

Cal Thomas
1-25-82

-1-

THOMAS: Thank you. I am very much delighted to be here tonight and to present myself as some political protozoa for examination under your collective microscopes. So much for depth. I'd like to apologize for the way that I'm dressed. I know I am not what you expect. The cleaners lied to me, they didn't get my sheet back to me after the last Klan rally in time, and I must leave about twenty minutes early for a Hitler Youth meeting.

I detest reading speeches, but in order to be profound I must do that, so I hope you'll bear with me. And as one with some degree of experience in television, Dr. Capps alluded to that, with NBC News in Washington, and numerous other unregenerate outfits, I will try to maintain decent eye contact. Let me tell you first of all that George McGovern and George Cunningham, McGovern for a longer period, George Cunningham most recently, are good friends of mine, and I saw George McGovern a few weeks ago when he was in Lynchberg, speaking at Randolph-Macon Women's College there, and will shortly be setting up a meeting between he and Jerry Falwell.

I like to think that I am able to disagree with someone's political position and not to jettison them as an actual or potential friend. And I consider George McGovern a friend. I think he's wrong, but that's neither here nor there. And he thinks I am. So I am trying to build some bridges in that area.

Tonight I'd like to offer my congratulations to some of my liberal adversaries for doing an excellent job of undermining

our corporate credibility by misrepresenting our true position at Moral Majority. With the willing participation and assistance of some of the brethren in my former profession, the press, our liberal opponents have convinced some Americans, even before we have been given a hearing, that we are attempting to ban or censor library books, that we favor capital punishment for homosexuals, that we have a Victorian view of sex, that we oppose all sex education in our public schools, that we are intolerant, intolerant, bigoted, insensitive to the needs of the poor, and believe in nuclear war.

Now, it is not amazing to me, it is not amazing to me, that our liberal friends would so misrepresent our true intention. But it is amazing to me that so many people have swallowed the bait. Permit me to attempt to set the record straight with you tonight. Let me assure you that despite what you may have heard or seen or what you will hear, that which I am about to share with you represents the true intentions and philosophy of the Moral Majority and its founder, Dr. Jerry Falwell.

What we are observing today in America is a delayed reaction, by people generally referred to in some circles as religious, and specifically as conservative religious, conservative Christian, conservative Jew, conservative Mormon and conservative without any particular religious world view. A reaction to the excesses of government, which we believe have devalued humankind to the point where we are ultimately considered the property of the state. We have, in short, regressed from the highest levels expressed in the slogan "In God We Trust," to the lowest level, trust

no one but the state.

Our people, conservatives, the so-called New Right, had not been involved in politics prior to the 1980 election. Many had not even bothered to vote, much less get involved in any form of political activism. But a series of events blasted them from their chairs of apathy. Vietnam, Watergate, abortion on demand, discrimination against persons whose world view is based on transcendent religious principles. Our people realized there was a threat to the values and traditions that helped build and have sustained America. And it is that perception to which they are now responding.

The reaction from some of our liberal friends can be likened to the reaction of a spoiled brat when you try to play with his toys. He throws a tantrum because he has never learned how to share. The arrogance of some on the Left, those who have held power virtually unchallenged for nearly fifty years, spills out today in various forms, including misrepresentations, falsifications, and suggestions that they lost the last election due to forces that had nothing to do with their voting records or their unmasking before an electorate they had previously hoodwinked with so much success.

Thank you, mother [RESPONSE TO ONE PERSON APPLAUDING]. We had a two for one deal on United. It was very good.

Now let me quickly--listen, that's unusual. Usually I don't even get one.

Now, let me quickly summarize the intentions of the founders of this country and what they had in mind when they wrote the First Amendment. You have heard of the First Amendment.

Some people are surprised to learn that the phrase, separation of church and state, appears nowhere in the Constitution, just as they are surprised to learn that God helps those who help themselves doesn't appear in the Bible. Now, let us be reminded that the First Amendment says this, and only this:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people to assemble and petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Moral Majority believes in the concept of separation of church and state. Certainly, Jefferson did as well, though he avoided the phrase in our founding documents. However, nowhere in any document I have been able to uncover did our founders advocate separation of church from state. In fact, it was Franklin, hardly a right-wing Fundamentalist, who suggested prayer as the glue that would hold the colonies together at that first Continental Congress, and who forged through prayer, many believe, a united and not a divided state.

In the Soviet Union we have the best example of separation of church from state. The church is allowed to have influence only in those areas where the state has no interest. Since the Soviet government expresses an interest in everything, the influence of the church is confined to its own four walls, and then only if it cooperates and registers with the government.

Writing for the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, sometimes referred to as the conservative Republican think

Thomas

-5-

84
Quote begins here?

tank, scholar Michael Malban has done a marvelous study of the intentions of the authors of the First Amendment, and has compared those intentions with modern court decisions. In his monograph, Malban notes that the Supreme Court has held since 1947 that the establishment clause, which requires both Congress and the states to maintain strict neutrality between religion and irreligion in any laws that might conceivably aid private religious organizations. Legal disputes since then have had to do with the differences between aid to religion, which is prohibited by the courts, neutrality, which is required, and hostility, which supposedly is prohibited. Free exercise legal doctrine, in contrast, has been anything but neutral. Continuous _____.

"As the court has espoused its doctrines, it has relied on an incredibly flawed reasoning of the intentions of the authors of the First Amendment. Unfortunately, modern scholars are little better. Some are good on isolated points, but rarely has one tried to explain the complexities of the establishment issue, or the relationship between establishment and free exercise. Precisely what was meant when the people were granted the right to exercise their religion freely needs detailed exploration. It is clear, however, that it did not mean what modern judges claim." End of quotation.

Now, let me summarize and comment on some of the most commonly raised objections to Moral Majority. Liberal preachers, after first denouncing our right to speak, were quickly brought up short on the hypocritical scale, when it was pointed out that they exercised their rights to speak out on political and social issues quite well during

the sixties and seventies. Caught in that trap, they quickly retreated and attempted to hold a new position. That position is basically that they are right in the way they approach issues, and we are wrong. Well, that's a matter of opinion, isn't it? Having established this philosophical beachhead on shifting sand, these liberals then go on to say that we have no right to impose our particular views on anybody else. Now, we are perfectly free to practice what we believe to be true in our own personal lives, but we must never, never, never try to pass laws or keep other laws from being passed, that force people to conform to those views. In other words, you sing the hymns, you conservatives, and we liberals will take up the offering and preach the sermons, to say nothing of making all the decisions at the business meetings. As the song goes, it's nice work if you can get it.

Now, let's examine this logic for a moment and see why it is flawed. I have been reading up on the Dred Scott decision. You will remember, those with above a C- in history, that in 1857, the Supreme Court, using the type of logic I have just described, said that blacks were not fully human, the therefore whites were entitled to own them as property. This, said the court, was not the imposition of a moral viewpoint, because no one was forced to own a slave. Freedom of choice. Those who wished to own slaves might do so, those for whom slavery was morally or religiously repugnant, did not have to own slaves. The vote in Dred Scott was seven to two. By that margin, and by that logic, the Supreme Court in 1973 approved abortion on demand.

Thomas

-7-

During the Vietnam war, I was frequently tear-gassed as I covered the antiwar demonstrations for NBC News in Washington. I remember well the liberal harangues about the immorality of the Vietnam war. I remember the William Sloan Coffins, and the Berrigan brothers, who urged students to go to Canada and break the law, rightly or wrongly. The Berrigans and their disciples broke into draft offices and poured blood on Selective Service records. I remember those within the church and without, who said you were immoral if you supported the immoral Vietnam war. Boycotts were conducted against Dow bathroom cleaner and other Dow products, because Dow manufactured napalm, which was used in bombs for that immoral war.

During the civil rights movement of the nineteen-sixties it was preachers who provided the moral impetus that resulted in civil rights legislation. Americans were forced to do battle with their consciences, and with racism in their own hearts, because of the courageous moral arguments against racism, articulated so well by Dr. King and many others, most of whom were pastors, by the way.

Today we have laws against murder, stealing, rape, incest, and cannibalism, among others. I am sure there are thieves, people who would like to murder, practitioners of rape and incest, and a minority who would like to eat their neighbors, who feel that their rights have been violated because somebody else's moral standards have been imposed on them, preventing them from carrying out their plans or at least imposing heavy penalties if they decide to do so.

The fact is that these and all other laws have been passed to promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense. The fact is that all law, philosophically, all law is the imposition of someone's morality over someone else's morality. The question is not whether morality will be imposed, the question is, whose morality? The answer is, whichever has the best track record and best likelihood for success. We believe, as do millions of Americans, that the morality that comes from, as all law comes from, the Judeo-Christian value base, has the best track record and provides the best foundation for an orderly society, which will include persons that even do not agree with that base or the pre-suppositions that flow from it.

The problem today is not that we have gone from, exchanged the Judeo-Christian ethic for another ethic. The problem is that we have left the Judeo-Christian ethic for no ethic, and we are adrift on a sea of moral relativity, without a compass or a reference point, and are hopelessly lost.

Another criticism of Moral Majority is that we sometimes appear arrogant. Well, if standing on principles and setting forth some deeply held beliefs in right and wrong seems arrogant, OK, we're arrogant. But I would rather be arrogant and right than wishy-washy and for the sake of some misguided definition of pluralism, refuse to take a stand on any issue because I might offend someone or someone might disagree with me. I was once called arrogant by Bill Coffin during a debate at Florida State University. When I stepped to the microphone and recalled that I had covered some of the

Thomas

-9-

Reverend Coffin's antiwar speeches, and as I recalled, no one was more arrogant and sure of his righteous cause than Bill Coffin. He half smiled. Then a student, the one I think who came dressed as a witch, as a commentary on the Moral Majority, said, as loud as she could, "Yeah, and he was right too." And there's a picture that will be in the paper tomorrow morning right there. I shouldn't have done that.

The right-wing, antipluralistic, Constitution underminer, Cal Thomas speaks to US Santa Barbara students and froths at the mouth, you know. One of the things you put up with when you go out and make yourself a target. All right. Make twenty prints. I'll take them before I leave.

Well, we would suggest that one man's arrogance is another man's steadfastness. I think the ad libs are doing better than the prepared text.)

Well, what is Moral Majority really all about, and what are we trying to do? You've heard that we have positions on everything, from movies to censoring library books. That is not true. That is part of the liberal strategy, to accuse your opponent of something of which he is not guilty, like wifebeating. You get others to say the same thing. Then you get your friends at the newspapers to write editorials
TAPE GOES BLANK HERE FROM 165 to 232.

THOMAS (CONTINUES) -- basically we stand for four issues. First, we are pro-life, and that includes not only unborn human life but so-called handicapped life, rich life, poor life, black life, white life, young life, and old life. We

believe the burden of proof is on the abortionists to show that life does not begin at conception, as even Newsweek magazine last week has finally acknowledged that it does, so I guess we can all, now that we've had the gospel according to Newsweek, take a little more sustenance from that.

and?

The Hippocratic Oath in medical history have held this view, that life begins at conception, and is a continuum until death, as a universal truth since the founding, virtually, of medicine. Only since the advent of sociological law, law by the Gallup Poll, law by the Harris Poll, and sociological medicine, has another view been advanced.

Second, we favor and support the traditional family, the husband-wife relationship. To support the traditional family does not mean we are against working wives or day-care centers. It does not mean that we don't understand that some people are divorced or widowed, that there are such things as extended families. It simply means that male-female relationship. Though we oppose, we oppose the attempts by practitioners of homosexuality, that does not mean that we hate homosexuals or we are trying to lock them in the closet, or deprive them of the normal civil rights that are enjoyed by every other American. I would be opposed, as would Jerry Falwell, to any witchhunt, police breaking down doors, and trying to interrupt what consenting adults are doing in private. However, we do believe in standing against laws that would grant people who choose to live this kind of life-style, special civil rights that do not go with other persons who choose to live certain life-styles. For

example, heterosexual adulterers. Or any other number of classes of groups who are not seeking, nor should they receive, special civil or human rights. But we do not believe in singling any particular one group out for, practitioners of any particular life-style, for special discrimination or harassment. And I certainly would oppose that as much as I oppose special civil rights for practitioners of that life-style.

Third, we are pro-moral. Well, who isn't? But under this umbrella comes our opposition to the attempt to legalize illegal drugs and our opposition to the spread of pornography, which exploits women and men, and which we believe is mind and spirit pollution. We have an environmental protection agency to protect us supposedly from what we drink and breathe, and I am not suggesting a federal agency to protect us from what we read and hear, but I am saying that as the Supreme Court has said, I think that community standards are the best basis for determining what is acceptable and what is unacceptable in a community. A standard of obscenity and pornography that I think most of us can live with.

Fourth, we are pro-American, not chauvinistically so, not blindly so, but in order to preserve our freedoms and way of life we favor a strong national defense. That's not because we believe ultimate security is to be found in missiles. It is not. If it were, we would be more secure than ever, because we have had more than we, we have more now than we have ever had before. But in a fallen and imperfect world, there are those who would seek to deprive us even of the right to be here tonight and to agree or disagree together.

We must therefore be stronger, or at least as strong as those who would eliminate our freedom. We also support the nation of Israel under this tenet, and Jewish people everywhere. This does not mean that we offer carte blanche to Israel on every foreign policy decision. It does mean that we stand by Israel's basic right to exist and the need for a homeland for Jewish people, so that minimally there will never again be a Holocaust.

Now, the only people who have not tried to assert, or impose, if you will, their views in public law are those who don't happen to believe that their views are true.

If you believe, for example, that abortion is really the taking of innocent human life, would you not be a hypocrite of hypocrites if you failed to act on that belief? Members of the I am personally opposed, but--club make me ill. Can you imagine what the reaction would be if someone said I am personally opposed to discrimination but I am not going to vote for civil rights clause because that would impose my moral viewpoint on bigots who wish to discriminate? It is a philosophically untenable position. One must ask, what in the world makes you personally opposed?

Now, finally, let me address the question of historical religious involvement in America on a little broader scale than I did at the beginning. I mentioned earlier the First Amendment and the fact that the Moral Majority is primarily political and not religious. But let me go a step further. The First Amendment prohibits the government from establishing a church, as had been done in England. It does not prevent the churches from doing anything except collecting taxes.

Any person who suggests that separation of church and state requires more than this, that is, that it requires churches to remain silent on so-called political issues, or requires preachers to be neutral on candidates, which again, we are, by the way, or that religious organizations must pursue only spiritual goals, is simply grinding his own ax rather than reading the law. It was the preachers and those they led who changed our monarchy into a republic. And what became of it? A clerical tyranny? A crackpot theocracy? Or a new birth of freedom? Our founders understood in various degrees the relationship between one's world view and government. John Witherspoon, who lived from 1723 to 1794 was the only pastor to sign the Declaration of Independence. Witherspoon linked religious thinking, in his case the Christian faith, and the intellectual base behind it, with the concept of government. He considered such linkage not incidental, but, if I may, fundamental. Witherspoon knew of and stood consciously in the stream of Samuel Rutherford, a Scotsman, who lived from 1600 to 1661, and who wrote Lex Rex, in 1664. Lex Rex means, of course, law is king, a phrase that was absolutely earth-shaking in the midst of the divine right of kings hangover from the Middle Ages. Prior to that, it had been Rex Lex, the king is law. In Lex Rex he wrote that the law, and no one else, is king, therefore the heads of government are under the law, and not a law unto themselves. It was that idea that was appealed to when Mr. Nixon suggested that he was above the law. And that Presidents could do certain things that common people like us would be prosecuted for.

Jefferson, though a deist, and others, knew they stood in the stream of John Locke, and while Locke had secularized Lex Rex, he had drawn heavily from it. These men really knew what they were doing. We are not reading back into history what was not there. We cannot say too strongly that they really understood the basis of government which they were founding.

Think of this great flaming phrase: "certain inalienable rights." Who gives those rights? The state? Then they are not inalienable, because the state can change them or take them away. Where, then, do these rights come from? These men understood that they were founding a country upon the concept that goes back into the Judeo-Christian thinking, that there is some one there who gave the inalienable rights. Another phrase also stood out. "In God We Trust." With this there is no confusion of what they were talking about. They publicly recognized that law could be kind because there was a law-giver. A person to give the inalienable rights.

Today the phrase "separation of church and state" in America is used to silence the church. When conservative religious people speak out on issues, the hue and cry from the state, the press, the liberal clergy upset by the competition is that we should be prohibited from speaking because there is a separation of church and state. The way the concept is used today is totally reversed from the original intent. It is not rooted in history. The modern concept of separation is an argument for a total separation of religion from the state. The consequence of the acceptance of this doctrine leads to a removal of religion as an influence in civil

government. The late Supreme Court justice, Hugo Black, said it best when he declared, "An unconditional right to say what one pleases about public affairs is what I consider to be the minimum guarantee of the First Amendment."

We would defend the right of our liberal friends to speak out, even to the point of questioning our morality or understanding of religious documents as we apply our beliefs. We ask only the same rights in return. I found nothing unconstitutional, unethical, or in violation of church-state separation when liberal clergy came to call at the White House during the Kennedy and Johnson years. But let Jerry Falwell receive one telephone call from Ronald Reagan, and you would think the Republic was in danger. Let him get a call from Menachim Begin, and you would think a crime had been committed. The hypocrisy is incredible.

New York liberal Senator Daniel Moynihan said recently on "Good Morning, America," "We are a blessed people, but we are not elect, and we must shape our future as we have our past, or we risk losing our freedom." I can think of no better statement concerning the purpose of Moral Majority.

There is something worse, when you think about it, worse than war, and worse even than speaking out. It is silence. The grossest immoralities have been perpetrated because there were those who remained silent and did nothing. We may not always be right, and in fact are not, but we will never be judged guilty of saying and doing nothing, just for the sake of a poorly defined pluralism, or for any other reason. I am grateful to have the opportunity to share some of these

Thomas

-16-

things with you. Now, Professor Capps, if you want to call the questioners or whatever, I am, because we are going to have a consultation here.

CAPPS: I know we are all very grateful to Mr. Thomas for these very provocative insights, succinct remarks, and he has consented to a question and answer period right now. Before doing that, and this was the reason for the consultation, I wanted to be able to give you some idea of what we have in mind for the evening. We will not be taking a break now, as we sometimes do after the speaker has presented his or her remarks, but we will take a break after the question and answer period, and following that, that will not be the end of the evening by any means. Following that we have some representatives here from a group, the Moral Majority in Southern California before it became its own chapter, a group called Californians for Biblical Morality, Rob Scribner and some who have come up with him from Los Angeles, and I know we would like to hear from them, and that would be after the recess, if that is agreeable with you. I think we are ready now for any questions that you would like to pose to Mr. Thomas. I am going to request once again that these questions come from people who are taking this course for credit.

Q: Unintelligible.

THOMAS: Yes. The question was, for those who were not able to hear it, when I was speaking about the homosexual practice, that I had mentioned that I was against special civil rights. Would I detail some of those that I consider to be special civil rights? One that I became exposed to most, first,

while still a reporter with the NBC affiliate in Houston, as some of you may know, the Federal Communications Commission requires stations to take ascertainties of various interest groups, racial groups, ethnic groups, religious groups, whatever, in their viewing area, or listening area, as part of the license-renewal procedure. And homosexual activist groups were seeking to get themselves listed as a legitimate entity, a special-interest group, as part of the ascertainment, that programming would reflect their views of themselves and what they were trying to do, and positive programming. That was one of the first introductions I had to the activism in this area. I think that, I think in other areas, such as legitimizing homosexual marriages for tax purposes, are questions of serious concern, that we would oppose the ability for homosexual individuals to adopt children, young children, for whatever reason, is something that I think needs serious debate, and those are some of them. Now, on the question, Jerry Falwell has spoken out on this on a number of occasions. Public school teachers. This has come up a great deal. Our position is that as long as a homosexual or a heterosexual person, who may be engaged in activity that is, that we don't believe has positive ends for the students, keeps that to him or herself, then they should be considered for employment on the same basis as any other person, on their academic credentials and the likelihood for success. And we would oppose just as much the homosexual person who flaunts his or her life-style as a legitimate alternative, and/or solicits members of the same sex in class, as we would the heterosexual individual who

Thomas

-18-

flaunts his or her adulterous or whatever life-style and/or solicits members of the opposite sex in class. We think there's more to teaching than just filling one's heads with facts and figures, certainly in the elementary and junior high and high school, and by the time you get to college, of course, everybody is on their own, as we all know. But we certainly think there are certain foundational principles that go into education, and that to erode those we do not contribute to the educational process. That's not an exhaustive list of some of the rights, but it's some of the more volatile ones. The lady with her hand up there.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS:OK. The question was speaking about censorship, what do I think about efforts by some individuals or groups to remove Catcher in the Rye from the, and Grapes of Wrath, as examples, from public school libraries. I am opposed to that. I read both of them, I was an English literature major, don't feel that I was corrupted any more than I would have been if I had not read them, but certainly think that I was educated a little more and given a broader world view. There's a difference between libraries and what is required as part of a public school, high school, junior high, elementary school curriculum. College is another matter. We are not talking about college, we are talking about state requires students, of course, to go to school at various ages, sixteen, seventeen, whatever, in various states. As taxpayers, parents who send their children to those schools are not giving their children to the state. The state, let's remember, as Ronald Reagan

told us during the campaign, is supposed to be the servant of the people. Not the other way around. And I find nothing wrong with parents going in and raising questions about certain materials, including books, that are being used and taught as fact that conflict with the values that they are trying to inculcate in their children. I, at the same time, would be opposed to any witchhunt kind of thing, where every group has a say on what book can be read and what book cannot be read. I think the best way to approach this is openness. A lot of people are fearful of the educational system because they don't understand it, and a lot of people are sealed inside the education system, are fearful of some of the more screwball far right groups who want to, you know, blacken out certain people in National Geographic magazine with a Magic Marker because they are afraid they will corrupt the morals of the impressionable young boys. So I, you know, you are always going to have your fringe groups in everything, on the left, on the right, and I think the, I think the center position with moderation, with some kind of reasonable background is the approach that we would take. But I am opposed to any effort to censor libraries. Libraries are different from public schools, very quickly, because you have a choice to go into libraries and to take out or not take out. That's the distinction I would make. Oh, my goodness, yes, right here.

Q: At one point you talked about _____ you made an analogy to abortion--

Thomas -20-

THOMAS: Yes--

Q: Do1--(remainder unintelligible)

THOMAS: Yes, I'd be happy to. I drew an analogy between the 1857 Dred Scott decision, which depersonalized, or devalued blacks, as human beings, and therefore deserving of protection under the Constitution, and the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision. I just drew a couple of analogies there. There's a whole litany that I didn't bring with me of about eighteen different points, the similarities between Dred Scott and Roe v. Wade. I think one of the very important things to understand is that when you begin to devalue human life at any point, where does one stop? Historically, wherever abortion on demand has been allowed, in whatever culture, it has inevitably been followed, if not stopped, by infanticide, the killing of the newly born, for whatever reason, handicapped, don't like the hair color, or whatever, and then inevitably followed by euthanasia. This is not Brave New World fiction. Francis Crick, the Nobel Prize Laureate of England, has suggested, on a number of occasions, writing in highly respected magazines, that all newborn babies should be given tests when they are born, and if they fail the tests, they forfeit the right to live. I am not making that up, you can look it up. And granted, they are on the fringe at the moment, but if we knock down the first domino, which doesn't always, the domino theory, as we know, doesn't always work in politics, perhaps, but it always works in these areas. If we knock down the first domino, if we decide that, you know, during

this nine-month period of pregnancy, where The New York Times has pointed out in a cover story in the magazine section about six months ago, that now, because of new medical advances, that some unborn babies are being saved as early as four and a half months, granted with a lot of problems, and only seventy per cent make it, but four and a half months. And yet babies are being aborted in this country at five months, at six months, at seven months. Common law, not only in this country, but, from which we receive our common law from England, has always taken the position that one is innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, by a jury of his or her peers. And yet the unborn are victims of capital punishment, condemned to death by an arbitrary decision by one individual, the husband, the boy friend, has no say, according to the courts. And we believe that a woman should have the right over her own body, but we also believe that there is ample evidence that the baby is a separate and distinct individual in a hundred per cent of the cases, different genetic, respiratory system, and fifty per cent of the cases, relatively a different sex, and when in a very short period will be totally independent physically for life, from the mother. And so that is our basic position on that. Though it could be much better developed. The gentleman in the red and white T-shirt.

Q: You seem to base your _____. However, unfortunately those (remainder unintelligible)--

THOMAS: Could I interrupt you just, you have just made a very interesting statement, and I want to get your philosophical

Thomas

-22-

presupposition on, why? I want to stop there. And I'll answer your question. Why should Dred Scott have been decided differently? Please.

Q: Dred Scott (unintelligible)

THOMAS: Why?

Q: Well, I believe Justice _____ said that blacks could not be considered citizens of the United States.

THOMAS: But why is that wrong? Is what I am trying to get you to answer.

Q: Well, why is it wrong?

THOMAS: Yes. Why is it wrong, why is Dred Scott wrong?

Q: It seems as though that a natural born citizen enters as freely as any black slave imported from Africa, so why then should they not be citizens of the United States?

THOMAS: But I mean, what authority are you appealing to? You are just making a why, you know, philosophical thing off the top of your head. Why shouldn't I say that I want to own one?

Q: _____ an objective moral principle, and I'd like to leave the morality issue out of it.

THOMAS: Well, I don't think you can--

Q: _____ also--

THOMAS: OK, I am going to get to that. But the point, see, what I, I am not trying to trap you. But you cannot just say, out of your own mind, you can't say out of your own mind that gee, we ought to do it this way. You've got to appeal--

Q: I am not _____--

THOMAS: All right.

Q: OK. _____ like to leave morality out of it--

Thomas Thomas

-23- -23-

THOMAS: OK. Well, I think I've made my point, so go ahead.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE he rather less rights? Would you develop

THOMAS: The point is, you cannot appeal to me just on the basis of common sense, and say that blacks ought to have the same rights as whites, unless--

Q:--the differences are between whites and blacks and then you'll have the answer.

THOMAS: Well, there are none. And I can give you a reason for that, because that transcends your poor base for a philosophical argument, because they are made, well, now listen, hissing is the sound of an otherwise good idea invading an empty space. Now, let's watch it. Because, and this is the only, this is the only moral absolute that you can refer to, not Gallup Poll, not Supreme Court, and nothing else, because they are made in the image of an infinite personal God. They are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. That's why they're equal, not because the courts have said so, not because the Congress has said so, not because the Gallup Poll has said so, and not because you say so. You see. That's why.

Q: on that, grade 3.8 poly sci, little different book that doesn't hold an inevitable person abortion, however, it does hold his own moral objective

THOMAS: Where did you get that from?

Q: So now, I'd like to turn to question 2, Roe v. Wade. Medical technology is the basis for giving mother less rights, as you have admitted.

THOMAS: Wait, wait, wait, wait. Medical technology is the basis for giving the mother less rights? Would you develop that? I didn't hear myself saying that.

Q: Medical technology, you said, was responsibility for a baby being born within four and a half months, is that correct?

THOMAS: No, I said, what I was trying to communicate was that in crisis situations, where the baby must be taken from the mother, in seventy per cent of the cases, according to the cover story in The New York Times magazine section, of about six months ago, seventy per cent of those cases, the babies were being saved and growing up to live normal lives, because of the advances in medical technology, but that because of the Roe v. Wade case, abortion on demand, babies can be killed up to the moment of delivery, as long as they're unseen. That's the point I made.

Q: _____ trimester, in the case of emergency _____

THOMAS: No, all three trimesters. You go back and read the case. All it said was that states could regulate after the first trimester. It didn't say they had to. So you have some states that chose not to regulate at all, and right up to the moment of delivery, a baby can be killed. Now, the only difference is that in one case it's seen and the other it's not, you see. I don't want to debate the whole issue tonight. It's much too involved. But that's basically the difference. And I would say that most people, I don't know if any of you ever have seen an abortion, I have, and I think it's a much better way to judge a situation. For example, I am for everybody seeing capital

Thomas

-25-

punishment carried out. I don't know how you stand on that, but I think philosophically we'd be much better for some of my conservative friends, who say they are for capital punishment, to actually see it, and then I would feel much better about their position if they continued to be for it. And I think that a lot of people who are just talking philosophically about freedom of choice and human rights, ought to spend a day in an abortion clinic. Then if they want to come out and be for it, great. I respect them much more for their integrity. Yes, sir.

Q: I would just like to ___ a situation for you and ask you to comment on the different things that a woman could do. _____ support herself, living in a dormitory in this college who was raped brutally becomes pregnant and wishes to have an abortion--

THOMAS: Pardon me, would you tell me the difference between brutal and non-brutal rape? But go ahead. I mean, it's all brutal, isn't it, when, OK, that's all right, thank you.

Q: To continue, if it would be immoral for her to have an abortion? Can you explain what her other alternatives would be?

THOMAS: OK. The question basically is summarized, sophomore woman living in a dorm, brutally raped, and becomes pregnant and consider the moral alternatives, is that a fair summation of your question? Well, the nature of the question presupposes a utilitarian view of life. Now, I could go and give you all of the names of all of the famous people who were products of rape. Ethel Waters, among the more prominent ones, but even that would be irrelevant.

Beethoven was the fifth child to come along, in a whole series of retarded, encephalic, whatever. And Beethoven's mother, under today's rules and regulations, would have had an abortion and we wouldn't have had Beethoven. But even that, even if all, even if all of those cases resulted in famous or poor people, that is not, that is not the rub. The fact is that only about one per cent of the reported cases of rape in this country result in pregnancy. That's number--would you like to cite us your approved text on that? [Shouts from audience] Well, OK, thought you were, OK, I am going to get to it. That's number one. And like the Fuller Brush man or the Avon lady, those who are pro-abortion or pro-choice, whatever label you want to put on it, want to use this as a foot in the door. You can't sell the vacuum cleaner till you get to the living room. And they have a whole agenda to go along with this. Now, the child who has been conceived as a result of the brutal act of rape does not know that he or she is the product of rape. And I think that what you do in that kind of a situation, you try to preserve and enhance both lives. You don't solve one brutality by creating another one. You don't detract from one trauma, the trauma of rape, the violation of rape, by creating another trauma and another violation. I think that you put the child up for adoption, you care for the woman. Now, let me say one other thing about abortion. And this is one of the things I am speaking to, among my conservative friends, and Jerry Falwell has just announced a program to do something about this. I think it is cruelty to say on one hand that I

Thomas

-27-

am going to pass a law on one hand outlawing abortions, and we would accept the life of the mother, by the way, we are not totally against it in every case, but we would accept the life of the mother, and not also extend the hand of compassion on the other side to try to redress the economic or relational problems that have caused the woman to seek the abortion in the first place, other than the convenience kind. I think if a woman, a young woman, has been thrown out of her home for, quote, dishonoring the family name, by getting pregnant or whatever, if she has some other kind of problems that can be helped, I think the people who are against abortion, or pro-life, pro the baby's life, need to be just as equally concerned about the life that has already been born and to do something about it. And this is one of the things I am speaking to, among the conservative churches, the conservative synagogues, some of these others who have so been, been so active in the anti-abortion movement. You can't just say, no, with one hand, and not extend the hand of sympathy on the other. And for all those about to do something on this, it's going to be announced nationally on television next Sunday, if you want to watch the program. But I think that there are services now available to the, to such a woman, a sophomore woman in college, that counseling, medical, psychological, whatever kind of, economic, whatever kind of help is needed, if she will seek them out.

Q: Who pays for it?

THOMAS: Well, I think what we need to do is to, and we are, reinstating the volunteer aspects that used to characterize American society before the turn of the century, where the

Thomas

-28-

conservative religionist -- let me give you a little history lesson here. You haven't learned it all in the last ten years. Right at the turn of the century there was a split in the church, if you will. The Fundamentalists, as they are known now, --

END OF SIDE I OF TAPE

SIDE II OF TAPE:

THOMAS (CONTINUES):--the orthodox, went off to preserve the orthodoxy of their doctrine, the purity of the faith. And they withdrew from social engagement. What we now refer to as the liberals, and by the way, in the nineteenth century the labels were reversed, interestingly enough. But what we now refer to as the liberals, the social gospelers, if you will, went off into the area of social engagement and ignored the purity of the doctrine. Both were wrong. In the context of historic Christianity, there's no such thing as the social gospel. There is one gospel. The same person who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the light, no man comes to the Father but by me" also said, "Feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and visit those in prison." You cannot segment it if you are in that part of the church. You cannot. The one who said those things did not. So how can those who proclaim to follow him do it? They cannot. And so what I think we are seeing today, not only because of economic necessity, but I think because, if I may use the phrase that's popular today, of consciousness-raising in the conservative churches. They are becoming more aware of their social responsibilities again. Falwell announced four weeks ago the establishment of a family

feeding and clothing center in central Virginia, to be used for the poor in that area, to be used as a prototype for conservative pastors and lay persons from other churches around the country to come in and manufacture, or multiply the same things in their own communities. I think this is a positive step in the right direction.

Yes, there is a role for government. There always will be a role for government. Not only as the controller of the lawless, but also as a provider for the hopeless and helpless. But unlike the way it's been in the past, as a first resource, we view government now as a last resort. I think the pork barrel is empty. We spent ourselves almost into bankruptcy, and we need to reinvolve all of those people who were attacking big government. Government got big primarily because of our insensitivity. I am speaking as a group. Of our insensitivity to the needs of others. We created a vacuum, and the only thing I learned in physics, because, before I had to drop out because I didn't understand it, was that where a vacuum exists, pressure exists on the outside, rushing in to try to fill that vacuum. The conservatives withdrew, the others, including big government, moved in. Now, if we want to throw big government out, we've got to move back and fill in the vacuum. I see that happening. I am glad it is happening. And I am encouraging it to continue to happen. Yes, front row.

Q: I'd like to speak a little about the strong national defense suggested the Moral Majority supports. Does that include military personnel building up, or at least supporting military personnel in that defense?

Thomas

-30-

THOMAS: Yes, of course.

Q: OK. I have two questions then. Does the Moral Majority support women in the military, and if so, then why does it not support ERA to help underright people for those women who support their country in times of crisis?

THOMAS: OK, let me, I will answer that, but I, do you mean to presuppose by that question that ERA would allow women to do certain things in the service that they want to do, now that they are kept from doing for some reason?

Q: No. What I am suggesting is women who are in the military or who have and/or will be in the military, that the ERA will help them throughout their life, not just while they are in the military. By passing the amendment.

THOMAS: OK. I would disagree with the premise, but I will seek to answer the question. We support the rights and, of women, to hold, to get equal pay for equal work, to do anything that their abilities and talents and education would allow them to do, alongside of men. This is not a right that we grant, that we, like certain Arab states are now saying, well, we might support Israel's right to exist. Well, that is a terrible condescension. As Abba Eban noted in The New York Times a couple of months ago, big deal! We're there. What do you mean they support our right to exist? We don't have any rights to give women. Women have rights. Again, going back to the little mini-debate we had here, because they are made in the image of the same infinite personal God, and are endowed with the same rights as men are, inalienable. We do believe, however, and I think it's defensible, that the Congress has determined, as the

Supreme Court noted in ruling against Jimmy Carter's unilateral action in trying to include women in the draft, that it is not the sense of Congress, which is to say, the will of the majority of the American people, to draft women for combat. Now, I think that if women want to volunteer for combat, and if they are judged by their superior officers, men or women, as being fit for combat, then they should have the right to participate in combat. And I have a few people I'd like to see go in the front lines. But, you know, OK, what about pro-life? That's usually the next question. How can you be in favor of the unborn babies and be in favor of war, pro-military, or pro-war, whatever.

Q: You don't solve one brutality by creating another one.

THOMAS: OK. Fair enough. That is a good rejoinder, and I'd like, now, one at a time now. I am, you know, I am limited by space and time here. We'll let you make your speech in just a minute. I think that most people philosophically will understand the difference, and I want to develop this point a minute, of the, between an innocent, unborn baby who has never had an opportunity to make any choice at all, including the right to be born, and individuals who have the choices as to whether they wish to serve in the military or not, either by, and if not, either through legal means, such as conscientious objection, which is a legitimate, and, I believe, defensible and morally correct position for those who can prove that it is a part of their either religious belief or philosophical belief, and have been consistent in it. Or illegally escaping to Canada and hoping for a forgiveness a few years hence, as was the case under the Goodell(?) commission, following the Vietnam war. But, so I think there are ways to avoid that. Now, unfortunately

there are not, there are not ways to avoid every responsibility that the state requires of someone. And some of them are very distasteful. I have served in the Army during the Vietnam war period, not because I wanted to, not because I believed in the war effort, not because I was thrilled about earning ninety dollars a month, not because I have got any kind of great approval from my peers, which I did not. I served, as quaint as this may sound, as nineteenth-century Victorian as this may sound, because my country required it of me. And with the exception of a few speed limits broken, and a couple of parking meter violations, I have tried, by and large, whether I have agreed with it or not, to work under the law of the land. Those laws I disagree with, I work very hard to change, within the system. That is the beauty of America. And those who are opposed to war philosophically, religiously, or otherwise, have many avenues, not only in direct protest to stop what they regard as the war machine, but also individually to absent themselves from participation in it, whether it by refusing to pay taxes, or whatever. Now, the beauty and the, what has been lost in this whole area of civil disobedience, which Dr. King understood and was the last great practitioner of, ending my sentence in a preposition, was that the power in civil disobedience is not disobeying the law and then hiring a fancy lawyer to get you off the hook. The power in exerting the morality of the incorrectness and the immorality of a law, is disobeying the law and going to jail, you see. The power of the civil rights movement was not in marching through Mississippi and Alabama, demonstrating that the segregation was morally as well as legally wrong, the power of the civil

rights movement was Martin Luther King's peaceful approach and sitting in the jail with people taking his picture. That's where the power of the movement came from. But we've got people today who want to violate the law and then go out and hire you know, F. Lee Bailey and write a book about it, and they get off the hook and there's no power in that. You see. So you have multi-opportunities, many opportunities for opposing the war machine individually as well as corporately.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS: Oh, I chased a rabbit? Well, we don't think that the ERA, we, that's the central point of your question, I believe. First of all, I think it's a dead issue. I mean, there's no, no state's ratified it in three years, everybody is canning it, Virginia's probably going to vote on it in a day or two, all the polls say that's going to be defeated. Illinois has had it nine times. They've never approved it. The question of the illegal extension, an unprecedented extension, is still before the courts. But even if it weren't a dead issue, we do, we believe that in the activism of the current court, and current courts, you could read into that language whatever you wanted to. I wouldn't go as far as Phyllis Schlafly in talking about unisex toilets like they have at U.Mass, but on a voluntary basis, but I think that there are some legitimate concerns raised by that, including alimony for a woman who chooses not to develop work skills and live the life of a homemaker and a mother for fifteen or twenty years, and the guy runs out. It does, it seems to me that under ERA you would have a very difficult time making a case that he has any kind of obligation to support her financially, which

Thomas

-34-

we believe that he does. Any many other cases of that kind. We all feel that ERA would essentially help women in the military in cases--

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS: Are you by any chance alluding to service wives who are divorced and can't get the pensions?

Q: No. I'm not _____ have served their country-----

anybody else who has done anything to help their country out--

THOMAS: Any legislation that is not currently on the books that does not address civil rights of women, that would be helpful in redressing legitimate grievances such as the kind you were alluding to, kind of superficially but not specifically in some of the areas, we would support. But we are very concerned about how the activist courts would take an ERA with what we believe is vague and nonspecific language. Yes, sir, right there in the --

Q: _____ importance of media as far as forming mass public opinion? I wonder if you'd like to make some comments on _____ media as collecting money or as how much money they spend -----

THOMAS: OK. Comment on my, in the back you might not have heard that, my talking about the manipulation of the media and our use of it and that sort of thing. It's very important to differentiate between what you see Jerry Falwell doing on Sunday morning on the "Old Time Gospel Hour" and Moral Majority. Our only opening to the media, as it were, is interviews, talk shows, newspapers and a daily radio commentary which I write, and Falwell and I do on four hundred stations nationally, daily

three and a half minute commentary. As far as the manipulation of the public mind, I am reading a tremendous book that even people who are not mass communication, but you need to read it. It is absolutely incredible. It's written by Ben Stein, who is a frequent writer for the Saturday Review, and also a former, may still be, I don't know, but at least a former Hollywood writer. It's called "The View from Sunset Boulevard." It's a small paperback, inexpensive, believe it or not, but it's tremendous. It doesn't, here's a guy from the inside of the industry, writing about the beliefs, political, moral, religious, everything of these Hollywood writers, quoting them by name, a small select group of less than two hundred, who are determining what the nation will see about itself. You know, when Robert Burns said, oh, would some one give us to see ourselves as others see us [sic] he wouldn't have said that today. He said that before television was invented. But the way we are seen today, the way our perceptions of ourselves are subtly controlled. Now I'm not talking about a big cabal, a big conspiracy. I used to have to put up with that stuff at NBC. Nixon's friends would come to me and say, oh, you people, you are all a bunch of Commies, trying to run our greatest President into the ground. And now I am with Falwell and I am called a fascist. So I guess I've come full circle. But you know, shows you people's perceptions. They see what they want to see, and ignore what they want to ignore, rather than examining the facts. I am not talking about a conspiracy, but I am talking about a common mindset. These people are cut from basically the same philosophical mold, they hold basically

Thomas

-36-

the same world view, they go to one another's parties, they have very little input from any other group other than their peers. That's the kind of control I am talking about. And you and I, well, you, maybe, have very little access or input into that medium. For example, I just finished a chapter in Ben Stein's book on big business. You never see any businessman or woman portrayed as a decent, law-abiding, caring person. Most of them are in three-piece suits in a drug ring. They are out killing people, raping people, slashing their tires. The poor, on the other hand, particularly minorities, are never portrayed in any crime situation. I am not saying that all businessmen are, they're not, no, no, I'm serious, I'm serious. You never see a, no, come on, come one, give me a break. The, I do, look, give me the credit for having spent twenty-one years in television and knowing a little bit, though you may not agree with my conclusions, a little bit about the medium, OK? I've been in it longer than some of you have been on the earth, so I do know a little bit about the business I spent so much time in.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS: I'm going to get to that. But I am talking about the people who shape opinions. All right, now how we use the media, it's like responding to a, a fly responding to an elephant. You have, again going back to these surveys, how they are taken. The Richmond Times-Dispatch took a poll, asked people would they vote for somebody just because Falwell told them to. Four per cent said, yes, they would. Conclusion, Falwell has no influence in Virginia. Well, that's great.

Thomas

-37-

That's what you call your self-fulfilling poll. Falwell doesn't endorse candidates. And they might have, might just as well have asked, would you vote for somebody your mother told you to vote for? No. I am a big guy. I make up my own mind who to vote for. We, aside from the radio commentary, and occasional interviews on talk shows and with newspapers, have very little access to the press. And so what we are doing is forming a separate information system. We are using direct mail. Even some of our liberal friends, Americans for Common Sense, have finally caught on to this. People for the American Way. Using direct mail. We've got our own newspaper, Moral Majority Report, which goes out to as many as a million homes every month. We've got this radio commentary. We've had to develop our own sources of information to bypass the three networks and the major wire services and news organs, LA Times news service, New York Times news service, Chicago papers, the primary media conglomerates. We've had to do an end run, in other words. And that's how, basically, we are appealing to our own people for support and to get the message of our true position out. It's tough. But that's how we're doing it. Yes, sir.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS: The Moral Majority has no position on capital punishment, unlike the widely reported story last year by this guy Dean Wycoff, whoever he is, I've never met him or heard of him, up in the San Francisco area, who said that he was with Moral Majority, he believed in capital punishment for homosexuals, and it was two days before the AP bothered to

Thomas

-38-

to call me to check out whether he was a legitimate member of our organization, which he was not. But it was too late because KRON had already put it on the air, saying Moral Majority officials _____ capital punishment for homosexuals. Well, I've been on, I have struggled with this issue more than any other. I mean it. I really have. And I want you to know that I do not catch my presuppositions the way some people catch a cold. I don't wake up in the morning and say, well, how did that get there? I have tried to think out and be responsible about why I believe what I believe in. And have been, and have tried to be open to other information from people who disagree with me. Jerry Falwell believes in the principle, the concept of capital punishment, but he would say, and I would as well, that I think it needs to be very--

(BREAK IN TAPE HERE ABOUT 15 seconds)

THOMAS(CONTINUES): --a poor translation. The exact translation from the Hebrew is thou shalt not murder, thou shalt not commit murder. There's a big difference between--

Q: you will --value of life was--

THOMAS: Well, I think, you know, if you are going to go back to the Judeo-Christian tradition, I am not here to argue theology, because we are a political organization, but I will suggest this to you. I will suggest that you read C.S. Lewis' book called God in the Dock, which gives this articulate and well-based argument in favor, philosophically, of capital punishment, as I have read. I think that there is ample precedent, and, not only in the Judeo-Christian tradition, but in common law, that it is a legitimate penalty

that society can exact from people. Now, whether it's a deterrent or not, probably will be impossible to prove because you can't go interview people and saying, yes, I did not hold up the 7-11 and shoot the manager tonight because I was afraid of getting the chair. I mean, you, there is just no way you are going to be able to develop a legitimate body of information on that. But nevertheless, I do think that it is a legitimate, final, and very limited it should be, penalty that society can be expected to impose on people who have, with many qualifications, saying mitigating circumstances, as the Supreme Court decided the other day, five to four, but it is there, it should be there, it has been there, and I think we do need it.

Q: So the value of life is conditional?

THOMAS: Oh, the value of life has always been conditional, hasn't it? I mean, the point is, you have a born person who, outside of these parameters I have just mentioned, mitigating circumstances, legitimate defense, innocent by rule of insanity, by reason of insanity, you have a born person who knows quite well the law, and the consequences for his or her behavior. And when you've got, as I covered a case in Texas, in the early seventies, involving Elmer Wayne Henley, David Owen Brooks, and, why is it that murderers always have three names? Have you ever noticed that? But, in which twenty-seven bodies of young boys were dug up, killed. Another story: interviewed a man who had kidnapped the daughter of a Ft. Worth, Texas, police officer, raped her, bludgeoned her to death, drowned what

Thomas

-40-

remained of her in a lake. The man had committed other murders, and had said that it is what he is going to, if he ever got out he would commit still more. Now, you have a lenient court system that is letting people out of prison. They are even talking about releasing Sirhan Sirhan, here in California. Is capital punishment, what would happen if Charles Manson were released, which is not beyond the realm of possibility under our current court system. And what if he were to kill again? Do you have the right to be protected from such a person? If they are not going to keep him in prison for life, do you have the right, or your family has the right, to be protected? I think so. So I think capital punishment, it could be argued whether it is a deterrent or not, certainly is a legitimate end of society in certain limited circumstances. Yes.

QUESTION UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS: I disagree with it. I would also say, well, I would thank God we got it before the Germans did, but I don't, I certainly don't think it's a gift from heaven. Well, you know, thank goodness then, be a secularist. Well, they say, oh, thank heaven for 7-11, anybody _____ all one. Got a violation of church and state? You know, really, it's getting silly. You know the Declaration of Independence ought to be thrown out as unconstitutional because it makes a reference to our Creator. Yes, in the black jacket over there. That's you. Black and white, I guess.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS: Well, we get here into a real difficult area that I am not really prepared to argue in front of a student

Thomas

-41-

audience. The point, you know, it's the old, well, you know, I don't need all the boos and hisses, right? But it's the old idea, and I am not saying I agree with it or not, OK? I mean, I did wear a tweed jacket, not polyester, so give me some credit. It's the old idea that, you know, Joe GI is out there fighting for the sweetheart and the wife at home, right? OK, that's kind of underlying a lot of this stuff. You know, it may be stereotyped and all of that. I understand that argument. The sense of this country has been, since its founding, that it does not want women drafted for combat. And again, I go back to the point that if women want to volunteer for it, it, they certainly have many opportunities open in the service already, if they want to specifically volunteer for combat, they should be allowed to do that, consistent with their effectiveness and ability to do the job, just like, you know, men. I would be terrible in the infantry, I am too tall and make a good target. But maybe, you know, there are certain things that one must judge about another person, in terms of ability. We are not, we are really not all equal. I can't paint. I could take a million courses on how to paint portraits and wouldn't be any better than I am right now. So I think we need to take into consideration a number of things in addition to sex, gender, and all I am saying is that I think women ought to be given as many opportunities as possible, as men, in the armed services. And that drafting them is not going to make them more equal or give them more opportunities than they already have. As a matter of fact, it gives them opportunities men don't have.

Thomas

-42-

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS: Well, you know, I mean you are not going to be able through legislation. You know, to make men and women totally, completely equal. There are always going to be some differences. The obvious one you know of. There's no way legislation can force me to have a baby. I mean, that's just a biological, you can call it inequality, fact, or whatever, difference, and efforts by some to legislate a sameness between men and women, are different. I'm glad they are, personally. I know my wife is. But, at least the last time I talked to her about it she was. Professor Capps wants me to take one or two more. He doesn't think you can stand too much more depth, so, the gentleman in the blue jacket in the back is waving his hand.

Q":UNINTELLIGIBLE.

THOMAS: OK. The question was, what, how do I think the buildup of arms is going to contribute to arms reduction, and what action, if any, is the Moral Majority taking to reduce arms? To the first part of that question, I think that, my experience growing up, I wasn't always this tall, was that we had a bully on our block who tended, not tended, who exclusively picked on those who were weaker than himself. And that was an early lesson to me. I don't think it's any coincidence that the Soviet Union's adventurism in, their invasion of Afghanistan, at, its, adventurism in El Salvador, and Africa, and in other parts of the world, almost unbridled, before, during the Carter Administration, which was perceived as being weak and ineffective and indecisive, I believe that a case can be made that the

Thomas

-43-

reason the Soviet Union, at least not openly, although apparently they came in in Polish uniforms, not openly invading Poland today is the result of Reagan in the White House and the Pope in Rome. _____ Pope sent a message to Brezhnev if the tanks rolled in, he was going to stand in front of them. We think that strength produces the kind of respect that can lead to legitimate, mutual, verifiable arms reduction. I argued this point with Phil Berrigan on CBS, and _____ you don't limit burglary to your neighborhood by taking the locks off your door and eliminating the police in the neighborhood. You don't contribute to arms reduction by laying down your weapons first, against an adversary who has promised, his predecessor has promised to bury us, and has said our grandchildren will live under Communism, Khrushchev years ago at the United Nations. You do it like Nixon did, believe it or not. Nixon, who had his conservative credentials beyond repute, opened the door to China. Nobody else could have done that without being accused by the far right as being pinko, or whatever, right? I think you'll agree with that. I think Ronald Reagan has the best opportunity for real and meaningful arms reduction by building up what all of the experts, all of the military experts, including the nonpolitical Jane's Fighting Ships, have acknowledged is a very weak American military defense, up to a level at parity with the Soviet Union, and then begin a mutual and balanced arms reduction. Now, we need, why do we need to have it verifiable? Why can't we trust the Soviets? Well, twenty-seven arms agreements with five U.S. Presidents, ABM to all of the others, the Soviet Union has violated

twenty-six. They violated numerous times the Helsinki final act. If they were applying for a loan at the bank instead of for arms reduction, we would need not only an incredible number of co-signers, but an awful lot of collateral up front. Their credit rating is bankrupt in the area of treaties that they agreed to. They were, you know, starting right from Eastern Europe following World War II, agreeing to pull out as part of the Yalta agreement, agreeing to pull out of Eastern Europe and hold free elections. They are still there and we are still waiting for the elections. So that's what I am saying, that building up parity and then mutual and balanced and verifiable arms reduction is the best way to achieve meaningful arms reduction, and I think Ronald Reagan is for that. Anybody who is for war or for continuing this contest in my opinion is by definition crazy. We'll take two more then we'll stop, I think. Yes, sir.

Q: How can the Moral Majority _____ how can it support the teaching of creation in the public schools as a _____ and at the same time deny the right to teach sex education in the same classroom?

THOMAS: OK. How can the Moral Majority, well, all of your people who applauded, if you'd like some more information about sex, I'll be glad to share you all I know in about thirty seconds. You know, I mean after all, George Bernard Shaw who said, those who can, do, those who can't, teach. All right, now, the issue between creation science and the class and sex ed. I think we need to define some terms here, as we always need to do before we communicate. We think that any scientifically defensible view should be presented

in the public school and the students allowed to choose which is the most plausible alternative. In 1925, the Scopes trial, you will recall the shoe was on the other foot. You had creation taught, in fact, to the exclusion of evolution. It was John Scopes, it was Clarence Darrow, pardon me, the monkey's lawyer, who suggested, it's published in the Yale Law Review, that to teach only one theory or origins is bigotry. We would agree with that. Now, if it's bigotry to teach only one origin of creation when creation is the only one that's being taught, isn't it equally bigotry to teach only one theory of origins when evolution is taught? We don't think the truth has anything to fear from free and open inquiry, and we think that the evolutionist is using the power of the state, the power of the court, to keep out, not the Bible, not the Genesis account, but the scientific view of creation from whatever point of view. Islamics have a view that they can defend scientifically, present that. If the Buddhists have a scientifically defensible evidence, present that. What's the matter with considering all views? Why use the power of the state to force only one view, which even the evolutionists can't agree on, and in the Time magazine story on Leaky, they had three or four evolutions, and said anyhow, he's crazy, this is the way it really happened. So not even they have a unified view of it. What's wrong in academic freedom, considering all of these things?

Now, the area of sex education. We are not opposed to sex education in the public schools, as many times as people have said that about us. We are opposed to sex indoctrination,

Thomas

-46-

starting from a particular world view that there is no right and wrong, not teaching about the value of commitment in marriage, in which sex can be most fulfillingly expressed, but saying it's all up for grabs, pardon the pun, it's all up for, you know, there is no right or wrong, everything is relative, what we are, we are in a big supermarket, and we're pushing our carts down the aisle of morality, and over here, we select a can of bisexuality, and over here, a bottle of premarital sex, and over here, a jar of extramarital sex, and over here, it doesn't matter, whatever choice is right, because there is no right or wrong. That's what we are opposed to. We don't think there is anything wrong with teaching the joy of commitment, and love, and sex within marriage, while certainly granting the civil rights of those who wish to practice otherwise to do so. Opening, sure, open inquiry. I think that you need to explore the various realities of life, but I don't think you need to either endorse them or say it doesn't matter, it's all up to you, go out and try it for thirty days with a money back guarantee. The only trouble is, you don't get your money back.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

THOMAS: Ah, now you are talking about a subject on which I do have some authority to speak. I, not that I haven't before. I referred to very thoroughly, including many of Mary Calderone's writings, one of the primary, you know, patron saints of the sexual indoctrinators, before doing "Sixty Minutes" with Mike Wallace. I also had him on tape with some slurs. I haven't released mine yet. But Mary Calderone in her new book, believe it or not, you

Thomas

-47-

can look it up yourself, defends incest, and defends a lot of shall we--

Q: What book so we can look it up?

THOMAS: What's the name of the book so we can look it up, it's the Family, wait a second, it starts with Family, I think it's McGraw-Hill that publishes it, The Family Book of Sex Education, or the Family Book of Sex. It has the Family in it. It is a new book, with Mary Calderone. It's in the, it's in, it's not only in the glossary, it's a little vague in the glossary, but in the context of the book itself, it is in there. Mike Wallace said, let me see that. I had it with me. He said, you're right, it does. He didn't carry that part on "Sixty Minutes," naturally.

Our feeling is about sex ed, look, if we approach driver ed, for example, in high school, right, the way we approach sex ed, we'd all, all the administrators and teachers would be run out of school. The first day of driver ed, you don't walk in and they don't say, hey, here are the keys, there is the car, go out and learn the rules of the road. They don't say it. No, you've got to take six months of classroom. And then you go out with a bunch of other people, and maybe a double steering wheel, and the instructors put on the brake and everything, and you got to learn the rules of the road. Right? I mean, maybe they didn't do that in California, where you've got so many screwy drivers out here. But the rest of the country is doing it that way, you know? But it's just said, hey, here are the keys to your body, now you just go out and learn the rules of the road, and if you get in a wreck, well, that's just too bad. That's not my

Thomas

-48-

responsibility. We don't think that's honest to young people. We really don't. Thank you for the opportunity of sharing some of these things with you.

END OF THOMAS SECTION OF TAPE