

# Having a bulging burrito of lust

*A frank and mature discussion of recent survey*

There's nothing wrong with discussing sex, as long as it's done in a mature and tasteful fashion without resorting to words such as "bazongas." Sex is a normal, healthy biological activity that occurs routinely among organisms in nature, especially monkeys, and there's no reason why we should be ashamed of our sexuality unless we are Sen. Bob Packwood. I say this because today's column is going to be a frank and mature discussion of the recent scientific survey of American sexual behavior.

**IMPORTANT ADVISORY FROM THE EDITORS:** In dealing with this topic, Mr. Barry will be forced to use certain frankly mature sexual phraseology such as "throbbing" and "burrito," so if you are a remotely moral person such as the Extremely Rev. Pat Robertson, you will stop reading this column right here and now. Thank you.

You probably read about the sex survey. Approximately 3,500 randomly selected Americans were asked detailed questions about their sexual behavior, and it turned out that 97 percent of them, within the previous year, had had sex with Madonna.

No, I'm kidding. It was only 93 percent. But that was not the most surprising finding. The most surprising finding, which I am not making up, was that 54 percent of the men surveyed said they think about sex daily. That's correct: 54 percent.

What can we conclude from this? We can conclude that the other 46 percent of the men

were lying. Because it is a known scientific fact that all men think about sex a minimum of all the time and I include Secretary of State Warren Christopher in that statement. You see Warren on TV,

*You get the impression, from the media that this nation is just one big orgy.*

and he always has the frowny, vaguely uncomfortable facial expression of a man who has just inadvertently swallowed a live weevil, so that on the outside he LOOKS like a serious government official thinking about foreign policy; but just beneath the surface of his dark diplomatic suit Warren is, trust me, a bulging burrito of lust, no different from those small,

sex-crazed dogs that attempts to mate with every female dog or human limb or item of furniture they encounter.

**IMPORTANT NOTE FROM THE LEGAL DEPARTMENT:** In the preceding paragraph, Mr. Barry is not suggesting that the secretary of state has ever, to our knowledge, attempted to have sex with furniture, not that Mr. Christopher is in any literal sense a "bulging burrito," and we have the photographs to prove it. Thank you.

What about American women? According to the survey, only 19 percent of the women said they think about sex on a daily basis. So the question is, if the other 81 percent aren't thinking about sex, what ARE they thinking about? I've discussed this question with some guys I know, and the only topic we could come up with is: sports. We figure that when women get together in those so-called "women's groups," they're actually running fantasy-football leagues, and the reason they don't invite us guys is they know we'd never remember when it was our turn to bring the refreshments.

The sex survey also produced some reassuring findings regarding the frequency with which Americans

have sex. You get the impression, from the media, that this nation is just one big orgy; turn on the TV any night, you'll see naked, glistening bodies thrusting toward each other (and that's just Dan Rather and Connie Chung).

So you probably think

that everybody else is more sexually active than you are. But the reassuring truth, according to the survey, is that some people are actually having LESS sex than you: Their names are Bud and Earlene Fiberhocker, and they are currently in full-body casts as a result of a trapeze-related mishap at a motel. Everybody else is having WAY more sex than you. And I include you spouse in that statement.

**NOTE FROM THE PUBLISHER:** Here at this newspaper we are dedicated to maintaining community standards as measured in gross advertising revenues, so if you were in any way offended by the frankness and maturity of this column, please send me a letter in writing, and I will send you, as a formal token of apology, a videotape entitled "Mr. Chuckletrousers Has a Big Night," starring Warren Christopher.

And Rev. Robertson, yours is already on the way.

—by Dave Barry—



# United States at critical point in development

*Continuing violence poses danger for society*

Sometimes people do things that just don't make sense. You know what I mean. When someone says they believe in one thing but do something that contradicts what they just said they believe in. I mean, How can you say you are pro-life and then turn around and condone a murder? It just doesn't make sense.

The religious foundation is found in the Ten Commandments. It is stated quite clearly that killing would be wrong. For years the debate between "Pro-Life" and "Pro-Choice" movements has been whether an unborn child is "alive" or not.

Under present U.S. law, up until a certain stage of a pregnancy the mother has the option of obtaining an abortion. If she feels that she can not give birth to the fetus, she can go to a clinic where she receives counseling before an abortion is performed. If she still chooses to receive the abortion, it is HER decision during the entire process, not the doctor's or his receptionist's.

The Ten Commandments also condemn thieves, adulterers, idol worship (that's a whole different column). If the Catholic Church and various other religious rights are condoning murder as

punishment for abortion doctors, can we expect similar movement towards the common thief? Or better yet how many members of the Christian faith are guilty of adultery? I shudder at the thought of the new and improved way of dealing with those who oppose the church or don't follow it's teachings; just kill them.

The recent murders involving doctors and employees of doctors who perform abortions has brought out the hypocrisy that has been existing in the "Religious Right" forever. How can you justify murder? One may say that abortion is murder and therefore it justifies the punishment inflicted by the John Salvi's of the world. These are the same people who oppose capital punishment in this country. I believe the argument would run along the lines of God being the judge of these people.

So who appointed John Salvi as "judge, jury, and executioner?" Apparently, the Catholic Church.

One bishop in New York was quoted as saying "people who perform abortions or work for those who perform abortions should expect to receive the punishment of God." So is John Salvi now God? I think not.

During the last political campaigns an unfortunate occurrence in South Carolina resulted in the deaths of

two young children. Susan Smith is due up for trial soon for the murder of her sons. This tragedy was on the minds of many Americans during the election campaigns.

Our new and beloved Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, said that it was the result of Democratic ideals and moral values. So Newt, who is to blame for the recent cold-blooded murders of doctors dedicated to providing a safe means of abortion to the poor and otherwise non-Republican society? These murders were not a crime of passion. They were a pre-meditated, cold and calculated ending of another human life. It is against the law to commit a murder. Abortions, no matter how you may feel about them, are legal. If you feel that the American people agree that abortions should be illegal, then lobby to change the law. Don't break another law in retaliation.

I personally could not make a decision to have an abortion. But that is the point, it is not my decision. My opposition to abortion is a result of my moral values. I do not have the right to expect everyone else in society to live by my standards. The standards of this society allow for

abortions; plain and simple, it is the woman's choice.

The major drive to legalize abortions was the women's rights movement. Do you really think the women who fought so hard to achieve

what they have so far are going to accept a huge step backwards? Why don't you ask them? I would wager that you would receive a very emotional response.

If the violence continues, the effects on our society would be very detrimental to the modern civil rights movements. Civil rights activists would be forced to defend their positions against violent people. They may even be forced into violence themselves. That's when civil rights movements stop being movements and become violent revolutions.

*Abortions, no matter how you may feel about them, are legal.*

The United States is at a critical point in its social development. If the violence against law-abiding citizens is allowed to continue, it will spell disaster for years to come.

—by Steve Landon—

