

Dole's wrong

Families need help from villages

When Hillary Rodham Clinton speaks at the Democratic National Convention, we hope she corrects something Bob Dole said at the Republican Convention. In a dig at the First Lady's recent book on children, Dole said it doesn't take a village to raise a child; it takes a family. He's mistaken: It usually takes a family *and* a village.

Gov. Arne Carlson's Action for Children Commission made the point well. "Caregivers need the support of the community, the state and society to fulfill their responsibilities," the commission said. "All families require some support in raising healthy, successful children." In a subsequent State of the State Address, Carlson said that government alone can't rear children, but "every sector of the community must play a role" — particularly parents. A year later, the governor said he was proud that state government was directing substantially more resources more effectively each year to such child-based programs as early learning, health, abuse prevention, child support and nutrition.

As Dole's chief supporter in Minnesota, Carlson should tell the presidential candidate what Minnesotans say about the village concept. He could quote:

Martha Farrell Erickson, director of the University of Minnesota's Children, Youth and Family Consortium: "In our homes, our neighborhoods, our congregations and our workplaces we need to hold each child like a sacred treasure."

Clarence Hightower, president of The City Inc., in a proposed communi-

ty covenant for Minneapolis residents: "As a member of the community, I believe that we are a universal village, where responsibility for the children of our village is shared by all adults. The success or failure of any child is the success or failure of my child."

The Minneapolis YMCA, subscribing to the proverb "It takes a village," commits "resources to building strong kids, strong families and strong communities," and has "rededicated ourselves to promoting positive values and to building a better society."

The list goes on and on. Children First in St. Louis Park. Twin Cities One to One support for mentoring. Success by 6. The Search Institute. The Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board.

They're all part of a supportive village every child needs — even children from warm and loving families. But particularly those children from broken, troubled or hard-pressed families.

That village includes government. Colin Powell told the Republican Convention that his immigrant parents "found a government that protected their labor, educated their children and provided help to those of their fellow citizens who were in need." He went on: "Children learn values by watching their parents in their homes, values which are then reinforced in their churches and in their places of worship, in the schools and in the communities in which they live."

Every child should have such a family — and live in such a village. Hillary Clinton should not let the opportunity pass to replay that message on national television.

VIEWPOINT

B3

THE COMMERCIAL APPEAL

MEMPHIS, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1996

Just who was that maskless woman?

■ If the portrait of Hillary as a devious, power-hungry Amazon was for real, who was that splendid impostor?

By Cecil Johnson

SOMEONE must have slipped in a ringer. The Hillary Rodham Clinton who chatted with the American public from the podium at the Democratic National Convention in the village called Chicago could not have been the same harpy out of hell that some people out in right field have been yelling that she is.

Where were the fangs, the claws, the bat wings, the flame-throwing snout and tonsils?

The demure speaker in the pale blue suit intoning about the needs of children and families and what government can and should do to help them absolutely could not have been the living gargoyle of their bombast.

Either that Chicago Hillary was as false as some of the Dmitris who once laid claim to be czar of Russia, or those who have been so vehemently demonizing the first lady for so long have simply been reviling her purely



AP
Hillary Clinton

for political purposes.

It is hard, though, to believe that the level of politicking in this republic has taken such a precipitate qualitative plunge that the wife of the president would be unjustifiably subjected to such incessant, baseless character assault.

Granted, that's possible. After all, the late Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of Franklin D., was subjected to some

Please see HILLARY, Page B4

(over)

nair.

One would like to assume, then, that the nation has progressed to a level of sophistication where wanton character assassination of a first lady is no longer considered acceptable behavior. In that case, the disrespect directed at Hillary Clinton would have to have some basis in truth.

But if the portrait of Hillary as a devious, power-hungry Amazon was for real, who was that splendid impostor who captivated the Chicago convention and projected such a reassuring image upon the television screens of America? Who was that maskless woman who spoke with such restrained passion and eloquence of the

first lady really meant in her book about the village-wide responsibility for bringing up children without referring by name to the politicians who purposefully distorted the message.

"And we have learned that to raise a happy, healthy and hopeful child, it takes a family, it takes teachers, it takes clergy, it takes business people, it takes community leaders, it takes those who protect our health and safety, it takes all of us. Yes, it takes a village," proclaimed the impostor.

The applause generated by that line reverberated from the Chicago convention across the land. And that could spell trouble for Dole if he and his supporters continue to try to make political points by attacking the first lady.

Unless they can prove that the person who made the extraordinary oration in Chicago was not Hillary Clinton but some kind of Memorex, their best bet will be to cease running against her altogether.

Otherwise they will only be perceived as uncivil, nasty and perhaps a bit insecure about the expanding place of brilliant, well-educated, assertive and compassionate women in the scheme of things American.

Unmasking the deception could be an impossible task because the speaker, whoever she was, performed so spectacularly in prime time that millions of Americans are now finally convinced that they have seen the real Hillary Clinton.

TO THE POINT

■ Was Carter miffed?

BILL Clinton placed two personal telephone calls to Jimmy Carter requesting, without success, that he attend the Democratic National Convention.

White House aides claim the former president wants to give the impression that the invitation was proffered in a way that it could not be accepted.

Carter's public position is that an ex-president should not be seen at a convention 16 years after his term in office ended. But privately, Carter's friends say the party's only living former president thought the invitation was late and insincere.

— Robert D. Novak
Creators Syndicate, Inc.

Cecil Johnson is a columnist and editorial writer for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.



**GORDON
MATTHEWS**

I HAVE been following the Republican and Democratic conventions with great interest because what happens on November 5 will determine the kind of relationship the USA will have with the rest of the world, the Third World in particular.

I was shocked by the personal attacks on President Clinton and Mrs. Clinton by the Republicans and grieved when Mr. George Bush suggested that Mrs. Clinton has demeaned the White House. He certainly demonstrated his true character.

Why is it that the Republicans are indulging in character assassination of the Clintons and using every dirty trick in the book to demean them? The answer is simple. It is through jealousy because of their brilliance — which far exceeds that of the Republican top brass — and their commitment to the common good.

However, my remarks will be dealing mainly with Mrs. Clinton, a lady of strength, skill and a high degree of insight. Her four years as First Lady has demonstrated that she is a woman who loves people, a woman who is concerned about the well-being of the poor and dispossessed, a woman who would like to see every American achieve the best in himself/herself through just laws, and a

woman who has made an indispensable contribution to the Clinton presidency for a strong and caring America.

A major matter

Mrs. Clinton understands the problems facing young people. The youth situation is one of her major preoccupations. She understands the solemn responsibilities of parenthood and the necessity for strong family ties. She understands the magnitude of the problems facing the nation and is making an urgent call for nationwide thinking, nationwide planning and nationwide action as the three great essentials to prevent nationwide crisis.

Mrs. Clinton is a woman of faculty which is that of extraordinary ability and general capacity. She knows that a nation only progresses from crisis to crisis and those who think ahead and foresee will meet the need when the crisis comes.

Why is it that the USA is the only developed nation among the developed nations and most Third World countries that reject the idea of a woman holding the highest political office? When one analyses American culture, the words of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt come to mind: "How men hate a woman in a position of real power!" Mrs. Clinton is despised



Hillary Clinton

USA and a great helpmate to her husband. Mr. Clinton is right to use and allow her to use her talents to the fullest for a better America.

After Mr. Roosevelt had been educated by Mrs. Roosevelt about the rights of women and the equality of women in all spheres of human endeavour, he wrote and preached:

"It is my firm belief that had women had equal share in making the laws in years past, the unspeakable conditions in crowded tenement districts, the neglect of the poor, the unwillingness to spend money for hospitals and sanitariums, the whole underlying cynical attitude towards human life and happiness as compared to material prosperity,

by the Republicans because she is a woman.

Are Americans aware of the fact that if Mrs. Clinton were a citizen of another country she would be a Prime Minister or a President? Why should a woman of such extraordinary talent be confined only to entertaining guests in the White House? She has too much to offer to be only concerned with domestic duties.

Mrs. Clinton is the first First Lady since Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to get involved in the affairs of State for the liberation of the poor and outcasts. She is an asset to the

which has reached its height under the present Republican administration, would never had come about."

Noteworthy step

On another occasion, he wrote: "I have always believed in giving women an equal share in the making of our laws. I have regarded their entry into politics — for they must enter politics if they are to have a voice in our legislative halls — the most noteworthy step toward securing greater happiness and greater prosperity for the individual that we have ever taken."

The Republicans have not changed. They still embrace racists like Mr. Jesse Helms. They are now attacking universal health care and educational opportunities for the poor. They want to turn back the hands of the clock. As Mr. Cuomo said: "The real threat to America is the Republican Party," and I may add, not only to America but to the world.

Come on, America! Rise to the occasion and recognise your women. Americans should thank the Almighty that they have such a power in the White House for the common good. Love and respect Mrs. Clinton for what she is — a committed woman to human well-being.

(The Rev. Dr. Gordon Matthews is an evangelist, real estate agent and commentator on business, social and political issues.)

Mrs. Clinton a lady of integrity

The Florida Times-Union

CARL NEIL CANNON
Publisher

FREDERICK W. HARTMANN
Editor

RICHARD T. ALLPORT
Executive Editor

ROBERT E. MARTIN
General Manager

LLOYD BROWN
Editor, Editorial Page

MARY E. KRESS
Managing Editor

Jacksonville, Thursday, September 5, 1996

FAMILIES

Two books, two ideas

Rarely has such a mean-spirited speech been delivered in public with such a pleasant smile as during the Democratic National Convention.

A beaming Hillary Rodham Clinton said that, of course, parents are responsible for their children. Liberals always telegraph their punches that way.

Then the wife of someone who just discovered that family values increase poll numbers said, "But we are all responsible for

ensuring that children are raised in a nation that doesn't just talk about family values, but acts in ways that values families."

Then she, like Al Gore, used someone else's misfortunes for political gain.

"Just think — as Christopher Reeve so eloquently reminded us last night, we are all part of one family — the American family."

Then, the clincher: "And each one of us has value. Each child who comes into this world should feel special — every boy and every girl."

All this is right out of her book about how children should be raised and indoctrinated by the elders of a village, rather than their families. Translation: Families, churches and private charities cannot be allowed to intrude upon the work of government — what Clinton calls "our mutual obligations."

But not everyone was bowled over by the heap of platitudes and political correctness in her book.

P.J. O'Rourke said in the *Weekly Standard*, "It takes a village to raise a child. The village is Washington. You are the child. There, I've spared you from reading the worst book to come out of the Clinton administration since — let's be fair — whatever the last one was."

For a truly inspiring book to close out the summer's reading, one might turn to Jeb Bush's book *Profiles in Character*.

Bush focuses upon individual

achievement and commitment.

It included the drifter who found \$30,000 in cash and turned it in, because he thought God might punish him for keeping something that was not his.

It included former Florida Gov. LeRoy Collins, whose strong moral position on the race issue in Florida in the 1950s set him apart from the strident voices.

It also included the Jacksonville man who began the Safe Harbor Boys Home, a volunteer, privately funded

organization that seeks to instill integrity in troubled youth.

Bush does not lecture on our moral obligations. Instead, he highlights people who, individually and in cooperation with other compassionate people, have tried to make lives better for other people, often at financial cost to

themselves, rather than devoting their lives to spending other people's money while feeding at the public trough.

Jacksonville this week lost a person who would have made an excellent character profile for Bush's book. Alexander Brest spent most of his life and a considerable part of his fortune making lives better for other people.

Before he died at the age of 101, Brest had helped build local roads and military bases with his construction company, started one of the first local television stations, financed a planetarium and played a major role in transforming Jacksonville University from a junior college to a first-class facility on a fine riverfront campus.

Having worked hard to educate himself, Brest knew the value of education and was committed to giving something back to the community. Based on what his Polish immigrant mother taught him, he determined his own moral obligation and fulfilled it — without needing a politician to tell him what he "owed" to society.



Clinton

Three cheers for Hillary, eloquent defender of the village

I wanted to stand up and cheer when I heard the final lines of Hillary Rodham Clinton's speech at the Democratic National Convention.

"We have learned that to raise a happy, healthful and hopeful child, it takes teachers, it takes clergy, it takes business people, it takes our community leaders ... it takes all of us," she said. "Yes, it takes a village."

Three cheers for Hillary for responding to the relentless Republican mocking of her book, which she titled with a paraphrased African proverb, "It Takes a Village."

She was genteelly jabbing back at Bob Dole, who just a few days earlier in his presidential nomination acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention said, "I am here to tell you: It does not take a village to raise a child. It takes a family to raise a child."

I'm not sure how Bob Dole would know. He was away in Congress while his daughter was growing up. He



divorced his first wife.

I hope he ate many homemade macaroni and cheese dinners at the kitchen table with his wife and daughter. Perhaps Dole attended each of his daughter's Back-to-School nights. Maybe he was snapping the Instamatic when his daughter blew out her birthday cake candles.

I doubt it. Both Dole and his daughter have said he wasn't home much. His high-powered political career didn't leave much time for family.

So Dole twists the word "village" into a thinly veiled commie-pinko-socialist — take your pick — threat.

"We are told that it takes a village — that is a collective, and thus, the state — to raise a child," he said.

Yes, Mrs. Clinton cheers traditional Democratic programs and talks about the need for health care in her book. But over and over, she repeats the mantra: It's parents who need to raise their children well. The village just helps.

The animosity that the "village" phrase arouses indicates the differences that the Democrats and Republicans believe government should play in our lives.

However, I doubt that Dole, if he weren't playing election-year politics, would disagree that the essential "village" of society — the schools, the churches and temples, the neighborhoods — are part of the village of Mrs. Clinton's book and of the African proverb.

The village is a place where neighbors bring meals when there's a new baby in the house. It's where volun-

teers coach our soccer teams and lead our Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops.

It's a village where churches and volunteer groups supply clothes for children in need. In this village, parents volunteer to tutor other people's kids in reading and math at the neighborhood elementary school.

We rely on this village of good people to teach values and give our children attention and knowledge. This village is here in Bakersfield and virtually every city in our nation. With so many American families scattered around the country, this collection of people who reach out to one another is more important than ever.

Simply put, no family is an island. Families never have been, in American history. Early Americans raised barns and started cooperative grain mills to grind flour for daily bread. It's the American village that gave us public education and public libraries.

This is the heritage behind our

potluck dinners, prayer circles at churches, the teams of volunteers who build houses for the needy and the carpools that get kids to dance lessons and sports practices.

Oddly, the village idea isn't something new or confined to Democrats. Republican billionaires Michael and Arianna Huffington, who tried to buy a Senate seat a few years ago for Michael, suggest that private charities could be providing food, shelter and the other social services that the "village" government supplies today.

Although the phrases, "it takes a village" and "family values" have been an election year chant from both the Democrats and Republicans, few can deny that they are closely linked.

Children need a family, it's true.

But they also need good schools, safe streets, caring churches and temples, and a larger body of adults who want what's best for them.

And if that's not a village with family values, I don't know what is.



THE NEWS & OBSERVER

THURSDAY, AUGUST 29, 1996

I advise and enjoin those who direct the paper in the tomorrows never to advocate any cause for personal profit or preferment. I would wish it always to be "the tocsin" and to devote itself to the policies of equality and justice to the underprivileged. If the paper should at any time be the voice of self-interest or become the spokesman of privilege or selfishness it would be untrue to its history.

— from the will of Josephus Daniels, Editor and Publisher 1894-1948

Mrs. Clinton's turn

The first lady had effective answers for Bob Dole and other critics, who hope to gain politically through unwarranted attacks on her. She discussed how government policy can enhance family life.

There was restraint and sensible substance in Hillary Rodham Clinton's convention speech, which should shame Republicans whose campaign tactics include portraying her as a scary, power-hungry shrew. The rhetoric was muted but the message Tuesday night was clear: This woman stands her ground, and with dignity, in the face of extreme, often outrageous criticism.

At the Republican convention, delegates bought bumper stickers declaring, "I don't trust President Clinton, or her husband." The GOP nominee, Bob Dole, sneered at her book, "It Takes A Village," though he appeared to have read no more of it than he had of his own party platform. Even former President Bush took a shoddy swing, pointedly exclaiming that HIS wife had upheld "the honor of the White House."

Despite the best efforts of the hate-Hillary industry to make her a symbol of all things sinister, the fact is that the first lady is exactly right on the subject that not only dominated her address to the Democrats but has long been her passion: families and children. Frequent references to her daughter, Chelsea, may have been calculated to remind the prime-time audience that she is a mother. But they also bolstered her point, in answer to Dole, that parents do not bring up their children in isolation, that what happens in the larger community does affect the quality of family life and that, on this score, she speaks from experience.

Dole had suggested that Mrs. Clinton promotes "the collective, and thus the

state" to push families around. But what came across in her speech was a desire for government policies to build up and affirm the importance of families: for instance, expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act, to let parents take time off for medical appointments and school conferences; access to health insurance for the unemployed; and 24-hour hotlines and home nurses for new parents.

It was disappointing that she did not go on to discuss how she reconciles her concern for children with her husband's support of changes in the welfare laws that may bring hardship to millions of poor families. The absence of any mention of the welfare flap was a gaping void in a presentation so focused on children's needs.

At least she did not flinch from health care, instead drawing attention to the subject that has served as an ammo factory for her critics. OK, so maybe it was a strategic mistake to put her in charge of drawing up the health care plan. Still, it's hard to see what's so awful about a first lady trying to find a way to make health care coverage available to all, a need that still exists.

Mrs. Clinton's speech brought inevitable comparisons to Elizabeth Dole's convention performance, as if this were a women's wrestling match — "Sister Frigidaire" versus "Sugar Lips," to use their old nicknames. Actually both women are strong and competent in their own right and as partners to their spouses. Both have now done good turns for their husbands and their parties.

It takes more than a village

To the Editor:

At the recent GOP Convention in San Diego, several prominent Republican speakers, including the nominee for president, attacked Mrs. Clinton, and a valued, old, African proverb by stating that "it doesn't take a village to raise a child... it takes a family!"

As a full-time working woman and a mother of four, I know for a fact that it takes a family and a village to raise a child. African-American families, especially, have known this and operated from this premise forever.

My two sons, young black males ages 16 and 21 (members of a population that some researchers believe is on the verge of self-destruction and extinction), and my two lovely daughters, ages 12 and 13, who spent the bulk of their young lives floundering in the foster care system before being adopted by my family, benefit greatly from my personal "village" - dear friends, relatives, neighbors

and co-workers. These individuals are intimately aware of my values and my dreams for my family, and they have helped me impart some essential values to my children.

My village has been there for me and my husband when we had to work late, attend a local community meeting, tend to a sick relative or just take some much needed time away. They were there for me when Jennifer (my little girl) talked her father into letting her spend the night with a friend. This friend, it seems, had values that did not fit well with our family values. Fortunately, members of my village saw her roaming around a mall in "full make-up". Aware of how I feel about this, they put my daughter in their car and brought her home to me and reinforced along the way our family values, which she had momentarily put aside to be with her peers. My village has more eyes than I could ever have. They are available when my children

need another ear, a different perspective or simply another friend. My village has always been there for me and my family, and I am fortunate to also be a part of their village.

I, also, was raised by a village as my mother worked from 12 to 14 hours a day as a maid. She worked to reach her goal of getting her family off welfare and out of public housing. But thanks to our village (precariously located in Northeast Washington near Benning Rd., a notorious area for violence and drug abuse), I felt safe, well fed and watched-over while she worked. Thanks to my family and our village, I was raised with the values of hard work, self respect and love of family and community that has allowed me to achieve success in my own life and pass these values along to my children.

I thank my family and my villages (present and past).

BEVERLY J. HOWARD, PhD.
Walport Lane
Fairfax

8/27/96 Opinion 13

THE CONNECTION

Newspaper of Fairfax

An independent, locally owned weekly
newspaper delivered free
to homes and businesses.

7670 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, Virginia 22102

THOMAS LEE TRYON / *It does take a village*

Republicans don't believe their rhetoric



Obsession is defined as a preoccupation with an often unreasonable idea or feeling. So, maybe the thing to do is blame the Republicans' preoccupation with (and public rejection of) the phrase "it takes a village to

raise a child" on their obsession with Hillary Rodham Clinton.

I hope that's the case, that what we're dealing with here is politics, pure and simple — the perceived opportunity to win votes by pillorying Hillary and her best-selling book *It Takes a Village: And Other Lessons Children Teach Us*. Why? Two reasons, neither of which has anything to do with shielding the vocal, opinionated and investigated first lady from criticism.

Several months ago, after Clinton's book was published, various midlevel Republican operatives appearing on C-SPAN and talk shows tested this attack strategy, and it must have generated enough support from focus groups to warrant use by U.S. Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchinson and presidential nominee Bob Dole at the Republican National Convention. "It doesn't take a village to raise a child; it takes a family to raise a child," they said to the roaring approval of the delegates.

Reason 1 to hope that this is nothing more than a partisan attempt to hurt President Clinton by belittling his wife's book and the premise it was based upon: The Republicans' assertion is unadulterated bunk.

Reason 2: Dole, Hutchinson and most of their fellow Republicans know it's bunk.

They know it because it defies the American experience and many of the principles that Republicans have so vigorously — and appropriately — espoused.

The Republicans, to their credit, have effectively emphasized the value of private-sector institutions in protecting families and providing assistance to them. In the last few years, it's appeared as though a consensus was finally beginning to develop in this country. It seemed as if more and more people were prepared to agree — or remember — that strong, productive societies are the result of effective child-rearing, and that it takes the combined efforts of parents, government and the private sector to raise happy, healthy, disciplined children.

There seemed — and seems — to be a re-emerging feeling that raising children is not a solitary task. You can see that recognition revealed in community policing, you can see it in school-based management, which is designed to get parents more involved in their children's education. And you can see it in efforts, often led by conservatives, to re-establish the importance of private and religious institutions in the lives of children.

Families are vital and the backbone of our society, yes, and they are ultimately responsible for the support and development of children. Who wouldn't grant Bob Dole his wish that every child in America could be born into, and raised in, a home with two loving parents? But Dole, who went through a divorce himself, knows that the ideal doesn't always work out. And, even when it does, children still need helpers and role models outside their family.

Dole suggested that "it takes a village to raise a child" is code for "the federal government should be responsible for raising children." But that's not what Clinton's book was about. Anyway, I doubt that Mr. Dole, who speaks so fondly, rightfully so, about his days back in Russell, Kan., would say that his parents did everything alone. It's just as doubtful that he would reject the

value of the government-sponsored public education he received and of the G.I. Bill from which he and millions of his courageous fellow soldiers benefited.

If it doesn't take a village to raise a child, should we just abolish Head Start, immunization programs, public hospitals and health clinics, school lunches and the public schools — and let families be solely responsible for everything? Should we not, then, just forget Dole's own plans for curfews and federally funded "opportunity scholarships"?

If it doesn't take a village to raise a child, then why do we have the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, the Boys and Girls Clubs, the YMCA, church youth groups, Little Leagues, the Red Cross, theater, art and music programs and all the other community-based efforts to help children? Are all the people who support these activities and think they're helping raise good citizens wasting their time?

Of course not.

No doubt that Dole, Hutchinson and others would argue that what they really take issue with is the extent of government involvement in family life. But that is not what they said at their convention. They said, simply and categorically, that it doesn't take a village to raise a child.

I'm going to give them the benefit of the doubt and assume they don't mean what they say on this one. Please, Mr. Dole, Sen. Hutchinson, don't marginalize the importance of our nation's villages and its villagers to satisfy your political obsession with Mrs. Clinton.

Thomas Lee Tryon is editorial page editor of the Herald-Tribune.

Yes, it takes a village — or whole town to raise a child

There have been some snide swipes lately at the idea that "it takes a village to raise a child." Perhaps you have fallen into the trap of applauding the put-downs of such an idea.

I'd like to give testimony that it took a village, it took the whole town of Ada, Okla., to raise Roy Buckelew. It took more than just my family, and your testimony is the same as mine if you think about it.

My mom and dad really were wonderful parents, and they took care of me and gave me what I needed — materially, morally, spiritually, educationally, emotionally. But they had help.

There were neighbors who kept me and fed when both my parents were working and needed a place for me to spend the day. And there were the schools with their principals, teachers, and coaches. I am still benefiting from being in plays, singing in choirs, running track, playing basketball and football, learning to draw and paint in art class, learning to read and write

ON MY MIND

By Roy Buckelew

and think.

And there was baseball. We didn't have Little League, but we had our own team for eight years, and a different man gave his time to be our coach every year and drove us to games all over Oklahoma ... for no pay. In fact, they paid for their gas, and a couple of years the coaches bought us uniforms with their own money.

And there was an elderly couple, Mr. and Mrs. DeMoss, who gave up the garden in their back yard so the neighborhood kids could turn it into a basketball court. And four or five months a year, five to 15 kids played basketball for hours every day on that make-shift court. What a time we had.

And there was church. I am still being inspired by my memory of my pastor, Roy McClung, and his secretary, Maxine Marsh, and the minister of music and youth, Owen Kersh. And I think of the

president of a savings and loan and the manager of Sand Q Clothing Store who were my Sunday school teachers. By the way, the president of the savings and loan arranged a loan for my first car when I needed it to go back and forth to the church where I was pastor during college.

And I think of the owner of a hardware store and his wife who were sponsors regularly on church youth trips ... and the Pete Cantrells who had the youth over to their house for swimming Sunday nights after church. And I think of Homer Belew who gave me my first job when I was in the 10th grade, and Norman Bayless who a year later gave me the best job I ever had as a youth. Both were deacons in the church.

And all the churches in and around Ada who gave me chances to preach almost every week while I was in high school and college. And then, to top it off, when I went to college having no idea how I was going to pay for it, I was told that my home church had given a

scholarship to cover most of the cost of my college education for all four years.

I don't know about you, but it took more than my family to raise me. It took the whole town — neighbors, teachers, coaches, employers, churches ... just like here in Arkadelphia or anywhere else.

So, don't be a sucker for snide swipes and snide snipers. Think ... think for yourself. Christians above all others, because we have the mind of God, should think. Whatever else Jesus was, he was a thinker, and his teachings demand that we think.

I think it's what Jesus had in mind when he said repeatedly, Whoever has ears to hear, let them hear what is being said. In other words, think about what you are hearing. Don't swallow what you're hearing without thinking about it.

Dr. Roy Buckelew is a professor of speech communications at Ouachita Baptist University. He serves churches as interim pastor.

A GREAT ARTICLE!
(Newspaper Davis)
DETROIT

14A DETROIT FREE PRESS/THURSDAY, AUGUST 29, 1996

Detroit Free Press

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER
321 W. Lafayette, Detroit, Mich. 48226
(313) 222-6400



A Knight-Ridder Newspaper

JOHN S. KNIGHT
(1894-1981)

LEE HILLS
Publisher Emeritus

HEATH J. MERIWETHER
Publisher

JOE H. STROUD
Editor

ROBERT G. McGRUDER
Executive Editor

JOSEPH M. VISCI
Managing Editor

DAVID KUSHMA
Associate Editor

CAROLE LEIGH HUTTON
Deputy Managing Editor/News

DAVE ROBINSON
Deputy Managing Editor/Sports and Operations

IN OUR OPINION

HILLARY CLINTON

She adds much to campaign and administration

Hillary Rodham Clinton's speech this week to the Democratic national convention offered another reminder of the potent asset she can be to her husband's administration and to her party's re-election campaign — and of why it would be a mistake to limit her contribution to either, in a misguided effort to reduce the political controversy generated by a strong, competent woman.

Mrs. Clinton's address lacked the warmth and informality of Elizabeth Dole's talk-show presentation to the Republican convention earlier this month. It didn't match the oratorical intensity of the stem-winders by Jesse Jackson and Mario Cuomo that preceded it. But it did allow the first lady to do what she does best: offer a coherent, specific policy agenda, in this case aimed at improving the lives of American children and families.

As she described her own roles as wife and mother, Mrs. Clinton talked about kitchen-table issues — schools, health insurance, working conditions, child safety, family stress — in a way that dovetailed with the policy prescriptions President Bill Clinton offered on his Midwestern train tour this week. Taken together, the presentations form the basis of what could be a consistent, important domestic agenda for a second Clinton term.

The first lady also gently but effectively rebuked GOP presidential nominee Bob Dole's mocking mis-

reading of the proverb "it takes a village to raise a child," which Mrs. Clinton adapted as the title of her book on children's issues. She noted: "Of course parents are first and foremost responsible for their children. But we are all responsible for ensuring that children are raised in a nation that doesn't just talk about family values, but acts in ways that value families."

Since the failure of the president's effort at comprehensive health care reform — an initiative Mrs. Clinton headed — the first lady's public profile has been lowered. The overblown Whitewater controversy has contributed to keeping her in a defensive crouch. But she made reassuringly clear this week that she remains committed to the notion of basic medical coverage for all Americans; armed with the knowledge gained from the mistakes she concedes she made the first time around, she would seem in a good position to head a second reform effort.

Mrs. Clinton is as much a lightning rod for criticism from Republicans as House Speaker Newt Gingrich has become for Democrats. Much of that criticism has been personal and unfair, yet she has borne it mostly with calm dignity. As first lady, she has made a real contribution to the development of public policy.

Despite the Democratic attacks, Speaker Gingrich clearly isn't going away anytime soon. For just that reason, neither should Mrs. Clinton.



BILL SIKES/Associated Press

Hillary Rodham Clinton