

Messenger for Peace and Justice

against the Soviet Union which, in my estimation, does not bring greater security but increases our insecurity because it is a destabilizing force inviting a first strike force on the part of the Soviet Union and inviting the concept of "launch on warning" on both sides. And there you have a totally irrational situation.

The most destabilizing act that the United States can engage in at this moment in our lives is to go forward with the deployment of the first Cruise missiles in Europe it will take us to the brink of nuclear war. . . . Of even more danger to us now is the deployment of the Pershing II missile. The Pershing II missile is considered the most accurate missile the United States ever developed. It has the capacity to travel between 1,000 and 1,200 nautical miles; some people think it can travel 1,500 nautical miles. It might not be able, from West Germany, to strike Moscow, but it can strike deep into the Soviet Union creating what is known as a "decapitating threat." Decapitation means—take the head off. And what people mean by that is that the Pershing missile, based in West Germany and aimed at the Soviet Union, with a highly accurate weapon with incredible capacity to destroy, would strike the Soviet Union and hit many of their command control centers—that's the head, the brain, the command capability. It seems to me that in a crisis we want the leadership in a capacity to talk to each other, but the danger is that the weapon is decapitating.

Beyond that, this weapon, if deployed in West Germany, would be deployed 6 to 10 minutes from the Soviet Union. . . . this cuts the reaction time down to zero. Ten or 15 minutes to make a judgement that could ultimately be the judgement that destroys the face of the earth as we know it is insanity of the highest order; when you reduce that down to a weapon that stands six to 10 minutes from the Soviet Union this is insanity to the highest degree. When you reduce that down with missiles six to 10 minutes from the Soviet Union, increasing the possibility of nuclear war by accident, by mistake, by miscalculation, is irrational.

. . . We are seeing from our psychiatrists, psychologists and teachers a "futurelessness"—a whole new concept—among our children. A society that kills its children is a society that's destroying itself. The child's life is all about the future and we are threatening their futures and are denying them in many ways the power over their lives. . . . That's why I believe the nuclear arms struggle is the moral issue of our times.

Militaristic, interventionist foreign policy

We must come together in a concept of peace because an interventionist, militaristic policy is inappropriate for the decade of the 1980s. As we move through the '80s it should become patently obvious to all that the problems of the world are not military—that they are economic; they are political; they are social; they are cultural. They have to be solved in that context, not in the context of war and interventionism.

I was one of the 14 people sent to Grenada to look at this most recent expression on the part of this country to Third-World people. Eighty-five percent of the American people supported in some way the invasion of Grenada. I found that shocking—deplorable. It only reflects the level of our ignorance with respect to what America is doing around the world under the guise of democracy.

When the United States first invaded Grenada, my first response, "I believe this was a thinly veiled effort to use white American students and the Prime Ministers of tiny Black countries to mask the further militarization of American foreign policy." . . . What other country could Ronald Reagan invade and gain maximum P.R. by simultaneously liberating white, upper-middle-class American students, capturing some bad Blacks, beating up some Cubans, humiliating some Soviets, ridding an island of Communism and having five or six leaders of Black countries say, "Thank you, Uncle Sam" for doing it? Only in Grenada, and if anybody thinks that can be ex-

ported anywhere else, he is living in a never, never land. . . .

Now we're about the Americanization of that island. I noticed that a couple of weeks ago the Administration invited corporations to the White House to discuss investments in Grenada. But when they ran off the Cubans, who is providing medical help for the rural Grenadians? Are we now committed to send American doctors, and nurses, and technicians, and surgeons into the area to provide medical care? We live in a society whose medicine is profit-oriented. You got to make money; it's not just a lot of humanitarian effort. . . .

We invited corporations in to figure out how to exploit the economy of Grenada, and not for humanitarian reasons. So it behooves these people to try to overthrow the left-wing government.

If we believe that using force as we did in Grenada can be used anywhere else we are making a tragic mistake and a dangerous mistake. To use force in Lebanon is to flirt with World War III with the potential of escalation to thermonuclear war. . . . To do it in Central America is to risk the death of tens of thousands of people. The Kissinger Commission. . . says we are going to rely more on militarism than negotiations, diplomacy and political solutions for problems that are clearly not military problems; they are human questions that have to be resolved in a human context. . . . Then we're going to throw money in for economic reasons but in that region you've got countries where we exploit the many to preserve the few. And as long as that political structure continues to be a reality in Central America, even the economic assistance in some way will not quite make it to the people that we want it to make it to.

The world is in danger, and the world will not become less dangerous by heightening our military capability and solving our problems militarily, but only when we in this country evolve a different perspective on our role in the world—begin to see our role in the world in very different terms—and develop a foreign policy based on peace and disarmament, human rights, human development, human evolution and economic justice.

Misdirected priorities

Whether we are challenging war-fighting strategies; whether we are challenging new technology; or whether we are challenging deployment of weapons that take us to the brink of disaster—any and all of these efforts are magnificent human statements that we make about ourselves. The interesting thing about a nuclear weapon is that it has no respect for the categories that tend to divide up groups of people. Nuclear weapons are an equal opportunity destroyer. So in that sense—in a rather paradoxical, poetic and tragic way—the nuclear weapon has been able to do something that none of our movements have been able to achieve. In the shadow of the nuclear bomb we have been—in one sense—rendered totally equal. In the shadow of the nuclear bomb our commonality has been magnified. In the shadow of the bomb our common need to survive as a total people has become magnified. Because in the shadow of the bomb, whether you live in the basement or the penthouse, if it's dropped you die equally. Whether you are gay or straight, Black or white, a millionaire or a pauper, men and women you die equally. If we for some reason continue to engage in these insane battles—racism, sexism, chauvinism, classism—in the shadow of the bomb all of those "isms" have been removed.

If we are intelligent people, the politics of the bomb have rendered us equal in the madness of death and destruction and we ought to be able to embrace the principles of liberation and equality for all people on this planet.

It seems to me that is what Martin Luther King was trying to say twenty years ago—that we have to come together in the concept of peace.

When I first went to Congress in 1971, America's military budget was approximately \$79 billion. In 1981 it was \$173.6 billion. In 1982 it went to \$218 billion. Our military budget for fiscal 1985 will probably exceed \$320 billion. . . . By 1987 it is estimated the American military budget will exceed \$425 billion. By 1990, given present commitments and present approaches, our military budget will exceed half-a-trillion dollars. . . .

The entire decade of the '80s we will probably spend between 3.5 and 4.5 trillion dollars. . . . In the years from 1945 to 1985 the military budget was somewhere around 4 trillion dollars. We will spend that much in the decade of the '80s. . . .

Can we solve the human needs of people in this country and make an appropriate contribution to the peoples of the world while spending that amount of money building a monument to military madness? You are taking about the problems of Blacks and whites, browns, reds, yellows in this country as they manifest themselves in unemployment, in inadequate education, in deteriorating urban centers, in lack of adequate housing, in the whole multiplicity of issues that manifest themselves but are not being addressed. You show me, in the last three years, one place where we have actually developed a creative approach to solving a human problem.

We've been focusing on budget deficits and dollars on the one hand and escalating the military budget on the other, and between the two giving powerful and monied people and corporate people nearly \$750 billion in tax cuts.

We're not answering the question, "How can we best address the human misery of our people?" And I maintain that a society answers the questions that it asks. If you ask, "How can we better destroy life? that's the answer you will get. If you ask, "How can we become militarily stronger? How can we develop more accurate weapons of destruction?" you will answer that question. But if you ask, "How can blacks and browns, yellows and reds and white people live in a modern environment in peace, in a sense of personhood, with justice and equity?" then we will answer that question.

How can we make the urban centers monuments to our genius and not our madness? How can we better educate our children? . . . How can we better prepare them for the future? . . . How can we preserve the integrity of the delicate nature of our ecological system? We will answer these questions. . . .

We can change the course of history

I believe we can change the course of history in the world. Twenty years ago Martin Luther King attempted to embrace what has now come to be called the "Rainbow Coalition of 1984." Twenty years ago it was a coalition of the victims of American society. Martin Luther King believed that if some way we could bring all of these people together, under the banner of peace, challenging the madness of the arms race; challenging the insanity of interventionist foreign policy; understanding the commonality of our struggle; speaking to freedom and justice and dignity; and addressing the human misery of our people, we could see change. He realized that in a very powerful and profound way.

I think we now need to embrace that principle. I believe we can solve these problems.

Martin Luther King went a very long distance—he went from Montgomery, where he started, to Memphis, where he died. He went from mere manhood to martyrdom; he went from the depths of misery to the top of the mountain. It seems to me that if the brilliant and prophetic and revolutionary black man could walk that distance in that short time, then you and I can do the same. We can join hands in a very powerful coalition to take the country on a journey from madness to humanity, from exploitation to equality, from racism, sexism, chauvinism and classism to freedom and world peace.



We in the West
 "We in the West must bear in mind that the poor countries are poor primarily because we have exploited them through political or economic colonialism. Americans in particular must help their nation repent of her modern imperialism." Martin Luther King, 1968



SE 20th & DIVISION
 SE 72nd & FLAVEY
 NE 15th & FREMONT
 W BURNSIDE at 21st
 SAN RAFAEL — 1910 NE 122nd

Forest Grove — 2329 PACIFIC
 Oregon City — 878 MOALLA
 Candy — 1051 SW 1st
 LLOYD CENTER

14410 SE DIVISION
 3905 SE POWELL
 NE 74th & GLISAN
 HILLSBORO — 960 SE OAK



I have a dream.

I have a dream that one day out in the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by their character.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be enfolded, every hill shall be exalted, and every mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plains, and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh see it together.

This is our hope. This is the faith that I will go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to climb up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning: "My country 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty Of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died Land of the Pilgrims' pride From ev'ry mountainside. Let freedom ring."

And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. So let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York.

Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania.

Let freedom ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado.

Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California.

But not only that, let freedom ring from the Stone Mountain of Georgia.

Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

Let freedom ring from every hill and mole hill of Mississippi and every mountainside.

When we let freedom ring, when we let it ring from every tenement and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old spiritual: "Free at last! Free at last! Thank God Almighty, we are free at last!"

PGE