CAPPS: --there'll be a colloquium, interdisciplinary colloquium, sponsored by political science, history, and anthropology, on the third of March, which would be Wednesday, I think, from three to five o'clock, Phelps 1420, and the topic is "The Politics of Aid to Developing Nations: Health, Food, Arms, and Technology." And a number of very distinguished speakers will be there: David Brokenshaw, Nancy Gallagher, Stephen Low, and a number of others. That's March third, from three to five, an interdisciplinary colloquium on "The Politics of Aid to Developing Countries: Health, Food, Arms, and Technology," Phelps 1420.

Now, with respect to this class itself, we have one more formal meeting, and that will be in this room next Monday night, and George McGovern will be back. I have been in fairly close touch with him since he was here the last time. I make my weekly telephone calls to his office, and I have talked with him two or three times, and with Christopher Dorval(?) at the times when Mr. McGovern is not there. And he is going to do us a favor next week of presenting a major paper that he has developed to give as a lecture in San Francisco the next day at the meeting of the Commonwealth Club. But he is going to give it here on Monday night prior to going to San Francisco on Tuesday. It will be on the nuclear arms race. And that will be the last session of the class.

I wanted to say something about the final exam. By

Wednesday of this week, Bob O'Brien and I will have all of the questions that will be asked on the final exam, ready to distribute to you. And we will have a list of ten questions. Of the seven that you already have as sample questions will be the basis for the first seven questions, and then we are adding three more. Number eight has to do with Robert Bellah's comments on the role of the counterrevolution. Number nine has to do with Professor Moltmann's comments on peace, the German-European peace movement. And the tenth one will be something we have to supply during the exam time itself. That will pertain to George McGovern's final lecture. Our intention is to give you the very questions that you will be asked on the final exam. We will give you these ahead of time, all ten, and then when it comes time for you to take the final, we will give you a list of say four or five from that list of ten and ask you to answer either three of them or two of them, depending on whether or not you are doing a project in conjunction with the final exam. I hope that's fair. I think from our standpoint it will serve our purposes. Since we haven't done it yet, if there is anyone who objects to that kind of plan, this would be the time to raise their objection. Everybody happy with that? OK, we have somebody, a couple of people happy with that. The final exam will be given twice. It will be given on Monday night, the fifteenth of March, and on Thursday night, the eighteenth of March. I think the easiest way for us to do that is for you to come to this room at, shortly before seven o'clock, on the night you are taking the exam, and we will have other rooms available, smaller rooms, for

you to take the exam in. We don't have those rooms now, and we don't want to, you know,put notes up on doors here and there, but simply communicate the rooms to you on the night of t he examination.

We'd like now, though, to have a show of hands as to how many of you think you will be taking the exam on Monday night. Can you count that one fast? I'd say that's about half. How many on Thursday night? A few more on Monday than on Thursday. About two-thirds on Monday night and about a third on Monday, I think, I mean Thursday. Everybody clear about that? OK.

I am going to do something tonight that is a little irregular. I brought some baskets from our house. I'd like to take up a collection, but before doing that, I want to explain carefully. This is entirely voluntary. The reason we are doing this is because the speakers who were here last week are not very well paid. The reason for that is that Professor Bellah came at expense to give that brilliant lecture, I thought, that he gave last week. I'd like to be able to pay him something, something in the way of a stipend. The university will cover his travel expense, but because he is a UC professor, there is no additional money available for any kind of honorarium. And I thought that you, too, would like to show your gratitude to him by making a donation, an appropriate donation.

Secondly, Moltmann, Jurgen Moltmann, came all the way from the University of Tubengen?, but he was here really over the weekend as our house guest, relaxing after giving the_____ lectures in Berkeley. There was no way that I could tap funds

to pay him. We have to go through all of the visa problems involved in paying somebody from Germany, but I thought again if we could raise a hundred dollars or so, as a sign of our gratitude to him, that would be very appropriate and I think he would appreciate it. Although neither person has asked for this. This is done entirely on my own. So I am going to pass these things in short while. Nobody is going to watch. I mean, if you are not able to contribute, everyone understands. If you can contribute something, it will be appreciated. It doesn't reflect on your grade. There is no kind of requirement involved in this. But I think it's an appropriate gesture.

Bob O'Brien has an announcement about the time this week when the video tapes will be shown again.

O'BRIEN: A lot of you have asked if you can view the Cal Thomas one again, so what we've done is getting some alternate dates. This Tuesday, from nine until eleven, you can see all of these tapes, the Cal Thomas tape, the William Billings tape, and the People for the American Way Tape. That's in South, 2517. They are half-hour programs, a half-hour program and a fifty-minute program. Also if that time isn't convenient, there's going to be a showing in the same room, but from two to four in the afternoon. Keep in mind that audiotapes are available for all of these lectures. If you missed anything you can listen to them in the language lab, and that there are discussions which I urge you to come to in Wednesday afternoon, from two to three, in South 1425.

CAPPS: I'd like now for a while, forty-five minutes or so, maybe a little longer, to present some background on some of the topics that we have been hearing about. And I have

a title for this presentation. It has to do with the conflict between Eden, that's E-D-E-N, as in the Garden of Eden, and Armageddon, that's A-R, we don't have a blackboard in here, so I'll spell it for you, A-R-M-A-G-E-D-D-O-N, Armageddon, as in the Battle of Armageddon.

And the way this analysis goes, is as follows. I am depending here upon an excellent study done by Morris Dickstein, a book called Gates of Eden: American Cultural Life in the Sixties, for some of the suggestions that I am working with.

Dickstein begins his analysis by looking at the nineteen-fifties. Let me say again, the purpose of all this is to create some perspective on the topic which has been at the forefront of our discussion. Dickstein looks at the nineteen-fifties, and he says it's a very intriguing time, because of the ambivalence that can be seen in American culture in the nineteen-fifties. On the one hand, he says, it looks like Better Homes and Gardens, like Des Moines, Iowa, on the Fourth of July. People are happy, eating watermelon, being able to salute the American flag, there's a feeling of patriotism in the country, all the lawns are carefully mowed and manicured, people seem to be well-fed, content, happy. President Eisenhower is in charge. There may not be any connection between those statements, but that's the way he puts it. And yet, at the same time, Dickstein says, if you look to the literature of the time, the art of the time, the music of the time, the content of the religious books of the time, you find

something that seems to be contradictory to the Better Homes and Gardens theme. And what is the contradiction?

Well, he says the most prominent literature of the nineteen-fifties is existentialist literature. And existentialist literature, that is, the writings of Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, the revival of interest in the writings of Soren Kierkegaard, the Danish philosopher, the interest in the writings of Paul Tillich, Gabriel Marcel, and a number of others, one of the characteristics of existentialist literature is its preoccupation with dreaded subjects, such as dread, anxiety, fear, angst, meloncholy, and all of that seems to be in contradiction, Dickstein says, with the more apparent mood of the time, which is happy, joyful, celebrative, patriotic. Now, he asks the question, how can this be? How can the nineteen-fifties, why would the nineteen-fifties be like that?

The answer, he thinks, lies in the events of August of 1945, the dropping of the first atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima. And the dawning, then, of the nuclear age. And he says that for all the surface tranquillity, there is this gnawing fear that the world may become involved in a nuclear holocaust, and holocaust, of course, is the right word, because the creation of the atomic bomb gives humankind the capacity to destroy itself, and the Jewish Holocaust, in the Second World War, illustrates that humankind may have that interior propensity, and therefore that event could very well take place.

All of that anxiety, that underlying fear, he believes, is reflected in the literature of the time. And therefore

the nineteen-fifties becomes a time of great ambivalence, ambiguity, a time of great conflict.

Now, he symbolizes that with reference to Armageddon. Armageddon is the famous Biblical battle, and from Biblical prophecy, a battle that is going to take place at the end of the age, a cataclysmic battle between the forces of good and the forces of evil.

We are talking about America today, so we can't talk at great length about the nineteen-fifties, and I'd like to move rather rapidly to the nineteen-sixties. We spend about three minutes on the nineteen-fifties. We'll spend about ten minutes, I think, on the nineteen-sixties. We all know that there is no great change that occurs between December 31, 1959, and January 1, 1960. It isn't as though everything changes because one decade comes to an end and another begins.

But there is a difference of mood, a significant difference of mood in the nineteen-sixties. There are various ways to come to terms with it. One can talk about the space program and the kind of confidence that is implicit in humankind's ability to send space ships, Sputnik and man landing on the moon, and all the rest of it. But according to Dickstein, the beginning of the age occurs on January 20, 1961, when President John F. Kennedy announces to the nation and to the world that this is a new generation of Americans, who are willing to (that's a lot nicer),who are willing to pay any price for the sake of freedom. Now, according to Dickstein, that reference to the new generation of Americans is literally true, literally true because by this time, by 1961, the postwar generation is taking its place in American

society. And Dickstein believes that most of the significant events in the nineteen-sixties can be correlated with the specific needs of that new generation of Americans at precisely the time that those needs are most explicitly felt.

For example, when that new generation of Americans enters college, living in the consciousness of the nuclear age, they call upon the educational institution to become radically changed. At about the time when that new generation of Americans is ripe to be drafted, they say, hell, no, we won't go. It's the time of the Vietnam war. And it changes the understanding of patriotism, military involvement, all of that, because they are living in the consciousness that the nuclear age could certainly come about.

Dickstein believes that in the nineteen-sixties there is a reversal of the mood of the nineteen-fifties. And the reversal of the mood is a turn to the opposite of Armageddon, and the reasoning goes as follows: Well, if the world could indeed end in a cataclysmic event like the Battle of Armageddon, so also might it conceivably end in the realization of human hope, the realization of human desire, and that would be the Garden of Eden. Now, the Garden of Eden is a utopian theme enunciated repeatedly in the nineteen-sixties. Again,one finds that in the literature of the time, one finds that in the songs of the time, music, the art, one finds it in governmental programs. The nineteen-sixties is the era in which President Lyndon Johnson launched his program for the Great Society. In 1965, a man who spoke with us last week, Jurgen Moltmann, published his book called The Theology of Hope, and The Theology of Hope was followed by a successor volume on the

theology of liberation. It was in the nineteen-sixties that the most popular song was the Baptist hymn, "We Shall Overcome." The nineteen-sixties becomes a time of liberation, a time of emancipation, appropriately called, appropriately existing under the symbol of Eden, because it becomes the era of the flower children, flower children living, as Dickstein says, in the Garden of Eden. It becomes a time when people are trying their hardest to become at one with nature, with the cosmos, with themselves, with their feelings, with their sensitivities, with their urges. It was a very happy time.

Now, the nineteen-sixties, the nineteen-sixties, shows then the switch from Armageddon to Eden. But Dickstein says in his book, about the sixties, he doesn't go into the seventies. My book on the Vietnam war picks up Dickstein's argument from the sixties up into the eighties. He says that at the end of the era, the end of the age, found Americans searching for values that they understood they had missed. Searching for values that they understood they had missed. So the end of the nineteen-sixties in American religion and politics becomes a time of considerable self-reflection, again considerable anxiety, people asking the question, what went wrong? Why weren't those hopes, those ambitions, fulfilled? What happened to those desires? What happened to the ideals of the Great Society? Lyndon Johnson retires from the scene on March 31, 1968, in support of the cause of peace, and retires as a disillusioned man; 1968 becomes a watershed year in American politics. It's the year of the

assassination of Martin Luther King, the year of the death of Robert Kennedy, the year of the bloodshed of the Democratic convention in Chicago in the fall of 19, in the late summer of 1968. The Tet offensive, the year when Thomas Merton died. And after 1968, everyone is aware that something has changed.

Now, the question is, what has changed? What changed at the end of that, what changed at the end of the era?

Well, a number of things changed. If you would ask Tom Hayden what happened, I think Tom Hayden would say, I heard him say this last year, Tom Hayden would say, it's affirmative action legislation. It's reaction against affirmative action legislation. It doesn't hit right at the end of the sixties. But it comes through the nineteen-seventies. And what would there be about affirmative action legislation that would create this great negative reaction? Well, as Tom Hayden sees it, affirmative action legislation is in direct conflict with the patriarchal, hierarchical system of society which had prevailed in America for some two hundred years, at least that, and which had prevailed in the Western world for a longer period than that, and had been supported from the very beginning by the dominant religious traditions of the Western world. When that went, many other things went with it. And the reaction against that loss of a patriarchal, hierarchical system was what surfaced then in the early seventies and throughout the decade of the seventies.

My own feeling is that it was the war. It's the war, not only the war, affirmative action legislation as well,

but certainly the war, because the war spelled, I think, the diminution of the American dream. Americans were involved in a war where success was very difficult to acquire, where it was difficult to know what winning mean, where there was loss of resolve, loss of purpose, loss of conviction, lack of self-realization. And I am going to say more about that in a couple of minutes.

For whatever reasons, by the middle of the nineteen-seventies, what at one time had been a collective American dream, the Great Society, entitlement for all people, everyone sharing in the American dream, what had at one time been a collective dream now became translated into purely individualistic terms. There was loss of confidence in the institutions within the country. Certainly loss of confidence in government. I am not the first one in this class to suggest that both successful Presidential candidates in 1976 and 1980 ran on an anti-government banner. Both were successful criticizing government.

Now, if you have read the book, Christopher Lasch's book The Culture of Narcissism, you get, you know something about the results, the implications, of the loss of confidence in the collective dream. Because what happens in narcissism, what happened in the late seventies, is a sort of full-scale preoccupation with the needs of the self, the needs of the individual person. It became a society in which individuals counted, and individuals count alone at the expense of the collective dream. Christopher Lasch says a great deal about individual survival strategies. And individual

strategies are how he describes jogging, eating health foods, learning how to relate, getting in touch with your feelings, going to Esalen, I think studying monasticism, learning how to be a mystic, and all of us, I think, have seen one or more of those things. And some of us are continuing to do, I'd say, most all of them.

Well, this is the narcissistic temper, and the narcissistic temper is what results,according to Lasch, when there is loss of confidence on the collectivity. That is, in the group, in the institutions within the country. And this happened, of course, in the late or middle, the middle nineteen-seventies.

Now I, as I have indicated already, I think a great deal of that had to do with the disillusionment that came about because of the quagmire of the Vietnam war. And as I have also indicated several times, I have been working on Vietnam. I teach of course called "The Impact of the Vietnam War." I haven't done it this year. I did it last year. And part of my work has been to interview veterans of the Vietnam war, and to get their stories. I think it might intrigue you to know that there were some fifty-seven thousand Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam. There were some forty-eight thousand of those who gave their lives in direct combat, that is, on the battlefield, in direct combat with the enemy, and about ten thousand lost their lives in war-related events, like being in accidents in Vietnam, being shot by their own troops, and so forth. But there have been more suicides among Vietnam veterans, there have been more suicides among Vietnam veterans since 1975 than there were casualties during the war itself. And that figure increases every year. And

according to Thomas Johnson, who is one of the chief psychologists of the Veterans Administration in Washington, they do not expect that figure to peak until about 1990. Currently there are 2.4 million, this is an accurate figure, 2.4 million American men and women who may be suffering contamination by Agent Orange, 2.4 million.

Since 1975, when the Vietnam war ended, there have been over a hundred thousand Vietnam veterans who have been jailed for one reason or another, and currently there are more than thirty thousand Vietnam veterans being held behind b ars. I have talked to the counselors of the Vietnam vets, and there are just not enough counselors to go around, there is now something which is called delayed stress reaction. It affects not only the combatants in the war, it affects their families, if they are males, it affects their wives, it affects their children, and no one yet knows what affect this is going to have on the Vietnam war generation, that is, the children of those who were involved in Vietnam.

As I indicated, I have been collecting statements by Vietnam veterans to illustrate this point. This one is not one I have collected. It is simply in a book called A Rumor of War, by Phillip Caputo. And Phillip Caputo talks about how he became disillusioned in Vietnam. He begins by saying, he remembers John F. Kennedy's inaugural address. "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." A line that was written by Ted Sorensen. But John Kennedy said it. And Caputo says, "This is what I wanted, to find in a commonplace world a chance to be a

hero. Having known nothing but security, comfort, and peace, I hungered for danger, for challenges, and for violence. I had no clear idea of how to fulfill this ambition until the day a Marine recruiting team set up a stand in the student union at Loyola University, in Los Angeles. They were on a talent hunt for officer material, and they displayed a poster of a trim lieutenant who had one of those athletic, slightly cruel-looking faces considered handsome in the military. He looked like a cross between an all-American halfback and a Nazi tank commander. Clear and resolute, his blue eyes seemed to stare at me in challenge. 'Join the Marines' read the slogan above his white cap,'be a leader of men.'" Caputo continues: "I rummaged through the propaganda material, picking out one pamphlet, whose cover listed every battle the Marines had fought. Reading down that list of battles, I had one of those rare flashes of insight. The heroic experience I sought was war. War, the ultimate adventure, war, the ordinary man's most convenient means of escaping from the ordinary. The country was at peace then, but the early sixties were years of almost constant tension and crisis. If a conflict did break out, the Marines would be certain to fight in it, and I could be there with them, actually there. Not just watching it in a movie or TV, not just reading about it in a book, but there, living out the fantasy."

Caputo continues: "Already I could see myself charging up some distant beachhead, like John Wayne in The Sands of Iwo Jima, and then I would come home, a suntanned warrior,

with medals on my chest. The recruiters started giving me the usual sales pitch. But I didn't need to be persuaded. I decided to enlist."

And there's much more there, but I am going to skip to the, Caputo's reaction at the end, when he came back. He writes: "I came home from the war with the curious feeling that I had grown older than my father, who was then fifty-one. It was as if a lifetime of experience had been compressed into a year and a half. A man saw the heights and depths of human behavior in Vietnam, all manner of violence and horror s o grotesque that they evoked more fascination than disgust. Once I saw pigs eating napalm-charred corpses, a memorable sight, pigs eating roast people."

At the end of the war, he says, when he came back, his aspirations had been altered, too. He writes: "I was left with none of the optimism, none of the ambition a young American is supposed to have. Only a desire to catch up on sixteen months of missed sleep, and I had the old man's conviction that the future would hold no further surprises, either good or bad. I hoped there would be no more surprises. I had survived enough ambushes, and I doubted my capacity to endure many more physical and emotional shocks. I had all the symptoms of a combat veteran, an inability to concentrate, a child-like fear of darkness, a tendency to tire easily, chronic nightmares, intolerance of loud noise, especially doors slamming, cars backfiring, and alternating moods of depression and rage that came over me for no apparent reason. And I am sorry to say that recovery," he writes, "recovery has been less than total."

Summing it up, Caputo says, "Beyond adding a few more corpses to the weekly body count, none of the encounters in Vietnam achieved anything at all. None will ever appear in military histories, or be studied by cadets at West Point. Still they changed us. They changed us, the men who fought in them, for in those obscure skirmishes, we learned the old lessons about fear, cowardice, suffering, cruelty, and comradeship. Most of all, we learned about death at an age when it is common to think of oneself as being immortal. Everyone loses the illusion eventually, but in civilian life it is lost in installments over the years. In Vietnam we lost it all at once. In a span of months we passed from boyhood through manhood to a premature middle age. The knowledge of death, of the implacable limits placed upon the human existence, this severed us from our youth, as irrevocably as the surgeon's scissors had once severed us from the womb. And yet few of us were past twenty-five. The average age was nineteen. The average age in World War II was twenty-six. Few of us were past twenty-five. We left Vietnam peculiar creatures with young shoulders that bore rather old heads."

Now, as I have indicated, I have much testimony on that particular topic. And the stories all go the same way. That is, the Vietnam combatant tells that, it's a macho story at the outset. It's about John Wayne, about Gary Cooper, about being a football star, being a wrestler, about being pro-American, apple pie, Chevrolet, the American flag, all the positive symbols that George McGovern was

talking about. And then they go to Vietnam, and something happens.

Some of you know Shad Meshad, who is a psychologist, was a psychology officer during the war itself. He is now my hero. I have dedicated the book, it's my privilege, not his, I have dedicated the book to him. And the line is: "To Shad Meshad, the one whose life has taught me the meaning of the war."

Anyway, Shad Meshad writes like this, or talks like this. He says, "I was from the southeastern part of the United States, and spent my entire life there. I knew nothing the northeast, or even about the southwest. And for sure, I didn't know a thing about Asia. So going to Asia was like an overnight event. The first thing I knew I was in Asian culture. And the biggest, the most traumatic thing that has ever happened to me was approaching the opposite culture, a completely different way of life that Asia presented to me. Sure, it was war. Sure, it was guns. It was blood, sweat and tears. But I knew nothing about Asians. The only thing I did know about them were the names that we gave them, both four-letter words, gook and dink. And our attitude was that the only good dink was a dead dink, the only good gook was a dead gook. This was my introduction to the culture of Asia. I went over there," he continues, "as I was told, to protect Asians from Communism. But I went as a health-care person. And when I arrived it was like, well, is this it? Without saying any more, I think that much of the guilt the Vietnam veteran feels is due to the fact that he went in like I did, and was used and manipulated. And he

had to abuse the culture to stay alive. Since coming back, he has mourned the fact that he never ever understood. And the moment he did begin to understand, he perceived that the American involvement in Vietnam was wrong. No, we didn't understand the culture," Meshad continues, "we thought, well, if it's Communist, we have the obligation to fight it. It didn't appear, it didn't matter that we didn't understand the language, their history, the situation that belonged to Van___, we went in like superstars. We are red, white, and blue. We are John Wayne, and we do it."

I want to read one more of these, and then make some kind of summary comments. I also had the opportunity to talk to a man named Fred Downs, who reflected, he is a wounded veteran, lost an arm in Vietnam. He won four Purple Hearts, the Bronze Star, the Silver Star, and he talks about what it was like when he came back and tried to enroll as a student at the University of Denver.

He says, "In the fall of 1968, as I stopped at a traffic light on my walk to class across the campus at the University of Denver, a man stepped up to me and said, 'Hi.' Appropriate thing to say, hi. Without waiting for my reply to his greeting, he pointed to the hook sticking out of my left sleeve. 'Get that in Vietnam?" he said. I said, 'Yeah, up near Tam Key in the First Corps.' 'Serves you right,' he said. As the man walked away, I stood rooted, too confused with hurt, shame, and anger to react."

Downs says that another event occurred in Denver, shortly thereafter. And this is typical of the stories that I have

heard. He said, "I went to downtown Denver to have my photograph taken of me in my uniform. The photographer and owner of the shop had been in World War II, and had been in business in Denver for many years. He asked me a lot of questions. I didn't want to talk about Vietnam. I just wanted to have my picture taken for my family back in Indiana. But he kept prying, asking me questions. And suddenly became very angry with me, because he accused me of pushing people out of helicopters, of torturing prisoners, all sorts of things that I had never done. All I did," Downs said, "was to to a war, come back from the war, and while I was there, do what I was told. But when I left the photographer and went back home, in the silence of my home, I broke down and cried because I couldn't understand it. It was completely beyond me."

Downs pleads that he was only an infantry soldier who w ent to war because he was asked to do so by the country for which he fought. As he puts it, "I had it hammered into me in my first awareness that fighting for your country is a good thing. In any other war, my fellow soldiers and I would have returned home to our country's accolades. Then we would have picked up our lives and gone on with our futures, secure in the knowledge that we had done the right thing. But Vietnam was different."

Well, that's the point I want to make, that Vietnam was different. And the difference in Vietnam spells, as Morris Dickstein says, the breaking of the American dream. The breaking of the American myth, he says, and the shattering of the American dream. And since that time, there have been

many people who feel most of all like outsiders. The Vietnam veteran certainly feels like an outsider. But the feeling of alienation is a widespread feeling within our culture. And this is reflected, as I have indicated, in the turn to narcissistic techniques, survival strategies. It is certainly reflected in something I think I know something about, the turn to spirituality in our religious life, in the religious life of Americans, and particularly to the writings of the desert fathers. The desert fathers, of all people, were outsiders who had no confidence in the direction of Roman culture, and went to the desert to live, to eke out an existence. And it's their statements made in the desert that are being read with great enthusiasm by many folks who live around us.

Now, I want to try to bring this up to date, because I'd like to spend a little bit of time sort of talking about the future. I'd like to shift now to July, 1979. Nothing special in July, 1979, except that this was the time that Jimmy Carter, then President, called some of the nation's leaders to Camp David, to talk about the mood of the country. And one of the persons that he summoned to Camp David, was Robert Bellah, who was here last week, who, I think, was the one who gave him the word "malaise." Remember that President Carter said, the country is suffering malaise.

It's also in 1979 that the Moral Majority got started. And there was an interesting background history on this point. The Moral Majority began as William Billings said, in Robert Billings' basement, because they saw what

government was doing, they understood what government was doing to be an attack on the private school system.

Now, I think it's wrong to heap everything on the Moral Majority. I don't want to take the attitude that I am going to blame the Moral Majority for everything. I have written about this a bit. I put a piece of mine on the reserve shelf in the library, about a trip that I made to Lynchburg, Virginia, which was to have been the first lecture that I gave in this class, but we didn't, the first night we didn't have the lecture, but it's on reserve in the library.

And it, I think it's an accurate portrayal of what went on in the conversation with Jerry Falwell, and in my meeting there in the Moral Majority office,in the Old Time Gospel Hour, and the Liberty Baptist College.

So what I'd like to do tonight is to not, not really lay blame, but to try to put the Moral Majority, to place the Moral Majority in the kind of perspective that I think I am weaving. And I'd like to begin thinking about the Moral Majority by simply quoting from Jerry Falwell. I think Jerry Falwell is by far the most important person on the new religious Right. Jerry Falwell sees things this way, and Jimmy Carter could have said something like this, I think, but he wouldn't have drawn the same conclusions.

Jerry Falwell says, "America is in serious trouble today." Fred Downs knew that. Shad Meshad knew that. Jimmy Carter knew that. I am trying my hardest to be fair.

"America is in serious trouble today. It has lost its economic and military prominence among the nations of the world. Exercising influence and leadership from this weakened

position is an exercise in futility. Our leaders are finally realizing what many have tried to say for years, that the Soviets are liars, cheaters, that they are determined to conquer our free country and to infiltrate the American society."

Now, Falwell engages in nostalgia, which is one of the things that narcissistic people do as well. As I say, I am trying my hardest to be fair.

And Falwell says, "I remember the time when it was a positive thing to be patriotic. And as far as I am concerned, it still is. I remember as a boy, when the flag was raised, everyone stood proudly, put his hand on his heart, pledged allegiance with gratitude. I remember when the band struck up 'The Stars and Stripes Forever,' John Phillips Souza's one, we stood there and goosepimples would run all over me. I remember when I was in elementary school during World War II, when every report from the other shore meant something to us. We were not out there demonstrating against our guys who were dying in Europe. We were praying for them. And we were thanking God for them. We were buying war bonds to help pay for the materials and the artillery they needed to fight and win and come back." He goes on to say, gives us something of his understanding of the status of the United States of America. This all comes out of that book that I hope you have read, Listen, America. Some of it does. "We are not a perfect nation," Falwell says, "we are still a free nation, because we have the blessing of God upon us. We must continue to follow in a path that will insure that blessing. We must

not forget that it is God Almighty who has made and preserved us as a nation. Americans must no longer linger in ignorance and apathy," he says, "We cannot be silent about the sins that are destroying the nation. The choice is ours. We must turn American around or prepare for inevitable destruction. I am listening to the sounds that threaten to take away our liberties in America, and I have listened," he says, "to God's admonitions and His direction is the only hope of saving the nation."

Now, I think I understand what Falwell is saying. When I was in Lynchburg I heard him speak twice, and I, till I'd fall asleep, try to listen to him on Sunday nights. And I have sent for the baby feet, which have not yet arrived. I think I might like him if he were my neighbor. I am not sure of that, but I don't regard him as any sort of personal enemy. And my intention is, then, to try to understand what he says. He has been very clever in identifying the issues. His issues and George McGovern's issues are radically different. George McGovern and Governor Brown, liberals generally, I believe, are thinking globally nowadays, which I think is appropriate, thinking about ecology,of the environment, global harmony. Jerry Falwell is thinking about America. And he is thinking about the family. He is concerned about divorce, about abortion, about the feminist movement, about sex education in the schools, about pornography, about homosexuality. Those are the big ones. And he adds to that that there is a need for strong national defense, and it's important to be pro-Israel. The reason that it's important to be pro-Israel is a verse from Genesis XII:3. I didn't know that, but his

assistant, Nelson Keener(?), told me this. That the country, he who blesses Israel will be blesses Israel will be blessed, and he that curses Israel will be cursed. That's really the theological reason for --

END OF SIDE I OF TAPE

SIDE II OF TAPE:

-- the pro-Israel stand.

And I think the way, I think what Falwell is concerned about, well, first of all, is the breakdown of patriarchy. The breakdown of the patriarchal order. Giving rights to women is a breakdown, is a sign that patriarchal order has been broken. One of the techniques that he uses whenever he speaks is to talk to his audience as a family. It's Father Falwell, I think, not Father Falwell like a priest, but Father Falwell, the patriarch, the progenitor, the leader of the family. And every time I have heard him speak, I have noticed that he begins with family matters. He will say, "I was in Birmingham, Alabama, the other night, and I met Linda Tate's uncle." He said, "Linda, are you out there?" People look around for Linda Tate. He says, he is reading from a note, he says, "This is T-A-I-T, not T-A-T-E." And then Linda stands up and people cheer, and he says, "Linda, I know your uncle, too." Or he'll read a list of people that have recently become engaged. And he'll say, "I knew your daddy. I knew your mama." And he'll talk about the family, and the line there is that wherever Christ is present, where Christ is present, all the family members know one another.

Now, I think he senses tha time when, we have departed from

the time when the family was a strong institution. He talks about the forty per cent divorce rate. And he understands that there is a kind of conspiracy going on, that the public schools, America's public schools, are responsible for the breakdown of America's primary institutions. He is down on Robert Hutchins; he's down on John Dewey; he's down on all kind of humanists, of all secular humanists, all advocates of the humanities. I told him that,I was carrying a folder when I met him, I was going to a meeting of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and I just happened to have that folder in my hand. And he looked at that, and I said,"I am one of these secular humanists that you have been criticizing." And he said, "Well, if you are a humanist, and you have something to say, why don't you say it?"

Well, OK, I heard him say that. And then he went on to say that nobody, he doesn't go around knocking on doors, asking to speak, but people are coming to him and asking him to speak. And he said, "How many people have come to you?" to me, as he was tapping on my shoulder. I told him that I had come to him, I had come to Lynchburg and I was on my way to Baltimore. There's nothing to be said for that except that he is a very clever man.

But he understands that in a permissive society, a permissive society allows humanism to take control. And all of this had been trained on a humanistic philosophy. A humanistic philosophy was what Stanley Sheinbaum was giving us the night that the People for the American

Way were here. When he was talking about open intellectual debate, having a place, a climate for objectivity, for intellectual objectivity. And what Falwell objects to in that regard is that all the schools are doing is training what he calls "free minds." Free minds. He doesn't want free minds. He wants to form minds. He talks about educational formation, spiritual formation, and the reason that the alterative Christian schools have been established is to provide an alternative to the free mind approach.

Now, what's wrong with free minds? Well, free minds, or unguided minds, too easily become socialistic. He regards John Dewey as presenting a socialistic philosophy. And we all know what happens when humanism becomes socialism, because humanism becomes socialism becomes communism, and he says we all know what communism does. When communism comes into a society, the churches, the doors of the churches are closed, Bible reading is forbidden, evangelists are not allowed to preach. And I think I told somebody this story before. But he says, "We can get to the bottom of the issue between capitalism and communism with a thirty-day experiment." He says, "What we do is that for thirty days we suspend all rules of immigration." I am beginning to write this down in my notes. I think this is a hot one. And he said, "I don't care how you spell that. You can spell it with an e or an i." And he said, "You'd have people coming or going, but for thirty days we would tear down all the borders, no restrictions, and everybody like international musical chairs. Everybody can move to whatever section of the globe he or she wishes to move,

even" -- he didn't say he or she, I said that, he said he -- "and at the end of thirty days they stop the music, and you are obligated then to stay at the place to which you've come." He said, "Can you imagine," still tapping on the shoulder like that Listen America picture that you have on the dust jacket of the book, finger up --"can you imagine, can you imagine what would happen at the end of thirty days?" He said, "Think about New Jersey. New Jersey would be teeming with people. They would be all over the highways, they'd be bumping into each other in the bus depots." And he said, "Go into Russia. Start in Leningrad and go all the way from Leningrad to Siberia and look around." And his hands flew up like this, "Any Russians, any Russians, do you find any Russians? No, no Russians." He said, "If you look the whole country over, you might find two Russians, Mr. and Mrs. Brezhnev, and Mrs. Brezhnev would be packing her bags."

Now, this, that kind of simplisticness is what dissuaded George McGovern from taking on Jerry Falwell in a debate. But he is very sincere about this. He sees that permissiveness has gotten out of control. And when permissiveness is allowed to run rampant, it creates the possibility for socialism, which then creates the possibility for communism, and communism, then, is the enemy which threatens to take over the society.

I want to refer briefly to Jerry Falwell's understanding of the Vietnam war. I would also like to say that his is why I became interested in Jerry Falwell. I am not

interested in Jerry Falwell, really, but I was reading Jerry Falwell and I found that his books are full of military analogies. He says that what was wrong in Vietnam, that America was fighting a no-win war. Therefore the Vietnam war becomes a symbol of America's ineffectiveness. The Vietnam war, he says, illustrates the weakened nature of American resolve. The Vietnam war illustrates the enfeebled American character.

Now, the Vietnam war is not over. In fact, the Vietnam war may be over, but the war is not over. The battle goes on. The war continues. The foe is the same. The foe, the enemy, is communism. And the war goes on.

And this is why I think that his sermons and his writings are full of military talk. For example, this is one of his, came from one of his sermons. George McGovern quoted part of this, but Jerry Falwell said, "The local church is the organized army equipped for battle, ready to charge the enemy. The Sunday School is the attacking squad. The church should be disciplined, should be a disciplined charging army, Christians like slaves and soldiers, ask no question." He continues, "It is important to bombard the territory, to move out near the coast, to shell the enemy. It is important to send in the literature, it is important to send the radio broadcasts, to use the dial-a-prayer telephones, and of course to send in the money. It is important to have all of those external forces being set loose on the enemy's territory. But ultimately the Marines,

the Marines have to march in and counter the enemy face to face, put up the flag, that is, build the local church. I am speaking of Marines who have been called to God to move in past the shelling, the bombing, the fox holes, and with bayonet in hand, encounter the enemy face to face, and one on one, and bring them under submission to the Gospel of Christ, move them into the household of God, put up the flag, and call it secured."

Now, it isn't surprising that you can find the same militaristic, bellicose language in many of the writers on the New Right. It isn't surprising, because we are at war. In San Diego there is a man, Tim Leahy(?), who has written THE book, the anti-secular-humanist book, which is called The Battle for the Mind. And Tim Leahy writes in the same way that Jerry Falwell writes. He talks about the church, the church must rise up, to challenge the enemy. I don't want to read all this stuff. I don't think this is very literary, and some of it is not very interesting, but I am simply giving you an indication of what I think is going on. Tim Leahy says, "It is time that the one hundred thousand faithful ministers in every Bible-believing denomination in our country lead the sixty million Christians to vote out of office,to vote out of office every devotee of humanism and every politician naive enough to vote for humanist programs." Translated, social programs. He continues, "It has taken over thirty years to reduce our nation to moral degeneracy, to national impotence, and to economic

inflation. If Christians and other pro-moralists work together, we could return the nation to moral sanity in ten to fifteen years."

During the fall I was in the office of Paul Wyrick(?), of a group called the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress. And then I picked up a -- which is the busiest place I have ever been in -- and I picked up a document called "The New Creatures and the New Politics," which comes out under Paul Wyrick's sponsorship. And it has lines like this: "A liberal out of power is more likely to repent at leisure. Besides, these days getting liberals out of power is a direct Christian goal in its own right. It is the only way to protect the victims from any further doses of liberal policies."

And then, finally, in this regard, I want to get on to something else. This is depressing stuff, I think. Francis Schaeffer,(?), you need to know about Francis Schaeffer. Francis Schaeffer has written a book called The Christian Manifesto. And the Christian manifesto is a direct alternative to the humanist manifestos of 1933 and 1973, and also an alternative to the Communist Manifesto of 1847. In the Christian Manifesto, on page 115, Francis Schaeffer says, "It is not too strong to say that we are at war." I don't think he is speaking symbolically. I think he means it, means it literally. "--not too strong to say that we are at war. And there are no neutral parties in the struggle. One either confesses that God is the final authority, or one confesses that Caesar is

Lord."

Well, I can't overemphasize the importance of Francis Schaeffer. Francis Schaeffer is THE intellectual for the new religious Right. It's not Jerry Falwell, it's not Pat Robertson, it's not Tim Leahy, it's Francis Schaeffer. And that book, The Christian Manifesto, is a very important book.

Now, to get to the crux of it, and I think I am getting close to the thesis. We started out, tonight anyway, we started out by contrasting Armageddon and Eden. And I said that the nineteen-fifties can appropriately be characterized as following the dictates of an Armageddon mood, or an Armageddon mentality. There is a fear of a cataclysmic end to the human race. There is a reversal indicated in the nineteen-sixties. And the reasoning goes, well, if the world could end in a cataclysmic destruction, perhaps it might also end, or alternatively end in the realization of human hope. And that then became the mood of the nineteen-sixties. I neglected to say that the chief exponent of that position, I believe, was Dr. Martin Luther King, in talking about the dream in which all could share.

The nineteen-seventies could be characterized as a time when there was this great systematic search for values that had been left behind. That is, there was soul-searching in the nineteen-seventies. There is the

narcissism, there is self-reflection, there is a turn to meditation, to the exploring of the interior life, as all that was expressed in mysticism, in meditation, and other forms of spirituality, and concern about monastic life, and all the rest of it.

My thesis, and it's a simple thesis, and I am only making one thesis. My thesis is that the Falwell movement is a return to Armageddon. The Falwell movement is a return to Armageddon. And I am playing that against what Robert Bellah talked about last week, in describing the intentions of the counterrevolution. Now, this time around, in the Falwell phenomenon, the return to Armageddon is coming with very much more force. Because this time around, it is not simply a mood, it's not simply reflected in the existentialist literature of the time, or in any other literature of the time, this time around the return to Armageddon is based upon Biblical sanctions, and has been invested with religious and political authority. That is, has been invested with religious and political authority. The way I think Jerry Falwell will be known in the history of fundamentalism is as the person who became political and tried to be intellectual within a religious environment which through the centuries has been known to be deliberately a-political, deliberately anti-intellectual. He is very political, and the movement he has created is now invested with religious and political authority, and has been raised to Biblical sanction.

What this means, then, is that one of the views, one of the prominent views of the end of the age that we have to deal with in our society is the Armageddon myth. And the Armageddon myth has it that there is a fight between two great powers, the power of light, the power of darkness, the power of good, the power of evil. If you are checking for historical antecedents to this, you find it in the Manichean, the Manichean philosophy that Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, had to deal with before he became a neo-Platonist. That doesn't matter. That's there in the history. But now all of it is back again. There's this colossal battle going on between the forces of good and the forces of evil, a colossal battle between God and the anti-God, Christ and the anti-Christ, the godly and the godless, and what has happened right before our eyes is that the fight, the conflict, between Russia and the United States has been placed within the Armageddon mythology. The United States and, he doesn't call it the United States, he calls it America, America is the godly and Russia is the godless. America is the light to the nations, Russia remains in darkness. America is on the side of Michael and his angels, Russia is on the side of the devil and his legions. And therefore the fight, the conflict between the two is given very deep significant Christian support. And my great fear is that if we continue to see the world this way, that Armageddon story may become a self-fulfilling prophecy. That is, it's very possible, as the people in the nineteen-fifties knew,

that this could be the way the world ends. That is, in this colossal fight between the two power centers, raised to mythological status and supported religiously and Biblically.

Well, we have come to this point several times before in this course, and the question I have had from the very beginning is, what is a person to do? I have a couple of questions I ask, I don't want to ask very many more than that. The one question I ask is, what's happening? What's going on? What's happening in our world and what's happening on our campus? What are the currents with which our lives are involved?

The other question is, what can anybody do? And I am not able to say what anybody can do, but I, my suggestion is that dealing with something like this is like dealing with a cancer. And there isn't any one thing that anybody can do. There isn't any one solution to an illness of this kind. But there are a lot of things, a lot of things that can be done and a lot of things that can be done together.

A person that I admire very much is the junior senator from Massachusetts, Paul Tsongas. And Paul Tsongas says that the basic problem is that we have begun with dogma. We start with dogma, and then we try to make the world conform to the dogma. And the problem is that there are too many pieces that do not fit. The world doesn't conform to the dogma. The alternative to this, he says, is to train our intelligence to deal with the issues one

by one, which humankind faces. And those issues we all know very well have to do with energy, ecology, global harmony, all the things that are listed in his book, and the kinds of things that George McGovern talks about.

Now, for a couple of other suggestions in response to the question, what can anybody do, I'd like to refer to some comments made by Kenneth Briggs. Kenneth Briggs is the religion editor of The New York Times. And when I had a conversation with Kenneth Briggs a few weeks ago, because George McGovern and I were talking about having some kind of religious summit meeting, where some of the nation's religious leaders might gather to talk about the situation, and to recommend alternatives to the combination of religious zeal and patriotism that have been put forward by Jerry Falwell. And Kenneth Briggs responded this way. That the President right now is handing the religious community its agenda. My comment there was, oh, I mean, let's hear a little more. And he said, first of all, the nuclear arms race. The nuclear arms race, runaway defense spending, that's exercising all sorts of people of religious, political, human sensitivity to respond. And the other issue is the economy. The inequities within the economy, the growing inequities between rich and poor, between the hungry and the well-fed, the haves and the have nots, et cetera. But Kenneth Briggs says that the one issue that is not being touched is the issue of personal morality. And he thought that personal morality is a legitimate issue, raised legitimately by the new

religious Right. And I am simply mentioning that as an observation of a very astute commentator on our time.

Another spokesman, another spokesperson, Jurgen Moltmann, who was here last time, who talked to us, as you call, about exorcising the fears. He talked about motivation, about contrast between working out of fear and working out of love. And he mentioned that the Russians fear the Germans, because during the Second World War, the Russians lost twenty million of their citizenry. The question would have to be asked at that point, what are Americans afraid of? What are Americans afraid of? And I think the answer is, among many answers, Americans are afraid of a sneak attack. Americans were surprised by Pearl Harbor. So we built antiballistic missiles to guard against the possibility of a sneak attack, so we will not be caught off-guard. But if we were to follow analyses like that, if we would think about what the other people are afraid of, it might be possible to develop what Moltmann called an intelligent way of exorcising that fear through the power of love.

There are other things that are coming along with great power, I think. The path of this movement is certainly growing. It is certainly growing in Europe and I think it is growing in this country. We all know of the statements made by Archbishop Hunthouse(?) of Seattle, who was refusing to pay his taxes, as he put it, we have to refuse to give our incense, and he said, I mean dollars, we have to refuse to give our incense

to the nuclear idol.

I have spent quite a bit of time with people in monastic communities, and I can say that there is a great yearning for peace within the contemplative movements. The Benedictines for Peace, for example, from Europe, are going to march down Fifth Avenue and, at the very time in May or June when the United Nations takes up the question of the nuclear arms race.

Beyond that, I think there are some transformations within religion itself, which will become very significant. I remember talking with the dean of Harvard Divinity School, Christer Stendahl(?), no longer dean but was at that time, about what happened one time when there was a Jewish-Christian dialogue at Harvard. And that Jewish-Christian dialogue didn't go very well. And some of us asked him, why was that, in your opinion? And he said, well, there's a simple reason for that. The problem is that Christians are anti-Semitic. And they said, no, you don't mean that. And he said, yes, I mean that. He said, and furthermore, the New Testament is an anti-Semitic book. The New Testament is an anti-Semitic book. Now, I am not, we are not talking about anti-Semitism tonight. But one of the powers of the apolyptic Armageddon mentality is that one does find it in the Bible. And I think it's going to be difficult for Bible-believing Christians, religious people, to exorcise those portions of the Bible and to provide religious critiques of the apocalyptic sections of the sacred Scriptures, but

something of that kind needs to occur if humankind is going to get past that particular point.

Another way of saying that is to question Jerry Falwell, when he talks about preaching the full gospel, but the full gospel is not full gospel unless there is some mention of world peace.

Another thing that can be done in treating the cancer, I believe, is to have classes like this one. And I am saying this, well, I guess first of all to express my great appreciation for all the support that you have given it, and the enthusiasm with which you have participated in all of the meetings. But I want to say that slightly differently, because my intention is not to somehow solicit praise for what has occurred. I like to get up early in the morning, and early in the morning when it's quiet, and I am probably a contemplative at heart, I think I am a contemplative at heart. And I like to listen to the sounds that occur in the morning. The morning is a better time than the middle of the day, because one can discern the sounds more easily because there isn't the great multiplicity of sounds. And you can listen to, you know, the birds in the morning, and the other animals, and the first sounds of human beings in the morning. And I like to run by the bakery in the morning and not just hear the sounds, but smell the bread baking at the bakery on Anapamu, and the Belle Miche on Victoria. These are not part of my notes. I am just kind of throwing this in. I am thinking about tomorrow

morning.

Now, if one were to think of the history of sound, if you go all the way back to the beginning and think about the sounds of the birds in the forests, or if you think about the first sounds of what some people like to call cave men, those rudimentary people, scholars call those people, you think about those first sounds, and then you trace the development of sound from the earliest stages up say to the time of Beethoven, or Brahms, or Wagner, or my favorite, Sibelius, or the Cars or the Beatles or Simon and Garfunkel. Well, there would be a tremendous tragedy if, at a certain point, there are no more sounds. If the, if that chronicle, that history of the development of sound were suddenly brought to an end. And I think there's an analogy there for the growth of peace. I think peace is what humankind has been striving for from the very beginning. We seem to get close to it and then it eludes our grasp and then we need to do it again and it eludes our grasp. But I think it may be like technique. That is, we get better at it. And maybe Moltmann was talking about this when he talked of the power of intelligent love.

I think the road to political security is like this, too. That is, it starts in a rudimentary way, and then we get better at it, and we learn what we need to do. And I am certainly sure that the road to religious maturity is like that. That is, there's a lot of excitement to begin with, but it's a long haul, it's a

long stretch, it's like a pilgrimage. One needs to go through the stages. And perhaps it's fair to say that one gets better and better at it.

But that's not the side of it I want to emphasize. The side of it I want to emphasize is that it would be a terrible tragedy if the road to peace ended in nuclear destruction. That is, it would be similar to if there were no sounds would be heard any more, like if politics ended in destruction, like if religion ended in nihilism. Now, I think we know, I think the best thing we have going for us, going for this, going for us on this, is the way we are constructed, may I say, or the way we are created. That is, I think there are impulses deep within our individual and collective selves that refuse to be violated by the Armageddon mentality.

I have learned a great deal on this subject from Robert Hutchins. And I'd like to close with a paragraph that Robert Hutchins wrote when he was still at the University of Chicago, on the need for world peace. And it goes this way:

"The goal toward which all history tends is peace. Not peace through the medium of war, not peace through a process of universal intimidation, not peace through a program of mutual impoverishment, not peace by any means that leaves the world too frightened or too weak to go on fighting, but peace, pure and simple, based on a deep-willed peace, a willed peace which has animated the overwhelming majority of humankind through the

countless ages. This will to peace does not arise out of a cowardly desire to preserve one's life, to preserve one's property, but it comes from the conviction that the fullest development of the highest powers of the human being can be achieved only in a world of peace."

Thank you very much.

END OF MEETING