

BIRTHDAY 00443

President Nathaniel Minkoff
Mark Starns

REMARKS

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

THE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

NEW YORK CITY

APRIL 19, 1969

(Tom Kahn)

Harry Laidler

✓ Lou Stulberg

✓ Ben Williams

✓ Aaron Henry

✓ David Dubinsky

✓ Bayard Rustin
✓ Jefferson Concord

✓ Labor Movement
✓ Norman Thomas

↳ We meet today at a time of great crisis and challenge in the affairs of this nation.

194 years after Jefferson + 11 Concord!!

During the Presidential campaign Senator Muskie and I talked about two issues which, in our opinion, superseded all others in their long-range effect on the health, if not the survival, of our democracy: the issue of racial justice in America and the issue of controlling the nuclear arms race among the nations of the world.

✓ Racial Justice
✓ Economic Justice
✓ Arms Control

Social Justice!

000443

- 2 -

Nothing has happened in ~~the three months~~ which have ~~passed~~ since January 20 to indicate that our evaluation of the critical nature of these ~~two~~^{two} issues was ~~correct~~^{wrong}.

To the contrary: we have been presented with compelling evidence that what we ~~as a nation~~ do about the twin imperatives of racial justice and nuclear arms control, this year, will likely commit America for the foreseeable future to either one of two paths:

Will we choose the admittedly difficult and often frustrating path leading to a deceleration of the strategic arms spiral with a corresponding acceleration of our efforts to attack the root causes of deprivation and unrest in this country?

L Or will we follow the far easier path, at least in the short run, of ~~proceeding~~ ^{Swearing in} to the backlogged requests of the military for an entirely new generation of offensive and defensive strategic weapons and thereby mortgage our chances of mobilizing a far greater proportion of America's resources in the cause of humanity, both at home and abroad?

Arms
Plans

L This is the fundamental decision now facing the Congress and the country.

~~L This is the issue which should now be uppermost in the minds of those persons, like yourselves, who have sustained the struggle for social justice in America for the past three decades.~~

- 4 -

A little more than a year ago the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders -- the Kerner Commission -- released its historic report and recommendations. (On the first anniversary of this report, Urban America and The Urban Coalition released a study, One Year Later, which evaluated our progress to date in meeting the goals of the Kerner Commission.

This appraisal stated that:

"--Poverty remains a pervasive fact of life...and the continuing disparity between this poverty and the general affluence remains a source of alienation and discontent.

"--Ghetto schools continue to fail. The small amount of progress that has been made has been counterbalanced by a growing atmosphere of hostility and conflict in many cities.

"--At present, there are no programs that seriously threaten the continued existence of the slums."

And as the Kerner report had warned a year earlier, the study concluded: "For a year later, we are a year closer to being two societies, black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely less equal."

↳ I was distressed at the meager attention given this important evaluation when it was released six weeks ago.

For this report outlined, as did the Kerner Commission before it, the specific actions which must now be taken in America to reverse this alarming pattern of social disintegration.

↳ We must understand the dimensions of our basic challenge: to achieve not only equity in opportunity but equity in results.

↳ And equity in results refers to very concrete goals -- the right to a job at decent pay, the right to an adequate income if one cannot work, the right to an education which releases rather than destroys human creativity, the right to decent housing in safe neighborhoods, the right to personal safety, the right to good health care and sufficient nutrition.

The Powerless into Power 000448
~~the Depressed and needy into the~~

Clearly, if America is going to remedy the inequality and injustice of our society, we must begin conducting our public business in a largely different manner than we have in the past.

Above all else, we are going to have to reorder our priorities and start putting first things first.

* * * *

Yes, we stand at a critical moment in the history of the United States -- a moment when the right decisions taken forcefully and courageously can dramatically alter the priorities of our national life

*and the very des
substantive of our
life.*

Let us be absolutely clear about what is riding on these decisions: no less than whether America can ever remedy the deep-seated social ills diagnosed by the Kerner Commission over one year ago -- and known to the distinguished members of this assemblage for many years.

⁰⁰⁰⁴⁴⁹
~~The~~ National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam
"negotiate now"
- 7 -
IBM } war in Vietnam

↳ The opening skirmish in this battle over national priorities will be fought over money for the initial deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system. ↳ But this debate is only symptomatic of the more fundamental decisions that must be reached in the coming year over military spending.

↳ This is why negotiations with the Soviet Union over the reduction of offensive and defensive strategic weapons are so critical.

↳ If we can freeze the strategic weapons race at its present levels, and then begin the process of mutual phased reductions of the nuclear arsenals, there is a chance of winning the battle of priorities...there is a chance that we can indeed begin putting first things first.

000449

- 8 -

↳ I have no illusions about the difficult nature of these negotiations. ↳ When responsible leaders of great nations approach their vital security interests, they do so with great caution. ↳ I know our leaders will not agree to anything that endangers our national security. And I make the same assumption about the Soviet leaders.

~~But I also assume that the Soviet leaders would not lightly enter into these talks with us.~~

↳ We must believe, until their actions demonstrate otherwise, that the Soviets understand the compelling reasons for ending the nuclear arms spiral -- a process which is not only expensive and dangerous, but one which has become meaningless in terms of securing for either side a decisive military advantage.

- 9 -

↳ It is especially important that prior to the negotiations we exercise great restraint in word and action on matters relating to strategic weapons.

↳ My concern for restraint causes me to regret very much those statements of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird imputing to the Soviets a commitment to achieve a first-strike capability in strategic nuclear weapons.

↳ Less than four months ago, Secretary Clark Clifford reached quite different conclusions as to the Soviet strategic posture.

↳ And Secretary of State Rogers clearly contradicted these forecasts of a Soviet first-strike capability in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and at his first press conference in Washington two weeks ago.

L If there is any substance to Secretary Laird's view, I believe President Nixon should lay these facts before the country with all the detail and gravity that a change of this magnitude in Soviet strategy commands,

L If these forecasts are not accurate, then the President should order the Secretary of Defense to stop raising these specters before the American people just at the time when conditions appear ripe for productive Soviet-U.S. negotiations.

L This is serious -- yes, deadly -- business. L We cannot tolerate ill-considered expressions from highly-placed governmental officials which could trigger a new round in the strategic arms race.

Statements which depart markedly from earlier U.S. pronouncements can only raise doubts in the Soviet mind about our strategic objectives.

- II -

A far wiser course, in my opinion, would be one of *Caution + restraint,*
~~watchful waiting~~, until we have determined through direct talks with the Soviets their actual willingness or unwillingness to decelerate the arms race. Then we will not have to speculate on such critical matters. We will know.

* * * *

↳ The process of shifting significant sums of Federal money from works of war, to works of peace will not be easy.

↳ Every positive advance in nuclear arms control has been opposed by powerful members of Congress and segments of the military and defense establishment. Any meaningful agreements reached with the Soviets concerning the freezing or reduction of our strategic weapons will almost certainly be fought once again.

In my view, a Presidential decision to postpone deployment of the A.B.M. system at this time would have been upheld in the Congress and supported by a significant majority of the American people. And this positive decision would have been a valuable prelude to the more difficult battles that will surely follow any major agreement with the Soviet Union over the mutual reduction of strategic forces.

But there is yet another opportunity. Even if the Congress should appropriate the funds for acquisition of sites and the manufacture and deployment of the A.B.M., the President could set aside that is withhold the funds. This would be particularly important if we were then in the middle of arms control talks with the Soviets.

This nation, ~~however~~, cannot afford to postpone certain critical actions that are essential now - even though the outcome of arms control talks with the Soviets will, in the end, be a major factor in deciding the proportion of our gross national product that will be available for domestic needs.

000455

Tax Reform awaits Action. Public services suffer from lack of resources, while the NP rich Get Richer — education, training, hunger

↳ In these areas -- jobs, welfare and housing -- the groundwork has been laid for meaningful progress now.

+ we can pay.

To date, the present Administration has given little evidence of its intention to seize the initiative in a decisive fashion. ↳ The issue, nevertheless, must be drawn. And if this is done in the Congress, I believe the people of America will understand and support our efforts.

↳ The right to guaranteed employment is attainable. This means that some jobs that do not now exist must be created.

↳ And this largely means public service employment -- the creation of health, police, housing, recreation, education, jobs -- at the state and local levels and among non-profit private organizations.

000455

- 14 -

↳ We are also learning that for ~~a portion~~ ^{some} of our population ~~more~~ employment, in itself, is not a sufficient answer. For example, if a male head of a family with three or more children works 40 hours a week 52 weeks a year at the minimum wage, he will be beneath the poverty line. ↳ Fully one-third of the poor are already working poor. And employment is of little help to those persons who are too young, or too old, or too sick to hold a job.

↳ As Ben W. Heineman, Chairman of the Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, recently stressed, a new income maintenance system must directly transfer incomes to ~~the~~ the poor, but must also explicitly preserve incentives for the poor to ~~increase~~ ^{increase} their income through employment, where that is possible.

- 15 -

↳ Indeed, direct income transfers can permit other mechanisms -- education, training, health, and employment -- to operate effectively.

↳ Both candidates in the Presidential election pledged a total overhaul of our welfare system. ↳ The time for action has now arrived. - Issue of Hunger - now!

↳ ~~Another~~ Another critical issue where movement can occur is the elimination of substandard housing and the building of livable communities.

↳ In the next 10 years this will require subsidizing 6 million dwelling units for those who cannot afford all the rent or mortgage payment for decent housing.

Metropolitan
Development
Bank.

↳ But this involves more than Congress appropriating funds.

It requires a national land use policy that works to reduce land costs and makes land use conform to public needs rather

than speculative ones. ↳ It requires a monetary policy that

allows the housing industry to obtain credit at reasonable rates.
successfully competes for the housing investment dollar.

It requires a commitment by the ~~whole public sector and the~~ *both the government and*

private industry
relevant private sectors to work at assembling sufficiently

large housing markets so that technological breakthroughs are made to reduce substantially our construction costs.

↳ And, the labor movement must help by continuing to organize its structure and practices to increase the availability of additional construction workers, particularly from minority groups, on the site or in the factory.

Social Democ
Forces

DARE

↳ The liberal coalition -- all its parts -- must begin talking and acting as a movement. ↳ This means talking about the politically unthinkable! It means making that which is politically risky, politically acceptable! And it means stretching the politically impossible and making it possible.

↳ Today the issue of military spending -- highlighted now by the question of deploying the Safeguard A.B.M. system but extending far beyond this immediate issue -- has the potential for creating in America an organized force for social justice comparable to the coalition which carried on the civil rights battle for two decades.

new
Coalition

↳ Unless this battle is won, this year, the outcome of subsequent encounters over the allocation of resources for cities, for education, ~~for~~ for health care, for jobs and housing, and for food will be largely decided even before this issues get to Congress.

Our military budgets will continue to expand; our domestic allocations will become proportionately smaller.

↳ This is precisely the outcome of President Nixon's recent cutbacks in the Federal budget.

↳ We now have the chance to reverse this ~~traditional~~ pattern if we focus our efforts on ending the insanity of the strategic nuclear arms race, while we begin simultaneously the difficult job of securing these resources for urgent domestic needs!

This is our opportunity in this moment of crisis and challenge... Can we now summon the courage and faith so clearly demanded by the times?

We must-!

#

~~We must~~ Can -

automated intelligence system is now being seriously discussed by the LEAA and several states, including Illinois. If the project can get underway, we would hope to give LEAA grants for extensive studies and testing—actually putting material into the computers and seeing what we can learn. If this prototype system should work out well, the LEAA then would make the plans available to the states. We also could give some additional grants for hiring the experts to help set it up. Most of the costs would be carried by the states. The states, for instance, would have to buy the hardware, the computers. They would have to hire the men to operate the system. LEAA would provide the plans and enough technical assistance to get it all started. It is an exciting prospect.

In this short time, I have tried to give you some idea of the programs the LEAA is beginning. We are deadly serious that effective programs become a reality. We need your help, for this great venture is, indeed, a partnership in the truest sense. We must not only work on specific programs. The public must be made fully aware that the stakes are great indeed, and that is something every state should do.

I cannot stress too strongly the need for another vital ingredient in the fight against organized crime. President Nixon, in a speech in Chicago last October, discussed a number of the priorities, and then said this: "Most of all, we need leadership which will pledge that organized crime is finished in this country—that the battle we are in will be won by the forces of order."

I hope our presence here today is one small indication that we are not going to tolerate organized crime any longer.

SPEECHES BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, in two recent speeches before the League for Industrial Democracy and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey has focused on the policy decisions which will determine this Nation's future.

Too frequently, these choices are phrased and debated in the neutral terms of budgetary analysis. It is true that our resources are not unlimited, but so-called dispassionate analysis may be a rationalization for treading the worn paths of tradition. Too often, we blindly enlist behind the banner of national security only to find that we have been led to expensive military commitments which not only fail to increase our security but bring us to the verge of a ruined environment and nuclear suicide.

Clearly this is a time of choice. We can let our society drift on its path to polarization. The affluent can enjoy their material comfort oblivious to the suffering of the invisible poor—for a while. We can retreat to the grassy safety of the suburbs, isolated from the violence of our deteriorating cities—for a while. We can let our military decisions become mere reflexes in a self-perpetuating spiral—for a while. But our complacency will be short lived. The suburbs are nourished by the cities, and the arms race is not only insatiable but, unchecked, logically leads to nuclear disaster.

Now new directions are possible without the passionate conviction that human needs must take first priority. Few men are better able to translate political decisions into human terms than Hubert

H. Humphrey. He knows that good things do not come without a fight and he has never backed off from battle. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Humphrey's speeches be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, BEFORE THE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 19, 1969

We meet today at a time of great crisis and challenge in the affairs of this nation.

During the Presidential campaign Senator Muskie and I talked about two issues which, in our opinion, superseded all others in their long-range effect on the health, if not the survival, of our democracy: the issue of racial justice in America and the issue of controlling the nuclear arms race among the nations of the world.

Nothing has happened in the three months which have passed since January 20 to indicate that our evaluation of the critical nature of these two issues was erroneous.

To the contrary: we have been presented with compelling evidence that what we, as a nation, do about the twin imperatives of racial justice and nuclear arms control, *this year*, will likely commit America for the foreseeable future to either one of two paths:

Will we choose the admittedly difficult and often frustrating path leading to a deceleration of the strategic arms spiral with a corresponding acceleration of our efforts to attack the root causes of deprivation and unrest in this country?

Or will we follow the far easier path, at least in the short run, of acceding to the backlogged requests of the military for an entirely new generation of offensive and defensive strategic weapons and thereby mortgage our chances of mobilizing a far greater proportion of America's resources in the cause of humanity, both at home and abroad?

This is the fundamental decision now facing the Congress and the country.

This is the issue which should now be uppermost in the minds of those persons, like yourselves, who have sustained the struggle for social justice in America for the past three decades.

A little more than a year ago the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders—the Kerner Commission—released its historic report and recommendations. On the first anniversary of this report, Urban America and The Urban Coalition released a study, *One Year Later*, which evaluated our progress to date in meeting the goals of the Kerner Commission.

This appraisal stated that:

"Poverty remains a pervasive fact of life . . . and the continuing disparity between this poverty and the general affluence remains a source of alienation and discontent.

"Ghetto schools continue to fail. The small amount of progress that has been made has been counterbalanced by a growing atmosphere of hostility and conflict in many cities.

"At present, there are no programs that seriously threaten the continued existence of the slums."

And as the Kerner report had warned a year earlier, the study concluded: "For a year later, we are a year closer to being two societies, black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely more equal."

I was distressed at the meager attention given this important evaluation when it was released six weeks ago. For this report outlined, as did the Kerner Commission before it, the specific actions which must now be taken in America to reverse this alarming pattern of social disintegration.

We must understand the dimensions of our basic challenge: to achieve not only equity

in opportunity but equity in results. And equity in results refers to very concrete goals—the right to a job at decent pay, the right to an adequate income if one cannot work, the right to an education which releases rather than destroys human creativity, the right to decent housing in safe neighborhoods, the right to good health care and sufficient nutrition.

Clearly, if America is going to remedy the inequality and injustice of our society, we must begin conducting our public business in a largely different manner than we have in the past.

Above all else, we are going to have to reorder our priorities and start putting first things first.

Yes, we stand at a critical moment in the history of the United States—a moment when the right decisions taken forcefully and courageously can dramatically alter the priorities of our national life.

Let us be absolutely clear about what is riding on these decisions; no less than whether America can ever remedy the deep-seated social ills diagnosed by the Kerner Commission over one year ago—and known to the distinguished members of this assemblage for many years.

The opening skirmish in this battle over national priorities will be fought over money for the initial deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system. But this debate is only symptomatic of the more fundamental decisions that must be reached in the coming year over military spending.

This is why negotiations with the Soviet Union over the reduction of offensive and defensive strategic weapons are so critical.

If we can freeze this strategic weapons race at its present levels, and then begin the process of mutual phased reductions of the nuclear arsenals, there is a chance of winning the battle of priorities . . . there is a chance that we can indeed begin putting first things first.

I have no illusions about the difficult nature of these negotiations. When responsible leaders of great nations approach their vital security interests, they do so with great caution. I know our leaders will not agree to anything that endangers our national security. And I make the same assumption about the Soviet leaders.

But I also assume that the Soviet leaders would not lightly enter into these talks with us.

We must believe, until their actions demonstrate otherwise, that the Soviets understand the compelling reasons for ending the nuclear arms spiral—a process which is not only expensive and dangerous, but one which has become meaningless in terms of securing for either side a decisive military advantage.

It is especially important that prior to the negotiations we exercise great restraint in word and action on matters relating to strategic weapons.

My concern for restraint causes me to regret very much those statements of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird imputing to the Soviets a commitment to achieve a first-strike capability in strategic nuclear weapons.

Less than four months ago, Secretary Clark Clifford reached quite different conclusions as to the Soviet strategic posture. And Secretary of State Rogers clearly contradicted these forecasts of a Soviet first-strike capability in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and at his first press conference in Washington two weeks ago.

If there is any substance to Secretary Laird's view, I believe President Nixon should lay these facts before the country with all the detail and gravity that a change of this magnitude in Soviet strategy commands.

If these forecasts are not accurate, then the Secretary of Defense should stop raising

these specters before the American people just at the time when conditions appear ripe for productive Soviet-U.S. negotiations.

This is serious—yes, deadly—business. We cannot tolerate ill-considered expressions from highly-placed governmental officials which could trigger a new round in the strategic arms race.

Statements which depart markedly from earlier U.S. pronouncements can only raise doubts in the Soviet mind about our strategic objectives.

A far wiser course, in my opinion, would be one of watchful waiting, until we have determined through direct talks with the Soviets their actual willingness or unwillingness to decelerate the arms race. Then we will not have to speculate on such critical matters. We will know.

The process of shifting significant sums of Federal money from works of war to works of peace will not be easy.

Every positive advance in nuclear arms control has been opposed by powerful members of Congress and segments of the military and defense establishment. Any meaningful agreements reached with the Soviets concerning the freezing or reduction of our strategic weapons will almost certainly be fought once again.

In my view, a Presidential decision to postpone deployment of the A.B.M. system at this time would have been upheld in the Congress and supported by a significant majority of the American people. And this positive decision would have been a valuable prelude to the more difficult battles that will surely follow any major agreement with the Soviet Union over the mutual reduction of strategic forces.

This nation, however, cannot afford to postpone certain critical actions that are essential *now*—even though the outcome of arms control talks with the Soviets will, in the end, be a major factor in deciding the proportion of our gross national product that will be available for domestic needs.

In these areas—jobs, welfare and housing—the groundwork has been laid for meaningful progress *now*.

To date, the present Administration has given little evidence of its intention to seize the initiative in a decisive fashion. The issue, nevertheless, must be drawn. And if this is done in the Congress, I believe the people of America will understand and support our efforts.

The right to guaranteed employment is attainable. This means that some jobs that do not now exist must be created. And this largely means public service employment—the creation of health, police, housing, recreation, education, jobs—at the state and local levels and among non-profit private organizations.

We are also learning that for a portion of our population employment, in itself, is not a sufficient answer. For example, if a male head of a family with three or more children works 40 hours a week 52 weeks a year at the minimum wage, he will be beneath the poverty line. Fully one-third of the poor are already working poor. And employment is of little help to those persons who are too young, or too old, or too sick to hold a job.

As Ben W. Heineman, Chairman of the Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, recently stressed, a new income maintenance system must directly transfer incomes to all of the poor, but must also explicitly preserve incentives for the poor to augment their income through employment, where that is possible.

Indeed, direct income transfers can permit other mechanisms—education, training, health, and employment—to operate effectively.

Both candidates in the Presidential election pledged a total overhaul of our welfare system. The time for action has now arrived.

The third critical issue where movement can occur is the elimination of substandard housing and the building of livable communities.

In the next 10 years this will require subsidizing 6 million dwelling units for those who cannot afford the rent or mortgage payment for decent housing.

But this involves more than Congress appropriating funds. It requires a national land use policy that works to reduce land costs and makes land use conform to public needs rather than speculative ones. It requires a monetary policy that successfully competes for the housing investment dollar. It requires a commitment by the whole public sector and the relevant private sectors to work at assembling sufficiently large housing markets so that technological breakthroughs are made to reduce substantially our construction costs.

Let us be crystal clear. The labor movement must help also by continuing to organize its structure and practices to increase the availability of additional construction workers, on the site or in the factory.

The liberal coalition—all its parts—must begin talking and acting as a movement. This means talking about the politically unthinkable. It means making the politically risky politically proximate. And it means stretching the politically impossible and making it possible.

Today the issue of military spending—highlighted now by the question of deploying the Safeguard A.B.M. system but extending far beyond this immediate issue—has the potential for creating in America an organized force for social justice comparable to the coalition which carried on the civil rights battle for two decades.

Unless this battle is won, this year, the outcome of subsequent encounters over the allocation of resources for cities, for education, for health care, for jobs and housing, and for food will be largely decided even before the issues get to Congress.

Our military budgets will continue to expand; our domestic allocations will become proportionately smaller. This is precisely the outcome of President Nixon's recent cutbacks in the Federal budget.

We now have the chance to reverse this traditional pattern if we focus our efforts on ending the insanity of the strategic nuclear arms race, while we begin simultaneously the difficult job of securing these resources for urgent domestic needs.

This is our opportunity in this moment of crisis and challenge . . . Can we now summon the courage and faith so clearly demanded by the times?

Remarks
The Honorable H. H. H.
The League for Industrial Democracy
New York City
April 17, 1969

L We meet today at a time of great crisis and challenge in the affairs of this nation.

L During the Presidential campaign Senator Muskie and I talked about two issues which, in our opinion, superseded all others in their long-range effect on the health, if not the survival, of our democracy: the issue of racial justice in America and the issue of controlling the nuclear arms race among the nations of the world.

L Nothing has happened in the three months which have passed since January 20 to indicate that our evaluation of the critical nature of these two issues was erroneous.

L To the contrary: we have been presented with compelling evidence that what we, as a nation, do about the twin imperatives of racial justice and nuclear arms control, this year, will likely commit America for the foreseeable future to either one of two paths:

2/

└ Will we choose the admittedly difficult and often frustrating path leading to a deceleration of the strategic arms spiral with a corresponding acceleration of our efforts to attack the root causes of deprivation and unrest in this country?

└ Or ~~we~~ will we follow the far easier path, at least in the short run, of acceding to the backlogged requests of the military for an entirely new generation of offensive and defensive strategic weapons and thereby ~~mortgag~~ mortgage our chances of mobilizing a far greater proportion of America's resources in the cause of humanity, both at home and abroad?

└ This is the fundamental decision now facing the Congress and the country.

└ This is the ~~question~~ issue which should now be uppermost in the minds of those persons, like ~~we~~ yourselves, who have sustained the struggle for social justice in America for the past three decades.

* * * *

3/

B-

A little more than a year ago the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders -- the Kerner Commission -- released its historic report and recommendations. On the first anniversary of this report, Urban America and The Urban Coalition released a study, One Year Later, which evaluated our progress to date in meeting the goals of the Kerner Commission.

This appraisal stated that:

"--Poverty remains a pervasive fact of life...and the continuing disparity between this poverty and the general affluence remains a source of alienation and discontent.

4/

~~See -~~

"--Ghetto schools continue to fail. The small amount of progress that has been made has been counterbalanced by a growing atmosphere of hostility and conflict in many cities.

"--At present, there are no programs that seriously threaten the continued existence of the slums."

And as the Kerner report ^{had} warned ~~a~~ year earlier, the study concluded: "For a year later, we are a year closer to being two societies, black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely less equal."

I was distressed at the meager attention given this important evaluation when it was released six weeks ago. For this report outlined, as did the Kerner Commission ~~document~~ before it, the specific action^s which must ^{now} be taken in America to reverse this alarming pattern of social disintegration.

51

~~the~~

the dimensions of

We must understand [^]our basic challenge: to achieve not only equity in opportunity but equity in results. And equity in results refers to very concrete goals -- the right to a job at decent pay, the right to an adequate income if one cannot work, the right to an education which releases rather than destroys human creativity, the right to decent housing in safe neighborhoods, the right to good health care and sufficient nutrition.

Clearly, if America is going to remedy the inequality and injustice of our society, we must begin conducting our public business in a largely different manner than we have in the past.

4

~~9~~ -

Above all else, we are going to have to reorder our priorities and start putting first things first.

* * * *

Yes,

~~Today~~ we stand at a critical moment in the history of the United States -- a moment when the right decisions taken forcefully and courageously can dramatically alter the priorities of our national life.

Let us be absolutely clear about what is riding on these

decisions: no less than whether ~~we~~ America can ever *remedy the deep-seated social ills* achieve Martin Luther King's dream or implement the *diagnosed by the Kerner Commission over one year* specific objectives laid down by the Kerner Commission more ago -- and known to the ^{distinguished} members of this ~~than one year ago.~~ *assembly for a long time, many years.*

7/

140 -

The opening skirmish in this battle over national priorities will be fought over money for the initial deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system. But this debate is only symptomatic of the more fundamental decisions that must be reached in the coming year over military spending.

~~Unless we are successful now in slowing down the nuclear arms buildup, it can be predicted without qualification that our military planners will win approval of a number of off postponed weapons programs costing, in the end, many hundreds of billions of dollars.~~

~~And it can be predicted with equal certainty that as this military spending accelerates, our urgent domestic needs will be shortchanged and our efforts to mobilize the country in eradicating these deprivations will fall woefully short.~~

8/

-26-

↳ This is why negotiations with the Soviet Union over the reduction of offensive and defensive strategic weapons are so critical. ↳ If we can freeze the strategic weapons race at its present levels, ^{and then} ~~we~~ begin the process of mutual phased reductions of the nuclear arsenals, there is a chance of winning the battle of priorities...there is a chance that we can indeed begin putting first things first.

↳ I have no illusions about the difficult nature of these negotiations. When responsible leaders of great nations approach their vital security interests, they do so with great caution. I know our leaders will not agree to anything that endangers our national security. And I make the same assumption about the Soviet leaders.

↳ But I also assume that the Soviet leaders would not lightly enter into these talks with us.

9/

M-

We must believe, until their actions demonstrate otherwise, that the Soviets understand the compelling reasons for ending the nuclear arms spiral -- a process which is not only expensive and dangerous, but one which has become meaningless in terms of securing for either side a decisive military advantage.

~~It is primarily for this reason that I have opposed the decision to proceed with a modified deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system. I remain unconvinced that the security of our second-strike forces requires such action at this time, especially when the small risks of postponing deployment of the ABM at this time are compared to the considerable risks of postponing the urgent domestic needs which confront America.~~

10/ -11-

It is especially important that prior to the negotiations we exercise great restraint in word and action on matters relating to strategic weapons.

My concern for restraint causes me to regret very much those statements of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird imputing to the Soviets a commitment to achieve a first-strike capability in strategic nuclear weapons.

Less than ^{four} month^s ago, Secretary Clark Clifford reached quite different conclusions as to the Soviet strategic posture.

And Secretary of State Rogers clearly contradicted these forecasts of a Soviet first-strike capability ^{in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee} at his first press ^{and} conference in Washington two weeks ago.

I think it is time
[It there is any substance to Secretary ~~Laird's~~ Laird's view, I believe President Nixon should lay these facts before the Country with all the details and grant that a change of this magnitude in Soviet strategy commands.

If these forecasts are not accurate, then the Secretary of Defense should stop raising ~~such~~ ^{these} specters before the American people ~~in the course of~~ just at the time when conditions appear ripe for productive Soviet-U.S. negotiations.

This is ~~serious~~ serious--yes, deadly--business. We cannot tolerate ill-considered expressions from highly-placed government officials which could trigger a new ~~round~~ round in the strategic arms race.

~~Such~~ ^{LS} statements which depart markedly from earlier U.S. pronouncements can only raise doubts in the Soviet mind about our strategic objectives.

A far ^{wiser} ~~more prudent~~ course, in my opinion, would be ^{of watchful waiting,} ~~one which avoided raising spectres of massive Soviet strategic commitments~~ until we have determined through direct talks ^{with the Soviet} ~~^~~ their actual willingness or unwillingness to decelerate the arms race. Then we will not have to speculate on such critical matters. We will know.

* * * *

The process of shifting significant sums of federal money from works of war to works of peace will not be easy.

Every positive advance in nuclear arms control has been opposed by ~~powerful~~ ^{powerful} members of Congress ^{and segments of} ~~the~~ military and defense establishment.

Any meaningful agreements reached with the Soviets concerning the freezing or reduction of our strategic ~~weapons forces~~ ^{weapons} will almost certainly be ~~expedited~~ fought once again.

~~In my view, the battle over national priorities could have been productively~~

In my view, a Presidential decision to postpone deployment of the A.B.M. system at this time would have been upheld in the Congress and supported by a significant majority of the American people.

And this ^{positive} decision would have been a valuable prelude to the more difficult battles that ~~will~~ ^{will surely} follow any major agreement with the Soviet Union over the ^{mutual} reduction of strategic forces.

This nation, however, cannot afford to postpone certain critical

actions that are essential ^{here though the} ~~now--regardless of the~~ outcome of arms

control talks with the Soviets ^{deciding the proportion of our gross national product} ~~will, in the end, be a major factor in~~

In ^{three} ~~two~~ areas--jobs, ^{welfare and} ~~and~~ housing--the groundwork has been laid

for meaningful progress now.

To date, The present Administration has given ^{little} ~~any~~ evidence of ^{its intention} ~~its intention~~

to seize ~~any intention of seizing~~ the initiative in a decisive fashion.

The issue, nevertheless, must be drawn. And if ~~this~~ this is

done in the Congress, I believe the people of America will

understand and support our efforts.

The right to guaranteed employment is attainable.

^{This} ~~that~~ means ^{that some} ~~jobs must be created~~ that do not now exist ^{must be created.}

And ^{this} ~~that~~ largely means public service employment -- the creation of health, police, housing, recreation, educa-

tion, jobs -- at the state and local levels and among

that be available for domestic needs.

14/

non-profit private organizations.

We are also learning that for a ~~small~~ portion of our population employment, in ~~it~~ itself, is not a sufficient answer. ~~to their problems~~

For example, if a male head of a family with three or more children works ^{is} 40 hours a week 52 weeks a year at the minimum wage, he will

Fully one-third of the poor are already working poor. be beneath the poverty line./ And employment is of little help

to those persons who are too young, or too old, or too sick to hold a job.

As Ben W. Heineman, Chairman of the Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, recently stressed, a new income maintenance system must directly transfer incomes to all of the poor, but must also explicitly preserve incentives for the poor to augment their income ~~in~~ through employment, where that is possible.

← ^{direct} Indeed, income transfers can permit other mechanisms--education, training, health, and employment--to operate effectively.

Both candidates in the Presidential election pledged a total overhaul of our welfare system. The time for action ~~is~~ has now arrived.

~~14~~ 151

nonprofit private organizations. ~~To create the reasonable~~

~~We are also learning that for a small portion of our figure of 1 million jobs a year would require an investment of \$4 billion annually. All the employees would be tax payers which reduces the cost of the investment. The~~
permutation of employment does not provide a realistic answer to their problems.

~~creation of these jobs also increase the total benefits to society since all of us could utilize adequate services.~~

Hand
The ~~other~~ critical issue where movement can occur is ~~by eliminating~~ *the elimination of* substandard housing and ~~building~~ *the* livable ~~communities.~~ *or*

will
In the next 10 years this ~~requires~~ *will* ~~an~~ enormous commitment that ~~will require~~ subsidizing 6 million dwelling units for those who cannot afford the rent or mortgage payment for decent housing.

But this involves
~~This requires~~ more than Congress appropriating funds.
national
It requires a *national* land use policy that works to reduce land costs and makes land use conform to public needs rather than speculative ones. It requires a monetary policy

16/

3

That successfully competes for the housing investment dollar. It requires a commitment by the whole public sector and the relevant private sectors to work at assembling sufficiently large housing markets so that technological breakthroughs are made to reduce substantially our construction costs. ~~It requires the~~

~~use of sanctions and incentives -- including a federal pre-emption of zoning power so that urban communities will build their share of housing for low and moderate income families~~

Let us be crystal clear. The labor movement must help also by ^{continuing to} organizing its structure and practices to increase the availability of additional construction workers, on the site or in the factory.

Involved is solely additions to the work force at decent pay with steady work. It would be tragic to delay

* * *

17/

The liberal coalition -- all its parts -- must begin talking and acting as a movement. ~~And that~~ ^{This} means talking about the politically unthinkable. It means making the politically risky politically proximate. ^{And} It means stretching the politically impossible and making it possible.

Today the issue of military spending -- highlighted now by the question of deploying the Safeguard ABM system but extending far beyond this immediate issue -- has the potential for creating in America an organized force for social justice comparable to the coalition which carried on the civil rights battle for two decades.

~~Dr. King loved America...and those Americans who seek to honor his name and memory should rally together now to win this battle over national priorities...because~~ Unless this battle is won, this year, the outcome of ~~the~~ subsequent ^{the allocation of} encounters over [^]resources for cities, for education, for health care, for jobs and housing, and for food will be largely

18/

re

Our military budgets will continue to expand; our domestic allocations will become proportionately smaller. This is precisely the outcome of President Nixon's recent cutbacks in the Federal budget.

~~We have failed to achieve Martin Luther King's dream for America primarily because we have failed to generate the bi-partisan political commitment necessary to do the job.~~

reverse this traditional pattern
We now have the chance to ~~summon this strength~~ if we focus our efforts on the job of ending the insanity of the strategic nuclear arms race and ~~the~~ *simultaneously begin* fighting to see that these resources are used for urgent domestic needs.

This is our opportunity. ~~we~~ *we* can now summon the courage and faith so clearly demanded by the times, ~~...and the~~ *?* ~~courage and faith which characterized the life and works of~~ ~~Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.~~

In this moment of Crisis and Challenge...

#



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org