

Paul Weyrich
March 5, 1984
Campbell Hall - lecture

... that is I am the co-inventor of the spoon-like device by which I try to shove values down your throats. But, this is the image which is portrayed of people who are involved in this movement. Both images are not accurate and I think that it is important when you look at this phenomenon that you examine it in the light of who it really represents and what it really is, because like all movements in history, it has its strengths, it has its weaknesses, it has its glaring flaws. It has, I think positive aspects, but I caution you about believing the rhetoric which is often written about the movement, just as it would have been inaccurate, for example, to characterize the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s the way some of the people in the Old Right attempted to characterize it.

A lot of of the people in the Old Right took isolated incidents where extreme leftists or communists sympathizers were allied with the civil rights movement and pointed to those particular instances and said, that ladies and gentlemen, is the civil rights movement. Well, that was an unfair rap, and likewise, trying to take isolated statements of a totality and attempting to hang them around all of those of us who are identifying with this particular movement is a bum rap. The people in the religious right are not by and large on the offensive politically. Quite the contrary, they got involved in politics precisely because they were on the defensive. They were people who viewed themselves, whether actively or inactively, as having been backed into the corner, not only on government decisions, ranging from the Supreme Court decision on prayer to the decision on abortion, to various pieces of legislation which tended to put the government on the side of radical lifestyles as opposed to traditional values. But, also who felt backed into the corner by the ecumenical movement. I described in an interview that we had with the good professor that the ecumenical movement, as perceived by these people was sort of an attempt to develop the

(near-beer) church of the loose leaf notebook, where people who had the lowest common denominator of values would get the latest updated version of the current thinking in theology and this made most of the people who were identified with fundamental values extraordinarily uncomfortable. That being the case, they looked to politics, really as the last resort. Because, if you look to what happened to what you might call the fundamentalist and evangelicals, is that following the Scopes trials in the 1920s, these people were treated in the political process. Both of them were in the forefront of politics up until that time, but following those times, they retreated from the political process, and indeed, it became sort of their theology that if you wanted to be saved, you could not be very close to politics. So, these were not people who were always seeking to ram their agenda down the throats of unsuspecting Americans, rather they were people who sort of retreated and took a very pietistic view of society. Their fundamental view was that it didn't matter what you did politically, that as long as you lived a decent life, that everything would be all right, and particularly with their belief in faith being the cornerstone in Christian religion, that as long as you had faith in Jesus Christ, that you should be saved, and therefore it didn't matter whether you participated in the Republican Party, or the Democratic Party or you were active in conservative groups or any other kind of groups because these things were irrelevant.

The consensus upon which that view depended, however, began to breakdown with these Supreme Court decisions and with various government activities, and with the rise of the ecumenical movement, causing them to look again at where they were. And, they found that they were out of the political mainstream - they were not participating in the electoral process.

Indeed, as in the early 1970s, when I used to go occasionally to some of these churches, and I would ask for a show of hands who is registered, I would find a handful of people indicating they were registered to vote. Right now, if you go to any fundamentalist or evangelical church in the cou

in the country, you will find at least a third to one-half of the people unregistered. So that, far from all of the people having gotten into the political process, there is still quite a ways to go because there is still a great deal of debate and dialouge in these circles as to whether outward political participation is appropriate. But, in any case, these people found themselves on the defensive, not the offensive, and any attempt to pick certain statements made by some of the offensive individuals and attribute those statements to be the mindset of the religious right is an inaccurate portrayl. By and large, these people want to be left alone, they are not seeking political dominance.

I picked up a Denver Post on the way out here yesterday, and in the Denver Post, there was a major article by a couple of authors who purported to know all about the religious right - I have never run into them - but, in any case, they postulated the idea that really the goal of the religious right is to establish a theocracy in the United States, that we are trying to set up some kind of a government where only we would be in control. Now, that's a very interesting idea, when you consider who constitutes what you might call the religious right, because the religious right is a very diverse group of people, it includes Orthodox Jews, with whom we are dealing on a constant basis, a little known fact in the media. So, it consists of Orthodox Jews, it consists of evangelicals, of fundamentalists, of traditional Catholics, of Eastern Orthodox, and in some cases, even people like Mormons, with whom the evangelicals and fundamentalists have a very big problem, because they view them as a cult. And yet, if you want to look at the religius right development, you would have to say that they are a part of it, and indeed they participate in many of the meetings that take place in the political issues. So, if we are trying to set up a theocracy, (first of all, who is we?) I mean, you know, which one of these groups is going to be in charge and secondly, how are we going to work out the denominational differences in this theocracy between Orthodox Jews, on one hand, and Mormons on the other extreme.

you can't With all shades of Christian groups in the middle, such a statement is absurd and ought not be passed on as serious scholarship about the religious right. The religious right is really a group of people who share values, and who have decided to put aside their historical and denominational differences, in order to, as Jerry Falwell, said once, when he was on stage introducing me, he said we have to work together now so we can attain the right to fight later, which is a pretty good way of putting it. In other words, the great differences between Protestants and Catholics, between Jews and Catholics, between Mormons and the rest of Christians, and so on, have been put aside in a political context, in order to work for the retention of certain values and government institutions which we feel would enable us to practice our faith without any kind of government interference, and enable us to raise our children in the kind of society where they are not threatened, and where our teachers are not locked up in jails because they refuse to conform to the state, as has been happening in the state of Nebraska to various parents who sent their children to Christian schools, and which Christian schools did not want to conform to the regulations of the state and so on, and so on. That really is what the religious right is about. So, please disabuse yourself of the idea that the religious right is, you know, some sort of modern version of the crusade whereby we are all going to acquire weapons and come marching into town one day in the new M-1 tank, line everybody up against the wall, and make them conform. Nothing could be farther from the truth, if you deal with these people. I mean, they are absolutely not of the mindset which would make them a dominant political power in the country. As a matter of fact, if you deal with them, you have a great deal of difficulty getting them to do the things that are necessary to even make themselves politically felt and effective. I mean, one of my jobs, and it's sort of ironic that I am a Greek Catholic, and so here is this Greek Catholic from the upper middle west dealing with all these fundamentalists and evangelicals, trying to get them to do things which make them politically effective, And you know, if you know them,

you can't possibly take serious the idea that they are all going to work together and form some kind of a threatening operation which will destroy the Constitution, I mean it's just not realistic, and anybody who says that has not met with them, has not lived with them, has not spent a great deal of time with them, and doesn't understand their mindset. The second thing that concerns me about the image that has been created for us is that we are really religious versions of the secular conservatism, and therefore, we take the same view about people as the secular conservatives. And I'm not talking about all secular conservatives now, but I'm talking about a good many of them, and I know a good many of them, and I have fought much more intense battles with them than I have with any liberals, I assure you, because many of the secular conservatives look at life in sort of the opposite way than secular liberals do. Only, they really amount to the same thing because the secular conservative is very obsessed with economics, and the secular conservative essentially views life as a contest in which the fittest in society will end up surviving, and therefore, the secular conservatives have quite a different view of the poor, of minorities, of people who need help, of the handicapped, of the unborn, of all of the people who, in my judgement, need help, than we do, and we are pictured of having their view, which I deeply resent because we do not. We have much the same view as liberals have about these various minorities, only our method of aiding these people, or how we see human nature, is fundamentally different. So, the argument between a liberal looking at the poor and having compassion toward the poor, a liberal looking at the handicapped, a liberal - the liberals don't look at the unborn because they pretend they don't exist, but they look at large numbers of other groups and they feel great compassion toward them, and want to help them.

The fundamental difference is that we look first of all, at individuals. We do not believe in any kind of collective grouping, because, I think, you will find that all collective groupings are not accurate. When we talk about women, for example, I mean, what does that mean? Are we talking about

a housewife in rural Georgia, or are we talking about an executive in midtown Manhattan, or are we talking about Betty Friedan, or are we talking about Phyllis Schafley, or - who are we talking about? I mean, they're all women, and how anybody can group all of these people into one category is beyond me. And the same is true when we talk about blacks, you know, if one wants to talk about the similarities between a black brought up in Thomasville, Georgia, and a black brought up in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and try to put them into the same category, one isn't looking at history accurately, in my judgement. And then, you get into Hispanics, that's the latest media fad is Hispanics, and there's our token Hispanic clapping now - uh, but, uh, you know, I mean, if, uh, well, I mean, uh, Hispanics, uh, I mean, what are we talking about? If you talk to Hispanics, and you suggest to a Cuban, for example, that he is the same as a Puerto Rican, I mean you can have a riot on your hands. If you suggest to a Puerto Rican that he's the same as a Mexican, you have big troubles. If you suggest to the Mexican that he is the same as somebody who came up here from Argentina, you'd get a lot of problems, and yet, the media lumps all these people together as Hispanics. That's nonsense.

So, we look at people as individuals, not as collective groups because we do not think that there is any kind of group morality. We do not think that there is individual right and wrong, and therefore, we want to see individuals held accountable, rather than groups, which, of course, leads to a wholly different view of, for example, the crime situation. Because some people, when a crime is committed, want to say, well that person couldn't help it because they were a part of this and that group and society has not dealt justly with them, and we reject that notion.

We do feel that there are great injustices in society, but we look at these injustices as the collective acts of a series of individuals who have erred, rather than some societal problem, which is, I think very hard to define. But, in any case,

we are not of the same mentality as the secular conservatives who, in many cases, have a fundamental disregard for the welfare of people who are less fortunate than themselves, and who view every question in economic terms, and who look upon most of the questions as being solved if we only provide enough opportunity for somebody to pick themselves off the ground and move forward.

We don't see things in quite the same way, and for that reason, we have had, as I say, very strong disagreements with some of the secular conservatives. I mean, I have been in meetings with Barry Goldwater where - and he would be the prime political example of that kind of secular conservative - where he has said screw the poor. I don't take that position and what bothers me is in trying to paint a picture of what we're about, we get the rap for that kind of thinking, when, in fact, that is not our mentality at all. In fact, I think that - I wish you would come with me to the various churches that I'm talking about, to the homes of the individuals who are involved in this movement, and see what they have done in a very real way, with very real personal sacrifices in taking people off the street, in feeding the hungry, in clothing the poor, in providing jobs for those who need it, in providing training for those who need it, in educating people who are less fortunate than themselves. They haven't done this with any government programs, and they haven't done it with any prodding from big brother, they have done it with individual acts of charity. And all across the communities, and I think you would be impressed, if that is something that concerns you about the compassions that these people have for their fellow man. Now, of course, there are exceptions to that, and of course, you have hard-hearted groups of people, and of course, you have hard-hearted individuals in every community. So, I'm not saying, you know, find yourself a fundamentalist, and you're going to find a really charitable person. I'm just talking that in general terms, I think that you would be impressed with the care and concern that these people have, and they don't at all take the view of society, and the view of those less fortunate than themselves that is attributed to them by some of the media, which has confused them with a different

set of sort of libertarian oriented conservatives, who are very much interested in economic questions, and in economic gain. So, against that background, I think it might be useful to examine where the movement is right now, because there is a great deal of commentary to the effect that the movement reached its peak in 1981 to 1982 and has been on a steady decline since that time. How many have heard that, by the way, how many have heard that the movement sort of peaked a few years ago, and is now on the decline, and so I am here as sort of the last remaining example of a soon to be forgotten species, who you can remember as old people having seen up here on the stage - oh yes, I remember, you know, when they were around. I've got bad news for you if you have heard that. The Moral Majority, for example, which is the most widely known of the religious right organizations is two-and-one-half times as large as it was two years ago. Catholic Jerry Falwell's Old Time Gospel Hour, was spending \$60,000 a month a year ago in taking 800-number incoming Watts line calls from people who wanted help. This year, they are spending \$300,000 a month from people who are calling them and wanting their help. The Pat Robertson Christian Broadcast Industry has doubled in the past months, and it was a very large operation to begin with. It is now reaching 26 million people every week, and is growing exponentially. James Robison has more than doubled the size of his television ministry. Charles Stanley, who was a regional minister in Atlanta, is now in all 50 states, and is getting 3,000 contributions a day - without ever asking for contributions on his program - unlike Falwell, and some of the others, he doesn't ask for them, and he is getting 3,000 voluntary contributions per day, without any mail solicitation, and without any asking for these contributions on radio or television. I think that's phenomenal. Every single one of these ministries has grown dramatically in the past couple of years. The major Bob Tetter, who is a Republican pollster and with whom I often disagree and has had no use whatsoever for the so-called many cases do not offer what the public is hungry for, and you know,

social issues, and has always preached to the Republican Party that they ought to run screaming from the room if any of the social issues are mentioned, was finally convinced by Congressman Knut Gringrich to include in a nationwide poll that he did for the religious right, and what Bob Tetter found in his survey, which was an in-home interview survey, which if any of you - I don't know if you've covered survey research in this course or not, but in-home surveys are the most difficult, and most expensive of any types of surveys that are taken, so no one could question the validity of it, and there was a nationwide sample which cost \$250,000 to produce.. Bob Tetter found, to his absolute amazement, that 45% of the American public at least once a week - 45%, that's right. And so, anybody who thinks that this movement is going away ought to take a look at it again.

By the way, one-third of Falwell's viewers are Roman Catholics. What this says to me, incidentally, is that the mainline institutional churches have absolutely failed in preaching the gospel. Because they have failed in preaching the gospel - well, you know, you can hiss if you like - I thought this was one of the uh, the uh, - would you like to try that in a different key? The fact of the matter is that - uh, I'm really surprised by the way, that in such a broad minded institution that would have me here, that you would find such a reaction.

The fact of the matter is that is 45% of the public is watching these kind of people, you have to take a look at why. That is an astounding development, because a few years ago, these people were considered odd balls. They were considered out of the mainstream. You get to 45%, you're almost talking about mainstream, that leaves only 55% of the people who aren't watching them, and a lot of those don't go to church, and don't believe in anything at all. So, you're almost to the point where the number of people who would necessarily identify with the major institutional churches. I think you have to ask yourself why. I think the major reason is that the modern churches in many cases do not offer what the public is hungry for, and you know,

that may be trouble, but it is a fact of life. So, the point I'm trying to make to you is that this movement, far from disappearing, is only beginning to gather strength.

Falwell is having a meeting of pastors from around the country here next month, and I'm told, that he already has something like 12,000 pre-registrants. These are pastors now of independent Baptist and fundamentalist churches, and so there are a lot of events like that taking place which serve to train and inspire this kind of religious leadership. Well, if that's the case, one may ask, then is Ronald Reagan assured of re-election because of all these people that are going to march out and vote for him? No, that is absolutely not the case. Many of them who were quite enthused about the Reagan Presidency in 1980 are unenthused. I suspect a good many of them will end up voting for President Reagan for re-election, but the kind of fervor that was active in his particular campaign in 1980, I do not think will be present again in 1984. Rather, I think these people are looking at a different agenda. I think they're looking at electing people more at the local level. I think they're looking at members of Congress, I think that some of their activities will tend to translate that way. I think it is a three to five year period between the time that many of them are now coming on-line, so to speak, with these television evangelists, and a time when they will begin to be active politically, because the message which they get from the evangelists is translated that way into some kind of a need for action, on the part of these people in society. So, I don't think you'll see any immediate dramatic effect, but I do think that there is some kind of religious revival underway; a movement back toward traditional values in the country. And I think that that will translate politically in three to five years hence, and so I'm afraid that you will probably, to quote another Californian who made a statement not too far away, I think you'll probably have some of us to kick around for some time to come. I will conclude there and try to answer a few of your questions before you have to get on to other classes.

The question is, if you don't believe in quotas, how would you go about remedying the discrimination which has been perpetrated against various groups and minorities in the past? I think that any kind of a quota system does any member of a minority a great disservice, because it puts them in a position because of what they are rather than the skills that they have acquired, and so I think the way that you being to remedy the real problem of discrimination is that you concentrate on giving them the kind of skills which enable them to compete in the real world, because I think that in the long term, any quota system is gonna work to their disadvantage, and they will not be equipped to handle things in such a way as they will be retained in the long term. Whereas to give them the kind of skills that will enable them to really compete is the best thing that one can do. I think, as a matter of fact, that a quota system is a form of racism because it suggests that the person really is inferior and incapable of competing on a generalized basis, and therefore must be included in some kind of system which really says, well, you know we understand they're really not up to it, so we have to put them in that position. If I were a member of a minority group, I would resent that. I know and employ any number of them, and they're as capable as anybody else in the country, and the thing to do is to give them the kind of skills that will enable them to compete in the long term.

... Bob Bauman was one of the economic conservatives that I mentioned beforehand. I'm one who called on Bauman to resign from the Congress, I'm the only conservative to have done so. I mean, the man has real problems, and I think we should pray for him and be concerned about him and his family, but I don't want to see him in a position of political leadership, because I don't think he's suited for it.

The question is, how can we justify taking advantage of technological improvements, such as television, without ignoring some of the side effects, such as women getting into the workplace. (I'm not sure what television has to do with that), but you know, technology is, in our judgement, neutral.

It can be used for good or for ill, and I think we would be foolish not to take advantage of any technological improvements that can improve mankind or that can spread the word of what we want to get across. I think that, you know, the development of the automobile certainly had a profound effect and the Industrial Revolution had a major effect. I think, by the way, that new technology is going to enable people, I'm very interested in new technology, as a matter of fact, because I think that new technology is going to enable a lot of people to stay with their families, that now are forced into the workplace, who don't really want to be there. It may amaze you, but not every woman who is out there working is out there to be quote fulfilled unquote. Many of them are out there out of economic necessity, and many of them would prefer to remain at home, but cannot do so. And, I think that computers and things that will enable them to work at home will have a very positive effect on that aspect of society.

No one in the New Right has suggested that Christian schools are the only means by which kids should be educated. There are some Libertarians who have suggested that public schools be abolished. On the contrary, I run something called the American Education Coalition, which is a means by which parents are provided with kits that enable them to try to do things in the public school system. So, I am hardly suggesting that public schools ought to be abolished. But, to your specific question, how do you take care of those people who aren't a member of a church, I don't think you understand that most of the church charitable work is done with people who are not members of the church in order to be a beneficiary. Yes, I think they could handle a good deal more than they're handling now, and if they can't -- then I believe in the principle of subsidiarity, which is that the government closest to the people can handle it best because they know the individual local conditions. Washington is the last place that one ought to turn to for some kind of assistance to these people. But, there is a role for government when it is clear that private

charity cannot suffice.

(Question is asked on if the same people who are watching television evangelists are also going to church.)

Well, I think that is possible, but I also think that is inconceivable in the Catholic church, where I was brought up, of 20 years ago, that the majority of the people would want to watch something like a Pat Robertson or a Jerry Falwell, if they were getting what they grew up with. I mean, it just is not conceivable, I think they are watching it precisely because of - and I know this to be the case, because they feel the message they are getting in their own churches is inadequate and so, you know, like all generalized statements, there are many exceptions to that rule, and I'm sure that some people who go to fundamentalist churches watch the fundamentalist programs on television as a supplement to it. And there are probably some people who are satisfied with mainline churches, who also watch these programs as a supplement to it. But, I think the exponential growth of these television ministries is more related to the failure of the mainline churches to give people that which they need, than it is to the inherent message of the ministers themselves.

I guess the import of your question is, has the Moral Majority been selective in its interpretation of scripture and have they left out other parts of scripture? I suppose that one could make such a case, I would say rather, they have emphasized certain teachings which they felt were in need of remedial help in society, which other groups were not emphasizing. Somebody said well, you know, why aren't you going out crusading on the civil rights question, for example? Well, I look around and I see umpteen organizations in Washington that are dealing on that question. And, I feel that those people have considerable representation. I don't think, for example, the point of view against raising homosexuality to the level of a protected civil right has much of a representation in Washington, and so if I were running the Moral Majority, I would say, you know, other people are taking care of this aspect of it, we should move into the political vacuum.

Do we intend to form a third political party? It's not beyond the realm of possibilities. I think neither one of the two major political parties really takes into account the views of a lot of these people, and therefore, I think if that continues in the long term, probably some new party movement will end up emerging, but probably not at the presidential level, probably at a level below the presidential level.