



TRANSCRIPT

SHOW AIRING APRIL 25, 2010

Host: Roland Martin

Guests: Rep. Ted Kaufman (D-DE)

Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX)

Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-DC)

LaKimba DeSadier, Exec. Dir., National Black Caucus of State Legislators

**Melanie Campbell, Exec. Dir. and CEO, National Coalition
of Black Civic Participation**

April Ryan, White House Correspondent, American Urban Radio Networks

George Curry, Syndicated Columnist

Armstrong Williams, TV and Radio Host of "The Right Side"

Robert Traynham, Host of "Roll Call TV," Comcast Network

Smokey Fontaine, Chief Content Officer, NewsOne.com/Interactive One



TV One – Washington Watch

K. Wills Transcripts

Contact/Producer: Jay Feldman

Story/Angle: “Washington Watch” – April 25, 2010 Show

**(HEAD-
LINES)**

MR. ROLAND MARTIN: At the top of our agenda this week, President Barack Obama tackles financial reform. Can Wall Street and the GOP stop him? Who will be the President’s next Supreme Court nominee? Liberal? Centrist? Woman? African-American? The pressure’s on from all sides. And “Measuring the Movement” – we’ll hear what you had to say about last week’s live forum in Harlem, folks coming together to bring about real change in the Black community.

Our “Washington Watch” newsmaker this week: Delaware senator Ted Kaufman on why financial reform is needed now and why the big Wall Street banks need to be cut down to size. Plus, our “Washington Watch” roundtable: April Ryan, White House correspondent for American Urban Radio Networks; Armstrong Williams, host of “The Right Side” radio and TV show; Robert Traynham, host of “Roll Call TV” on the Comcast Network; and syndicated columnist George Curry.

And she dedicated her life to fighting for equality and human rights. Today we honor civil rights pioneer Dr. Dorothy Height, who passed last week at the age of 98. All that and more today on “Washington Watch.”

**(SEG-
MENT 1)**

MR. MARTIN: President Barack Obama faced fierce opposition to reforming the nation’s healthcare system, but he won that fight. Now he’s facing another hurdle, reforming the nation’s financial system to prevent a repeat of the Great Recession

we're just coming out of. The Senate is set to tackle this hot-button issue tomorrow, and my first guest wants to go even farther than the President and the Democratic senate leadership. He wants to break up the big banks so none is too big to fail.

Welcome to "Washington Watch" Delaware Democratic senator Ted Kaufman.

SEN. TED KAUFMAN: Hey, Roland.

MR. MARTIN: Glad you're here.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Hey, thanks for having me.

MR. MARTIN: Let's set it up. You were chief of staff –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Sure.

MR. MARTIN: -- for then Senator Joe Biden –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Exactly.

MR. MARTIN: -- [who] later becomes Vice President. Then you get appointed to his seat. You're also not running for reelection –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Exactly.

MR. MARTIN: -- so you have a heck of a lot more freedom –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- than most other U.S. senators.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Here's what I find to be interesting. The President goes to Wall Street this week. Some say he gave a *somewhat* tough speech –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- but Democrats had the opportunity to make this a really tough bill --

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- to reform Wall Street. If you had to measure on a scale of 1 to 10, what would you say this bill measures at in terms of toughness?

SEN. KAUFMAN: Well, in terms of the total bill, I think it's probably about an 8. I think it's -- I think it's -- I think it's a good grade. I think it'd be a good bill, but I just think that, especially on the "too big to fail," we should really go further than we're going in the bill. But that's a difference of opinion that I have with the President and with other members of -- of the party, although a lot of members of the party agree. And that's my basic approach -- is that what caused this thing in Nint- -- after the crash in 1929, in 1933, we came in, and we passed a bill called Glass-Steagel, and what it did was say if you want to be in the commercial banking business -- just the regular banking business -- and be FDIC-insured, and so that people could take money out of their backyard, or out of their mattress, and put it in the bank and know it was going to be safe, then you couldn't be in investment banking, where you get in these risky things -- stock and all the other things that go with it. And we separated it, and for 50 years, we didn't have a problem.

Then in 1999, we took away Glass-Steagel. Banks started getting into these very risky investments, and that's when things really went downhill. So, what I want to do as a start is to break the banks apart the way we had under Glass-Steagel, as a first step,

and then put some caps on each one of the different areas, to bring them down. *We do not need these massive banks*, in my opinion. I have a difference of opinion with a lot of folks. We do not need them. There's a number of studies that show that we do not need to compete internationally with these big banks. Basically, the banks now, Roland, are *massive*. Just 15 years ago, if you added up all the assets of the six largest banks, they made [up] 17 percent of the – our gross national product. You know what it is now?

MR. MARTIN: What?

SEN. KAUFMAN: Sixty-three percent –

MR. MARTIN: What –

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- 63 percent.

MR. MARTIN: -- what's interesting about what you lay out there in terms of these banks – and we – we saw it with the SEC, frankly, charging Goldman Sachs.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: In that – in one case, they were investing money –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- of clients, but then in another part of the bank they were betting against those various investments. Any other world, that's called a conflict of interest.

SEN. KAUFMAN: No, it i- -- no, that isn't – that – that is – that – even *there*, that's a conflict of interest. They just didn't do anything *about* the conflict – [chuckles] – of interest. But that was clear- -- under *any* world, that is a conflict of interest, and

that's the reason we passed Glass-Steigel, to begin with. Now, thi- -- maybe they could do -- still do this conflict of interest if they were an investment bank, because you have a little more freedom of action, but that's why we separated them -- because there is a basic conflict of interest when you're in the banking business and in the investment banking business. And then even with the investment banking business, there's a potential for a conflict of interest.

So, I don't know whether Goldman Sachs is guilty of this, or not; the courts will determine that, but you ge- -- you got a little picture into what was going on when their basic argument is, "Look, these guys all know what we're doing." That's -- I -- *I don't know*. That doesn't sound to me like, you know, the right[?] -- [unintelligible]. Now, legally, can they get away with it? I don't know, and that's one of the things I'm looking at. I'm on the Judiciary Committee. Some of us are looking at "how can we tighten the law?" We want to -- everybody's innocent until proven guilty, but how do we tighten the law so these conflict[s] of interests have more -- the power of law?

But we'll see what happens with Goldman Sachs. I'm so glad the Securities and Exchange Commission is bringing this case. I mean I really think this is important, how -- whatever way it turns out; they[ve] started bringing some cases -- 'cause I think what really made me mad, one of the things I came to Wall -- to -- when I came to the Senate was we[ve] got to do something about these folks that practically destroyed the entire country, left people out of work. I mean you know, it -- how -- losing their homes. And they just walk away, you know, with big bonuses and forget about it.

MR. MARTIN: And I want to pick up on that, because this week –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Sure.

MR. MARTIN: -- the President went to Wall Street –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- to give a particular speech, and he talked about what happened to the homes of Americans.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: Here's what he had to say.

[VIDEO CLIP.]

PRES. BARACK OBAMA: And while it's true that many Americans took on financial obligations that they knew, or should've known, they could not have afforded, millions of others were, frankly, duped. They were misled by deceptive terms and conditions buried deep in the fine print. And while a few companies made out like bandits by exploiting their customers, our entire economy was made more – more vulnerable. Millions of people have now lost their homes.

[END OF VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. MARTIN: Senator, the issue the President just talked about in terms of the impact [on] homes – very important. We talked about it on this show –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- because [of] what it means to African-Americans and, frankly, the – the destruction of Black wealth. Elizabeth Warren sat on this very set and talked

about 50 percent of Black wealth likely wiped out as a result of the home foreclosure program, talking about these various loans.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: And so you have the banks, though, spending millions of dollars with lobbyists, trying to change these laws. Clearly, the American people have said, “Look, we don’t like what they’ve done.”

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: In fact, if there’s *any* poll – we’ve cer- -- we’ve seen multiple polls showing that two thirds of Americans say they *want* more regulation –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Exactly.

MR. MARTIN: -- against Wall Street.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: And so why is Congress so afraid to say to the banks, frankly, “You can go to hell.”

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: “We’re going to truly stand up for the American people”? Why dance with these devils?

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right. Well, I think what – I – I – to be honest with you, let’s see what the final bill is. And we[’ve] got to give – there’s a whole process. We’re just going to introduce the bill tomorrow. We’re going to have – there’s amendments that are going to come out of this. But, remember, what – also, what the American people

keep saying is they want bipartisan s- -- cooperation on things. So, what they're trying to do is like we tried to do on every one of these bill[s], and that is try to get a bipartisan bill. Well, there's really, I think, [a] difference of intensity, feeling about how bad we should go after Wall Street, based on just the political history of the two parties. So, people are concerned[?].

Back to your first point, *absolutely right*. I mean this – the idea of this consumer agency – we're going to have a tough consumer agency. The President's onboard on that. Chris Dodd's onboard. We're going to have a tough consumer –

MR. MARTIN: Do you –

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- agency.

MR. MARTIN: -- so, do you prefer it being independent, as Elizabeth –
[crosstalk] –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Oh, absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: -- Warren is saying, or is it okay for it to be under the Federal –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Roland –

MR. MARTIN: -- Reserve?

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- Roland, in no way. Look, if it's under the Federal Reserve, or Treasury, or those things – those people['s] number one responsibility is the soundness and safety of the banking system. They had this before. The Fed had the ability to do this before. If your number one thing is safety and soundness, and somebody says, "Well, look. You know, if you actually tell consumers, this thing is

going to hurt our profit, which could bring down a bank,” there’s a co- -- backdoor conflict of interest. There’s a conflict of interest with the people running it. We need a consumer product s- – safety [agency] that’s outside of the banks, that can just worry about consumers. Let the banks worry about – the Fed worry about the banks, and let them worry about the consumers.

You know, people are talking about the price of this thing. The price of this thing – it isn’t just, you know, the \$2½ trillion,

MR. MARTIN: Right.

SEN. KAUFMAN: It’s all those people out there. I mean, as you know better than anyone, if you lose your job, you just don’t lose your economic wherewithal; you lose your healthcare in many cases. Now, we’re going to fix – we fixed that.

MR. MARTIN: Um-hum?

SEN. KAUFMAN: And then – I mean I don’t know. You’re coming home and telling your spouse and kids, you know, “I’ve lost my job.” And we *identify* with our job[s]. And the idea that we went out there and did all these jobs [sic], and the next thing, all these people are losing their homes. I mean this – this is *serious*. This is what happened. We have to have a serious response.

In 1929, we had the great crash. We went back, and we did some really big things. We set up Glass-Steagel. We put through FDIC insurance. We made [a] change in our margin rules. We did all these things. I want to do the same thing again.

Now, maybe we’re going to have to do it in, like, one or two steps. I don’t know.

I *know* that if we don't do it in this bill, we'll do it next year, or the year after.

MR. MARTIN: And Glass-Stiegel, obviously, had lots of bipartisan support –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- when it actually was enacted.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: Let me ask you this. You come from a state [with] significant banking interests.

SEN. TED KAUFMAN: Sure.

MR. MARTIN: When you listen to folks coming out of New York –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right?

MR. MARTIN: -- they talk about the impact on Wall Street –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- and jobs. And – and what somewhat bothers me with this is that every time there is a discussion in this country about making some changes –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Yes?

MR. MARTIN: -- folks automatically say, "Oh, no. We're going to lose jobs."

SEN. KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: But didn't we lose 8 *million* –

SEN. KAUFMAN: Roland, look –

MR. MARTIN: -- as a result –

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- Roland –

MR. MARTIN: -- of this mess?

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- Roland, that is -- I *totally* -- you and I are exa- -- [chuckles] -- yeah. You know, we are *totally* on the [same] wavelength. I'm -- I'm tired of these people coming to me and saying, "Well, you know, this is rea-" -- "This isn't gonna help me. I'm just doing it to protect all the *other* people." You know, people come into the corporation[?] and say, "I want to protect the consumers." Well, you -- you know, *that's* not what they're about. They're about protecting[?] --

MR. MARTIN: They're about \$6 billion in bonuses.

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- *exactly*. So, no, no. It's the -- jobs -- I was on a show in New York, and somebody on the show said, "Hey, look," you know, "we[ve] got to look out for New York and the market."

I said, "Guys, if you don't do this right, there'll be *no* jobs in New York. We" -- "Do you" -- "How many times do you think everybody's going to come to Wall Street to invest their money if we have things like this?"

MR. MARTIN: But a- -- but also, the reality is if it ... were not for the American taxpayer, these banks wouldn't be in business.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right. But the ba- -- but the point is, Roland, the ne- -- if -- if, in fact, they don't do the things they have to do, people aren't g- -- these markets -- it isn't guaranteed everybody goes to Wall Street to get their money. I mean how many Americans do you think right now feel comfortable going to Wall Street to making a deal? I mean they'll make a deal with their local bank, and they'll make a deal --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- with local -- [unintelligible] -- but how many people feel comfortable going to Wall Street? When *that* happens, when people stop investing -- for instance, one of the things -- if I had a friend that had a 401(k) right now? "Don't invest in Wall Street. Get in a bank. Get in Treasury bills. Get in some way, but get in something safe, because we just don't know where this" -- you know, "where this thing's going to go." Now, I'm encouraging people to go into the market. We have the best markets in the world, but if we lose that, Roland, you talk about *jobs*? That -- *it all could be gone*. There's nothing in ... God's universe that says there has to be a Wall Street and that there has to be a -- a market up there. The only reason there's a market up there is because people believe, in the United States of America, when they go to the b- -- our markets, they get a fair deal. When they stop believing that, [the] party's over for Wall Street.

MR. MARTIN: Well, look. I don't -- I certainly have no issue in terms of being -- being tough against the banks, and I say forget the fact when it comes to campaign donations. Forget --

SEN. KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- all of that. At the end of the day, too many Americans were adversely impacted by this particular mess. Either you clean it up, or it simply continues again.

SEN. KAUFMAN: But, Roland, you know I'm not running again, but I'll tell you

what. I've been involved in a lot of campaigns. If I were running this year, I'd be saying exactly the same thing I'm saying. This is one of those things that's not only the right thing; it *resonates* out there. I'm telling you. I've been –

MR. MARTIN: Oh, absolutely. And I mean –

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- I mean I go –

MR. MARTIN: -- Republican, Democrat –

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- I go –

MR. MARTIN: -- independent – it –

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- when I go around Delaware –

MR. MARTIN: -- it doesn't matter.

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- when I go around Delaware and talk to people, I mean they stop you –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

SEN. KAUFMAN: -- in the street and say, "You're doing the right thing." So it would've[?] made a *great* – I mean if I was – I'm not running, but if I was running, it's a great campaign issue. It's the right thing to do.

MR. MARTIN: Sen. Kaufman, we certainly appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

SEN. KAUFMAN: Hey, thanks for having me.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Take care.

SEN. KAUFMAN: It was a real pleasure.

MR. MARTIN: Folks, coming up after the break, critics are calling for a more

diverse panel of Supreme Court candidates. Does financial reform really help Main Street? And has the President got his mojo back? More on these stories and much more when April Ryan of American Urban Radio Networks; Armstrong Williams of “The Right Side”; Robert Traynham of “Roll Call TV”; and syndicated columnist George Curry join me for our rowdy roundtable discussion.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 2)**

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. Winter’s gone from D.C., and there may even be a thaw between Democrats and Republicans on Capitol Hill. [Chuckles.] Yeah, *right*.

In our “Washington Watch” news panel today, April Ryan, White House correspondent for American Urban Radio Networks; Armstrong Williams, host of “The Right Side” radio/TV show; Robert Traynham, the host of “Roll Call TV” on the Comcast Network; and my man, syndicated columnist and Alabama’s greatest, George Curry.

MR. GEORGE CURRY: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks, let’s g- -- [chuckles] – get right to it. Financial reform – [the] President goes to Wall Street this week. [He] doesn’t necessary talk tough to Wall Street. It was sort of a – you know, a – a nice, little speech; but here’s what’s interesting. Americans have been saying, “Look, we want regulation against Wall Street.” They don’t want to see what – what took place last year repeated again.

Why are folks so afraid to go tough on Wall Street, George?

MR. CURRY: Well, I mean Republicans were afraid for political reasons, and

now they – [chuckles] – they realize that there’s *so much venom* out there. People are disgusted. The *very* people who say they don’t want government interference, by the way, are now *begging* for this, because it’s scandalous – particularly the notorious AIG. [CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: Armstrong, it’s very interesting when – when you listen to Democrats and Republicans. You – you – of course, you had Mitch McConnell saying this week that, you know, this – this is about bailing banks out; but, again, the American people – Republican, Democrat, independent – [are] saying, “These cats messed over all of us. They’re still getting billions of dollars. The last thing we want is a repeat of what took place.”

MR. ARMSTRONG WILLIAMS: Well, unfortunately, President Obama went to New York with a wink. There’s a great understanding that he has to do what he has to do; but, yet, no different than before, when the bonuses were being paid out, and they said, “We’re not aware.” Then it was revealed they *were* aware. The unfortunate thing is what the American people are realizing [is] that Republicans and Democrats in the White House are all in the same bed with this issue. It’s not real reform. It’s – it’s ... symbolism. It’s a photo op, and when it’s all said and done three and four months later, it will still be the same, and that’s why the American people have lost trust in them, and they remain outraged – ‘cause they know that this is a farce.

MR. ROBERT TRAYNHAM: You know, Roland, what’s telling is that when the President went to Wall Street earlier this week and late last week – is the chilly

reception he received not just from Republicans, but from Democrats. He got no backing whatsoever from the Democrats on Capitol Hill, and the reason why is because George and Armstrong are absolutely right. Republicans and Democrats, sadly to say, are in bed with each other on this issue. Not only is it very complicated –

MR. MARTIN: It's about money.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- it's about money, but it's also about politics. It's also about regulation. You know, there is a thing called "too big to fail"; and if, in fact, you take a look at a Citi, or a JPMorgan, or a Goldman Sachs – if, in fact, these organizations *were* to fail, the economy would collapse, and the President knows that. And that's the main reason why he did a mild slap on the wrist to Wall Street.

MR. MARTIN: So, April, why dance? Why is the White House dancing around this issue, when if he – if the President went tough against Wall Street, *I don't see the public being upset?*

MS. APRIL RYAN: Well, number one, I – and I think all the panel hit – hit this squarely – the fact that it's about money, and that's why they're not getting tough. Thi- - this is the –

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, but a lot –

MS. RYAN: -- financial center of –

MR. MARTIN: -- of our money –

MS. RYAN: -- the nation.

MR. MARTIN: -- we lost!

MS. RYAN: Right, right. But the President went to New York, to Lower Manhattan, with minimums – not with the teeth that he was expecting. And the issue is really right now – is telling the banks, “Okay. I’m going to tell you you’re going to go” – “and when you invest money,” you say, “normally, you used to put a dollar to something that was on paper for \$50,” and then the o- – the rest of us, who put into those banks, are the ones who have to – to pay the – pay the piper for everything. *They* just lost a dollar. So, now what’s being told to these banks [is], “Look, you are going to have to put up more money to” -- “to support any risky investment, or any -- [crosstalk]” –

MR. MARTIN: But I don’t –

MS. RYAN: -- “deal.”

MR. MARTIN: -- think the – the real concern for the American people, frankly, is whether or not they put up more money. It boils down to – it boi- --

MS. RYAN: No, it’s about the banks –

MR. MARTIN: -- but it boils down –

MR. RYAN: -- putting up more money.

MR. MARTIN: -- to, “Are you going to play the same games today as you did before?”

MR. WILLIAMS: But the pro- -- the --

MR. TRAYNHAM: It’s a – I’m sorry. Go ahead, Armstrong.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- the – the ...problem is – is that the President is dealing with a bureaucracy. In all fairness to the President of the United States, there’s just not much

that he can do. The –

MS. RYAN: That's right.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- President is run by Wall Street and the banking institutions.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I disagree – [crosstalk] –

MR. WILLIAMS: No, but he *is*.

MR. MARTIN: -- saying he can't do more. [Crosstalk] –

MR. TRYANHAM: [Crosstalk]- --

MR. WILLIAMS: There – there's no- -- unless he does it through legislation.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. WILLIAMS: The bully pulpit –

MR. MARTIN: -- no, no, no.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- is not working for him.

MR. MARTIN: But – but the point of legislation – we just heard Sen. Kaufman on the show lay out what took place after the Great Depression, where Congress really went after and put some real solid rules in place.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Well –

MS. RYAN: FDIC.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- and the reason why Congress did that is because, obviously, we had a Great Deal – Depre- -- Depression, but even more importantly, there was a Supreme Court that backed up the Roosevelt-era type policies. You don't have that right now, Roland, where if, in fact, this Democratic Congress was to pass this

“overreaching legislation” – quote-unquote – the Supreme Court most likely would – would knock it down.

But let me go back to another point, which is very interesting. The Democrats – and I don’t know why – have not really gone back to the whole populist theme about fighting for the little guy, as – as fighting these golden parachutes, fighting these CEO compensations. *That’s* where they win, and that’s –

MR. MARTIN: And, Joe –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- what they should be thinking about.

MR. MARTIN: -- and Joe is that – go – go ahead.

MR. CURRY: -- I – I think this. I think that people are *really* upset more than anything else – is that these financial institutions know that these are bad – these derivatives, for example – that you can bet against them, whether they’ll go up and down, and you’re going to make money, regardless. And then you’re go- – [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: So – so, you’re making money on the front end –

MR. CURRY: -- so it’s making – the front end, the back end –

MR. MARTIN: -- with the – with the investors –

MR. CURRY: -- and you’re saying, “*Despite* the money from taxpayers, I’m going to continue to pay these bonuses.” *That’s* what really irks people.

MR. MARTIN: But – but – and – but let’s go to the politics, the point that – that Robert just made, and I think that is the point. There’s a – still a significant gap

between enthusiasm between Democratic voters and Republican voters, and all last year, we – I was highly critical of the President and his administration on this show when they were sitting here, wagging their finger when it came to bonuses, but doing nothing. And so when you – if you – so, let's say you do get the bill. Okay. What did you really get? Are you really going to p- -- are you really appealing to the American electorate, and they say, "Absolutely. That person stood up for us"?

MS. RYAN: You're appealing to the American electorate.

MR. MARTIN: Are you actually *doing* it?

MS. RYAN: You're appealing to the American electorate when you say that, "I'm going to have consumer protections for you, and these banks are going to be responsible. We're not going to bail them out anymore." And the President is just saying, "Look, we're not bailing them out. I'm protecting you" –

MR. MARTIN: April, April –

MS. RYAN: -- and – but wait a minute. This is –

MR. MARTIN: -- people want more than that.

MS. RYAN: -- I'm telling you –

MR. MARTIN: They want more than that.

MS. RYAN: -- look – but –

MR. MARTIN: They want –

MS. RYAN: -- they don't want –

MR. MARTIN: -- more than just –

MS. RYAN: -- let me tell you something. When the -- when the metal hits the road -- or, the *rubber* hits the road, the bottom line is, "What is going to happen to me?"

After all of what --

MR. MARTIN: But you['ve] got to see --

MS. RYAN: -- happened on Wall Street --

MR. MARTIN: -- but you gotta -- [crosstalk]- --

MS. RYAN: -- what happened --

MR. MARTIN: -- you've got to go get[?] the[?] plan.

MS. RYAN: -- on Wall Street, the -- what's planned is what happened on Wall Street caused foreclosures and people to lose their jobs. And the President is saying, "That's not going to happen" --

MR. MARTIN: Robert.

MS. RYAN: -- "again."

MR. TRAYNHAM: But, you know, Roland, what the -- what the White House needs to do is very simple, is play small ball. What they need to do is talk about how credit cards should not be preying on low-income folks.

MR. MARTIN: That's right.

MR. TRAYNHAM: What they need to be talking about -- it's -- it's little thin- --

MS. RYAN: They *are* --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- well --

MS. RYAN: -- doing that: credit card reform.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but – but speaking I- -- in other words, bringing these folks in, beating them up and going back to Main Street and saying, “I’m fighting for you.”

MR. MARTIN: But you know what?

MR. TRAYNHAM: That’s not what –

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] – “The” – “The” –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- the administration is doing.

MR. MARTIN: -- “Huffington Post” had a great headline that talked about two different presidents, and they had a headline from FDR by saying, “I” – basically, “I DON’T MIND IF THEY HATE ME.” I mean the – it see- -- the President seemed to do a different – President Obama seems to do a different –

MR. WILLIAMS: But – but – but --

MR. MARTIN: -- kind of –

MR. WILLIAMS: -- however –

MR. MARTIN: -- dance here.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- however, though, you don’t need financial reform. All you[’ve] got to do is go back to what your earlier guest said, which I completely agree with. Glass-Stiegel was put in place to make sure you separate capital investment from banking. Once they rolled that back, it – it opened the door for corruption, manipulation and out-of-control finances.

MR. MARTIN: Absolutely.

MR. WILLIAMS: It –

MR. CURRY: We *do* need regulation. We don't – you – [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: That *is* regulation.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- that i- --

MR. CURRY: -- yeah, and it was the law. But –

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] – but go ahead.

MR. CURRY: -- what we had before, obviously, is a *problem*. And so people want some real *teeth* in this, and – and the problem is – the *real* basic problem with Obama is he is not confrontational. He just keeps reaching: “Some way we're going to get a compromise,” and sometime[s] you need to just put your foot down and say, “Forget it.”

MR. TRAYNHAM: Because –

MR. CURRY: “Let's go.”

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- that's a common theme. You – when you look at healthcare, when you take a look at financial [reform], he's not a very combative person when it comes to one-on-one relations[?].

MR. MARTIN: But I do –

MR. TRAYNHAM: That's not his style.

MR. MARTIN: -- but I do believe, though – look, like it or not, this is the end of April, just a few more months before you go into an election. You look at how the folks on the right are – are fired up. I'm sorry. The – the ... nice and easy, “Let me just” – you know, “I don't want to be confrontational” approach – they have got to fire up their

base!

MR. TRAYNHAM: But they think they *have* already on healthcare.

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry.

MR. TRAYNHAM: They think that.

MR. MARTIN: I – I – I –

MR. TRAYNHAM: And they also think –

MR. MARTIN: -- I – I –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but, Roland – but they also –

MR. MARTIN: -- I don't s- -- I don't –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- think the Supreme Court --

MR. MARTIN: -- see it. I'm being honest with you. I don't see it.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but – but they also think, with the Supreme Court, if they get a left – and I know we'll talk about this. If they get a left, hefty intellectual that's going to go against Alito, go against a Roberts, they think that's going to be enough to fire –

MS. RYAN: They need a liberal.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- up –

MR. MARTIN: But will they –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- their base.

MS. RYAN: They need a –

MR. MARTIN: -- but here's the question.

MS. RYAN: -- liberal.

MR. MARTIN: Will they do it?

MS. RYAN: They need a liberal.

MR. MARTIN: George, do you expect this president to choose a strong liberal, or will they go for the centrist to sort of appeal to every- -- different people?

MR. CURRY: If his past is any indication, he does not like getting people who are identifiable with the left; but if he doesn't in this case, it's going to be a problem, because –

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, the –

MR. CURRY: -- you're going to replace somebody like Stevens. If you get anybody – if it's a Kagan, who's mostly – the Solicitor General, who's – who's considered a frontrunner – well, when it comes to ... civil liberty and executive power, she is basically *conservative*. And so you will actually *lose*, unless you get somebody – and he's going to be held *accountable* on this --

MR. MARTIN: Are they going to – are –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN -- are they going –

MR. WILLIAMS: [Crosstalk] – I will –

MR. MARTIN: -- to go left?

MR. WILLIAMS: -- I will tell you this: the President was putting out – they were floating the name of a judge last week, and there was this advocacy about they could

get the first gay on the Supreme Court. That balloon burst real quick, and now the administrative judge, Garland, who is liked by Roberts, well respected by many Democrats – the President is not interested in a fierce battle over the Court so close to election day.

MS. RYAN: No. And let me –

MR. WILLIAMS: He's not.

MS. RYAN: -- let me say this.

MR. CURRY: He *has to*.

MS. RYAN: We –

MR. CURRY: He *has to*.

MS. RYAN: -- we all have tickets – this is a theater game, and we all have tickets to watch this. But you're right. You know, they're floating a lot of names.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS. RYAN: Gays, Asians, *and* they have two Blacks on this list – two, Black women.

MR. CURRY: Black women.

MS. RYAN: And one of them they are *really* pushing, 'cause I mean I was getting so many calls –

MR. MARTIN: Judge Sears out of Georgia?

MS. RYAN: -- no, no, no.

MR. WILLIAMS: No, no.

MS. RYAN: Not Sears. Not –

MR. CURRY: -- Williams. Williams.

MS. RYAN: -- Sears.

OFF CAMERA: Ann Williams.

MS. RYAN: Ann Claire Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: Williams.

MS. RYAN: And she's –

MR. MARTIN: Even – eve- -- even though –

MS. RYAN: -- yes.

MR. MARTIN: -- it[?] – [crosstalk]- --

MR. CURRY: -- she was appointed by Reagan.

MS. RYAN: She's out of Chica- -- yeah, she was appointed by Reagan – and Clinton. And some *liberals* –

MR. WILLIAMS: But she's *safe*.

MS. RYAN: -- right! And –

MR. WILLIAMS: She's safe, yeah.

MS. RYAN: -- she is – she is able to be confirmed.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS. RYAN: And that's the key –

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR. CURRY: Let's not –

MS. RYAN: -- *confirmation*.

MR. CURRY: -- let's not forget -- let's -- [unintelligible]- -- the -- the National Bar Association, the Black lawyers --

MS. RYAN: Yes.

MR. CURRY: -- recommended her.

MS. RYAN: Yes.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Right, but, Roland --

MR. CURRY: And the thing about it, too, is what she has a lead on -- if to get a Black woman -- is because she's already been an appellate judge --

MS. RYAN: And you have to --

MR. CURRY: -- and a lot of them --

MS. RYAN: -- remember longevity --

MR. CURRY: -- get appointed -- [crosstalk].

MS. RYAN: -- longevity and confirmation --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- that -- that's right.

MS. RYAN: -- are the two things[?].

MR. TRAYNHAM: But, you know, Roland, I think -- I think President Obama's going to take a page out of George Bush's playbook on the Supreme Court. He's going to nominate someone that is intelligent, that's thoughtful, but behind the scenes as tough as nails. And that was, obviously, Justice, uh --

MR. WILLIAMS: No. No.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- J- -- no, no, no. Justice Roberts.

MR. MARTIN: President -- President --

MR. TRAYNHAM: And e- -- and --

MR. MARTIN: -- George W. Bush chose --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- no.

MR. MARTIN: -- somebody --

MR. TRAYNHAM: No.

MR. MARTIN: -- who was thoughtful, smart, but who was a *fierce conservative*.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Okay, but my point --

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes!

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- is --

MR. MARTIN: It was *very* --

MR. CURRY: Yes, he did.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but -- but, Roland --

MR. MARTIN: -- *clear* --

MR. CURRY: Yes, he did.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but, Roland -- but my point is --

MR. CURRY: Yeah.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- that when you t- -- when you take a look at the Chief Justice, he's actually very thoughtful and *public* --

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Okay.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- and -- [crosstalk] --

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: Robert, Robert, Robert --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but listen. Listen. Let me --

MR. MARTIN: -- Robert --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- finish.

MR. MARTIN: -- you can be thoughtful --

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: -- on the left and the right --

MR. TRAYNHAM: But -- but let me --

MR. MARTIN: -- but he *knew* --

MR. WILLIAMS: At the *core* --

MR. MARTIN: -- after Harriet Miers --

MR. WILLIAMS: -- at the *core* --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- [crosstalk] -- let me *finish*.

MR. MARTIN: -- he had to appoint a strong conservative.

MR. TRAYNHAM: You're making my point.

MR. MARTIN: So, the question is, is this President, though, going to appoint someone who is a strong liberal?

MR. TRAYNHAM: I think so.

MS. RYAN: No, someone who's --

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. CURRY: Let me go to your point.

MS. RYAN: -- moderate.

MR. CURRY: Let me -- let me go to --

MS. RYAN: Someone who's moderate.

MR. CURRY: -- your point. There was a study done at the University of Houston, Professor, that showed that George W. Bush appointme- -- -pointees were more conservative [than] Ronald Reagan's. Will -- will Barack Obama do that on the other side? I don't --

MR. WILLIAMS: No.

MR. CURRY: -- believe so.

MR. WILLIAMS: No.

MS. RYAN: He's got to balance the Court --

MR. MARTIN: So, you say --

MS. RYAN: -- out.

MR. MARTIN: -- no. [Crosstalk] --

MR. WILLIAM: Well, look. He *can't*.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- you say yes or no?

MS. RYAN: I say liberal. Yeah, he's got to have a moderate --

MR. MARTIN: Strong liberal?

MS. RYAN: -- liberal.

MR. WILLIAMS: He can't.

MS. RYAN: *Moderate* liberal.

MR. WILLIAMS: He can't.

MS. RYAN: *Moderate* liberal.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's too close to an election. His situation is too tenuous. He's not going to do it.

MR. MARTIN: Robert?

MR. TRAYNHAM: He *will*. He *will*, because it's too close to the election. He needs to fire up that base, 'cause they're not fired up right now. They're not fired up over healthcare. They don't think this president's fighting for them. "Don't ask, don't tell" – you go on down the list, this liberal will – base is *not happy*.

MS. RYAN: A Black –

MR. MARTIN: John –

MS. RYAN: -- woman will fire 'em up –

MR. MARTIN: -- John Roberts –

MS. RYAN: -- [crosstalk, chuckles].

MR. MARTIN: -- Sand- -- well, John Roberts, Sam Alito, they were thoughtful, they were smart; but the right knew they were s- -- they were *rock-solid* –

MR. TRAYNHAM: I agree.

MR. MARTIN: -- *conservatives*.

MR. TRAYNHAM: I agree.

MR. MARTIN: The President has to appoint –

MS. RYAN: Everything's –

MR. MARTIN: -- to appeal to his –

MS. RYAN: -- strategic.

MR. MARTIN: -- base, they've got to be a rock-solid –

MS. RYAN: *Everything's* –

MR. MARTIN: -- liberal.

MS. RYAN: -- strategic.

MR. CURRY: And, the problem is what – what you've done with –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. CURRY: -- George W. Bush is the Federal Society has basically replaced the American Bar Association. That is –

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. CURRY: -- this whole –

MR. TRAYNHAM: That's very true.

MR. CURRY: -- network of conservative lawyers, professors and judges –

MR. TRAYNHAM: It's a whole network.

MR. CURRY: -- their – their whole plan was to reclaim the Courts. They have *done* that, but Barack Obama has an obligation to do something about[?] –

MR. WILLIAMS: Not an –

MR. CURRY: -- that.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- obligation. [Crosstalk] -- because --

MR. CURRY: He *does*.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- political -- politics --

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. WILLIAMS: -- will not allow it.

MR. TRAYNHAM: And his base is reminding him of that.

MR. TRAYNHAM: His base is reminding him of that.

MR. MARTIN: Absolutely. Well --

MS. RYAN: Again --

MR. MARTIN: -- again, I think it's -- it's going to be -- it's ... certainly going to be a fierce fight -- not necessarily the confirmation, but, again, who he appoints. Like it or not -- the De- -- the -- the liberal base *is not fired up* for November. And if there is another middle-of-the-road decision, it is going to spell even more disaster for Democrats come the polls in November.

We're out of time. April, Armstrong --

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MARTIN: -- Robert, George, we appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

You knew I was getting the last word, so I don't know *what* you were trying --

[chuckles] -- to do.

[LAUGHTER.]

MS. RYAN: You know what. Ooh! [Laughs.]

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. You can join in on the discussion –

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MARTIN: -- by logging on to TVOneOnline.com and leave your comments there. April will probably do the same thing since she couldn't talk there.

MS. RYAN: [Cracks up.]

MR. MARTIN: Up next, her life's work was a testimony to her commitment to equality – Black women most of all. We'll look back at the career of the late Dr. Dorothy Height and the legacy she left behind, in her own words, and the people who knew her and were inspired by her.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 3)**

MR. MARTIN: Last Tuesday, we lost an American hero, Dr. Dorothy Height, who passed at the age of 98, this extraordinary woman, who was equally at home with the least of us and the greatest, befriended and respected by White House residents from First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt to President Barack Obama and all the presidents in between. Born in an era of intense racial discrimination, she refused to be bound by the cords of that injustice. She was committed to tearing down the barriers of race and gender discrimination.

Here with me today to talk about Ms. Height's legacy is Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton of the District of Columbia; Texas congresswoman Eddie Bernice

Johnson; Executive Director of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators LaKimba DeSadier; and the Executive Director and CEO of the National Coalition of Black Civic Participation, Melanie Campbell.

Ladies, welcome to the show.

PANELISTS: Thank you.

[CROSSTALK.]

MS. LAKIMBA DESADIER: Glad to be here.

MR. MARTIN: I – I ...was – I was talking to Susan Taylor a few weeks ago. Dr. Dorothy Height was fighting in the hospital, and the doctor was surprised that she was – she was still hanging in there, and Susan said it was amazing. “Just two weeks ago, she was at her desk, called me and said, ‘I need you to come to D.C. *now*.’” And she said, “Whenever Dr. Height called, I don’t care what you were doing. You got up and left to go see what she wanted.”

DEL. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON: And if the truth be told, when she was told she had to go into the hospital, she resisted and said, “I’m sorry. I’ve got a speaking engagement.” They had to virtually *force* her into the hospital. They could see she was weak and needed to go, and she stayed there a long time, fighting to the end. She – [chuckles] – gave new meaning to the word “*act-iv-ist*.”

[CHUCKLING.]

DEL. NORTON: Spell it the way *Dorothy* did.

OFF CAMERA: Indeed, indeed.

MR. MARTIN: What about that in terms of – ‘cause Donna Brazile told me that the doctors were even amazed that – they said, “Man. We” – “We d-“ – they said, “This woman is absolutely resilient.” And even – and the same driver we use, Mr. Kyle, he said, “Man, she said she’s in the hospital pullin’ cords out, she said, “Cause I have *work to do.*” So, even to the end, she made it clear, “*I have work to do.*”

Melanie?

MS. MELANIE CAMPBELL: Oh, most definitely, and she always taught us “never give up.” One of the last – one of the last groups that she spoke to before she went into the hospital was with – with Master Series – Barbara Skinner’s group – Dr. Barbara Sinner [sic] – Williams-Skinner’s group, and the – and which is a group of young w- -- young people, and she said that, “No, I have to speak.” And she said she wasn’t feeling good, but she said, “No, *I want to speak.*” And her message was, “Never give up.”

And so even through the end, in that – in those weeks, she – she didn’t give up. And she – and that’s the lesson. Whatever you do, you do it ‘til the end –

MR. MARTIN: Look – [crosstalk] –

MS. CAMPBELL: -- and – [crosstalk].

MR. MARTIN: -- last few ye- - last number of years, she would be around in a wheelchair. And I *swear* she was *everywhere!*

OFF CAMERA: That’s right.

MR. MARTIN: There wasn’t an event that I went to around the country that you

did not see this woman in a wheelchair -- with *the hat* on.

MS. CAMPBELL: Right.

REP. JOHNSON: Absolutely.

MS. CAMPBELL: First one to get there, last one to leave.

MS. DESADIER: She was a trailblazer.

REP. JOHNSON: Yeah.

MS. DESADIER: I mean she was teaching us, as our generation, that we – there's no excuses [not] to be what we need to be. We should not accept anything less, and we should always promote. So, that – she gave us the example. She led by example all the time.

MR. MARTIN: Congresswoman?

REP. JOHNSON: Well, I've known her so many years and helped to organize the National Council of Negro Women in Dallas. And what impressed me about her is how she could smoothly move from one room to another. I remember in 1984, she was at the Democratic National Convention in California, and I got back home. The Republican National Convention was in Dallas. And she called me to say that she was there. And so I said, "Well, I must do something while you're here."

So, I had a party at my house for her, and she came and brought some Black Republicans. So, I said, "You get along with *everybody*, don't you?"

[CHUCKLING.]

DEL. NORTON: Well, that's an important point.

REP. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON: Yes.

[CHORUS OF AGREEMENT.]

DEL. NORTON: Here was a woman who spent her life fighting for civil rights and women's rights, mostly associated with Black people, but equally respected by Republican- – Republicans and Democrats. It was a Republican president who gave her one of the highest honors. A Democratic president gave her one of the highest honors, but I[ve] got to say something to you about her holding on, 'cause you mentioned that, Roland. I was one of the women that gathered when she went into the hospital. That was at *least* three weeks ago.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

DEL. NORTON: We got –

MR. MARTIN: 'Cause I got the phone call –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- and they said –

DEL. NORTON: -- I got the phone call from – from Alexis Herman. “We think,” you know, “this is it.”

We gathered. We said, “We’ll just stay here until the end.” She didn’t have any relatives. Some of them were coming from New York.

Well, we would’ve still been *sitting* there.

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.]

[LAUGHTER.]

OFF CAMERA: That's right.

DEL. NORTON: We finally had to give up and go *home*, because *she* wasn't giving up.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

DEL. NORTON: She wasn't ready to leave this earth!

MR. MARTIN: Right.

DEL. NORTON: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: Absolutely.

OFF CAMERA: She had work to do.

MR. MARTIN: We – we knew about – she's often talked about when she was rejected by Barnard College, because they had met their quota. She actually did a[n] interview with Armstrong Williams. We have several different bites from that, so I want to play that and then talk about how that really set up her whole lifelong commitment to activism.

[VIDEO CLIP.]

DR. DOROTHY HEIGHT: I graduated with honors from my high school, and I was accepted at Barnard College for admission. And when I reported for admission, they discovered that I was a Negro, and Dean Gildersleeve just said to me – she said, "Well, you're young enough, and you can come back next year, because we have two Negro students" – Vera Joseph and Belle Tobias – "and we cannot take a third."

Well, I think that I will never be able to get over the – the traumatic feeling that there was – you know, when you just finish high school and had all these recommendations and had the grades.

The good thing was that I eventually went down to New York University and got there just as they were closing registration, and my sister accompanied me 'cause I had an older sister with whom I was living in New York. And the dean asked me for my diploma. I didn't have one – my application. My sister suggested that I show her my letter from Barnard College, and I did. And the dean looked at it, and she said, "Hm-m-m. A girl with these kind of grades won't *need* an application."

[END OF VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. MARTIN: She talked about that traumatic experience. Do you think that – that plays a role in what drove her, that the rejection of other African-Americans – especially women – faced all across this country, whether there it was jobs, employment, education?

DEL. NORTON: I think it was in her DNA, because before that, she was already in the streets, protesting lynching. This is a woman who came from a part of the country where – and that's why they didn't know at Barnard – a – a virtually all-White high school, but who felt her Blackness when most people didn't, and who was willing to march out in front with it. So, by the time she was rejected at Barnard, she was ready for them. You notice what she did. Instead of going back, dejected, or even applying to

one of our HBCUs, she went down the street to – to New York University. “Never give up. You’ll find somebody who will accept you.” That’s a lesson for us all.

MR. MARTIN: Go ahead.

MS. DESADIER: That’s an example of her quote. “If the time is not ripe, then you ripen the time.” That’s what she *did*. She took advantage of that. She decided to move on and find something else to continue her legacy, which she has done.

MR. MARTIN: [We’re] going to a break. When we come back, I want to pick up on this, but also on how it took a woman to have to keep all these massive egos together at the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, and so what that had to be like, in this male-dominated civil rights hierarchy, being, frankly, the only woman – or, one of the only women – at the top. So, we’ll pick up on that when we come back.

Folks, we’ll be back in a moment with our panel discussion – the great Dr. Dorothy Height.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 4)**

MR. MARTIN: Welcome back to “Washington Watch.” With our panel, we’re talking about Dr. Dorothy Height. And before I went to the break, I talked about the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. You get the Big Sil- -- Big Six civil rights leaders, and [by] all the various accounts, massive egos to – to deal with here. Here’s what she had to say [about] how she had to keep all of these folks together, who were, frankly, tearing at each other as it relates to what to do on August 28th, 1963.

[VIDEO CLIP.]

DR. HEIGHT: We'd become a group of people where unity was more important than uniformity, where there was a respect for the differences among us. Of course, there were all those fl- -- petty things that would arise, but I think -- I got -- had a little part in helping to bridge those gaps and s- -- because, in reality, I was the only volunteer in the group.

You see, in that group -- it's very interesting. I'm a social worker. You had Whitney Young, who was a social worker. Here was Roy Wilkins, where the NAACP was more directed towards the laws. You had the -- Dr. King, with his solid background in nonviolence and his religious, Christian background. You had James Farmer, who'd been working with the freedom riders and so on. And in a sense, I was the one who said that though the Student Nonviolent [Coordinating] Committee was doing things that people didn't quite like at that point, not -- not that their objectives weren't right, but their tactics -- but I said, "We have to bring them to the table," and they came to the table.

[END OF VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. MARTIN: How vital was it, in hind- -- important is it to make sure that her part of history is not forgotten? Because whenever you talk about civil rights leaders, you will hear the lo-o-ong line of -- of men mentioned, and Ella Baker, even Fannie Lou Hamer, Dorothy Height often [are] not talked about; but she played a *pivotal* role in this whole fight, in this movement.

DEL. NORTON: And was the only woman at the top of the movement. When she talks about the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee – [chuckles] – I was in SNCC at the time, and it is true that the young people had to be brought to the table. Who was for bringing us to the table? Dorothy Height.

But Dorothy Height was a pre-feminist woman leader. There were hardly any *White* women leaders, and here is a Black woman sitting at the top of the Black civil rights leadership. Remember, they were the only spokespeople for Black people. There were almost no people like Eddie Bernice and I. There were *very* few elected officials. So, when anybody – power brokers or not – wanted to go to find out where we stood, they went to these men, mostly, and to Dorothy. And, frankly, she was not as high-profile as they were.

REP. JOHNSON: Well, without pushiness, with lots of grace, she was always there. She did not allow the men to leave her out. And as you look at pictures down through the years, she was the only female that [was] in these meetings, and she never felt uncomfortable about it, and she was never going to be left out.

MS. CAMPBELL: One of the things over the last year and-a-half, we – I co-convoked the Black Womens' Roundtable with Dr. Height, and so we met every week after President Obama was elected. And one of the things that we – that she taught us was she said, "We" – "We have" – "We work with *all*" – "We work with the men, but we also have to organize ourselves." And also, to never forget to remember. And every time she spoke, she mentioned Mary McLeod Bethune. And so part of making sure

one's legacy stays is that we have to never forget to remember Dr. Dorothy Irene Height. She taught us you have to – you – you're at the table – when you're in the room, act like you're at the table. And so, you know, d- -- don't s- -- don't get behind. You s- -- you stand up. If you're the only woman in the room, then you're representing *all* women – for sure. And when you're women together – we just come together.

And unity was really her thing. Make sure that we're unified. We don't have – we're not – we're all not monolithic, but we're going – she – you know, she'd always do that fist? And how important it was about that fist and together we can get much, much more done. And so we're going to make sure that we continue her legacy by always remembering Dr. Dorothy –

MR. MARTIN: But she actually –

MS. CAMPBELL: -- Height.

MR. MARTIN: -- spoke about what she wanted her legacy to be in her interview with Armstrong Williams.

[VIDEO CLIP.]

DR. HEIGHT: Well – well, I really want to be remembered as someone who tried to work for justice, who tried to relate herself to other people and to purposes that were big enough to transcend so many differences, and that I – I tried to fulfill my life's work – and[?] that's for justice and equality.

[END OF VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. MARTIN: LaKimba, what does it mean for this generation not to forget

pioneers like her?

MS. DESADIER: It's because of her struggle, her sacrifice, it's women like myself, Melanie Campbell, Dr. Scott – we're able to do what we do – serve as – for our constituents, for our friends, for our members. It's – it's *more* than important; it's what we *should* do to pass the torch down to our generation – next generation.

MR. MARTIN: Real quick, final comment.

DEL. NORTON: [It's] *very* important to remember her association with the women's movement as well as the Civil Rights Movement. And when Black people were confused as to whether or not we could be in more mo- -- one – more than one movement at a time, Dorothy led by example. Don't shed one part of you in order to make sure you're true to the other part.

MR. MARTIN: And she also forced those – those White-dominated organizations to also –

MS. CAMPBELL: And –

MR. MARTIN: -- address Black women –

[CROSSTALK.]

MS. CAMPBELL: -- and –

MR. MARTIN: -- and not ignore them.

MS. CAMPBELL: -- she was global. You know, we were I- -- as far as what she – the work she did in Africa, you know.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MS. CAMPBELL: And so human rights, as well, was something that she – we – we know that she – many women who work internationally, they came through the National Council of Negro Women's doors –

OFF CAMERA: Disability[?] – [crosstalk].

MS. CAMPBELL: -- to learn what that was about.

MR. MARTIN: I'll tell you what. She cer- -- certainly maximized 98 years of life, and we certainly appreciate –

OFF CAMERA: Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: -- all that she has done. Folks, thank you so very much. I appreciate it. Look forward to having you back.

PANELISTS: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. Last weekend, I was privileged to host a forum with many of the top leaders, activists and thinkers in the African-American community. We were all dedicated to creating a specific set of goals to move us forward. Well, folks at home have been burning up the Web about it, and coming up next, NewsOne.com's Smokey Fontaine checks in with your feedback.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 5)**

MR. MARTIN: Last week, many of you watched the National Action Network's live, televised forum right here on TV One, which was designed to encourage the Black community to act and not just talk about our problems. Smokey Fontaine has been

following the feedback from that event, and he joins us now from NewsOne.com's headquarters in New York via our HP Sky Room.

All right, Smokey. A lot of folks [are] talking about this. What's the feedback? What are they saying?

MR. SMOKEY FONTAINE: Well, [the?] Black media, press online have – completely have Sharpton's back. They called the National Action Network – this – this event the most triumphant of his career. He's basking in praise. He really has the ear of the President. However, we've seen some of the – the comments mixed about whether Sharpton really deserves all this praise. Is he the future of Black leadership?

Now, we know the Web always gives sanctuary to cynics and contrarians and haters, and we've seen that in the comments. We've seen a difference between what the blogs are saying about him and what real members are saying about this success of his.

MR. MARTIN: Now, again, first of all, the event we're talking about really was about bringing all of these different people together, but getting commitments as to what they are going to do over the next 12 months, really, frankly, laying out a true Black agenda versus talking about it. And so what – what ... was the reaction from people with regards to the presentation of what people say they want to commit to?

MR. FONTAINE: People want to commit to a Black agenda. The question is, is – they're wondering if Al Sharpton is the person to lead it. But we see it in two ways. We see the fact that he's risen on Black Planet to have 276,000 friends. We've seen a

Google search for him be overwhelmingly positive, when only a year ago, you could Google search for Al Sharpton and found lots of – find lots of negative press. So, we know the tide is moving in his favor online. The issue still becomes, can Al Sharpton use the Web to really – to – to benefit his agenda?

MR. MARTIN: Well, first –

MR. FONTAINE: There have been –

MR. MARTIN: -- of all, I –

MR. FONTAINE: -- link- --

MR. MARTIN: -- I – I really hope, first of all, those people also remember, Smokey, that it wasn't just about what Sharpton is going to do by having the different people – 100 Black Men, by having NAFEO, by having the Urban League, NAACP – it really was a matter of what each individual organization was going to do, as opposed to just what *he* was going to do.

MR. FONTAINE: Yeah, it was a *forum*, and I think he did that very, very well; and people respect that, because he's bringing all of our constituents together and giving us an opportunity to move the dialogue. It's a National Action Network. It's – it's more than just talk. "Let's put some action behind what we're all saying." And so the Web is supporting him on that.

It's unfortunate, still, though, that people who know how to use the Web can share a link on Twitter, and that can have a really negative effect on what people find when you Google "Al Sharpton," trying to get to – kind of commit to some action that

you've been inspired by when you watch or go to one of his events.

MR. MARTIN: Well, one of the points that, again, we made last week [was] it's not just about what the people onstage were going to do, but it's also a question of what the individual was going to do. So, people can still send their personal commitment to Commitment@TVOneOnline.com -- that's Commitment@TVOneOnline.com -- so they can all step up, and that is put their name, address, phone number, cell, e-mail, Twitter -- whatever you have -- on there; because, again, it's about moving people to act, Smokey.

MR. FONTAINE: Exactly right. Look, the National League Policy Center, which is some flash, right-wing group, is trying to guide the conversation by saying, you know, the RNC is supporting Sharpton and really trying to tear him down.

We have the power to use the Web ourselves. Send in that e-mail, and let's -- let's really make our voices heard. And we can do this together.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Smokey, thanks a bunch. We appreciate it.

MR. FONTAINE: Thank you, sir.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Folks, and just like I said during the forum, "Washington Watch" will be following up with a progress report on what's actually getting done *every 90 days*. So, catch our first report in July.

I'll be right back with "My Perspective."

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 6)**

MR. MARTIN: It's time now for "My Perspective."

Folks, Black farmers have been fighting the federal government for some 25 years when it comes to discrimination. They've filed a lawsuit. They've now reached a settlement, some \$1 billion, but Congress refuses to actual[ly] fund the settlement. At the Measure of the Movement session in Harlem last week, Cong. Jim Clyburn, he said that he expects Congress to actually fund this settlement.

Well, you know what? It's time. It's time for House Speaker Nancy Pelosi; Steny Hoyer, the Majority Leader; for Clyburn; even for the White House to come out and tell Congress they *must fund this settlement*. These farmers were mistreated by the federal government. They were discriminated against by the federal government. Some of them are dying right now, being buried, never having this lawsuit settled. It makes absolutely no sense.

What should *you* do? Call the Speaker. Call the Majority Leader. Call the Whip. Call the White House and say, "Enough is enough. Take care and fund these Black farmers."

That's my perspective. What's yours?

Well, that's it for this edition of TV One's "Washington Watch." I'm Roland Martin. Goodbye, and have a blessed week.

[END.]