BEYOND VIETNAM LIES IRAQ: SHARED SACRIFICE IN THE WORDS OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this year as we celebrate Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday and Black History Month, that Dr. Martin Luther King be remembered not only for his involvement in the civil rights movement, but also for his quest to achieve peace and justice for all by speaking out against war. On April 4, 1967, Dr. Martin Luther King gave a speech entitled ''Beyond Vietnam.'' In this speech, Dr. King spoke out against the Vietnam war, and more importantly, spoke of the need to wage peace, not war.

In the weeks that President Bush and his administration have been leading this country to war against Iraq, I have found myself going through many of the same motions of a man who opposed a war more than thirty years ago. I began by voting against the Congressional Resolution that gave President Bush the authority to carry out this war, and have most recently pushed for Americans to more carefully consider the costs of going to war without just cause by introducing a bill that would reinstate the draft. My push to reinstate the draft was meant to first, show my opposition to a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq and second, to insure that if America does go to war, that an equitable representation of all classes of Americans are making the sacrifice for our great country.

In being reintroduced to Dr. King's speech, I found that, while he was attempting to end a war, his goals in giving the ''Beyond Vietnam'' speech were similar to my own, in that he wanted the persons being called upon to fight the war to realize that the war they were fighting was serving the needs of persons that were not interested in serving their needs. As have I, Dr. King recognized that the poor were disproportionately shouldering the burden of a war. Dr. King described the war as a ''cruel manipulation of the poor'' and an ''enemy of the poor'' that was ''sending their sons and their brothers and their husbands to fight and to die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population.''

The recognition that the sacrifices being made for this country were (and continue to) not be shared was only one of a number of realizations Dr. King made in regards to the Vietnam War. As many of the insights he made then continue to be relevant in our journey down the warpath to Iraq, I invite you to read these excerpts from a speech delivered on April 4, 1967, at a meeting of Clergy and Laity Concerned at Riverside Church in New York City and consider the words of Dr. Martin Luther King.

BEYOND VIETNAM: A TIME TO BREAK SILENCE

I come to this magnificent house of worship tonight because my conscience leaves me no other choice. [. . .] The recent statement of your executive committee are the sentiments of my own heart and I found myself in full accord when I read its opening lines: ''A time comes when silence is betrayal.'' That time has come for us in relation to Vietnam. [. . .] I come to this platform tonight to make a passionate plea to my beloved nation. [. . .] Tonight, however, I wish not to speak with Hanoi and the NLF, but rather to my fellow Americans, who, with me, bear the greatest responsibility in ending a conflict that has exacted a heavy price on both continents.

Since I am a preacher by trade, I suppose it is not surprising that I have seven major reasons for bringing Vietnam into the field of my moral vision. There is at the outset a very obvious and almost facile connection between the war in Vietnam and the struggle 1, and others, have been waging in America. A few years ago there was a shining moment in that struggle. It seemed as if there was a real promise of hope for the poor—both black and white—through the poverty program. There were experiments, hopes, new beginnings. Then came the buildup in Vietnam and I watched the program broken and eviscerated as if it were some idle political plaything of a society gone mad on war, and I knew that America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Vietnam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demonic destructive suction tube. So I was increasingly compelled to see the war as an enemy of the poor and to attack it as such.

Perhaps the more tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and their brothers and their husbands to fight and to die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them eight thousand miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in southwest Georgia and East Harlem. So we have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools. So we watch them in brutal solidarity burning the huts of a poor village, but we realize that they would never live on the same block in Detroit. I could not be silent in the face of such cruel manipulation of the poor.

My third reason moves to an even deeper level of awareness, for it grows out of my experience in the ghettoes of the North over the last three years—especially the last three summers. As I have walked among the desperate, rejected and angry young men I have told them that Molotov cocktails and rifles would not solve their problems. I have tried to offer them my deepest compassion while maintaining my conviction that social change comes most meaningfully through nonviolent action. But they asked—and rightly so—what about Vietnam? They asked if our own nation wasn't using massive doses of violence to solve its problems, to bring about the changes it wanted. Their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today—my own government. For the sake of those boys, for the sake of this government, for the sake of hundreds of thousands trembling under our violence, I cannot be silent. [. . .]

Now, it should be incandescently clear that no one who has any concern for the integrity and life of America today can ignore the present war. If America's soul becomes totally poisoned, part of the autopsy must read Vietnam. It can never be saved so long as it destroys the deepest hopes of men the world over. So it is that those of us who are yet determined that America will be are led down the path of protest and dissent, working for the health of our land. [. . .]

And as I ponder the madness of Vietnam and search within myself for ways to understand and respond to compassion my mind goes constantly to the people of that peninsula. I speak now not of the soldiers of each side, not of the junta in Saigon, but simply of the people who have been living under the curse of war for almost three continuous decades now. I think of them too because it is clear to me that there will be no meaningful solution there until some attempt is made to know them and hear their broken cries. They must see Americans as strange liberators. [. . .]

After the French were defeated it looked as if independence and land reform would come again through the Geneva agreements. But instead there came the United States, determined that Ho should not unify the temporarily divided nation, and the peasants watched again as we supported one of the most vicious modem dictators—our chosen man, Premier Diem. The peasants watched and cringed as Diem ruthlessly routed out all opposition, supported their extortionist landlords and refused even to discuss reunification with the north. The peasants watched as all this was presided over by U.S. influence and then by increasing numbers of U.S. troops who came to help quell the insurgency that Diem's methods had aroused. When Diem was overthrown they may have been happy, but the long line of military dictatorships seemed to offer no real change—especially in terms of their need for land and peace.

The only change came from America as we increased our troop commitments in support of governments which were singularly corrupt, inept and without popular support. All the while the people read our leaflets and received regular promises of peace and democracy—and land reform. Now they languish under our bombs and consider us—not their fellow Vietnamese—the real enemy. They move sadly and apathetically as we herd them off the land of their fathers into concentration camps where minimal social needs are rarely met. They know they must move or be destroyed by our bombs. So they go—primarily women and children and the aged. [. . .] They wander into the hospitals, with at least twenty casualties from American firepower for one ''Vietcong''-inflicted injury. So far we may have killed a million of them—mostly children. They see the children, degraded by our soldiers as they beg for food. They see the children selling their sisters to our soldiers, soliciting for their mothers.

What do the peasants think as we ally ourselves with the landlords and as we refuse to put any action into our many words concerning land reform? What do they think as we test our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe? Where are the roots of the independent Vietnam we claim to be building? Is it among these voiceless ones?

We have destroyed their two most cherished institutions: the family and the village. We have destroyed their land and their crops. [. . .] Now there is little left to build on—save bitterness. Soon the only solid physical foundations remaining will be found at our military bases and in the concrete of the concentration camps we call fortified hamlets. The peasants may well wonder if we plan to build our new Vietnam on such grounds as these? Could we blame them for such thoughts? We must speak for them and raise the questions they cannot raise. These too are our brothers. [. . .] They question our political goals and they deny the reality

of a peace settlement from which they will be excluded. Their questions are frighteningly relevant. Is our nation planning to build on political myth again and then shore it up with the power of new violence?

Here is the true meaning and value of compassion and nonviolence when it helps us to see the enemy's point of view, to hear his questions, to know his assessment of ourselves. For from his view we may indeed see the basic weaknesses of our own condition, and if we are mature, we may learn and grow and profit from the wisdom of the brothers who are called the opposition. [. . .]

At this point I should make it clear that while I have tried in these last few minutes to give a voice to the voiceless on Vietnam and to understand the arguments of those who are called enemy, I am as deeply concerned about our troops there as anything else. For it occurs to me that what we are submitting them to in Vietnam is not simply the brutalizing process that goes on in any war where armies face each other and seek to destroy. We are adding cynicism to the process of death, for they must know after a short period there that none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved. Before long they must know that their government has sent them into a struggle among Vietnamese, and the more sophisticated surely realize that we are on the side of the wealthy and the secure while we create hell for the poor. [. . .]

This is the message of the great Buddhist leaders of Vietnam. Recently one of them wrote these words: ''Each day the war goes on the hatred increases in the heart of the Vietnamese and in the hearts of those of humanitarian instinct. The Americans are forcing even their friends into becoming their enemies. It is curious that the Americans, who calculate so carefully on the possibilities of military victory, do not realize that in the process they are incurring deep psychological and political defeat. The image of America will never again be the image of revolution, freedom and democracy, but the image of violence and militarism.''

If we continue, there will be no doubt in my mind and in the mind of the world that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam. [. . .] The world now demands a maturity of America that we may not be able to achieve. It demands that we admit that we have been wrong from the beginning of our adventure in Vietnam, that we have been detrimental to the life of the Vietnamese people. The situation is one in which we must be ready to turn sharply from our present ways.

[. . .] I would like to suggest five concrete things that our government should do immediately to begin the long and difficult process of extricating ourselves from this nightmarish conflict: (1) End all bombing in North and South Vietnam; (2) Declare a unilateral cease-fire in the hope that such action will create the atmosphere for negotiation; (3) Take immediate steps to prevent other battlegrounds in Southeast Asia by curtailing our military buildup in Thailand and our interference in Laos; (4) Realistically accept the fact that the National Liberation Front has substantial support in South Vietnam and must thereby play a role in any meaningful negotiations and in any future Vietnam government; (5) Set a date that we will remove all foreign troops from Vietnam in accordance with the 1954 Geneva agreement. [. . .]

Meanwhile we in the churches and synagogues have a continuing task while we urge our government to disengage itself from a disgraceful commitment. We must continue to raise our voices if our nation persists in its perverse ways in Vietnam. We must be prepared to match actions with words by seeking out every creative means of protest possible. [. . .]

The war in Vietnam is but a symptom of a far deeper malady within the American spirit, and if we ignore this sobering reality we will find ourselves organizing clergy- and laymen-concerned committees for the next generation. They will be concerned about Guatemala and Peru. They will be concerned about Thailand and Cambodia. They will be concerned about Mozambique and South Africa. We will be marching for these and a dozen other names and attending rallies without end unless there is a significant and profound change in American life and policy. Such thoughts take us beyond Vietnam, but not beyond our calling as sons of the living God.

In 1957 a sensitive American official overseas said that it seemed to him that our nation was on the wrong side of a world revolution. During the past ten years we have seen emerge a pattern of suppression which now has justified the presence of U.S. military ''advisors'' in Venezuela. This need to maintain social stability for our investments accounts for the counter-revolutionary action of American forces in Guatemala. It tells why American helicopters are being used against guerrillas in Colombia and why American napalm and green beret forces have already been active against rebels in Peru. It is with such activity in mind that the words of the late John F. Kennedy come back to haunt us. Five years ago he said, ''Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.'' [. . .]

I am convinced that if we are to get on the right side of the world revolution, we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values. We must rapidly begin the shift from a ''thing-oriented'' society to a ''person-oriented'' society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, materialism, and militarism are incapable of being conquered.

A true revolution of values will soon cause us to question the fairness and justice of many of our past and present policies. [. . .] A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth. With righteous indignation, it will look across the seas and see individual capitalists of the West investing huge sums of money in Asia, Africa and South America, only to take the profits out with no concern for the social betterment of the countries, and say: ''This is not just.'' It will look at our alliance with the landed gentry of Latin America and say: ''This is not just.'' The Western arrogance of feeling that it has everything to teach others and nothing to learn from them is not just. [. . .]

We must move past indecision to action. We must find new ways to speak for peace in Vietnam and justice throughout the developing world—a world that borders on our doors. If we do not act we shall surely be dragged down the long dark and shameful corridors of time reserved for those who possess power without compassion, might without morality, and strength without sight.

Now let us begin. Now let us rededicate ourselves to the long and bitter—but beautiful—struggle for a new world. This is the calling of the sons of God, and our brothers wait eagerly for our response. Shall we say the odds are too great? Shall we tell them the struggle is too hard? Will our message be that the forces of American life militate against their arrival as full men, and we send our deepest regrets? Or will there be another message, of longing, of hope, of solidarity with their yearnings, of commitment to their cause, whatever the cost? The choice is ours, and though we might prefer it otherwise we must choose in this crucial moment of human history.

IN HONOR OF DANNY H. CAMERON

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Danny H. Cameron, respected businessman, community advocate, dedicated family man, and friend and mentor to countless, as he is honored as the Black Professional of The Year by the Black Professionals Association Charitable Foundation in Cleveland, Ohio.

Since its inception in 1982, Mr. Cameron has led the National City Community Development Center (NCCDC) as its President and Executive Director. In this capacity, he has carried out the mission of the NCCDC with great focus, vision, and dedication, aimed at uplifting the residential and commercial aspects of our Cleveland neighborhoods. Under his direction, the National City Community Development Center has extended into the communities of six states. The astounding achievements of Mr. Cameron and the NCCDC include investments of nearly 400 million dollars into the construction, renovation and preservation of homes in Cleveland and other cities, resulting in 39,000 affordable housing units for low and middle-income families and individuals. Amazingly, because of the direction of Mr. Cameron, more than ninety percent of new housing in Cleveland grew out of NCCDC investments.

In addition to his professional accomplishments, Mr. Cameron has been a deeply committed community volunteer. He has created programs for area high school students that encourage learning and growth in the areas of computer technology, and has developed funds that provide college scholarships to area youth. Mr. Cameron has also committed his time, service and expertise on the boards and commissions of many worthy civic and community agencies.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor of Mr. Danny H. Cameron, as we recognize his significant contribution to our community. His work, expertise and dedication have served to improve and unify our diverse citizenry. Mr. Cameron's strong leadership abilities, vision, and passion for social and economic justice for all have earned him the deep admiration and respect of the Cleveland community and communities beyond. Mr. Cameron's gift of service to others raises the spirit of families, strengthens the unity of inner city streets, and provides a window of light and hope in our neighborhoods by illuminating our corner of the universe, one family, one house, and one street corner at a time.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SEAMUS CONNOLLY

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to enter into the RECORD today these remarks to acknowledge the accomplishments of Seamus Connolly. He is the Director of the Boston College Irish Studies