practicing homosexual clergyman into the office of bishop. One can already hear the Apostle Paul telling us— “For the time will come when they will not tolerate sound doctrine, but according to their own desires, will accumulate teachers for themselves because they have an itch to hear something new. They will turn away from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (II Tim. 4:3, 4) But the Church has already decided that Scripture is not the final authority in such matters.

The myth here with the Episcopalians is that sodomy is something new! Truth is it is nearly as old as mankind (Genesis 13:13). The Episcopal Church in America has entered an era of religious apostasy and this vote will return to bite it in the not too distant future.

But, this is not my subject this month. I want to return to the issue raised by Cal Thomas regarding the four researchers at the University of California (Berkeley) who have decided to follow the Frankfurt School and place Hitler, Mussolini, Ronald Reagan and Rush Limbaugh on the political right.

The truth is that Hitler and Mussolini were never conservative in any way, shape or form. They were leftwing dictators in bed with Stalin and all had the same basic worldview based on two major doctrines: socialism and evolution. All three were staunch socialists and all

three were equally staunch evolutionists.

For those interested in this subject I would strongly recommend a careful read of Ludwig vonMises' *Socialism* and Richard Vetterli and William Fort, Sr.'s *The Socialist Revolution*.

First, a few comments from vonMises... "In this conflict Benito Mussolini, the outstanding man in Italian socialism, chose at first the orthodox Marxian position. Nobody could surpass Mussolini in Marxian zeal....The programme of the Fascist, as drafted in 1919, was vehemently anti-capitalistic. The most radical New Dealer and even communists could agree with it...Fascism was not, as its advocates boasted, an original product of the Italian mind. It began with a split in the ranks of Marxian socialism." (pp. 525f)

Continues vonMises' ... "The philosophy of the Nazis, the German National Socialist Labour Party, is the purest and most consistent manifestation of the anticapitalistic and socialist spirit of our age....Hitler was not the founder of Nazism; he was its product. He was, like most of his collaborators, a sadistic gangster. He was uneducated and ignorant; he had failed even in the lower grades of high school. He never had any honest job. It is a fable that he had ever been a paperhanger....For more than seventy years the German professors of political science, history, law, geography and philosophy eagerly imbued their disciples with a hysterical hatred of capitalism, and preached the war of liberation against the capitalist West." (pp. 528f)

Second, a few comments from Vetterli and Fort. "Perceiving the political spectrum thus, and identifying it within the context of contemporary political movements, one undeniable fact becomes apparent: that the collectivist systems of Communism and Fascism belong not on the opposite extremes of the political spectrum, but, on the contrary, their characteristics demand that they share a position side by side on the far left." (p. 2)

"A comparison of Nazi Germany as it existed with the development of the Soviet Union has led many scholars, since World War II, to intensify their interest in the nature of collectivism and totalitarianism, and to recognize the close proximity of Nazism and Communism." (p. 3)

"Hitler himself was quick to point out that 'there is more that binds us to Bolshevism than separates us from it....I have always made allowances for this circumstance, and given orders that former Communists are to be admitted to the party at once.'" (p. 4)

"Mussolini, too, was a socialist....Bernard Shaw, the ablest of all European Socialists, himself a proponent of the Fabian brand of collectivism, did not hide his admiration for the new Italian dictator. 'In spite of his dictatorship,' wrote Shaw, 'Mussolini practices more positive socialism than many of his adversaries whose names are inscribed in the party role.'" (p. 10)

“ ‘Only force rules,’ demanded Hitler, spouting social Darwinism, Marxism and Nietzscheism. ‘Force is the first law....World history proves that in the struggle between nations, that race has always won out whose drive for self-preservation was the more pronounced, the stronger....Because we recognize the fact that our people can endure only through struggle. We National Socialist are fighters.’ ” (p. 112)

“Italy was collectivist prone. Ashton points out that the fascists were ‘well aware of the fact that Communism springs from the same collectivist stem as their own system.’ ” (p. 62)

If the above is so obvious why would four researchers at the University of California seek to place Reagan and Limbaugh in the same mix with Hitler and Mussolini? The answer should be obvious—(a) to paint Reagan, Limbaugh and all conservatives (Christians or otherwise) as Nazis and Fascists for propaganda purposes, and (b) to make sure no one ever discovers that political and economic liberalism is located in the same quadrant of the political and economic spectrum as Communism, Fascism and Nazism.

## **Month In Review**

Q And moreover, because the Preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; yes, he pondered and sought out and set in order many proverbs. The Preacher sought to find acceptable words; and what was written was upright—words of truth. The words of the wise are like goads, and the words of scholars are like well-driven nails, given by one Shepherd. And further, my son, be admonished by these. Of making many books there is no end, and much study is wearisome to the flesh.

“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is man’s all. For God will bring every work into judgment, including every secret thing, whether good or evil.”

—Ecclesiastes 12: 9-14

Q The washer breaks, the stew gets burned,

And Junior catches cold;

Then Sister tears her brand new dress...

You try hard not to scold...

You head for bed to nurse your head,

And hope to leave it all.

And that's the very time, of course,

The preacher seems to call!

The dinner's late and Daddy shouts,

'Where did you hide my shirt?'

You cut your finger on a knife,

And boy, does it hurt!

At last you tumble into bed,

Your vision strangely blurred,

You lift your heart to heaven,

But you wonder if God heard.

Ah, God is in His heaven!

He saw what just transpired:

He placed another star upon

The crown that you inspired!

He knows your every heartache...

He sees your deep despair,

And in His way He keeps you,

And loves your every hair!

The woman is His buffet

For every wind that blows:

She has a special portion

Of his grace...and how it glows!”

—Sarah Jane Tomlinson

Q Every promise we can make, every prayer and step of faith,

Every difference we will make is only by His grace.

Every mountain we will climb, every ray of hope we shine,

Every blessing left behind is only by His grace.

Refrain

Grace alone which God supplies, strength unknown He will provide.

Christ in us, our Cornerstone, we will go forth in grace alone.

Every soul we long to reach, every heart we hope to teach,

Everywhere we share His peace is only by His grace.

Every loving word we say, every tear we wipe away,

Every sorrow turned to praise is only by His grace.”

Q Looking for God—or Heaven—by exploring space is like reading or seeing all Shakespeare’s plays in the hope that you will find Shakespeare as one of the characters or Stratford as one of the places. Shakespeare is in one sense present at every moment in every play. But he is never present in the same way as Falstaff or Lady Macbeth...

“If there were an idiot who thought plays existed on their own, without an author (not to mention actors, producer, manager, stagehands and what not), our belief in Shakespeare would not be much affected by his saying, quite truly, that he had studied all the plays and

never found Shakespeare in them...

“My point is that, if God does exist, He is related to the universe more as an author is related to a play than as one object in the universe is related to another.

“If God created the universe, He created space-time, which is to the universe as the metre is to a poem or the key is to music. To look for Him as one item within the framework which He Himself invented is nonsensical.

“If God—such a God as any adult religion believes in—exists, mere movement in space will never bring you any nearer to Him or any farther from Him than you are at this very moment. You can neither reach Him nor avoid Him by traveling to Alpha Centauri or even to other galaxies. A fish is no more, and no less, in the sea after it has swum a thousand miles than it was when it set out.”

—C.S. Lewis, *Christian Reflections*

Q “The news that five members of the Supreme Court were winging their way over to Italy on the heels of the decision striking down Texas’ anti-sodomy law seemed somehow appropriate.

“Some of the flying judges were no doubt there to discuss their newly proposed constitution—given as the official reason for the junket, but two or three of them must have at least contemplated communing with European elitists on how they ought to vote on upcoming cases here. After all, in the Texas case they had for the first time in a majority opinion cited European public opinion, decisions of the European Court of Human Rights and other foreign courts as reasons to strike down the Texas law.

“It was the first time that the U.S. Supreme Court had ever cited foreign decisions and opinions in this way as major determining factors in a major case and was the principal reason for Justice Scalia’s scathing dissent. Scalia, joined by Justices Rehnquist and Thomas, wrote of the majority’s reliance on foreign opinion and judicial decisions as a basis for the decision, that ‘the court’s discussion of these foreign views ... is meaningless dicta, however, since this court should not impose foreign moods, fads, or fashions on Americans.’

“In fact, of course, the court majority or some of those making it up are caught up in the need to march in step with those in Europe. Justice Stephen Breyer, for example, likes to talk about the need in the future to ‘harmonize’ our laws with those of Europe and went so far as to appear on television after the Texas sodomy case to wonder whether our constitution will remain ‘relevant’ in the coming age of globalization.

“The implications of a reliance on the opinions emanating from Brussels are profound. Does this mean that in the next term the court will strike down the death penalty as inconsistent, not with the Constitution but with the position of the European Parliament or that the justices will review European campaign finance laws before voting on the constitutionality of the McCain-Feingold reforms? Who can say?”

“It was Breyer who, along with Justice Anthony Kennedy seemed most taken with the opinions of the Europeans in deciding the Texas case. Indeed, Kennedy in the court’s majority opinion specifically cited and praised an amicus brief filed in the case by Mary Robinson, the controversial former head of the U.N. Commission for Human Rights, suggesting that in deciding the case, the U.S. Supreme Court should follow the lead of other nations in recognizing a ‘global concept’ of homosexual rights.

“Forget for a minute the question of whether Texas’ anti-sodomy law represented good or bad public policy, and consider instead the broader implications of the way in which the court went about striking it down. Their decision was based not on the language of the Constitution nor the wishes, beliefs or opinions of the founders. It wasn’t even based on previous Supreme Court precedent, lower Federal or State Court opinions or a developing consensus view in the United States.

“Instead, it was grounded in court decisions and public attitudes that have developed in Britain, France and the rest of what is increasingly known as ‘Old Europe.’”

“As Scalia also pointed out, the court didn’t crank the opinions of Africa, the Middle East or Asia into their decision-making. Had they done so, they might have found some substantial disagreement with the ‘global concept’ of homosexual rights that they found in Europe. The fact is that the views the justices find so attractive are those of the European upper-class elite: the folks who sit around in Paris and Brussels looking down their noses at us and opining on how the world ought to be run. For the U.S. Supreme Court or any justice who sits on that court to base a vote on their opinions, attitudes and prejudices makes a mockery of the Court, the Constitution and more than two hundred years of history.

“If Justice John Marshall had asserted the right of judicial review at the dawn of the 19th century because of a perceived need or desire to ‘harmonize’ our views with the views of those who then populated the salons of Europe, he’d have been driven off the court and out of town on a rail.

“We don’t do that anymore, but good ideas are truly timeless.”

—David Keene, TheHill.com, July 15, 2003

Q The war in Iraq is not the only place where battles have been occurring. The Spring 2003 issue of the National Science Teachers Association recommends an anti-creation book, authored by three evolutionists, entitled, *The Creation Controversy & the Science Classroom*. Talk about saber-rattling! In the single paragraph that extols this surprisingly brief (64-page) book, confrontational words such as opposition, debate, ammunition, forceful, arms and strategies are found. Ironically, a quote from an elementary school teacher in Cabot, Pennsylvania, on the same page says the book is written in ‘neutral terms’!

“It would seem that the secular community’s right hand doesn’t know what the left is doing. On one hand, books such as the above are written to formally condemn creation science in public school classrooms, while at the same time evolutionists proclaim it’s ‘unconstitutional’ to teach creation science in public school classrooms! Thankfully, one of American’s foremost censors of creation science admitted, ‘The Supreme Court decision says only that the Louisiana law violates the constitutional separation of church and state; it does not say that no-one [sic] can teach scientific creationism—and unfortunately many individual teachers do.’

“The origins issue will continue to be a battlefield because evolutionism is not just a theory of biological origins, but the basic foundation of the secular worldview. ‘...there are no living sciences, human attitudes, or institutional powers that remain unaffected by the ideas... released by Darwin’s work.’

“Secularists understand how important this battle of the worldviews is—much more so than most church members. The late S.J. Gould said, ‘Modern creationism, alas, has provoked a real battle’ and ‘This battle must be won...’ But battle objectives are confused by atheists such as Niles Eldredge who recently said ‘[Creationists] are motivated primarily to see that evolution is not taught in the public schools of the United States.’ This is an erroneous premise, of course. ICR [Institute for Creation Research] does not advocate removing evolutionary teaching in public schools. We would, however, like the many scientific problems regarding evolutionism clearly addressed in the free marketplace of ideas. We would attempt to present to young people in our tax-supported public schools a non-Biblical origins model alongside the questionable science of evolutionism. Advocates of critical thinking skills could only agree to such a suggestion, and students on both sides of the issue would benefit.

—Frank Sherwin, *Acts and Facts*, June 2003, p. 5

□ Q The pancreas is a human body organ that is easily overlooked. It lies quietly in a fold of



the upper small intestine, and does its job without much fanfare. Ancient anatomists didn't think it did much of anything. Yet, it is a marvel of chemical engineering, precisely designed to do its important work of good digestion.

“The exocrine, or duct-secreting, portion of the pancreas actually does most of the chemical work of food digestion. (There is also an endocrine, or bloodstream-secreting, part of the pancreas, but that's another story.) Pancreatic exocrine cells manufacture protein catalysts or enzymes, which quickly break down food molecules. This is a formidable chemical job, for the food we eat is a very complex mixture of organic molecules. By way of comparison, just imagine for a moment putting into a car's gas tank all the different things that are used by the human body for fuel! The car's engine would be utterly unable to process them, as it can only use a few simple hydrocarbons. Yet, the body is able to process thousands of different kinds of carbohydrates, proteins, and fats. How is it able to do this?

“Most food molecules are polymers, or giant molecules made from many small subunits. For instance, proteins are made from many amino acids, starches and polysaccharides are made from simple sugars, and fats are made up of fatty acids. The enzymes which break down these other proteins are called proteases. Those that break down starches are called amylases, and those breaking down fats are called lipases. Enzymes from each of these three groups are made in the pancreas. These enzymes work on food molecules with surgical precision, breaking them down to their subunits so that they can be efficiently reused to make new biomolecules, or else sufficiently burned to release energy. Enzyme action is a marvel of chemical engineering, and shows every indication of purposeful and intelligent design.

“However, there is another engineering problem that must be overcome to make this chemical digestion system operational. Since pancreatic enzymes are made within cells, and cells are made mostly of proteins and fats, what keeps newly made enzymes from destroying the very cells making them? Pancreatic cells solve this problem by also making inhibitors of the enzymes, to keep them from working until needed in the intestine. This problem is highlighted by the fact that, with loss of inhibitors through death or disease, the pancreas breaks down very quickly, as it literally digests itself!

“The chemical problem of evolving, by blind chance, a corrosive and a container that can hold it at the same time is a difficult one for evolutionists. It is astronomically improbable that a series of digestive enzymes would evolve by chance, but it would also be necessary for inhibiting proteins to evolve simultaneously in order for a digestive system within a living organism to work. Considering that not even one functional enzyme has ever been produced by chance, it strains evolutionary faith to the utmost to believe that a whole host of finely counterbalanced functional proteins making up an integrated system could just happen by luck.

“Another way the pancreas defies evolution is through its comparative anatomy. The

pancreas in chordates occurs in two main forms, compact (one main organ) and diffuse (multiple small organs). Evolutionary theory would lead us to expect a steady progression of anatomic structure through fish, amphibians, reptiles, and mammals. This is not what anatomists have found. Instead, compact and diffuse forms occur in apparently random fashion in fishes and mammals, while reptiles and amphibians have a compact form. This creates an evolutionary conundrum. Why would a rodent pancreas look more like a fish pancreas than a human pancreas? This is another deep puzzle for evolutionists, but no problem at all for creationists.

“To conclude, even the inconspicuous pancreas, as part of the human body, shows many wonderful design features which confound evolutionary explanations of its origin. Thus, like the rest of the created order, it gives glory to its Maker.”

—David A. Demick, M.D., *Think and Believe*, Spring 2003

Q Scientist say they have discovered new evidence of the Bible’s legendary kingdoms of David and Solomon deep in the ruins of a Hebrew town sacked nearly 3,000 years ago by an Egyptian pharaoh.

“The evidence refutes contentions by other researchers who insist that the biblical monarchs were merely mythic characters, created by scholars and scribes of antiquity who made up the tales long after the events to buttress their own morality lessons.

“The debate, however, is not likely to subside, for archaeology is a field notable for lengthy quarrels among partisans, however scientific they may be.

“The latest evidence comes from Israeli and Dutch archaeologists and physicists after seven years of digging at a historic site called Tel Rehov. The site is in the Jordan valley of Israel, where successive settlements rose and fell over the centuries.

“Using sophisticated techniques for establishing dates through the decay rate of radioactive carbon, the scientists have pinned down the time of a disputed moment in history, recorded in the Bible, when a pharaoh now known as Shoshenq I invaded Jerusalem.

“As the book of Chronicles relates in the Old Testament, Shoshenq (the Bible called him Shishak) came ‘with twelve hundred chariots and threescore thousand horsemen,’ and plundered Israel’s capital, as well as such towns and fortresses as Rehov, Megiddo and Hazor.

“The pharaoh later listed those conquests on a monument in the temple of Amun at Karnak, where the Egyptian city of Luxor now stands.

“The new timetable places Shoshenq’s rampage and looting at Rehov in the 10th century rather than the ninth, a significant difference. It sets the date at 925 B.C., about five years after Solomon was said to have died, and about 80 years earlier than other archaeologists maintain.

“Those scholars, known in the world of archaeology as ‘minimalists,’ insist that both David and Solomon were little more than tribal chieftains, and certainly not the mighty monarchs described in the Bible

“A report on the new evidence appears in the journal *Science* by Hendrik Bruins, a desert researcher at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in Israel, Johnnes van der Plicht of the Center for Isotope Research at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands, and Amihai Mazar of the Hebrew University at Jerusalem, the principal archaeologist at Tel Rehov.

“Mr. Mazar said that one specific ‘layer of destruction’ at the site yielded a harvest of charred grain seeds and olive pits that enabled his colleagues to date them with an unusually high level of precision. The dates of both earlier and later layers showed clearly how the successive layers of occupation could be determined from the 12th through the ninth centuries B.C., he said.

“ ‘They provide a precise archaeological anchor for the united monarchies of the time of David and Solomon,’ Mr. Mazar said. ‘The pottery we found there also tells us that the conquest dates from the same period as Meggido, when its mighty gates and walls and temples were also destroyed by Shoshenq’s armies.’

“Yigael Yadin, who won fame as an army officer during Israel’s war for independence, turned to archaeology more than 40 years ago and excavated the imposing ruins at Meggido. He maintained that the structures were destroyed during the so-called Solomonic period.”

—The Washington Times, April 14, 2003, p. A 2

Q For 18 months I have been the token conservative columnist for the *Miami Student*, the student newspaper of Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. I was recently dismissed because faculty members complained to the paper that my column had offended them.

“On Jan. 17, 2003, the paper published my column entitled ‘Hold MU professors accountable.’ I wrote that professors should be answerable to the court of public opinion for the politicization of the classroom environment. To illustrate my point, I mentioned one class where a professor of French surprised the class by replacing her usual teaching with the

showing of a film, 'Ridicule.' The film opens with a man casually unzipping his pants, exposing himself for all to see. After a lengthy close-up of his genitals, the man urinates on another man's head.

"Beyond questioning the pedagogical value of this film to a French class, I argued that if students are going to be subjected to content such as this, the professor should at least warn her students that the film contains images that may deeply offend the sensibilities of many students.

"In the column I also mentioned that Jonathan Strauss, chairman of the Department of French and Italian, had 'proven to be just as explicit concerning unnecessary sexual content' in his own classroom with films that condone lewd sexual content, rape and incest. Chairman Strauss justified that material as part of the department's 'commitment to cultural diversity.'

"In the abstract, it is of profound value that discussion on cultural and social issues occur within a university setting. In practice, there is no such debate and discussion at Miami University of Ohio. Mr. Strauss complained to the faculty adviser of the student newspaper. The adviser, Cheryl Heckler, in turn complained to the editor and requested that I be terminated and be forced to write an apology. The editor then fired me.

"Allow me to fill in the details. Three days after the column was published, Professor Heckler demanded that I meet with her. Ms. Heckler is an associate professor of English, as well as a self-styled crusader against censorship and oppression who is published often on the subject of freedom of speech. Ms. Heckler believes me to be narrow-minded and was extremely upset with the column considering the professor I criticized graduated from the University of Pennsylvania and is considered a very valuable asset to the faculty. In conclusion, she told me, 'There was no moral defense for this column.'

"Ms. Heckler then e-mailed Jill Inkrott, the editor-in-chief, and told her I should be made to write letters of apology to the professors I criticized, as well as to the whole Department of French and Italian. Ms. Heckler recommended that I be fired from the Miami Student. Miss Inkrott was on the case immediately. First she demanded that I reveal the names of the students who provided me with the information for the column. I was stunned with the unmistakable possibility that students will be retaliated against for expressing their candid views on what happened in the classroom. I told Miss Inkrott that the facts in the article are not in dispute and that I would not be co-opted into a witch hunt.

"Then Miss Inkrott tried to make me apologize to those I criticized, and demanded that I schedule a meeting with Mr. Strauss to 'hammer out any differences of opinion.' Intimidated by Mr. Strauss and Ms. Heckler, Miss Inkrott went on a fishing expedition and learned that one of my sources was a girl I have been dating. As such, and despite being an eyewitness (and a public figure as the leader of a campus student organization), the source for my

column was automatically disqualified. I do not have fewer rights to publish a story because I happen to know one of the sources. Armed with a justification to censor my conservative and ‘intolerant’ views, Miss Inkrott followed the ‘recommendation’ of the professors and fired me.

“Theoretically, an editor has a right to dismiss a columnist. In this case, there is no justification whatsoever. Beyond the chilling effect this has on campus speech, it sends the message that debate and discussion come second to the sensibilities of the readers. With that justification, I could ‘recommend’ the termination of all of these professors. I didn’t do so. I met their expression with more expression. They responded calling for censorship.

“I am not alone. According to Thor Halvorssen of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE): ‘This goes on all the time. It is a national scandal.’ FIRE is providing me with assistance. Mr. Halvorssen sums up my case perfectly: ‘It is unbearable that a professor and journalist will demand a forced apology and seek the termination of a student columnist because his honest criticism is politically incorrect.’ Ironically, the French professor whom I criticized for showing ‘Ridicule’ is one of my defenders. In an interview with the Cincinnati Enquirer regarding the issue she magnificently declared: ‘He shouldn’t be punished for his beliefs. He shouldn’t be censored.’”

—Aaron Sanders, The Washington Times, March 2, 2003, p. B5

Q As much as one-third of the tax-exempt National Education Association’s yearly \$271 million income goes toward politically related activities, according to union documents filed with the Internal Revenue Service.

“The documents show that the 2.7 million member teacher’s union spends millions annually to field what one critic calls an ‘army of campaign workers,’ while maintaining that it spends nothing on politics.

“The NEA has avoided millions of dollars in federal and D.C. income taxes every year for political activities that are not tax-exempt, says the Landmark Legal Foundation, a Herndon-based public-interest group that has asked the IRS to investigate and recoup the money.

“The NEA’s Washington headquarters spends more than \$47 million yearly to field a national advocacy staff called UniServ, whose 1,800 directors help screen and select political candidates for endorsement and campaign for their election.

“State and local NEA affiliates spend an additional \$43 million for the UniServ network, which enables the union to select, train, and fund at least one employee in each congressional

district to link all 13,000 local affiliates.

“ ‘They’re precinct workers,’ Mark R. Levin, Landmark’s president, said of NEA UniServ directors. ‘It is the largest army of campaign workers that any organization has. They’re free to do it—they just have to pay taxes on it.’

“According to NEA documents, UniServ directors administer fundraising solicitation for the NEA’s political action committee, organize selection of union delegates to party nominating conventions, and organize activities to support NEA-endorsed candidates during election campaigns.

“ ‘Documents show UniServ is paid out of NEA’s general revenues, not its political action committee,’ Mr. Levin said. Each year for the past 10 years, the NEA has reported spending zero dollars for political purposes in tax returns as a Section 501 (c) (5) tax-exempt labor union under the Internal Revenue Code, he said.

“ ‘The Landmark Legal Foundation has misrepresented NEA’s activities,’ said Kathleen P. Lyons, the NEA’s chief spokeswoman. ‘To be sure, NEA uses general treasury funds to pay for political activity in the general sense of the term. But it does not, contrary to LLF’s assertions, use such funds to pay for the type of political activity expenditures that should be reported to the IRS under that designation.’

“She said NEA expenses for a variety of activities—including ‘lobbying Congress in support of legislation that will promote public education’ and ‘assisting NEA affiliates in encouraging NEA members to vote for pro-public education candidates running for public office’—are not reportable to the IRS as political expenditures.

“The NEA gives \$31,150 grants to each community UniServ office. Full-time NEA members pay annual dues of \$130, from which \$21 is earmarked for UniServ offices.

“NEA documents filed with Landmark’s complaints to the IRS include NEA’s ‘strategic objectives’ and ‘program accomplishment’ in direct or indirect political activities involving election of federal, state, and local candidates, passage or defeat of legislation, and ballot initiatives on a wide range of issues.

“In 1996-97, the NEA’s budget included \$9.6 million for 42 headquarters staffers—10 percent of the union’s employees at the time—to build a ‘broad-based’ political network to support its strategic objectives.

“The union actively participated in the 1996 Clinton-Gore re-election effort. In 1995-96, NEA political division director Mary Elizabeth Teasley and manager John Pacheco in Washington served as NEA representatives on the Democratic National Committee’s

National Coordinated Campaign Steering Committee, known as ‘the national table.’

“That committee held regular meetings to devise strategy to help Democratic congressional campaigns and the Clinton-Gore re-election campaign, according to an April 17, 1998, letter from DNC general counsel Joseph E. Sandler to the Federal Election Commission, which at the time was investigating coordinated political activities between unions and party campaign committees.

“Miss Teasley was then being paid \$113,264 annually from NEA’s general operating funds, and Mr. Pacheco was paid \$96,375 annually.”

—The Washington Times, April 7, 2003, p. 1

Q Since 1989, according to a recent tally by the Center for Responsive Politics, a nonpartisan campaign-finance watchdog group, the National Education Association has contributed \$22.3 million to congressional candidates and national party committees. Among all of the nation’s trade associations (e.g., realtors, doctors, trial lawyers, bankers, home builders, etc), corporations, labor unions and other interest groups, only the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees—like the NEA, another public-employees union—contributed more money over this period than the NEA. Add in the \$17.8 million in political contributions from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the other teachers’ union with which the NEA is seeking to merge, and no other group or association even remotely approaches the financial power of teachers in the political arena.

“Utterly at odds with the voting patterns of their members, the AFT and NEA have directed 99 percent and 94 percent of their respective contributions to the Democratic Party. But even that isn’t the biggest scandal. In the case of the NEA, as the Landmark Legal Foundation has conclusively demonstrated in numerous filings with the IRS and the Department of Labor, the \$22.3 million represents only a small fraction of the union’s total political expenditures. As Landmark has meticulously documented in its complaints with the IRS and DOL, the NEA’s Washington headquarters currently spends more than \$47 million and NEA state and local affiliates spend another \$43 million to underwrite the activities of the unions’ UniServ network, a de facto political organization that effectively serves an auxiliary unit of the Democratic Party.

“For all practical purposes, the 1,800 directors of UniServ function as ‘precinct workers,’ Landmark President Mark R. Levin recently told George Archibald of The Washington Times. UniServ represents ‘the largest army of campaign workers that any organization has,’ Mr. Levin noted. ‘They’re free to do it,’ he quickly adds, but—and here’s the rub—‘they just have to pay taxes on it.’ In fact, in tax returns filed with the IRS since before the 1996

election, the NEA has insisted that it has made zero expenditures from its general revenues on political matters for which it would be required, under IRS rules and regulations, to pay taxes.

“An NEA spokeswoman told Mr. Archibald that the IRS conducted an exhaustive audit of the organization’s 1993 Form 990 tax return and ‘found no irregularities with the NEA’s reporting in this regard.’ Despite numerous complaints filed with the IRS by Landmark, the NEA reports that the IRS has not conducted a subsequent audit.

“How blatantly political must the NEA’s activities be before the IRS considers them to be funded by taxable revenues? Landmark, for example, has revealed that the NEA used tax-exempt general operating funds to pay the annual salaries of NEA’s political division director Mary Elizabeth Teasley (\$113,264) and manager John Pacheco (\$96,375). In 1995 and 1996, both served as NEA representatives on the Democratic National Committee’s National Coordinated Campaign Steering Committee, where, according to a DNC general counsel, they helped to develop ‘the unified Democratic Party effort’ throughout the 1995-96 campaign.

“If the IRS considers this to be an appropriate expenditure of tax-exempt funds, then it is failing in its responsibilities. To ignore such evidence is prima facie evidence that the IRS is itself acting politically.”

—The Washington Times, April 11, 2003, p. A 22