

kind—philo, the Latin root, translates to “for the love of man.”

Joan Fail, executive director of Communities in Schools in Columbia, agrees and makes similar observations about local giving trends from her experiences at CIS and previously with the Nurturing Center. “I’ve seen very strong support from individual giving in the 11 years I’ve been in the non-profit sector. Whether it’s a good economy or bad, South Carolinians are just giving people.”

Erin believes South Carolina’s recent strong charitable giving record can be attributed to two factors—a strong economy and the fact that people give to causes close to their communities and families.

“A strong economy, including a decline in unemployment, leads to increased household giving. The level of giving is affected by a person’s concern about the future, and the strong economy has reduced anxiety about the future,” Erin says.

She points to the Independent Sector study, noting that people do tend to give more as their financial security increases. The decision to give is often influenced by whether individuals have sufficient disposable income. On a national level, this report indicates an increase in the percentage of respondents who reported giving a larger amount, up to 24 percent in 1999 from 21 percent in 1996.

While good economic conditions do make for better times in the non-profit sector, Joan does caution against a giver’s income level as the sole organizations when identifying potential donors.

“What always surprises me is that I find those people who have less disposable income actually give a much higher percentage of what they have than those who have more,” Joan says. “That has taught me many valuable lessons, and I never make an assumption about whether someone may give based on income. I’ve seen studies that indicate people actually give more if they pay higher taxes rather than lower taxes, disputing the assumption that lower taxes mean increased disposable income for charitable contributions.”

So today, with the apparent plateau of economic conditions around the corner, should non-profits be concerned with declining contributions? Not necessarily. Erin says, “People give to people. They give to local concerns or causes in which they have some connection. It’s a personal decision.”

She notes that three factors generally influence people to give to charitable causes—being asked by someone, through participation in an organization or through a family member or relative. Even in an economic downturn, these personal factors are unlikely to change.

[From the Sandlapper magazine, Winter 1998-99]

FROM ONE SMALL SEED . . . A SUPER BOWL SUNDAY CHARITY STARTED BY COLUMBIA YOUTH QUICKLY WENT NATIONAL

(By Margaret N. O’Shea)

The Rev. Brad Smith often thinks of the tiny seed he tossed into his senior youth group at Spring Valley Presbyterian Church in Columbia that winter Sunday nine years ago, because its phenomenal growth has changed his life and the lives of countless others. It was a simple line in a prayer: “Lord, as we enjoy the Super Bowl football game, help us to be mindful of those among us without even a bowl of soup to eat.” But such seeds fall on fertile ground in the generous South, where people instinctively re-

spond to a neighbor’s need—or a stranger’s—with casseroles and kindness.

Not even the sower could envision how that single seed would flourish. But youth in the church seized the notion and nurtured it. By the 1990 Super Bowl, they had mobilized it. By the 1990 Super Bowl, they had mobilized other young people in 22 Columbia-area churches to collect one dollar each and cans of food from worshipers as they left to go home, filling soup kettles with the donations for local food banks and soup kitchens. They scored \$5,700 and vowed to top it the next year. They did . . . over and over again. In time, more than 125 churches in Richland and Lexington counties were familiar with the kettles and bowls used to collect donations, and churches in other states were borrowing the idea. In 1995, what the Spring Valley youth enthusiastically dubbed “The Souper Bowl” went national.

With its roots in midland South Carolina, it is today a charity branching nationwide and affirming the miracles that can occur when enough people give just a little. Last Super Bowl Sunday, it inspired people in all 50 states and Canada to toss \$1.7 million into soup cauldrons at churches and community centers to help feed the hungry or meet other needs in their local neighborhoods. Now, every year while Americans are riveted on a football game that determines a national championship, more and more of them also focus, however briefly, on the Souper Bowl, which defines a national conscience. It is a simple way for ordinary people to make a difference.

The challenge has been to keep simple a sweeping movement that now has thousands of volunteers, at least 8,000 local branches, corporate sponsors and 10 professional football teams behind it, and high-tech support to keep track of donations. All the money remains in the communities where it is collected; local groups choose where to give the cash and food. Totals are reported to a phone bank in Columbia or logged on the Internet.

The numbers help participants see more clearly what their own contributions, however small, can do when added to others’. “In an age when young people are bombarded with cynicism, it’s important for them to know that by God’s grace, they can make a difference in the world,” Smith says. “We are so divided as a country in so many ways. Republican and Democrat. Rich and poor. Black and white. Young and old. The Super Bowl is a rivalry. But our Souper Bowl transcends differences. It brings diverse people with different backgrounds, different opinions, different faiths, together for a common purpose, and together they make a tremendous difference. Just knowing that changes the way many of our young people choose to live the rest of their lives.”

On the Internet—and wherever the Souper Bowl of Caring, as it’s now called, is discussed—the football images are tempting. Youth carry the ball. Donors score. Teams win. A youth group in Virginia is called for clipping after challenging their pastor to shave his beard when their collections reach a goal. Some churches blitz their communities with flyers and letters and phone calls. On the Web site, donated by South Carolina SuperNet, football icons offer links to a playbook, coaches’ corner, player profiles, and a chance to score a touchdown on a hunger quiz. Prior years’ statistics are retired numbers, of course.

But for Brad Smith, the mustard seed is the image to remember. He recalls the half dozen teenagers who showed up after school to brainstorm about the first Souper Bowl.

Each had friends who attended other churches and schools and agreed to call them. One by one, those churches joined the effort. Later, as young people went away to college or moved to other cities, they would in the same way get their new churches involved in giving. Each year would bring younger brothers and sisters of kids who’d been involved earlier on, stuffing envelopes with press releases for out-of-state newspapers, making phone calls, manning the phone bank, distributing posters, holding the cauldrons.

When the Souper Bowl first began to spread to other states, it was still through the word-of-mouth concept. Pennsylvania, the state that always comes closest to South Carolina’s contributions and once has even surpassed us, began participating after a Lutheran layman in his 80s heard about the program while vacationing in Myrtle Beach and took the idea home.

Laura Bykowski, a Spring Valley volunteer who “retired” from a marketing career to raise a family, has used her child’s nap-time to ply those marketing skills for the Souper Bowl. As a result, professional football players agreed to make public service announcements and nearly a dozen teams, including the Carolina Panthers and Atlanta Falcons, threw their considerable weight behind the Souper Bowl. National Football League star Reggie White and Campbell’s Soup launched a nationwide promotional campaign, including radio ads, posters and a press conference in San Diego the Wednesday before the 1998 big game.

Columbian Jim Antley designed and maintains the Web page. Some 30 volunteers help enter data. Frank Imhoff compiled the database.

But it’s still the energy of youth that drives the Souper Bowl of Caring. Local tradition is at least one all-night workathon, where young people gather at the Spring Valley church social hall to share pizza, watch a Monty Python movie, stuff envelopes and lick stamps until dawn. And youth make up the bulk of the volunteers who do the actual work on Super Bowl Sunday.

Last year, about a thousand churches and organizations used the Internet to report their donations, but seven times that number telephoned on Super Bowl Sunday, calling into a 50-line phone bank contributed by Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Other companies have offered support and expertise, usually because someone who works there has asked. Some communities get corporations to match what individuals give.

Yet, the focus remains small. The idea still is to ask for only a dollar, only a can of food. If the amount collected is only about what it takes to pay for a 30-second commercial in the televised football game that day, it is still a monumental blessing for the charities chosen to receive that bounty.

With the phenomenal growth of the Souper Bowl, its original organizers have insisted on maintaining the grassroots character. “We believe the idea is a gift from God,” Brad Smith says. “It is our task to be good stewards of it.”

RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, The Right to Organize is a fundamental right—workers fought, bled and even died for this right.

Workers organize because they want to ensure that their labor is valued . . . they want a voice at work.

About four years ago, we began working with the AFL-CIO to lend our voices as Members of Congress . . . to help build coalitions with workers as they try to organize.

As elected officials, we can join with clergy and other community leaders to ensure that workers have the freedom to choose to join a union.

That's what the 7 Days in June are all about.

We are here today to join the chorus of voices that says: 'Employer interference with workers' choices is unacceptable.'

This year's 7 Days in June . . . 9th through 16th . . . promises to be even bigger than last year when more than 12,000 workers, community leaders and elected officials participated in more than 120 events in 100 cities.

The participation in these events by Members of Congress is important—when we lend our support, we help lift the spirits of those trying to organize.

We also help them win!

You know, there are some things an elected official should do . . . and some things an elected official should not do.

Well, let me tell you, one thing an elected official should never do . . . stand by and watch while a state supported university tries to derail a union organizing drive the way Michigan State University tried to stop its teaching assistants from organizing earlier this year.

That is why last February I began to help the MSU graduate students organize.

Graduate students teach classes, grade papers and do research—they spend up to 30 hours a week working with no medical coverage and minimal compensation . . . and that's on top of their own graduate coursework.

MSU was the only research university in Michigan where teaching assistants did not have collective bargaining rights.

So we got together with the students and the Michigan Federation of Teachers to see what could be done.

We began by gathering signatures on petitions in support of the student organizing drive.

I called MSU President Peter McPherson several times asking that his Administration remain neutral during the organizing campaign.

Some of us in the Michigan Congressional delegation (KILPATRICK, KILDEE & CONYERS) sent a joint letter to President McPherson as well.

As it got close to the vote, I wrote a letter in support of the drive which was published in the student newspaper.

And during the election, a number of us who supported the students stopped by the campaign headquarters.

Together, I believe we made a difference in the lives of these students . . . and I am proud to say there are over 1,200 new union members in the State of Michigan today because of it.

I know a number of my colleagues have similar experiences to share, and I would encourage everyone to look for ways to lend their voice to organizing efforts—when we

work together, we build a better place to live for all of us.

#### VICTORY AT MSU REQUIRED TEAMWORK

(By David Decker)

The successful organizing effort as MSU was a yearlong project. It required a massive amount of work and then when we filed enough cards to get an election, the MSU administration launched an anti-union campaign. Through it all the campaign moved forward by talking one-on-one with the graduate employees from each department at work, on campus and in their homes. As the campaign progressed we added a web site, e-mail list, and a get-out-the-vote phone bank. In addition to organizing the graduate employees we also organized our friends in the U.S. Congress, the Michigan House and Senate, and in organized labor to bring pressure on the MSU administration to stop its anti-union campaign.

MFT & SRP organizer Jon Curtiss, the BEU organizing staff, steering committee, and department contacts led the organizing effort at MSU. Augmenting Jon and the GEU crew were numerous volunteers from the Graduate Employees Organization (University of Michigan), including President Cedric DeLeon and staffer Mark Dillely who worked the campaign full-time in the closing weeks and from the Graduate Employees Organizing Committee (Wayne State), including President Peter Williams, Glenn Bessemer and staffer Charlie Grose. At key point throughout the campaign MFT & SRP PSRP organizer, Krista Schneider, lent her assistance.

But while the key to the victory, the MSU graduate assistants and staff did not stand alone. They received incredible support from elected officials, other labor organizations, and the greater MSU community.

Congressman David Bonior voiced concern to MSU President McPherson directly and in a letter concerning the university's anti-union campaign, and had a letter printed in the State News supporting the organizing drive. Joining Bonior in a letter were U.S. Representatives John Conyers, Carolyn Kilpatrick and Dale Kildee, Congressman Sander Levin also talked with President McPherson expressing his concerns. And Congressman Bart Stupak sent a letter as well.

State Representatives David Woodward (D-Royal Oak), Buzz Thomas (D-Detroit) and Bill McConico (D-Detroit), a member of the Highland Park Federation of Teachers, all stopped by the office to help with the Get Out The Vote Effort. A total of 26 State Legislators signed a letter to President McPherson, State Senator Diane Byrum sent a letter with similar theme.

State Representative Ray Bashamis staffer, Hoon-Yung Hopgood, Senate Democrat Office staffer Dana Houle, and State Democratic Party staffer Dennis Denno all helped with phone calls.

Scores of MSU alumni, including Detroit teachers President Janna Garrison, Metro Detroit AFL-CIO President Don Boggs, Organization of School Administrations President Diann Woodard, labor attorney David Radtke (who also spent a day helping with organizing house calls), wrote President McPherson.

Numerous unions including Operating Engineers Local 547, AFSCME Council 25 and Teamsters Joint Council 43 let the MSU President know what they thought of the anti-union effort, MSU alumnus Jack Finn, Legislative Director of United Food and Commercial Workers Local 876, expressed his thoughts in a letter printed in the State

News. SEIU lobbyist Cindy Paul joined in with house calls, while Julie Barton from Jobs For Justice helped with the phone bank. UAW Regional Director Cal Rapson called University Trustees on our behalf.

Michigan State AFL-CIO President Mark Gaffney and the staff—Denise Cook, Ken Fletcher, Mark Alexander and Mary Holbrook provided their support. Former Michigan AFL-CIO President Frank Garrison also made contracts on behalf of the MSU graduate assistants.

The MSU Labor Coalition, headed by Wayne Cass of Operating Engineers Local 547, was there throughout the yearlong campaign as was the Clerical-Technical Union who early on lent us their offices for meetings and at the end helped with the phone bank.

Two MSU Trustees, Board Chair Colleen McNamara, and Trustee Dorothy Gonzalez took all of our calls, met with us, and urged the Administration not to run an anti-union campaign.

#### THE THREAT TO WORKERS' FREEDOM TO CHOOSE A UNION

The struggles working people face are not exceptions to the rule—when a majority of workers say they want a union, employers routinely threaten their right to make their own free choice with a campaign of coercion, harassment and firings.

Ninety-one percent of employers, when faced with employees who want to join together in a union, force employees to attend closed-door meetings to hear anti-union propaganda; 80 percent require immediate supervisors to attend training sessions on how to attack unions; and 79 percent have supervisors deliver anti-union messages to workers they oversee.

Eighty percent hire outside consultants to run anti-union campaigns, often based on mass psychology and distorting the law.

Half of employers threaten to shut down if employees join together in a union.

In 31 percent of organizing campaigns, employers illegally fire workers just because they want to form a union.

Even after workers go through all this and win a National Labor Relations Board election to form a union, one-third of the time their employer never negotiates a contract with them.

More than at any time in recent history, working people are joining together in unions with the hope of improving our living standards, our communities and our jobs. But as workers succeed, employers are stepping up a campaign of coercion, firings and harassment to block our freedom to make our own decisions about joining a union.

That's why the AFL-CIO and its 13-million-member affiliated unions have begun a broad, long-term campaign to restore the balance needed to project the right of workers to make a free choice to join a union.

Through Voice@Work, unions are helping workers form unions in a new way. Right from a campaign's start, workers reach out to their elected representatives, clergy members and other community leaders to gain support for their freedom to form a union. Many of these community leaders eagerly back their constituents' efforts to build better lives for their families and help call on employers to avoid intimidation and coercion.

7 Days in June is the annual high point in our effort. We join together—workers, our unions, state federations and central labor councils, community leaders, clergy, public officials and students—to say employer interference with workers' choices is unacceptable. 7 Days in June this year is June 9

through 16. It promises to be even bigger than last year, when more than 12,000 working people, community leaders and elected officials participated in more than 120 events in 100 cities.

Working families will continue to push for a voice at work by telling Americans why workers are struggling to form unions and how their employers are waging a war against them.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MICHAEL M.  
GLASSON

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has faithfully served the citizens of Genesee County, Michigan, for 15 years. On June 18, civic, community, and government leaders will join family and friends to honor Mr. Michael M. Glasson, as he retires as County Purchasing Director.

Michael Glasson was born and raised in my hometown of Flint, and holds a Bachelors Degree from Michigan State University and a Masters in Public Administration from Wayne State University. In 1974, he began his career in purchasing, working as a buyer for Hurley Medical Center, which led three years later to his becoming Chief Buyer for the City of Flint, a position he held for nine years. Michael then made the transition from city to county, as he became Purchasing Director for Genesee County in 1986.

As Purchasing Director, Michael helped usher his department into the modern age with the development of new purchasing regulations, the automation of the purchasing process, and the streamlining of the entire department. Under his leadership, the department set a new standard of efficiency and effectiveness.

Michael serves his peers and colleagues as a member and past president of the Michigan Public Purchasing Officers Association, is a Certified Instructor with the National Institute for Governmental Purchasing, and he has also served as an Instructor at Ferris State University and Detroit College of Business. In 1996, he was recognized by the Michigan Public Purchasing Officers Association and awarded the Klang Award for outstanding contributions to government purchasing.

Mr. Speaker, Michael Glasson has been a positive influence on Genesee County government for the last 15 years. The many people he has come in contact with during that time have benefited from his dedication, his attention to detail, and his ability to work with people from all walks of life. I ask my colleagues in the 107th Congress to please join me in congratulating him on his retirement, and wishing him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

CONSCRIPTION POLICIES

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I highly recommend to my colleagues the attached article "Turning Eighteen in America: Thoughts on Conscription" by Michael Allen. This article was published in the Internet news magazine *Laissez Faire Times*. Mr. Allen forcefully makes the point that coercing all young men to register with the federal government so they may be conscripted into military service at the will of politicians is fundamentally inconsistent with the American philosophy of limited government and personal freedom. After all, the unstated premise of a draft is that individuals are owned by the state. Obviously this belief is more consistent with totalitarian systems, such as those found in the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, Red China, or Castro's Cuba, than with a system based on the idea that all individuals have inalienable rights. No wonder prominent Americans from across the political spectrum such as Ronald Reagan, Milton Friedman, Gary Hart, and Jesse Ventura oppose the draft.

Selective Service is not even a good way of providing an effective military fighting force. As Mr. Allen points out (paraphrasing former Senator Mark Hatfield), the needs of the modern military require career professionals with long-term commitments to the service, not short-term draftees eager to "serve their time" and return to civilian life. The military itself recognizes that Selective Service serves no useful military function. In 1993, the Department of Defense issued a report stating that registration could be stopped "with no effect on military mobilization, no measurable effect on the time it would take to mobilize, and no measurable effect on military recruitment." Yet the American taxpayer has been forced to spend over \$500 million on a system "with no measurable effect on military mobilization!"

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1597, which repeals the Selective Service Act, thus ending a system which violates the rights of millions of young Americans and wastes taxpayer dollars for no legitimate military reason. I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Allen's article then cosponsor HR 1597 and join me in ending a system which is an affront to the principles of liberty our nation was founded upon.

TURNING EIGHTEEN IN AMERICA: THOUGHTS ON  
CONSCRIPTION

(By Michael R. Allen)

In March of 1967, Senator Mark Hatfield (R-Oregon) proposed legislation that would abolish the practice of military conscription, or the drafting of men who are between 18 and 35 years old. Despite its initial failure, it has been reintroduced in nearly every Congress that has met since then, and has been voted upon as an amendment at least once.

This bill was an excellent proposal that should have never been needed. The dovish Hatfield's arguments in promotion of the bill constituted what is actually the conservative position on the item. In its defense, Hatfield asserted that we need career military men who can adapt to system changes within the context of weaponry. Short-term

draftees, maintained Hatfield, would not be particularly adept at utilizing modern technology. More recent efforts to overturn the Selective Service Act have similarly stressed efficiency.

This basic logic is the driving force behind the political anti-draft movement. Others oppose the draft because it represents another governmental intrusion into the lives of America's young adults. Those lacking skill or ambition to serve will be greatly humiliated once drafted, and those without developed skill in search of an alternative career will be denied an opportunity to choose that direction. The draft also is a blatant attack on the Thirteenth Amendment, which prohibits involuntary servitude. If the federal government fought individual states over the legalization of private-sector slavery, then should it not also be equally compelled to decry public-sector servitude? Of course it should, but an elastically interpreted "living Constitution" makes all sorts of public schemes safe from legal reproach.

Recruiting students and vagrants is of no use to a competitive military, since both groups are uninterested in active duty. By contrast, a volunteer army—assuming the country needs any army at all—will yield those with an interest in serving their country and those who seek the military as a place to get that necessary step up into a better life. A primary partner to draft reform would be to offer an alternative for those who request not to serve militarily. Non-combatant positions, such as field doctors and radio operators, might be made civilian positions. Then, those who wish not to engage in battle will be able to serve the nation for as long as they need.

Additionally, the government can save some money, albeit not much, by not having to buy uniforms for these civilians.

Yet the most compelling reason for having volunteer military forces is the right of a person to own his or her body. The right to self-ownership must be supreme in a free nation, since without it there is no justification for government or laws at all. If one does not own his body, then why should murder be a crime? Why should there be money for the individual to spend? The self must own itself for there to be any liberty. And clearly one does have self-ownership. A man controls his own actions, and efforts to force him to do what he desires not to do are nugatory. The best the State can do is arrest him after he has disobeyed the law. It cannot prevent a willful person from committing illegal acts. The draft ignores the concept of self-ownership and proceeds to diminish the available benefits of a free society for young men.

Issues of cost and unfairness can sway those not seeing a moral reason to oppose conscription. The government spends a lot of money that might be used in armory for war in order to draft a number of men that would be similar to the number who might otherwise volunteer. In this way, the draft is a redundant method that consumes entirely too much money.

It is unfair because those who do not get called remain free while those called into duty must serve or face charges that will haunt them for the rest of their lives. This practice, while through chance, is unjust because it targets those Americans with low draft numbers. Through the archaic, unjust draft process America once more is embracing authoritarianism. If the government chose, National Guard forces could be utilized to alleviate the costs of draft, recruitment, and salary. The savings could then be