

O-W R

Buffalo, New York
November 22, 1995

C-Span
400 North Capitol Street NW Suite #650
Washington, D. C. 20001

Dear Sir:

It appears that whoever selects the haranguers for the "Washington Journal" is incorrigible. His panelists get worse and worse and today they hit the absolute nadir in the person of Andrews, the president of People for the American Way.

That has to be the misnomer of all time and it would be hard to determine whether, looking up, Stalin or Hitler smiled on Andrews more approvingly. When I was a kid, any member of his organization would have been called an A.P.A., with the adjective of choice either black or dirty.

People for the American Way (What gall!) is merely an extension of that '20s and '30s band of bigots who frothed at the mouth at the very thought of Al Smith running for president. There are fools who believe such hatred died with the presidency of John Kennedy, but it never even paled when Kennedy proved to be less than a saint.

Andrews, on C-Span, was the typical soap-box orator who could not resist running off at the mouth. Worse, he spouted nothing but Socialistic drivel and it is an indictment of the state of Maine, and our system of government, that he could ever have been a Congressman with aspirations to be a Senator.

I reiterate what I said in an earlier letter regarding the appearance of Bianca Jagger: C-Span owes its viewers an explanation as to what criteria are used for an invitation to its "guests". It is inconceivable that any responsible member C-Span's staff would initiate such an invitation to Andrews.

Viewers of C-Span tolerate a great deal, not the least of which is having to accept The Washington Post, The New York Times and USA Today to provide the daily Bible, chapter and verse. To have such as Andrews add his interpretation of the Gospel, according to Norman Thomas, is more than a bit much.

Frankly, having panelists such as Andrews and Mr. Frenzell is purely an academic exercise. Having exited the government, their status is no different from any other layman, and their opinions are just that, opinions.

It is obvious that while some people who call in are dwellers in Never-Never Land, more than less of them are articulate, knowledgeable and much more representative of attitudes, ideas, opinions and desires of the electorate throughout the

Page 2
November 22, 1995

country.

Very often, people who call in when there is a lull in some debate or vote in Congress are much more intelligent and perceptive than callers in the morning who must contend with the panelists. One or two mornings a week devoted to such call-ins with a format that C-Span might devise could be much more productive and enlightening.

You could as well develop a method of using letters you receive much as you do E-mail. E-mail is fine but persons having access to it seem to be a rather exclusive group and the letters are necessarily brief. With a little imagination and the application of certain strictures by C-Span, letters could be a most revealing portrait of how America thinks and the debate about substantive and significant issues could be carried much further afield.

There are too many Andrews with an axe of their own to grind and the fertility of America's mind is left uncultivated.

C-Span could do a great deal about it

CC: People for the American Way