

People for the American Way  
2-1-82

-1-

CAPPS: The first time I had the privilege of standing before you, I said that I was not George McGovern. I'd also like to say that I am not Cal Thomas. Cal Thomas was here last week, and next week we have a visit from, can everyone hear from the back? No? I was about to say that next week, how's that in the back? Next week we have William Billings, who is the president of a group called the National Christian Action Coalition. If you are interested in the present work of the National Christian Action Coalition, I would like to refer you to the, to page 25 of today's Wall Street Journal, where there is an article under the title, "Reagan's Bill on Racial Bias Faces Trouble." And it's about the situation that, at Bob Jones University, and the school system in North Carolina, and the person who is featured most prominently in commenting on that situation is William Billings, the president of the National Christian Action Coalition, who will be here next time. We have some literature from Mr. Billings' book available in the front of the room. And I would like you to read that between now and then, so that our discussion of that topic can be more pointed. There, with a class of this size, I have considerable expenses involved in duplicating material. So if you wouldn't mind, I've got a box up here which says "White Paper Only," and I would like to ask you to contribute 25¢ toward the reproduction of that material and all the materials up in the front. And we can probably do that during the break. How is the sound system now? Am I coming through in the back OK? Bob O'Brien gave me several

announcements to read. First of all, the AS notes are available in the class to the notetaking service in the UCEN. Secondly, there will be a voluntary discussion section this Wednesday, in fact, all succeeding Wednesdays, in Phelps 1425, that's Wednesday afternoon with Bob O'Brien, beginning at two o'clock. Next announcement: Bob O'Brien's office hours, these are all about Bob O'Brien, Bob O'Brien's office hours have changed to Wednesdays, immediately following the discussion in South Hall 4708. South Hall 4708, for Bob O'Brien's office hours. Let's see, don't forget that all the tapes of the previous lectures have been made and are available through the language labs. Last week when Cal Thomas was here, I interviewed Mr. Thomas through the resources of the learning lab, and I think that we will announce next time when that video tape will be available for you to watch if you will be interested in doing that. We did the same thing this afternoon with representatives from People for the American Way. And that tape will also be available, and we can make that announcement next week. This is our fourth meeting, and we've met in a different room on each occasion. I think we are here for the rest of the quarter. Well, I think we are here anyway. And there are a lot of people that need to be thanked for making all this possible. First of all, I made some kind of offhand remarks last week about the Daily Nexus, a paper that I do read in the morning before I read the Wall Street Journal, and I'd like to thank Mitchell Cohen and Chris Miller and Eve Dutton and John Christ for all the articles

they have written about the class, and for all the notices they have put in the paper about changing the location. We have also gotten very good press coverage for this class. Jerry Rankin of the Santa Barbara News-Press and Joan Walsh of Santa Barbara News and Review have reviewed the lectures and have made their reviews available to the larger public. Of KEYT, Carol Howard, Christine Kraft, covered this tonight. KSBY, KOCY, Joan McGruder and Mel Garber and the Public Information Office, have done a tremendous amount of work, and David Chapman and Bobby Kelly and others, I know I am forgetting names, in learning resources, have done a great deal to put all of this together. I take as much time as I can with the announcements, because that's the only lecture time I have allowed myself, but I will have a chance, I hope, before the quarter is over, to give you more of my own thoughts on this topic. This is a topic that is developing right before our eyes. Every time we, everytime one picks up a newspaper, you can find some reference to the topic that we are discussing in the class. For example, there were several items in the paper today, both in the LA Times and the Wall Street Journal, and there is a television program tonight at nine o'clock, "Pray TV," which has something directly to do with the topic of this course. I am not going to watch that one, because if we get out in time I am going home to watch World War III. And there are some principles involved in studying a topic of this kind in the way that we have done it. I was able to say this afternoon on the

television program that I have always felt that religious studies is about religion and religion is about human life, and religious studies there fore is not simply about religious studies. I think the same thing is true about political science. What I am suggesting is that the world is unitary, that the academic world can be correlated with other public worlds, political worlds, economic worlds, social worlds. And what we do in the university, I believe, is to find spots and create the connections. So in this class we have the opportunity to bring these several components together to make these connections more explicit. We are going to do this again tonight. We have asked representatives of the various political interest groups that we are studying to make presentations to the class. Last week we heard from a representative for the Moral Majority. Tonight we have a stellar cast representing People for the American Way. Next week it will be the National Christian Action Coalition. Then that will be about as much as we will do in terms of presenting the political interest groups, as it were, from the inside. The task we have from that point is to provide the interpretation and we will also do all of that together. The, there are several people who are, have come up from Los Angeles today to be with us tonight, representing People for the American Way. I am going to mention their names now, and then they will introduce themselves as they speak. Tracy Sussman is the western regional director; Stanley Sheinbaum is a member of the board of advisers; Leon Sullivan is closely connected with

the work of People for the American Way; David Soul is here tonight; we also have Celia Lowe, Pam Lopez, and Elsa Myers, to get us, again, a tremendous job in coordinating the entire program. I am going to call first on Stanley Sheinbaum. Stanley is a, is intimately connected with the University of California, being a regent of the University of California. He is also an economist, an author, a member, as I said, of the board of advisers of People for the American Way, associated, an officer of the American Civil Liberties Union, a civil libertarian, a former Fellow of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and that makes him a former resident of the City of Santa Barbara. It is a great pleasure to call upon Stanley Sheinbaum for the first presentation.

SHEINBAUM: Thank you very much, I am pleased to be here. These are all old hunting grounds for me. I actually taught here one year. I was not invited back, until the governor appointed me as regent. And as a regent, I was glad to hear the, Dr. Capps asking for twenty-five cents, except I wish he had asked for thirty-five cents. We are getting into a time when we need it.

But I am here in another capacity, not as regent. I am here as public citizen, however you want to describe it, someone who is on the board of advisers of People for the American Way. People for the American Way is an educational organization that was really put into place by Norman Lear, the television producer, of whom I am sure you are all familiar. Norman Lear and I happen to

be very good friends, and I have been involved in this from the start, and I have some sense of how it gestated in his head. He had set out to make a movie on religion. The more he went around the country studying, talking to people about religion, he became somewhat concerned with the phenomenon that we now know as the new religious Right, usually associated with the electronic ministries as we call them. This does not encompass all evangelical ministries, but they are an increasingly important phenomenon in our society. And to Norman Lear, and to me as well, as worrisome phenomenon in our society.

The People for the American Way went into business roughly a little more than a year ago, by the energy and the creativity of Norman Lear. And as time has gone on, one thing has happened, and that is that Jerry Falwell and the Moral Majority with which Cal Thomas is associated, has tried to set themselves up as the entity or the target that People for the American Way is attacking. No way. We think that Jerry Falwell and the Moral Majority are of lesser import than the whole range of organizations, some religious. explicitly, some are religious specifically, some political. They are interrelated, the religious and the political entities. They are, the people who are on the boards of one are on the boards of the other. One of the things that Jerry Falwell and Cal Thomas keep saying is that they are the targets.

For example, Norman Lear is now producing for television on Washington's Birthday a TV spectacular called "I Love

Liberty." It will be on Washington's Birthday, it will be a two-hour live spectacular on ABC, Channel 7, and will have any number of major public figures, both from the entertainment industry, the political world. And immediately Jerry Falwell, without having seen the script, sets himself up as the target. He wants equal time.

I listened to the tape of Cal Thomas as he spoke here last week. And I am assuming that most of you were here at that time. And there are several things that I think have to be pointed out. I have the advantage of having heard him. He will not have the advantage of having heard me.

Any number of times during that speech, he referred to the hypocrisy of the liberals, who are trying to silence these conservative right-wing, conservative evangelical ministers, on the positions that the liberals do not like. But when the liberal ministers speak, Martin Luther King, if you will, coming out against Vietnam or fighting for civil liberties, William Sloane Coffin, then the chaplain at Yale University, fighting also for civil liberties, civil rights, the minorities, and against the war in Vietnam. Cal Thomas complains that we don't come out and object to those religious ministers being political.

In no way do I, does Norman Lear, does People for the American Way object to anybody saying anything they want to say, be he a member of the extreme right, be he a minister of the extreme right or the extreme left. I happen to be the chairman of the American Civil Liberties

Foundation of Southern California, and Norman Lear happens to be the president. And we believe in free speech. So what he is saying is, what Cal Thomas is saying is a distortion. What we are saying, what we are expressing, is a concern and a concern that is a very profound concern, that religion and politics are getting mixed up by these evangelical ministers, Pat Robison, Jerry Falwell, others, the organizations, the Christian Round Table, the Committee for a Free Congress, the Christian, what's the name of Mr. Billings' organization? National Christian Action Coalition, to repeat, some explicitly political, some explicitly religious.

We think they are creating a circumstance that has a danger in it. There have been in history any number of instances where religion has moved into the area of politics and we know what the result has been. You can look at the Inquisition in Spain, you can look at Savonarola. The threat of religious people using religion, and that's a heavy qualification, using religion in political activities is a serious one.

Let me give you some quotes, and then let me tell you what I mean in a moment by, when I say using religion. From the Religious Round Table: We are a Christian machine, marching off to political wars. Pat Robison: It is absolutely vital that we Christians take control of the U.S. government. Jerry Falwell: When we as a country again acknowledge God as our creator and Jesus Christ as the Saviour of mankind, we will be able to turn this country around economically, as in every other way.



The Christian Round Table again: The Constitution was designed to perpetuate a Christian order.

Now, there are any number of people, I am sure, in this audience who feel that way about Jesus Christ, about a Christian audience, a Christian order, but there are also Jews here. I am sure there are Buddhists in this country. There are Hindus. There are ascetics. What happens to them in that kind of a world? But the hardest part, and when I talk about the overlap, the serious overlap, not in what they say, to repeat, they have every right to say anything they want. Most of them and I disagree about abortion. Most of them and I disagree about nuclear arms. Most of them and I disagree about gun control, any number of things. But what they say and how they go about it is the problem for me.

And how they go about it is to tell people that unless you take this or this or this stand on a particular political issue, you are not a good Christian. Indeed, in some instances they tell people they will burn forever in Hell unless their positions follow the teachings of these people, of these groups.

Let me give you an example of the kinds of issues that the National Christian Action Coalition, Mr. Billings of next week. There are fourteen issues. These are fourteen key moral issues. They include Taiwan, they include the SALT agreements, they include the position on gold, they include the federal debt, the ERA, the Department of Education, and South Africa. And all this is based on the teachings of the Bible.

Now, last week, for those of you who were here, what came out for me as I listened to the tapes last night, was the heart of the matter. At one point a student began to ask in the question period, Mr. Thomas about something that he had said, having to do with medical technology and the time, the length of time during which a pregnancy, an abortion, was still possible, leading into why the Dred Scott decision was wrong. Most of you who were here will remember that. In the middle of the question, Mr. Thomas said, why? The student had said the Dred Scott decision was wrong. Forget the substance of the question. It's not what I am addressing myself to right here. Why? Mr. Thomas insisted. What is your authority for this? Did this come simply out of your head? And it is in that that we find part of the problem that, I find part of what is wrong, basically wrong, with the approach of this radical religious Right. They don't want you to use reason. He keeps referring to the Judeo-Christian ethic. He is talking about the Bible and the Scriptures. Fine. But that is the only thing, the only authority you should use, in judging any of these things on the ERA or Taiwan or SALT or whatever these secular political issues are. Do not use reason yourself. This idea about Dred Scott came out of your mind, with no authority? You are not to use reason, was the implication of Cal Thomas the other night.

Part of the trick is that you are to use the Bible as interpreted by whom? As interpreted by these ministers.

And then you have to ask yourself, from whence comes the authority that they are the sole interpreters of the Bible or of the Scriptures? That strikes me as a very, very serious question. They deny the right to reason. They deny centuries of American development, Western development. They deny centuries of Asian development. But you mean you got this out of your own head? What is your authority? And the authority has to be the authority that Cal Thomas, Jerry Fallwell, Pat Robison, says it is. It's the Bible as interpreted by these men. Don't try to figure it out yourself. Why those of you who accept that kind of reasoning are in the process, are in the enterprise of reason in a major university, I find odd. But some of you do. And I want you to think about that.

One other thing Mr. Thomas said, how, three minutes left. One other thing Mr. Thomas said. He said we do not censor, we do not burn books, ban books, I'm sorry, ban books. He said that at the beginning. I was impressed with that statement. Later on he changed it. He said, well, libraries are one thing, schools are another. In a library you have choice. They are not out for banning, censoring books in libraries. But schools, it's different. Because there you are a captive audience. But on the other hand, and it's a peculiar problem, schools are an entity of the state, public schools are. Who is to judge whether it is that book or that book or that book that is not to be used? Do you want the state to do that?

And it may be, it may very well be, that the Moral Majority as such may be against censorship, but there are people in the general movement out there, in that part of the evangelical movement, who want the following books removed: Steinbeck, Of Mice and Men; Salinger, Catcher in the Rye; Huxley, Brave New World; Twain, Huck Finn; Shakespeare, Midsummer Night's Dream; Malamud, The Fixer; Defoe, Robinson Crusoe; Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, because it uses the word "bastard" and because it uses the word "bed" as a verb.

There is a humor to it, but it is deadly serious. They want it their way and they do not want you to think about it. They want you to use the Bible as your authority, the way they see it. Thank you.

SUSSMAN: One of the problems here is just getting on the stage. Can you hear me? Am I shooting at this the correct way? You have to nod or something. OK, thank you.

My name is Tracey Sussman. I work with People for the American Way as Western Regional Director. And I want to say I am very, very happy to be here today. And thank you, Dr. Capps. You know, it's funny. Dr. Capps asked us to come and talk about religion and politics. It seems to me that it reminded me of a story about a woman who died in the Johnstown flood. Let me tell you why. Woman died, started to go and knock on that pearly gate, and St. Peter said, whoa, lady. We don't have any television here, and all we have is good conversation. So in order to get into this place, you have to be able to tell a good tale. You have to know what you are talking

about, you have to have your facts straight, be educating, and also be a little bit amusing. What can you talk about? She thought for a minute and said, well, I just died in the Johnstown flood. I am going to talk about floods. And St. Peter said, fine. I'll get your audience together, and just remember that Noah's in that audience.

Well, that's the way I feel. Your own Dr. Walter Capps is kind of the Noah who knows a great deal about this subject. And anything we leave out I am sure he is going to cover.

First of all, I'd like to say that People for the American Way is an educational institution. It's an educational organization. It is not a political organization. I believe last week you heard from a political organization. Because we are an educational organization, I'd like to talk to you a little bit about education, or theories of education. I'd like to say that one of our theories of education is that people should learn how to think, not what to think. And in learning how to think, you will get a process which will last you all your life. I am a perennial student. I went back in my thirties to get my master's. I feel that I am close to you in that. We both have done term papers not so long ago. And being a student gives you a certain perspective that sometimes we lose when we are out of school for a while.

I'd like to tell you that the most precious thing to me in education is learning how to think critically. And by that, I don't mean putting anybody down, I don't mean criticizing in that way. I mean thinking things through,

finding out what things really mean.

And to give you some examples, I'd like you to think of a nose, just think of a nose. OK. Now think of a face with a nose on it. Now, were any of you able to think of a nose without a face, the first time? And didn't you see your own face? If your skin is black, did you see a black face? If your skin is white, did you see a white face? Did you? OK. My point is that we all start our education process with a set of assumptions. Those assumptions are our education, our families, our religion. They are all the things that we bring to a new process of thought, that we are, so we see things subjectively. And everyone has to figure out when he or she listens to a speech or reads a text, am I outside that text or inside that text? Where do I fit in there? What is my subjective climate of interpretation? And everybody has that subjective climate of interpretation.

I think that one of the important things is to approach anyone who says they are infallible, and question them. I would never believe anyone that claims infallibility.

The second thing, I think that information changes so fast that we have to learn the processes that are going to hold us over in the future. Let me give you an example, when I am talking to my kids, OK? What do I mean about information changing? I mean, how many of you have ever gone to a party and had a whole conversation about the dates of the Civil War? Or your multiplication table? Those now can be gotten off a calculator. OK. So

you don't need the little bits of information as much as you need to know how to get the information. But how are you going to think, or get your mind so creative, so full of juices, that you are going to be able to solve the problems of the future that we don't even know what the questions are?

Well, I don't have all the answers to that, that's for sure. But one thing I can tell you is a story. I want you, this side of the room, to create a monster. You know, like to see Godzilla stomping through Tokyo on Saturday morning, right? OK. Think of some attributes of the most horrible monster you can think of. OK. I'll give you one. The monster has gigantic BO, and wherever it goes, it just smells for a hundred miles, OK? That's one. Let's say you thought of that.

Now, this side, I want you to think of how you conquer that monster. All right. A million-ton megaton can of Ban? Who knows? But you can go down and you can create something out of your imagination, and now you have to solve the problem. Switch. Think of smog, think of air pollution. That's your problem. That's your monster. Solve it. You see the creativity. Now, tomorrow's problem will be a new monster. But if you think creatively that you can solve the problem, you will be able to find answers. Thank you.

All right, one other thing. Know the difference between fact and opinion. What is a news story? What is the editorial content, and what is fiction? And you

know, a lot of people don't know. They don't think about it. And I'll give you an example. We were hosts to a Nigerian student who lived with us, and he had never seen television before. He came to live with us, and he watched the news, and he watched the ads, and he watched everything. And one Friday night he came running home, and I said, What are you so anxious for? And he said, Oh, he said, I have to see Sanford. And I said, Oh? And he said, Oh, yeah, I want to know what's going to happen. They are such a marvelous family. I just think, you know, he's just great. And he went on and on. And I said, Benson, that's a TV show. And he said, Yes. And I said, But it's not real. He said, You mean they're not a real family? And I said, No, it's a drama. He said, Well, what that I watch on television is real? And I realized that this man, this grown man, didn't know the difference between editorial content, drama, and news. And we spent the next six months practicing how to read TV. And he, it took him a long time to learn that he would not be more sociable drinking Pepsi-Cola, that it would rot his teeth. He had to stop believing some of the things that he read.

OK, I want you to think critically. I want you to know the difference between fact and opinion. Those are very important things.

And lastly, I'd like to say that what you heard last week, I don't know if it was fact or opinion. You're going to have to make up your own minds. I don't know



if it was news, editorial, or fiction. You're going to have to use your own critical thinking processes.

But I do know one thing. It's hard when you don't go back to the primary data. Does that sound familiar? Primary data? When you only hear about what people say about other people, instead of hearing the words out of their own mouths. And People for the American Way thinks people should speak for themselves. And because of that, we have an eighteen-minute film that we would like to share with you, that has the Moral Majoritarians, it has a lot of the radical Right politicians speaking. And now you hear it in their own words. Thank you.

FILM CLIP SHOWN

SIDE II OF TAPE:

CAPPS: Next Monday night we will be meeting in this room again. I know that this is not an ideal place to meet, but I think it's the best of the several possibilities that we have. Also on next week I will be bringing in some sample questions that you might think about for the final examination. I don't want to take the time tonight to talk about the final exams, or about the term project that you might do to satisfy a portion of the requirements for the course, because we still have some very interesting items to discuss, and we want to have a question and answer period tonight. And there has also been a request that we not continue on the full length of the evening, so that some of you can go home and watch one of two television programs, "World War III" or "Pray TV." We have guests here who have, I think I mentioned

"World War III" once before. I would like to mention that one again. There will be time at the close tonight for questions and answers, but before we do that, I have the great privilege of introducing David Soul, also representing People for the American Way. Some of you didn't know that. Some of you know him for his role in "Starsky and Hutch." I mentioned, I think I mentioned "World War III" once before this evening. He is also producing a film for NBC television, "Wounded Knee--1973." It's a great privilege to have David Soul here.

SOUL: You can do better than this. I can't do it, I just can't do it, I, well, as you may all know by now, there's a film on called "World War III," which I am not going to be able to see, either, but if you don't like what I am saying, maybe we can quit early and then go see it. I have another choice, too. My wife is having contractions, and I'm here and she's at home. But she said not to worry about it, that if it comes, it comes, and be all right. No, It's OK, they are a long way apart right now, about an hour apart. So I guess I'll leave when I'm finished, maybe.

I am not a joiner. I don't know how many of you feel that way about things. I don't join things. I don't like labels. I don't like politics particularly. I don't like to do what I'm supposed to. I guess a lot of the don't like is the child in me. I want to make up my own mind about things.

Which brings me to the People for the American Way. I have never really been involved in any organizations

in my life, though I felt that I always, I care a great deal about humanity and about people. But I find in the business that I am doing, in practical application for the things that I am trying to do in my own business, in films, that the things that I really want to do most have to do with issues that face every one of us. If I can't fulfill the word communication in terms of issues where I am listening as much as I am putting out, I am in the wrong business. And that requires me to listen as much as I can to hear what people's needs are, and try to the \_\_\_\_\_ that I have to respond. I don't think there's anything different between that and being a teacher, between that and being a minister, between that and being a plumber. And I find a lot of obstacles in my way. I don't have to go to the Moral Majority to find obstacles in that. All I have to do is to go in to NBC and say, I have a project that I want to do, and pitch a story, and they say, get me Joe on the phone. And they have a little conversation about it. And they say, yeah, we've got five medical shows going already. We had a show like that last year, got about a twenty share. I don't think we want to do that one. We're going to have a lot of problems, really concerned about standards and practices on this one. Who you got in it? Subject material doesn't go well. We don't like historical stuff here.

And all of a sudden we have the Moral Majority, this new right-wing approach to the control of thinking, added to the collection of obstacles, in David's approach to dealing with issues, as I see them, in film.

And suddenly, without realizing, without knowing why, I felt that it was important that I stand up with students, peers of mine, we are peers as students, and say, I, along with you, am going to challenge what other people say is fact. Because that is my right, that is my responsibility. And as I do my films, I wish that, I don't know quite how to say this, I wish the grace of God in a sense, in the way in which I approach my material, so that I allow the truth, or a truth, to be there.

That's why I am with the People for the American Way, why I am here talking with you. Because I feel the need to share that feeling with you, with these people, and find a way to get through what I think obliterates the real important issues of the day, which is, what are we going to do with our social welfare? What are we going to do with our unemployment? What are we going to do with this world at the brink of nuclear conflagration? What are we going to do with education? What are you going to do when you get married and have kids? What are we going to do with our elderly? I mean, let's, I get so PO'd sometimes, because I feel I am in a high-school debate again, dealing with a, nothing but a philosophical bull crap and a lot of labels that mean nothing to me.

I hope I don't, I shouldn't say just to me. I am a part of the whole. And I would like to try to approach this question that we have been dealing with tonight in

as positive a manner as possible.

I want to tell you a story very briefly about this film, "Wounded Knee," that I am involved in making. Wounded Knee, 1973, if you don't remember, or don't know about it, was a seventy-one-day siege of a hamlet of Wounded Knee in the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota, by the United States government. Or, depending on your point of view, was the occupation of that by about three hundred members of the various tribes, but particularly the <sup>?</sup>Ogala Sioux nation. It is a very delicate subject, having a lot of political, military, overtones, a lot of, there was a lot of clandestine FBI misconduct that was brought out in the subsequent trials. There was a lot of talk that the Indians were simply trying to use the press to manipulate their position. Several people and several producers have tried to do a film on Wounded Knee on that event. Most of them have come in with the idea that this is, you know, this is the event of the, I don't like the, the Black Panther event of the sixties, the Wounded Knee is that of the seventies, you know, and we are going to come in and we'll tell it like it is, and we are going to come in with our liberal attitude, or, going to really show it the way it is, be honest with these people, we're going to lay it out there, and we're really going to tell this story the way it really is. And everybody is going to stand up and they will love it, and

you're going, great, \_\_\_\_\_point, right to the\_\_\_\_, and they come in and they forget who they're talking to. They forget that they're dealing with a different culture, with people who think differently, who have a spirituality all their own, who have a language all their own, who have been on this continent and had land of their own long before anybody, any of us ever showed up. And they believe that by taking, because they have a finished screenplay they can come in and shoot the film, because they're from Hollywood, you know, they make films, that's what we do, we make films. A lot of people have failed. I don't know whether I am going to succeed or not. But an interesting thing has happened to me, which has given me, I guess, even more sensitivity to this whole issue that we're talking about tonight. And that has to do with the other person. That has to do, for the last year and a half, with going out to that reservation, going to the tribal chief, the elders, the women, the tribal chairman, the district council, tribal council, the children, students, simply talking a little and listening a lot. And finally seeking their blessing on what we're doing.

I am reminded about a year ago now, on February 27, which is the anniversary of the takeover at Wounded Knee, I was out there last year, and four groups of us walked from the four directions of the wind, on the roads leading into Wounded Knee, one from Manderson(?), one from Denby(?), one from Pine Ridge, and one from Porcupine, to meet on the hill where the Sacred Heart

Catholic Church sits, which was the headquarters at Wounded Knee, and also the burial ground of the massacre of 1890, Wounded Knee, for the services. After the services, we went to a hall, Porcupine Hall, which is a historical hall anyway. Every great great meeting that's ever been held on that reservation has been held at Porcupine. By we I mean Kevin McKiernan(?) and myself, another, the person who wrote the material for me on this particular subject. We went there, and we were two white guys at a weenie roast, basically, we were the hot dogs, you know? We were sitting up front, and there were six hundred people from that reservation, from all over the reservation. And we stood up, basically, and said, this is what we'd like to do here, what do you think? Well, there started two hours of being fried, of feeling that big, of turning red, turning inside out, wanting to crawl out the door, of standing up straight, of tears. These people got up, these people from Pine Ridge, these human beings, these people with such opinions. One man stands up and says, I've seen fifty thousand miles of film that Hollywood has come out here to try to make, and whatever happened to it? Somebody else got up, I know this man Kevin McKiernan. He was with us for seventy-one days at Wounded Knee. He took pictures. When the FBI came to get those pictures from him after Wounded Knee, he wouldn't give it to them, he wouldn't give the pictures to them because we hadn't had the trials yet, and he was afraid that if they got the

pictures that there would be something to be held against us. I trust this man.

Eighty-five-year-old Matthew King(?) gets up. I have never been to school. First he talks in \_\_\_\_\_ kota, you know. He doesn't care if you understand or not. And then for some of the people, young people, who don't understand \_\_\_\_\_ kota, he talks in English. And he says, I am, I am not educated, I didn't go to school. I am a historian of this tribe. I was here in 1915 when they shot this film on Wounded Knee, and when the United States government saw that film, they took it away, because it told the truth of what happened at Wounded Knee. I only ask one thing, that if you do this film here, you tell the truth.

Another man got up and said, we didn't go to Wounded Knee eight years ago so that some movie company could come in here eight years later and make this film.

Buddy Lamont(?) didn't die here, and two hundred after Wounded Knee so that eight years later we could make some money from Wounded Knee. He said, eight years ago we didn't come into Wounded Knee so that we could have some film made.

I am trying to think what else, there was one comment that he made that was really--eight years ago, he said, Wounded Knee was the finest moment in our history. How can we, these men who come here, when did any two white men ever come here to ask us about our opinion about anything that they did?

Even in spite of everything that's happened out there, there was a certain graciousness and a certain



openness to our presence. And there was, the word, I guess, is tolerance. That's really the word, the tolerance and the willingness in spite, they had the power, they had the strength there to say no. They know how much that meant to me, to us.

Then came time for the decision. But there was no decision. The meeting just sort of fell apart, and there was a giveaway, there was a funeral there the day before, and now the family was giving gifts to everybody, all the family's friends. Kevin and I were sitting across, he was sitting there and I was sitting over here, looking at each other, saying, you know, what, I mean nobody said whether we, or this, nobody said anything. They started giving gifts away, and well, that's the way it goes. And then one by one, people from that meeting would come by and say, you got it, you got it, man. It's OK. You know, different people that deal with things differently than the way I ever learned. I always learned that we all talk about it and we have a vote, and then you raise your hand, and that's the way it's supposed to be. And here's somebody does it entirely different.

I don't have any, I don't think it means anything. I'm just, I mean, it means a lot, but I don't know what I am trying to say, except that I share that experience with you, because I think it's something really important to remember, that we don't let all this stuff that's going on around, all this talk going around, affect the fact that we, that we have to take risks, and that we have to use our energy independently, individually, to

seek the answers to those questions that we each individually have. And perhaps together, then, we find the full cycle. Thank you.

*Small voice*  
?? \_\_\_\_\_: A technical genius, you see. I think that the People for the American Way has a speakers' bureau that's working, do you agree with me? There's Leon, there's Stanley, and there's David, volunteering their time and I want to say thank you. Yeah. We started out saying, we want to put together a speakers' bureau that's not paid staff. We want to have people from the community come forward and volunteer their time. And I just feel real good, because it is working. I want to tell you also that besides the speakers' bureau, we have put together some little clips, little public service announcements and ads, because we wanted to get our message out a little bit. And if you have a minute, they're very short, I'd like to share them with you, because they're the products of our ingenuity, so to speak. Can we have the lights dimmed? And the first set of spots that we did. Do you want me to do this? OK. While that's happening, I'd like to remind you that if we could have the evaluation sheets, we'd really appreciate it, because we'll learn from it. So to hand them to someone up here on your way out, it would be very much appreciated. I'm going to stay here, it's safe.

## FILM CLIPS SHOWN

*Same female voice*  
? \_\_\_\_\_: After these were made, Goldie Hahn, Mohammed Ali, and Carol Burnett decided to donate some time to

People for the American way, and came up with their own version of what a little spot announcement could be, a public service announcement that said something positive that you could put in the back of your mind and think about. And I'd like those to be shown now.

MORE FILM CLIPS

? \_\_\_\_\_: You're a great audience. I'm glad you like those. Have any of you seen them? I'd like a show of hands, have they been, OK, good, I am glad to know they are getting out into the community.

Listen, a lot of you, I think, think that the yellow forms are, with your name and address, will get you on the mailing list. Guess what? We don't have a mailing list. We have a membership list. And that's the blue form. And if any of you would like to join, we'd love you to get on the mailing list, so you can get all the publications. But we can't send things out every month. We don't have the capability. You have to be on the computer to get that.

We want to just summarize now. Stanley? And a couple of sentences of summarization, and then we'd like to entertain your questions. And I hope that when you ask a question you'll direct it to a specific person or say, this is an open question.

SHEINBAUM: Thank you, thank you, Tracey, and thank you all for coming tonight. I want to emphasize something I already emphasized in my remarks. I don't believe these people, the conservative evangelicals, the right-wing

evangelicals, really want us to be full people. I go to the quotes that Leon Sullivan read at the end of his speech, by the, by Oliver Wendell Holmes. I think a life is action and passion, it is required of man that he should share the passion and the action of his time. At the peril of being judged not to have lived. We are alive. This is our only life as we pass through this one time. It was Pope who said, at least I think it was Pope, who said, I think, therefore I am. Do not let others do your thinking. Argue with them. I am not sure that everything I believe is that exact or that true. I love nothing, I am a liberal. I don't like to talk to liberals. They say the same thing I hear all the time and I say. I prefer to hear from a conservative so I can argue about it. It turns me on. This is the way it works. This is what separates man from animal, the ability to think, the ability to have an intellect. This is why we are here as we are here on this earth. Do not let them steal from you, as Cal Thomas said to that student, why? Where did you get that idea? Out of your own head? He is implicitly denying your right to think on your own. But the very differences in all of us, that's said seven different ways here, it is said an infinity of ways. And this is the only country that exists where the diversity is as wide as it is. This is what makes America. This is the tumult. This is what makes it exciting. We are all living. He who won't think is not living. Make it America, this is yours. This is the best message, I think, I can say to

you of all the messages you've heard tonight. Do it on your own. Listen to all of it. But think for yourself. Thank you.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM(??): There's an infinity of views on creation. I mean, in the generality, there are two views. The evolutionary view, and somehow a view that I don't happen to believe in, which is that the earth was formed ten thousand years ago. That's the creationist view. They are, they seem to be taking that position that it was formed ten thousand years ago. How do I arrive at it or how do we arrive at what is taught?

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM(?): Let me talk about the University, which I know best, being a regent here. The regents do not, under any circumstances, tell faculty what to teach. Faculty are comprised of students and scholars in the best sense of that term, who themselves spend their lives studying these various things. They are the ones who decide what will go on in the classroom. One way or another, we do not influence that at all in any way. What we do, who, get, are people who develop the respect of their colleagues, to teach whatever it is they think best. And among them you get a wide disparity. But we want it all taught. But it's to be judged by the faculty, by the people who've done the hard work and studied it, not by people like me, who have been appointed politically.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM: The education community, with its own scholars, determines this. It is not determined by the state. But some of the right-wing evangelicals want the state to step in and censor the books and teach one thing or another. But it's the scholars who make that determination. It's, the whole point is to keep it from being a political determination. That's the point.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM: Was the question heard? Do we People for the American Way, and we are in varying ways associated with it, agree with the four points of the Moral Majority. We have attacked the Moral Majority as engaging in mind control. Well, I didn't hear anybody say mind control. What I said is that they, as with Cal Thomas last week, was saying to that student in that one incident, we don't want you to think that -

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE:

SHEINBAUM: That's right.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM: I don't understand that. I mean, what he is saying to that student is that how could you possibly think for yourself unless you are using our interpretation of the Bible. That's what he is saying to that student. And that's not mind control. They do use emotions to whip up certain attitudes, that I will agree to. But then I was asked, what do we feel about the four major points of the Moral Majority: pro-life, pro-family, read them again?

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE.

SHEINBAUM: --pro-moral, pro-America. I don't agree with their pro-life stance. I happen to believe in choice. I happen to believe that a mother has her right to determine for herself. I do not believe, as they seem to, that the state ought to be making that decision. That they want certain kinds of laws, where the state would make that decision.

On pro-family, I don't understand their pro-family stance. I just don't understand what it means.

On pro-moral, whose pro-moral, theirs or mine? That's the active debate I want to see. I have my morality, they have theirs. And I am willing to talk to them any time about my morality, and they theirs.

As pro-American, they have their interpretation what being pro-American is, I have mine. And I happen to be very proud of it.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

Female voice ? \_\_\_\_\_: Excuse me, can I get in? I know you'd like to get into the kind of nitty-gritty opinions about these issues that you have been talking about. The People for the American Way like to examine issues, not take stands on them. And you are wrong by saying that because we didn't mention them, we agree with them. You would also be wrong in saying that because we didn't mention them, we didn't agree with them. In our board of advisers, in our organization, we have people with lots of different opinions. I think if you got seven of us in a room you'd get nine opinions. But the important thing we'd like to stress with you is not a stand on one issue that

will come and go, but rather, the rights of people to have the opinions on various issues. That has been our whole stress today. And we really didn't want to get into an argument about the specific things. We wanted to address the broader picture. Is that OK? Thank you.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM(?): You think we're demeaning them in the film?

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM(?): Well, we try, I would love if they would make a film clip of me or David Soul or Leon Sullivan and let the clip speak for itself, as I think that clip spoke for itself. They were the subject matter, unrehearsed by us in that clip.

Q: Unintelligible

SHEINBAUM(?): Barry Goldwater?

Q: Unintelligible

SHEINBAUM(?): I couldn't--

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM(?): I will tell you that--I'm missing this. I will give you the name of Father Theodore Hesburgh, who, by the way, is opposed to abortion, you may be interested. I'll give you the name of Barry Goldwater. There are a number of names. A\_\_Heiskell(??), the former publisher of Time-Life magazines. There are any number of conservative people who are supporters of People for the American Way. One last one, over there.

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

? SHEINBAUM: I can't hear you--



SHEINBAUM(?): Well, this is one way of reaching people in sessions such as this. Some of it you saw on the, those spots which we used. We do print a newsletter, you want to respond more to that question? We don't have the monies that are available, we don't solicit on television. We don't have the millions of dollars available to, one of the things that intrigued me about Cal Thomas last week, he was constantly complaining that the media, the corporate media, meaning basically the three networks, never give them a break. Well, somehow I have the sense that the corporate media has made a national figure of Jerry Falwell. They have paid a lot of attention to him. And Jerry Falwell is a media genius. He does know how to get up there; he is, there are now any number of evangelical stations, evangelical networks, I don't see them lacking. But we approach it entirely differently on a much more limited scale.

FEMALE VOICE \_\_\_\_\_: And the media spots that you saw has consumed about a third of our income, about a third has gone to direct mail education, and about twenty-four per cent is used for overhead, which I think is really very, very low, nationally. One more, and then--

Q: UNINTELLIGIBLE

SHEINBAUM: Well, obviously there's a lot of responsiveness to the Moral Majority. That is clear. And understood. Why it exists and why it is successful in that sense, the other evangelicals as well, it's a new approach to

religion, not all that new. It's a little more extreme than it has been in the past. I think we are living in very rough times. The guidelines of this country have somehow fuzzed. And I think people seek these simple solutions--

END OF TAPE