

Panel 3: Discussion

MR. HARRIS: Good. Let's start then with comments or questions you may have, yes. And there's a mic there, if you will identify yourself, please.

VOICE: Gene Taylor, from (unintelligible) Safe Haven --

MR. HARRIS: A little closer?

VOICE: (Gene Taylor) Can you hear me now? I notice you said what we did to them, but you did not say anything about them kidnapping and beheading journalists and soldiers. The latest journalist they kidnapped was in his twenties, he is an Irishman youngster. And they penned him up in somebody's house and treated him like an animal.

Now, are we supposed to just, like, let them get away with anything? And I never hear anything done about the people that do the beheading. Not only do they do the beheading, but they show it on television. What happened to that? You haven't seen any of that? How do you handle that?

I'm not saying that torturing them, like the eye-for-an-eye thing is right, but I don't appreciate them getting away with beheading people. Can we go over there and behead them back?

MR. HUNSINGER: I think atrocities are atrocities. But I don't think that justifies anyone resorting to torture and abuse. And I want to look at the beam in our own eye.

MR. HARRIS: Joseph Duffy, then JoAnne.

VOICE: (Joseph Duffy) Let me direct a question for comment to the first three speakers - E.J. too -- in terms of the religious question.

I'm persuaded that the most fundamental religious belief in America today is the essentially that under Rabbi Milton Friedman and Rabbi Hyack (phonetic). I alluded this morning to the fact that I watched this happen in the Clinton administration, with the director of USIA trying to get the American message together.

It seems to me that when the Cold War was over, instead of defining it as a victory of free spirits, it was defined very sharply as a victory of free markets, totally unqualified.

And I have to say, in my engagements now with young people in the business world, I find that to be the most fundamental religious faith. And as we've talked today about things to crack that, I've been trying to figure out -- I have one idea. I've only talked with a few company presidents. I've talked with one dean of a business school. I hope to approach some foundations.

It's based on the remembrance that Michael Harrington wrote a book in 1960 or '61 called *The Other America*. It's also based perhaps on the theme of "The Field of Dreams"; if you build it they will come. And my theme is, if you take young people and the future leaders of this country to see this country, if you take them there they will understand.

Harvard has just said now they want an international study as a part of the curriculum. I've devoted my life to that, but I really think the issue now is seeing America. And I think that we could get enough people in the business community of some stature who

understand the problem, and others, to sponsor a kind of national effort where we would take -- I would begin with MBA graduates, frankly -- on a tour of certain parts of this country in an engagement, document it.

That I think is the biggest issue I discovered. We can talk about the statistics as I do all the time, but they get debated back and forth. You know, whether it's poverty or the minimal wage. Minimum wage is a lot higher in many states where people have refused to abide by it. But I'd just like to ask you about the issue of helping the next generation become a visiting America, because I just don't think it's happening, and I think there may be an actual practical thing one could do by helping some of these -- because I think it would be a religious experience to see that part of this society, and engage it, that they simply frankly don't see.

MR. HARRIS: Any comment from members of the panel?

REV. HEHIR: Well, I think it would be a good idea and I think it would have an impact. I don't know that it would go necessarily in the direction you think it would go, because I think people may agree with you that the situation is intolerable, 40 million people shouldn't be without health insurance. There's a second set of questions about "how do you get that done?" And I think then, you enter the debate about the appropriate role of the state, the success or failure of federal programs, how you, you know -- Keynesian economics versus neoclassical economics --

VOICE: (Joseph Duffy) That's the thing I want to provoke.0254

REV. HEHIR: That's fine, but I only mean that by seeing the country, which I think it would be an important kind of thing for any of us -- by seeing it, it is then not self-evident what you should do about it. And I do think -- I mean, I must say, it saddens me a bit, you know, that I'm close to my 35th year of teaching, and one of the things is that very generous, very bright students, who want to do something about social questions, do not think for example they should go into government to do something about it. They have very, very minimal sense that that's where you can get something done.

Now, I think, you know, it's not an argument that that's the only place you can get something done. But there is, you know, if you go back to when Geno flourished, the premises of what you ought to do are much more up for grabs, now. And with those very people I think you want to influence.

MR. HARRIS: All right. E.J., did you want to --

MR. DIONNE: You know, I think that the faith of Hayek and Friedman may have hit its high tide. And it's still strong, and no one -- you know, I think if we're honest with ourselves, no one really has a plausible system, overarching system, to put up against the market system. The challenge, the real question is what kind of market system do you want to have?

And that a kind of Hyack view certainly, and to some degree Milton Friedman's view, is a rather radical version of the market system. My own sort of sense of the United States is that from the beginning, we're a country that has kind of -- it's not so much vacillated as moved in response to events, from an emphasis on individualism, to an emphasis on community or, good politics.

And there tends to be -- and yes, I confess this is perhaps excessively optimistic -- but there tends to be a corrective mechanism in our system. And when you look around now at how, say -- first of all, people under 30, Brian's right, a lot of them want to go into service, nonprofit service rather than government. But there is I think kind of a social awareness in the next generation coming up, and a different set of political attitudes than perhaps the folks came up in the eighties. I like to say this generation may be more practical than the folks of the sixties, more socially concerned than the folks of the eighties -- and that's a parody of both of those other generations.

Three problems: health care. I think, you know, there are always three ways our society provides services to people. They can be provided through an employer, but that tended to happen a lot more when unions were stronger, and they're not strong. We can throw the burden on individuals. Or the government can step in.

And I think health care is an area where, as the recent GM agreement showed, there's going to be a lot more sympathy for social and community provision, simply because there won't be other alternatives. So I think you're seeing it there. And then again, to go back to the GM experience, which is a sort of very particular because of the generous contract UAW arranged -- it's funny, you can tell where people are by whether you think that was a good thing or now, they're being attacked and it's terrible thing. I rather like them, myself.

You know, people are understanding that competition and a global economy creates pressures that, you know, that are pushing down for a significant number of people their opportunities to get decent pay.

And then the third is the one I alluded to, which is pressures on families. You know, I was grateful that the Reverend here raised family values, because I think there are, you know, there are a couple ways to talk about that. Certainly one is, you know, how well does our society create circumstances under which people can be good parents?

But I also think again people who are progressive have to be prepared to say there is a lot of junk in this culture -- that is this a mass-market culture -- that itself is a product of the market. And I like to tell my conservative friends, "You seem to love the market at every sphere, but you complain about this culture. Just, by the way, where do you think that comes from?"

So I see a series of areas where I think the true faith is being questioned, not so much by agnostics, but by people with a slightly different and perhaps prophetic view of what the faith ought to be.

MR. HARRIS: Rabbi Saperstein.

RABBI SAPERSTEIN: Yeah, let me just add one note to that, though, 'cause I think there's good news-bad news on this. And there are folks here who spend full-time in academic settings, both sitting out with you, and up here on the panel -- and I'm more than willing to be corrected if I am wrong about this.

But let me tell you what the good news is. The good news is I think there's been a real resurgence of willingness to deal with important moral issues in the world today on the college campus, a lot more sense of activism on the college campus. I do think Brian's right, that it does not translate necessarily into government service; that 30 years of the

right running consistently against the government, against the public sector, has damaged the sense of the common wheel in this country, eroded an ethos of public service in America, with I think long-term deleterious effects to this country.

But I actually think on college campuses today there's another dynamic, that I've heard since as much, and here's a paradox: when I've traveled to college campuses, when I listen to students, since 2, the summer of 2, the Durban conference, 9/11, Darfur, the war in Iraq, the Intifada in the Middle East, have congealed to put almost the entire emphasis of much of the kind of mass enthusiasm on the foreign-policy issues. And there is comparatively little play on the domestic issues that we're dealing with at this conference. For good or for bad.

I mean, I'm delighted that there is that kind of energy and they're dealing with important moral issues. George put one of them on the table to us. But in terms of what was the focus of Geno Baroni's life, and I think the passion of many of us here, that the quality of America depends on the ethic of this country, and the sense of justice, and fairness, and compassion, and decency; to the core of our public policy and the life of each and every citizen here.

I find much less concern about this. This could turn around quickly, but I think it's an important dynamic to understand as we look at where the play is going to be in the next few years.

MR. DIONNE: A quick footnote on that. I think there is a point there, although I was looking at Pablo Eisenberg, my colleague in the back, at Georgetown. And there is a substantial amount of young, you know, student -- and activism by other young people around some important economic issues. The anti-sweatshop movement for example I think is very important. You know, some of the Union summer events.

I mean, this is not a majority of young people, but this is a kind of activism, and at Georgetown itself, it was students who worked in alliance with low-paid employees to help raise their standards. And the beauty of that actually is that Georgetown is a Catholic school, that has Catholic social doctrine at its heart, and there had to be a willingness on the part of the administration to say, "Yeah, we do want to practice what we preach."

That would be a good challenge to a lot of different institutions in our country.

MR. HARRIS: All right. JoAnne?

VOICE: (JoAnne Page) I'd actually like to stitch what you just said to the Abu Grabe conversation. My name is JoAnne Page, I'm the president of the Fortune society, and on the Eisenhower board.

And Dostoevsky said that you can judge the quality of a civilization by entering its prisons. I think the practice ground for Abu Grabe was America's prisons. And it's not surprising that many of the people who actually get convicted were people who were prison guards in this country.

And I'm a child of the Holocaust. My dad's a concentration camp survivor. And what I know is that if you declare people enemy, you can do anything to them. And a civilized country puts some boundaries on what it's willing to do to the people it names to be its

enemies. And our boundaries have moved profoundly. They moved a long time before Abu Grabe.

And I've watched over the 30 years that I've been doing work in and out of prisons, as the prison population has expanded. I've watched our Supreme Court justice, Clarence Thomas, in one of his opinions say that it's okay to beat a prisoner as long as you don't do permanent injury. I've watched us expand our use of segregation, until we have prisons that are 23-hour lockups, where we keep people that are in 23-hour solitary confinement, with an hour out for a shower every once in awhile; watching them go crazy and keeping them there for years.

And we are violating the most basic international rules against torture in our day-to-day operation of our own prisons. So, Abu Grabe was a slide, but it was not a deviation.

Can you draw your circle of caring about torture wide enough that it covers what's happening behind prison walls in this country?

MR. HUNSINGER: Yes, absolutely. And I think in order to draw people in who are concerned, tactically it's important not to overload them with too much all at once. People need a lot of pastoral care and assistance. This is a very hard question to confront and think about, and that's part of the program that I would like to develop, is not just hit people with these harsh realities, but do something to make it possible for them to have the capacity -- I mean I have trouble. I have to put this stuff aside, you know, when I'm not sleeping well anymore and just, you know, come back to it later.

I agree with you that there is a precedent in our own prisons. There's another strand which we need to look at, which has to do with our intelligence agencies. There's a professor at the University of Wisconsin, a historian named Alfred McCoy -- now, you could Google this -- he talks about the 50-year history of the development of these kinds of practices within the intelligence services. There's a big, long academic article on this, and a shorter version. But there are multiple sources here.

And I agreed with Joe Duffy actually, perhaps a little more than some of the others. I agree with some of the concerns that were spoken there, too, but I think in a way there's no substitute for first-hand contact with the problems. Of course, a lot depends on the capacity for empathy, as Reverend Thurston said. And that I think is a special responsibility for religious communities, to help instill a capacity for empathy in people, and empathy is very deeply embedded in the meaning of the Golden rule, you know, the role reversal process.

And without empathy, you know, you could see all these dire circumstances in which people live, and not be sufficiently moved by them. And then of course, there's the whole next level that Father Hehir raised about what do you do about it after that?

But if people aren't moved by what they see and what they know at the first-hand level, we often don't get to that next step about policy considerations. And I think that focusing on the energy that exists right now, as I saw with that spread of the open letter in such a short period of time, and moving out from there into -- I think people will actually make these connections on their own about the circumstances in prisons in the United States, and where these interrogators come from, and so on.

But the human rights lawyers with whom I have been in conversation say that at least in these base camps and so on, in Iraq and elsewhere, the worst abuses have come in not through the military, but through the intelligence services, and other nonmilitary agencies. They even taught the military some of these things. So that's a different and deeply disturbing aspect of the problem that doesn't connect directly to domestic prisons. And they're not mutually exclusive.

MR. HARRIS: I want to go next to Representative Kaptur, and then over here again.

VOICE: (Marcy Kaptur) This is an extraordinary panel, and I'm really going to ask you for recommendations on reading. Because in talking about the torture scandals and as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I heard what you said.

But one of my concerns about the US military, and about our country, really, is a change I see in philosophy in many sectors. Number one, in terms of the military, we have never had a US military operation with over 100,000 contractors in the field. It used to be that duty, honor, and country were the standard. Now it's how much are you going to pay the contracted mercenaries, whatever their job title might be?

And my concern is that as the administration withdraws troops from Iraq, they will simply be displaced by mercenaries of US, or any foreign nationals willing to take the money that we can pay.

So the idea that we fight for patriotism and for the ideals of our country is being displaced for the first time in our history by paid individuals who are not regular forces. All right, that's number one.

But if I look at that trend, which is a very, very serious one in our country, at some of the words used for bills in Congress, which pit the individual against the community in a way. Our community of interests, our national interests, as a country.

I think about the names in Social Security. You know, they want individualized retirement accounts. Now, I have an IRA, and I believe in private savings. And our family has always had a good record on that. But the idea of Social Security, which I support, that word wasn't popular. It's "individual," not "social."

I talked about the military. You think about the speeches in Congress about "my family." People will get up and talk about "their family." I'm always interested in that because how does one define "family?" Isn't America supposed to be a family? So people are worried about their family, and it's taken to -- when you look at the charter schools in communities like mine and all of the country, you abstain from public support of public schools. In fact, public school dollars are being drawn into charter school education to save "your family," and whatever happens to the rest, we don't want to know about.

And then, health savings accounts, where Delphi -- I represent Delphi along with three dozen other members of Congress -- where now wages are being proposed to be cut by two thirds, and health benefits removed.

The purpose of this question really is, I see sort of this Ayn Rand "the individual over all," and this philosophy of individualism corrupting the institutions that have made America great, including our military, including our public school system.

Not that all these institutions don't need help and strengthening. But it's the attitude that "I pull my ripcord and I'm out. If I can save myself, I'm out." And I'm wondering, have you written anything, or could you make recommendations of books that one might read or articles? Because I think this it is really at the very heart of it. I can remember, and I'll end with this example: when we had the Social Security debate several years ago, one member of Congress standing on the floor with a photo of a middle-class family about Mr. Dionne's age, with their children.

And he drew a line between the hands of the grandparents -- in their own family -- themselves as the parents, and the children, to sever within the family the responsibility for Social Security. It was such a -- you know, we want to change Social Security for our children, but we're not going to worry about somebody else's grandparents. Again, it's a vivid symbol of this "I'm pulling the ripcord for my family, but somebody else take care of the rest." Where is this coming from? What is this philosophy? Many of you are religious, and teachers and philosophers. Could you talk about this a little bit please?

MR. HARRIS: All right.

MR. DIONNE: I'm gonna take a quick crack at just the reading list for a half a second, and then I want to -- I've decided my role here is to be "Candide," and to be overly optimistic, but I do want to say something, and I specifically want to talk to the lady who raised, rightly, the question of what do you do about enemies who do serious things that are evil?

But just to your point. It seems to me the two people who have written books recently that I would recommend on this very theme of the public versus the private. One is a philosopher at Harvard, whom Father Hehir knows, one called Mike Sandel (), and he wrote a recent collection of essays called Public Philosophy. And Michael Walzer's book at the beginning of the year -- with a regular title about inequality, whose title escapes me -- W-A-L-Z-E-R, who for me is kind of a guide to a lot of questions when I'm not talking to Michael or David. Those are two things I put on the table.

Just my Candide-ism here. One: one of the things we forget I think in this torture scandal is how many people in our military have been acting against this. I mean, it's very important that the bill in Congress was pushed by Senator McCain himself, a former POW. My sister is a captain in the Navy reserves, as is her husband. She and her husband were both in the JAG core which is, you know, the lawyers in the Navy.

There's no one I know, other than our speaker here, whom I have heard to be more passionately opposed to some of these policies as many of the military lawyers. And they are worried about this on behalf of our troops. Because I think it's a false choice to say, you know, "Either we defend ourselves and torture people, or we're humanitarian." A lot of people in our own military tell us, "This is not the way to do things, not the least of which is because we put our own people at risk if we do not live up to a certain set of standards."

So I think there is obviously a powerful moral case on this, but there is a powerful practical case, which we are hearing from people in our own military. Which raises your question about the privatization of the military.

Some of you may remember that Charlie Wrangle called for the restoration of the draft, and he did so in part to raise the question of whether these burdens are being fairly borne in our society. And I don't know if you like the way Charlie Wrangle talks as much as I do, but I can't resist telling this story -- the first sentence of my column was "God bless Charlie Wrangle."

So the next morning, my phone rings and I pick it up and at the other end is, "God bless Charlie Wrangle."

(Laughter.)

"My mother would have loved that." And so we went on and talked. But I think he made a very important point which is, if we've got to be more serious about service -- and this is where I think it brings in some of the young folks that Brian was talking about -- I think that we desperately need in our country a new GI Bill, a generous GI Bill, that would link a requirement to service -- it could be civilian or military -- with substantial aid as the GI Bill did, for going to college, which is now getting away out of the reach of an awful lot of people in our country, and also assistance for housing.

And that seems to me that if we sort of united this sense of, you know, responsibility to the collective good with society's responsibility, back to all of our citizens, I think we'd have a much more powerful way of talking about these things.

MS. KAPTUR: (Unintelligible) my district, only half of the people support mandatory service.

MR. DIONNE: Well, the reason that I have come to the GI Bill, I don't think we are going to have a draft anytime soon. But I think if you had a generous enough GI Bill, you would create a series of very strong incentives that would encourage service.

And to my friends who say, "Well, really wealthy and privileged people would get out of it," my hunch is really wealthy and privileged people would probably get out of whatever we created anyway, no matter what the law said, so let's encourage broad-scale service, and let's try to give more real help to people who need it, in exchange for their willingness to serve the country.

MR. HARRIS: Good.

MR. HUNSINGER: Let me recommend one book and one web site. The book is called *Torture and Truth* by Mark Danner. These were originally articles in the "New York Review of Books." If I can pull that conference off, he will be my keynote speaker. He's agreed to come.

And the web site is called "Balkinization," B-A-L-K-I-N. It's run by a professor from the Yale Law school, whose last name is Balkin, and it has the best legal analysis that an ordinary person such as myself, a nonlawyer, can understand. And they go into a lot of detail about just what's at stake in any legislation related to human rights and torture. The URL is balkin.blogspot.com.

REV. HEHIR: Let me just say a word on this. I've taught the military for over 20 years. I go to the war college all the time, and it is a combination of both. This topic needs to be plumbed and you know, it doesn't fall outside the question of ethics and war, but it doesn't fit in the macro questions. You have to make a step, somebody like myself is

dealt with tactics, strategy, that kind of thing. You don't necessarily go down this road -- interesting enough, when I was at the war college this year, and gave the standard address on the macro questions, I was questioned by people in the audience about this and, you know, felt a gap in my own presentation. But it does take the kind of concentrated attention to law and politics that Professor Hunsinger has raised.

But I would reaffirm also what E.J. said. In fact I think it's probably the case that there is no professional group in the country that has spent more time about trying to think through the ethics of what they do than the military. It is a very systematic kind of thing.

How you put that together with what's happened is precisely what takes the research. But the professional military start with self-interest. They don't want to be tortured if they are captured. And if the United States sets the pattern that torture is all right, then they know exactly -- I mean, John McCain's experience in this realm speaks volumes. So there is that kind of -- but it's more than just self-interest, it's a sense of profession.

And to be honest, I don't think -- the military themselves do not support a draft, and it isn't the Democratic argument that Charlie Wrangle and Mark Shields make. It is the kind of qualification they think you need to fight in today's military, which takes an educational level that in the generalized draft, they'd be afraid they wouldn't get. So that they basically oppose the draft on technical, functional reasons, I think.

MR. HUNSINGER: Yeah, that whole letter by Captain Ian Fishbach can be found online. It addresses some of your concerns, and he speaks for a lot of military people. And so yeah, it may be that the military and people like -- well look, it's Senator McCain, and Senator Warner, and Senator Gramm. This is a different coalition than we're used to on questions like this.

RABBI SAPERSTEIN: We're jumping all over the place, so let me join the jumping around.

I want to get back to something JoAnne was talking about, because I really agree with her. What we have seen in our own prison system, where we have such a high disproportionate number of people of color because of the discrepancy in the ways of laws work, in terms of different kinds of drugs, the inadequate -- the evisceration of much of the legal services structure in this country, a lack of representation for people, and the fact that people with wealth are -- it's created this dynamic of prisons containing people who are "the other," who are the enemy, as someone else said.

And the existence of prison rape against men and women -- not quite as high a percentage of women, but still the pervasive presence of prison rape, and the common use of that by prosecutors as a coercive threat and weapon, and of prison authorities as a disciplinary tactic -- talk about cruel and unusual punishment, the notion that people get sentenced to prison, and an unconscionably high number can assume, depending on their physical characteristics, that they may be subject to rape in ways that will scar them for life, 0274far beyond the incarceration itself, you know, leads to the kind of dehumanization, making an enemy, making "the other" of those in prison, in a way that then, you take those prison guards, send them over both from the private firms as well as some of the folks in the military police, really help set this in context.

So I was really glad you linked those two things together, very powerfully.

MR. DIONNE: And just so everybody knows, David doesn't just talk about these things. He's actually helped build a very unusual coalition with other people, on this very issue.

MR. HARRIS: Now we come back to over here.

VOICE: John Kromkowski from Catholic University. It struck me that one of the interesting parts of Geno's tradition was bringing people together and finding convergent dimensions within various traditions. And it struck me that this is probably the first time in a very, very long time that I've heard seven minutes capsulized the tradition of community justice that Rabbi, you presented.

And I'm also struck by your observation I think you've made a couple times about the way in which that tradition grows out of a tradition of justice, but doesn't particularly focus on rights. And it seems to me that it might be worth taking a look at how much deeper religious and ethical education we need to in fact find ways of linking these community-based ethical groundings, within all of the Abrahamic faiths. It seems to me that's the kind of thing that you know would relish, and could really bring a variety of these traditions together, to get some very, very positive action pieces, of the sort that many people have already mentioned. So I want to propose that as something that might come out of this conference.

And then I want to make a very, very painful but nonetheless, very necessary correction to your piece, Reverend. Whenever you pick up a bad example of bad activity and you label it with an Italian name, your continuing to continue to maintain this notion of criminality within the Italian-American condition -- tradition. And if you want to modify that letter to not talk about a don getting information from his lawyer, to a corporate crook, or organized crime, then I'm with you.

But if you want to label, and draw people's attention to criminality in the Italian community, then you're focusing on a negative stereotype.

MR. HUNSINGER: Oh, I see.

VOICE: (John Kromkowski) One of the things that Geno was very, very interested in is where are the positive prototypes of ethnic metaphors, ethnic behaviors, and interethnic cooperation.

And you may probably lose three or four percent of your potential sign-on audience by someone putting up a picket on you because you're calling toward criminality of Mafiosi. It has nothing to do with your argument. It has something to do with a mental set within the American consciousness, that we can use these kinds of examples to label people and to make cases that are extraneous to the central argument, which was beautiful and well done.

MR. HUNSINGER: Yeah, I was quoting Anthony Lewis there, but I take your point and thank you for it.

VOICE: Gene Taylor again. I always understood the Geneva conference was supposed to be a guideline for the ethical treatment of prisoners. What happened? They don't go by that anymore? Or maybe my history is outdated?

MR. DIONNE: Well, your history is good.

(Laughter.)

MR. HUNSINGER: Yeah. Well, there has been an effort to define a certain category of prisoners, who are "detainees," that's actually a fairly technical word, so that they fall outside the jurisdiction of the Geneva Conventions and other international laws, you know, based on sort of technical legal hairsplitting, that you know, they don't represent a nation-state and therefore it's only nation-states that these conventions apply to.

Outside the United States, I think these arguments have no credence whatsoever, and within the United States there is a distinguished body of international lawyers who think these arguments are dubious. But there are people in power who have made these arguments, and kind of have created a climate --

VOICE: (Gene Taylor) Found a way to get around it.

MR. HUNSINGER: Yeah.

VOICE: Hi, my name is Melissa Silvey. I actually just want to make three comments. I agree, racial profiling is well and alive these days, and I think, you know, I don't know if that's a cultural thing that kind of goes across the entire country, or if it's more prevalent in more urban areas. So I kind of wanted to question that and ask you what your experiences are, whether it's just really prevalent throughout the entire country?

The second point I wanted to make was on the use of emergency rooms for health care. And the Rabbi had mentioned that. And I think the costs associated with that, you know, my background was working in public housing; that is their primary care. And the amount of money that costs is definitely passed on, so that people who don't have insurance will never get insurance, essentially, if we continue to use the hospital as our primary care because they can't be turned down service.

And that like to thank you also. I think in the mass media we talked about earlier, we've become really desensitized, and I appreciate you re-sensitizing me. For me, it was very emotional to hear you speak. And you go home every night and watch the nightly news, you're inundated with news. You know, Blackberries, Internet, you know, it's just constant. And I think we almost get away from the actual human story, and I just appreciate that you brought us back to that. So thank you.

REV. THURSTON: Let me say based on what we have seen, racial profiling is prevalent across the country, both in urban and rural areas. The mindset, number one, is still very pervasive as Bill Bennett mentioned in his statement related to crime and the African-Americans. That's a mindset that's prevalent across the country. In many urban areas, in our cities, we have found that it becomes a real problem when the police who are policing predominantly African-American communities are not the same individuals who live in those communities.

And that gap produces what we see as a lot of racial profiling in those areas. In the city of Chicago that is a real problem, even to the point where the mayor has said to us in a meeting that they're just not getting the applications of African-American young men to become policemen. And of course, they can't be policemen and be on the street hanging out at the same time. So it can develop even into a greater situation than just that, but we've seen it prevalent across the country.

VOICE: (Unintelligible) did a TV show on that very thing one time (unintelligible) TV program?

REV. THURSTON: Yes, ma'am, I sure do.

VOICE: I don't know if you saw that or not.

REV. THURSTON: Yes, I did.

MR. HARRIS: One last comment. Yes, Gary?

VOICE: It's hard to talk about morality without ending up talking a little bit about the media. And maybe this is a crosscut issue that -- I'm trying to do something for Geno here -- I'm not sure there's 0280much of a difference between a suburban family when their kid comes home dressed in Goth culture, or an urban family when their child comes home in gangster rap attire, and singing songs about killing everyone. I think it's heartbreaking for both. And little wonder.

You know, how much can a generation take of these unfettered free marketeers producing open-budget music videos, \$1 million each? That's a hell of a message, something you know, our constitutional framers didn't really think about when we were thinking about free speech. You know, it's not just speech; it's music -- it's brilliant stuff, too.

I think this is something that we can, you know, cut across different cultures and unite upon to protect children, and to ask questions about morality. How much can a generation take? It's unbelievable, the focus of that. And there are some areas that we do have -- well, let me just leave it at that.

MR. HARRIS: All right, let's say. One last --

REV. THURSTON: I did wanted to respond to that, and ask, is the difference so great from the times before, or is it the fact that the media is just so much more exposed now, and there's so many more 0281options now, that present it in such a magnified way, that we wrestle with -- yeah.

MR. HARRIS: Joe?

VOICE: (Joe Duffy) Just quickly, one thing we might all do is inform ourselves about the fact that the US just had the only vote against a UNESCO resolution to try to (unintelligible) some national cultural patrol, and we cast the only negative vote as I recall it. There may have been one other one. But I find so little concern about that --

RABBI SAPERSTEIN: Israel was the other vote.

(Laughter.)

VOICE: (Joe Duffy) Right. But I do think we should be informed about it. An issue that's not getting much attention right now, and it's a very important one because it comes to this question.

MR. HARRIS: Let me just wind up reminding you about the 5:30 -- or immediately, the reception, of a wonderful program as well as some refreshments. And also, to tell you that we'll start promptly with an even better panel --

(Laughter.)

-- at 8:30 in the morning, right here at 8:30. We hope you'll be here promptly at that time. And I'll wind it up by saying this: I'm very impressed by the brilliance of Dr. Alan Curtis at putting together this program. We've seen -- and especially so with the panel we've just had, and the other panels we've had today, the inspiration that we can draw from the life of Geno Baroni.

And also the sort of burden it puts on us individually, the extra burden. I'll just repeat something that others have said, and that I alluded to earlier, to. What I found, the deepest need, yearning really, of young people -- and maybe it's other people as well -- is to find the meaning in their lives, to make their lives meaningful. And this great interest in service.

And I think that you and I have to be many -- most of you already are -- Geno Baronis, to help people see that politics and government is really the ultimate and most effective way by which that yearning to make life meaningful and to do something meaningful can be realized.

Thank you to this great panel, and thank you all.