

September 18, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 13099

confident that America's commitment to the rule of law would prevail.

Realistically, the cultural deficiencies of a slave heritage which had made African men and women humanoid robots, programmed only for work but with the capacity for reproduction, were recognized. However, it was confidently believed that these shortcomings, massive as they were, could be surmounted just as immigrant Europeans, many with substantial personal obstacles to overcome, had demonstrated.

Negroes burned no buses, dynamited no schools or churches, slaughtered no innocent children at worship and lynched no one. No leaders of groups dedicated to segregation were assassinated from ambush. Instead, patiently, slowly, and often with maddening frustration, Negroes undertook countless legal battles to achieve equal treatment as citizens.

Finally, after a series of defeats, the public climate changed and in 1954 the legal wall was breached by the U.S. Supreme Court's school desegregation decision. The enactment of the first national civil rights legislation in the twentieth century heightened the anticipation.

However, the view on the other side of the wall was not that of the promised land. Instead there was a steeper cliff of stubborn citizen resistance to the clear mandate of the courts and the Congress.

To many Negroes the great American dream had turned into a nightmare. Many who had drunk great draughts of the heady intoxicant of liberty and believed the assurances of Negro leaders and national leaders were hurt, frustrated, confused and then angered.

The wisdom of established leaders was questioned and angry new voices are heard demanding a showdown with white America. Those voices proclaim that Negroes have been tricked into reliance on law and legislative efforts, and now, without defining the concept or how it will be exercised, they call for Black Power.

This new reaction repudiates any hope of integration into the life of America. Instead of wanting "in," its proponents want "out."

I am not speaking of the Nation of Islam whose members are popularly called Black Muslims.

I speak instead of the less venturesome Negro who lives in a ghetto where employment is precarious, education inferior and rebuffs based on race a daily experience.

He is a young person in his late teens or early 20s whose personal experience does not include the oft-cited "great gains" of the last three decades. He was born during World War II or shortly thereafter and grew up during the Korean War and now lives during the Vietnam adventure. He has seen violence legitimized as an instrument of national policy.

To him, God is dead or possibly never lived. He sees the sons of the poor and disinherited bearing the brunt of the fighting in Vietnam where by an ironic twist an army career affords him the best hope of equal opportunity for advancement in a fight proclaimed as an effort to bring democracy to another people across the sea.

He wonders would it not be the wiser personal choice for him to risk his life to better his own conditions here than to lay it down on foreign soil for someone else.

I believe this group comprises a small minority of America's Negroes, but I believe with equal conviction that the great majority, although eschewing this direction, are without an alternative which offers any reasonable hope of a solution to his plight.

The majority of America's Negroes stand at the crossroads. Can they believe in the sincerity of America? Consider the decade from 1950 to 1960, which I characterize as the lost decade.

Some 330,000 new housing units were built in the Detroit area, principally in the suburbs. They were largely financed by federal

programs which forbade racial discrimination yet only three percent of these new houses were made available to Negroes and much of this was public housing. Still, no effective official action was taken to enforce the non-racial guarantees and we see today a suburban ring around Detroit 96.4 percent white.

During this same decade, Detroit's Negroes could purchase only used housing at substantially greater costs usually without mortgage financing. The result was the doubling up of families to meet the monthly land contract installments.

The enforcement of city zoning and health ordinances has been lax to non-existent in predominantly Negro neighborhoods. School attendance has increased because of overcrowding so the Negro pupil often has a custodial instead of an educational experience.

The attitude of many policemen and the recent incredible behavior of some of Detroit's Recorder's judges during the riot convinced the Negro citizen that one of the missions of these agencies is containment of the ghetto population. The resultant citizen animus (hostility) against law and law enforcement agencies too frequently is justified by incidents of insult and brutality.

The recent irrational and destructive civil disturbance in Detroit, paralleling those in other Northern cities, was easily predictable. The proposed panaceas of more Headstart programs and job upgrading projects suggest treating a cancer with aspirin.

What is required is equal treatment under the law. What is required is more law enforcement instead of less. The Negro wants enforcement of the laws which were enacted to give him equal access to jobs, housing, and places of public accommodation.

The enforcement of these laws is essential and not only for the Negro. For nothing can be more corrosive of our national moral fiber than to have the stated law ignored by the vast majority of our citizens.

I realize the difficulty of the challenge I announce. A Scottish legal philosopher once said that a society's civilization is measured by its obedience to the unenforceable.

I recognize that every white American cannot be compelled by law to accord to his Negro fellow citizens the rights the Constitution and laws of this nation guarantee him. Laws are effective only when they have the support of the majority.

He must decide for himself whether he wants this nation to continue as the noblest experiment in human relations the world has ever seen. He must, by a revolutionary reorientation of his personal conduct, tell the great majority of Negroes standing at the crossroads that we shall continue this experiment together.

If he does not, James Baldwin's prophecy of the fire next time, a preview of which we are witnessing across the nation, may be realized. I fear the result could be genocide because reservations, such as those in which American Indians were crowded, would be inadequate to contain twenty million black people.

### A B M U.S. BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President; in a front-page article published Saturday, the Washington Post stated that President Johnson "has decided to go ahead with a thin ballistic missile defense."

The purpose of this so-called thin defense will be to counter the nuclear threat likely to be posed by the Communist Chinese in the early years of the coming decade.

That this threat exists is no mere idle fear. A July 1967 report by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, chaired

by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTOR], pointed out that:

The Chinese . . . are making excellent progress in thermonuclear design. They now have the capability of designing a multi-megaton thermonuclear device suitable for delivery by aircraft.

We believe the Chinese will continue to place a high priority on thermonuclear weapon development (and) with continued testing we believe they will be able to develop a thermonuclear warhead in the ICBM weight class . . . by about 1970. We believe that the Chinese can have an ICBM system ready for deployment in the early 1970's. . . . A low order of magnitude attack could possibly be launched by the Chinese Communists against the United States by the early 1970's. At present we do not have an effective anti-ballistic missile system which could repel such a suicidal (for the Chinese) but nevertheless possible strike.

There has been a prolonged debate, both in these Halls and in public over the need for this antiballistic missile system.

That the United States possesses offensive missiles of unquestioned strength and magnitude is obvious. We are said to be the strongest nation on the face of the earth. Our weapons have the capacity to greatly cripple or destroy much of civilization on earth as we know it.

Yet, no matter how powerful our offensive weapons, our defensive posture—our ability to fend off attack—is only as strong as our ability to instill the fear of an unacceptable loss from our offensive weapons in the mind of a potential enemy.

This necessarily means that we give a potential enemy credit for rational thought; for being able to weigh in the balance his weapons against ours; for being able to understand that no matter how great his offensive threat, our own offensive weapons are so many times greater that any attack on our land would mean the total and immediate destruction of his own.

Unfortunately, however, the present Chinese Government apparently lacks even the basic requisites of rationality and stability. Its leaders are aging, desperate, irrational, and utterly militant and belligerent.

Despite the overwhelming internal problems which presently beset the Chinese people, these leaders are continuing to press forward with the production of nuclear weapons and the development of intercontinental ballistic missile systems with which to deliver those weapons.

It is a strain on the limits of credulity and commonsense to assume that the hand on the Chinese nuclear trigger will be directed by a mind which has thoughtfully and carefully weighed the utter foolishness of embarking on an act of nuclear war. Are we to permit ourselves the luxury of letting a mad government, such as presently rules in Peking, decide the fate of even one of our great cities?

Could we ever forgive ourselves, as a nation, if, because we felt it "not worth the money," we left our cities open to and defenseless from a nuclear attack by Red China?

For, it would not take but one such thermonuclear device as the Chinese are now manufacturing, to totally destroy a San Francisco, a Los Angeles, or a Seattle. And while our retaliation might be

massive and virtually instantaneous, would that bring back those lives lost, that property destroyed?

Our only protection against such a threat as the presently erratic, belligerent, and irrational Communist Chinese Government poses, is an antiballistic missile system. It will be able to stop those missiles which such a misguided Red Chinese Government might intentionally launch. And, importantly, such a system would not only provide a deterrent but would also protect us against an accidental launching of a ballistic missile which might otherwise trigger an all out nuclear holocaust.

True, it would be nowhere near adequate to counter an offensive attack by the Soviet Union—but that Nation, no matter what else we may say about it, is at least ruled by somewhat rational men, men who understand and recognize the overwhelming and destructive power posed by our own offensive weapons.

I think there is no question but that the Chinese nuclear threat is a real one. And if we do not prepare for it today, we may ever rue that fateful decision long into the future.

I commend the President for this decision and I urge that this vital defense effort go forward without further delay.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article entitled "United States To Bind 'Thin' Shield of Missiles" and excerpts from the report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on "Impact of Chinese Communist Nuclear Weapons Progress on U.S. National Security," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1967]  
UNITED STATES TO BUILD "THIN" SHIELD OF MISSILES

(By George C. Wilson)

President Johnson has decided to go ahead with a "thin" ballistic missile defense.

The plan calls for spotting missile sites far enough apart to give the entire United States some measure of protection against enemy ICBMs, rather than trying to protect only key military bases and cities.

The ABM decision may be announced as early as Monday when Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara addresses the United Press International editors in San Francisco.

Or President Johnson could wait a while longer in hopes of pressuring the Soviet Union into setting a date for talks on an ABM freeze.

But Johnson Administration officials yesterday did pass the word to key policy makers that the decision has been made to take the next big step toward an operational American missile defense.

#### LITTLE AT A TIME

The thin missile defense the Administration has decided upon can be built a little at a time, like an erector set.

Called Nike X, it consists of elaborate radars and two types of anti-missile-missiles. The long-range missile, the Spartan, is supposed to intercept enemy warheads 400 miles out from its launching pad.

This means the first contest is a silent one out in soundless space. The short-range missile, the Sprint, is designed to whoosh up at tremendous speed to destroy any warheads that elude Spartan. This last ditch fight is near earth, with Sprint having a range of 25 miles.

A bargain basement missile defense could be built in five years for \$3 billion. It is billed as one which would protect the U.S. against the first ICBMs China is expected to have in 1971 or 1972.

But the \$3 billion defense would be thickened by putting in more sites so the protecting missiles do not have to guard such large expanses of the countryside.

#### RAISES PRICE TAG

Also, missile bases and key cities in the U.S. can be selected for special protection in this thickening process.

The thickening raises the price tag. But Pentagon leaders contend a good measure of protection can be bought for \$10 billion. Such a system would consist of about 1000 long-range Spartans and 100 Sprints at sites spread across the U.S.

President Johnson and Secretary McNamara, when they do speak out on the thin ABM, are expected to stress that the United States has by no means passed the point of no return in missile defense. Critics of the ABM contend that it could lead to a new nuclear arms competition between the United States and Soviet Union.

But advocates stress that a go-ahead on the thin ABM does not lessen American interest in reaching an agreement with Russia on controlling both offensive and defensive missiles.

The subject is sure to come up when Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko meet in New York at the end of this month. Their meeting was set up yesterday by Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin in a 40-minute call on Rusk. Dobrynin, who had returned from Russia early in the week, said Gromyko is scheduled to arrive in New York Monday for Tuesday's opening of the United Nations General Assembly. Rusk plans to go to New York Sept. 24.

The erector-set quality of the ABM could leave the President room for diplomatic maneuver. He can push at each ABM milestone for an arms control agreement such as the preproduction, production and deployment phases.

The decision to go ahead with ABM means the release of \$377 million already in the present fiscal 1968 budget for the engineering drawings and factory equipment needed to put the ABM system into production.

The President, by announcing the go-ahead, also takes the steam out of the Congressional drive for a start on a missile defense system.

Chairman John O. Pastore (D-R.I.) of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee may well have pushed the Johnson Administration into its decision. Pastore Sept. 9 had called for building a missile defense, announcing at the time that Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) would hold hearings "soon" on the ABM issue.

#### IMPACT OF CHINESE COMMUNIST NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRESS ON U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

##### BACKGROUND

As the nuclear threat posed by the Chinese Communists became more pronounced, Chairman Pastore decided to conduct a special inquiry regarding Chinese Communist nuclear weapons development. This probe began on January 11, 1967, and was formally announced at the Joint Committee's first public hearing of the 90th Congress on January 25, 1967.

In connection with this study the Joint Committee received the following testimony in executive session:

January 11, 1967: Richard Helms, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

February 1, 1967: Dr. Norris Bradbury, Director, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, and Dr. Michael May, Director, Livermore Radiation Laboratory.

Mar. 13, 1967: Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

July 13, 1967: Representatives of the Department of Defense, CIA, and AEC.

These witnesses presented testimony concerning advances being made by Communist China in developing nuclear weapons as well as their progress in developing the capability to deliver these weapons against neighboring countries or the United States.

Detailed technical presentations were heard concerning each individual Chinese Communist nuclear test and an assessment was made of future developments by Red China in the field of nuclear weapons and associated delivery systems.

An analysis of the impact of the emergence of Red China as a nuclear power on U.S. foreign policy with particular emphasis on the proposed nonproliferation treaty was also presented.

Information concerning French and Soviet nuclear weapons and delivery methods were also discussed but principal emphasis was on Red China.

#### CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of various hearings we have had and studies made by the Joint Committee, the following committee conclusions have been developed:

##### 1. Chinese nuclear weapons capabilities

The Chinese Communist test of June 17, 1967, at the Lop Nor Nuclear Test Site was her sixth nuclear test in the atmosphere and her first in the megaton range. Such a test was expected because of the success of the preceding thermonuclear experiment conducted on December 28, 1966. The Chinese purposely may have limited the yield of that test—their fifth test—to keep the fallout in China at an acceptable level. The fifth test indicated that the Chinese had taken a major step toward a thermonuclear weapon.

There is evidence that the sixth test device—with a yield of a few megatons—was dropped from an aircraft.

Analysis of the debris indicates use of U<sup>235</sup>, U<sup>238</sup>, and thermonuclear material. As in the other tests, there is no evidence that plutonium was used. The preliminary indication is that a considerable improvement accompanied the increase in yield. A large amount of U<sup>238</sup> was used in the device.

The sixth Chinese nuclear test has confirmed the conclusion reached from the analysis of the fifth Chinese nuclear test that they are making excellent progress in thermonuclear design. They now have the capability to design a multimegaton thermonuclear device suitable for delivery by aircraft.

We believe that the Chinese will continue to place a high priority on thermonuclear weapon development. With continued testing we believe they will be able to develop a thermonuclear warhead in the ICBM weight class with a yield in the megaton range by about 1970. We believe that the Chinese can have an ICBM system ready for deployment in the early 1970's. On the basis of our present knowledge, we believe that the Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971. But this would be a tight schedule and makes allowance for only minor difficulties and delays. We believe that the Chinese have already completed the development of a medium range ballistic missile. We have no indication of any deployment.

We also believe that by about 1970 the Chinese Communists could develop a thermonuclear warhead with a yield in the few hundreds of kilotons in the MRBM class and that they could develop an MRBM warhead with a megaton yield about a couple of years later. Meanwhile, should they desire a thermonuclear bomb for delivery by bomber, they

could probably begin weaponizing the design employed in the sixth test.

The missile-delivered fourth Chinese test demonstrated that the Chinese now have the capability to design a low yield fission warhead compatible in size and weight with a missile. With a few tests, the Chinese could probably design an improved fission weapon for MRBM or bomber delivery. However, they may forego extensive fission weapon production in order to have materials and facilities available for thermonuclear weapon systems.

The Chinese bomber forces consist of a few hundred short-range jet bombers and a handful of somewhat longer range bombers. We have no knowledge of a Chinese plan to develop heavy intercontinental range bombers.

Earlier, the Communist Chinese conducted four other nuclear detonations:

October 16, 1964: Low yield (up to 20 kilotons).

May 13, 1965: Low intermediate (20 to 200 kilotons).

May 9, 1966: Intermediate (lower end of 200 to 1,000 kiloton range).

October 27, 1966: Low intermediate (20 to 200 kilotons).

The Chinese were able to continue their nuclear program after the Soviets apparently ceased technical assistance in this area by 1960, and detonated a uranium device in October 1964.

All of the Chinese detonations have utilized enriched uranium ( $U^{235}$ ) as the primary fissionable material. Uranium-238 was also present in all tests. The detonation of any device which also contains  $U^{238}$  results in some fissioning of the  $U^{238}$ . The debris from their third and fifth tests indicated some thermonuclear reactions had involved lithium-6 in those devices.

We believe that the Chinese are interested in the development of submarines equipped with suitable relatively long-range missiles; at this time we have not determined the exact nature or status of the program.

#### 2. French nuclear test program

Turning to the French nuclear test program, in February 1960 the French tested their first atomic device. In 1966 the French conducted five nuclear tests. In 1967 they held a short series of three tests. Another series of tests is planned for next summer. All of the 1966 tests were plutonium fission devices. The last two tests in 1966 were experiments aimed at the thermonuclear development.

The year's tests were conducted on June 5, June 27, and July 2. They were suspended by balloons, above the Mururoa Lagoon. The tests all had low yields. The French announced that all of the tests were to be of triggers for thermonuclear devices which the French still have not tested.

Although French officials continue to state publicly that France will detonate her first thermonuclear device in 1968 when enriched uranium becomes available, there have been hints in the press that France is having difficulties with its program. Should this be true, the first generation of both the land-based and submarine-launched missile systems might have to use warheads developed in the 1966 series.

To recapitulate, the Chinese are well ahead of the French in thermonuclear weapon design. In 2½ years and six tests the Chinese have successfully tested a megaton thermonuclear device. The French, on the other hand, have conducted many more tests over a 7-year period and have not yet tested a true thermonuclear device or achieved a megaton size yield.

The French have developed higher yield fission weapons than the Chinese. The French have achieved yields of up to 250 kilotons while the Chinese fission devices have had lower yields.

The French now have an operational strategic force of about 60 Mirage IV air-

craft with a stockpile of 60 to 70 KT nuclear weapons. At this time the Chinese do not have such an operational strategic force.

#### SUMMARY

The Joint Committee believes that the American public needs to know the threat that is posed by Red China. Communist China has emerged with a fledgling, but effective, nuclear weapons capability. This capability has and will continue to have a great effect on U.S. foreign policy in the Far East. It will have an effect on our relations with the South East Asia Treaty Organization. It will have an effect on the nonproliferation treaty principally because of the close connection between Chinese nuclear power and the national security of India. Its effect will also be felt by Japan. Moreover, the Chinese Communists could use nuclear blackmail to assert their position not only broadly in Asia, but specifically in Southeast Asia.

Perhaps most significant for the United States is the fact that a low order of magnitude attack could possibly be launched by the Chinese Communists against the United States by the early 1970's. At present we do not have an effective anti-ballistic-missile system which could repel such a suicidal (for the Chinese) but nevertheless possible strike.

It is for these reasons that the Joint Committee feels the assessment it has made, based upon information received in executive sessions, should be brought before the American public—not to overemphasize or to underplay but to state clearly and concisely with due regard for the protection of intelligence sources where we stand in relation to this emerging threat to our national security.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS TO THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, last Thursday evening, at the convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police in Kansas City, Mo., President Johnson delivered what has been justifiably acclaimed as a major and penetrating speech on crime in America.

In this speech, President Johnson crystallized the thoughts and fears that have been preying upon the minds of millions of Americans for many months. He related in a forthright manner what he and his administration have done and are doing to meet the challenge of crime.

Congress, too, has its own grave responsibility in this struggle. Two of the most vital and most urgent measures proposed by the President to combat crime—the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967 and the Firearms Control Act of 1967—still remain in committees of this body. I strongly urge Senators to read the President's speech with the utmost care and to hasten consideration of this vital legislation and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, KANSAS CITY, MO.

President Morris, Mayor Davis, Chief Lawrence, Mr. Tamm, Chief Kelley, ladies and gentlemen:

There is an old story about President Calvin Coolidge and his response to the question, "What do you think about sin?"

As you may remember, President Coolidge is supposed to have answered, "I'm against it."

Most Americans would say the same thing today about poverty, disease, and ignorance—and crime.

So I don't expect special credit this morning for coming before the International Association of Chiefs of Police to talk about crime and only say, "I'm against it."

It would not enlighten your discussions, nor contribute to public understanding, if I were to spend my time here in a long lament about the evil consequences of crime. I think they are as self-evident as they are real.

Neither am I going to be content to just preach about the decline in morality in America.

In the first place, I just do not believe that morality is declining. The responsibility that this Nation has shown, in meeting its human obligations at home and abroad, convinces me that America is a Nation that is strong today.

In the second place, I do not believe that sweeping indictments of our Nation's morality will help us get at the solution of the real problems that affect morality—the problems of poverty, the problems of disease, the problems of ignorance, or of international aggression, or of crime. Self-righteous indignation is not a policy. It is a substitute for a policy.

What America needs is not more hand-wringing about crime in the streets. America needs a policy for action against crime in the streets—and for all the people of this country to support that policy.

Believing that, as I strongly do, I established in March, 1965, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, I instructed and charged this Commission to deal with the following questions:

How can law enforcement be organized to meet present needs?

What steps can be taken to insure protection of individual rights?

Through what kinds of programs can the Federal Government—of which I am a part—be most effective in assisting and supplementing, not supplanting, State and local law enforcement?

I asked the members that I carefully selected from throughout the Nation to consider the problem of making our streets, homes, and our places of business safer—and to inquire into the special problems of juvenile crime, to examine the administration of justice in the lower courts—to explore the means by which organized crime can be arrested by Federal and local authorities closely coordinating and cooperating together.

The Commission's report, rendered last winter, is a study of crime and a study of criminals. But it is much more than that. It is a systematic analysis of the strengths—as well as the weaknesses—in our American law enforcement. It is a prescription for action—action—action at every level of government, and it is a constructive guide for thoughtful citizens throughout this land in every walk of life.

Acting on its report, I urged the Congress this year to promptly act—promptly act—upon the most comprehensive Federal legislation that has ever been devised to help local authorities meet the problem of crime at the local level in their cities.

That legislation was called the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act. It was based on the five fundamental principles of the Crime Commission Report:

First, that crime prevention is of paramount importance.

Second, that the system of justice must itself be just. The system of justice must itself be just and it must have the respect as well as the cooperation of all of its citizens.

Third, better trained, better paid, and better equipped people are desperately needed throughout the land.

Fourth, police and correctional agencies must have better information and deeper and broader research into the causes, and into the prevention and control of crime.

Fifth, and last, substantially greater resources such as more judges and prosecutors, and faster court action, more and better court personnel, more modern court administration—thus modernizing, improving and bringing the entire criminal justice system up to date in the 20th Century.

I did not propose that the Federal Government take over the job of dealing with crime in American streets because from the birth of the Republic to the present moment responsibility for keeping the peace in our cities has been squarely on the shoulders of local authorities.

Respect for law and order begins at home. Children must learn it and must be taught it from their parents. Your children learn it from you—and by what you do and by the example you set. That means that every time we water the lawn when there is an ordinance against it at a certain time of day, the children learn their own lesson about respect for law and order—if we water the grass at the wrong time.

That means that every time a parent writes a note to the teacher to discuss Mary's or Johnny's absence from school when they really don't need to be excused and are not sick, they, the children, learn from the parents the wrong lesson about respect for law and respect for order.

The crimes that have most disturbed our people—homicides, robbery, physical assault, burglary, automobile theft and driving while intoxicated—are crimes against local and state law.

Those laws are made by the city councils and made by the state legislators. They must be enforced by the police and the state patrol. Their perpetrators are tried in local courts, by local citizens. They are sentenced locally. They are prosecuted locally by judges—by prosecutors who are elected by local people and by judges who are selected by local people.

They are returned to local communities when their sentence has been served—their penalty paid. These local communities look upon their record and they are under the supervision of local authorities.

Unlike most other countries, we—America—have no national police force. It desires none. Our founding fathers were very careful to see that none was provided for. Why, today in this country our largest city has more police officers than the entire United States Government. One city has more police officers than the entire government of the United States of America.

Officials in Washington just cannot patrol a neighborhood in the far west, or stop a burglary in the south, or prevent a riot in a great metropolis.

In the end, then, the quality of the local police, the action of the local prosecutor, the local grand juries, the fairness and the justice of the local courts, the effectiveness of the local correctional systems—all of this responsibility is lodged appropriately and properly in the hands of local authorities—of local citizens.

They at the local level must decide how good they want their law enforcement in their local cities to be.

They must determine whether it is right—whether it is just and whether it is fair—to ask a man to risk his life to protect their life for a salary that is lower than they pay another man for working behind a desk or standing on the assembly line in an industrial plant.

They must determine at the local level whether they want a court system that they select and provide for which delays justice until justice is denied.

They must determine locally whether they want a correctional system that deals with youthful offenders, not as lives to be redeemed, but as people who are doomed to clash repeatedly with the law.

If they decide that they want something better for their communities than what they are getting today, then we think that if they make this decision—and they can make it today through their Congressmen and their Senators supporting the recommendations that the President has made—some of which have been before the Congress many years—then their national government can, should and will help them get it—not by taking over the system of law enforcement, but by helping them strengthen and reform it.

That is what the Safe Streets Act which I recommended to the Congress would do. If its spirit and if its purpose survive, it will provide grants to those cities and to those states who not only increase their present commitment to criminal justice, but who are willing to go out and develop programs for better training, for better use of their personnel, or for higher standards and innovations such as tactical squads and community relations units, and new techniques of rehabilitation.

It will help pay the salaries of those who operate these programs. It will help pay the salaries up to one-third of the grant which could be used to increase the pay of policemen and other criminal justice personnel working with them.

The key to this program is experiment, innovation—and better use of the most advanced knowledge that we have gained in this country of crime, its treatment, and its causes. In my opinion, every law enforcement official in this country ought to welcome it in the spirit in which it is offered: as a practical and imaginative tool for helping our law enforcement officers cope with crime in the cities without in any way—in any way—diminishing either their responsibility or their authority.

Now to a matter that affects you and affects you much more than most of the citizens, but in the end it will affect every single one of us—it will reach into every home in this land—and this is the gun sale law. A law to limit—a law to safeguard—the sale of guns has been before our Congress for several years.

Its passage would plug up one more big loophole to save your life, and mine, or the life of some innocent child down the street. I hope it will pass.

Its purpose is simple—it is to keep lethal weapons out of the wrong hands—out of the hands of dangerous criminals, out of the hands of drug addicts, out of the hands of mentally ill people who really know not what they do.

Its basic aim is to limit the out-of-state purchases and the interstate mail-order sale of firearms. We believe this is the most effective way that the Federal Government has of protecting your safety and the safety of your children from criminals, drug addicts, and the mentally ill.

If we want to curb crime—if we want to arrest crime—if we want to restrain criminals—here is an action that we can take that will be a long step forward.

Let us not be content to bewail the rising crime rate or to talk about the statistics of the numbers of repeaters who fill our jails and prisons while we turn our back and ignore the fact that they can go to any mail order house and get a weapon to shoot your wife after they tear the door down at midnight.

Let us act instead of talk against crime. Let us repair as many shattered lives as we can. Let us do it within and through the American system of due process and in keeping with our tenacious regard at all times for the blessings of individual freedom.

You, and the men who you command, are America's front line in the fight against crime. You endanger your lives every day just as the man does in the rice paddies of Vietnam to protect freedom, to protect liberty, to protect your country.

This summer, some of you experienced a new kind of disorder in your cities. You faced, not individual acts of violence or just thievery, but you faced massive crimes against people and against property.

Much can explain—but nothing can justify—the riots of 1967.

They damaged a great deal more than the storefronts and the American homes. They damaged the respect and the accommodation among men on which a civilized society ultimately depends, and without which there can be no progress toward social justice.

The violence of this summer raised up a new and serious threat to local law enforcement. It spawned a group of men whose interest lay in provoking—in provoking—others to destruction, while they fled its consequences.

These wretched, vulgar men, these poisonous propagandists, posed as spokesmen for the underprivileged and capitalized on the real grievances of suffering people.

And the vast majority of those people—the vast majority of them—believe that obedience to the law, in Abraham Lincoln's phrase, must be our religion here in America.

They have seen the law change. They have seen it become more just as the years passed in our times. They have seen their rights more firmly established, their opportunities sharply increased in the last decade.

They know that the law in a democratic society is their refuge, and that lawless violence is a trap for all those who engage in it.

We must redeem their faith in law. We must make certain that law enforcement is fair and effective—that protection is afforded every family, no matter where they live—that justice is swift and justice is blind to religion, color, status, and favoritism.

We cannot tolerate behavior that destroys what generations of men and women have built here in America—no matter what stimulates that behavior, and no matter what is offered to try to justify it.

Neither can we abide a double standard of justice, based on the color of a man's skin or the accent of a man's speech.

Those who wear the police officer's badge—those who sit in judgment in the courts—those who prosecute in the chambers—those who manage our correctional institutions—all of these have a very special responsibility for the maintenance of order and the achievement of justice throughout the land.

But every single one of us—private citizen and government official—shares some in that responsibility.

We can all say very easily, "We are against crime"—and then we can let it go at that. We can preach sermons, we can write editorials, we can make speeches, and we can get our picture made talking about crime and moral behavior—we can think that we have done our duty.

Or we can respect—we can encourage—all of our citizenry to respect the law and to respect those who protect us in the name of the law.

We can be willing to pay the bill or improving the performance of our police, our courts, and our correctional institutions and give them the salary, pay and equipment that they need. We can insist on devoting enough of our resources and enough of our brainpower to meet the problem of crime—to make America safer and more just for all its citizens.

I have always felt that we could make great strides forward if we would only realize that the nurse and the medical attendant who in the middle of the night may determine whether we live or die when we need attention—that they have better training, better pay and better inducements—that the teacher who prepares our children, sets an example for them and infuses knowledge into them—and sets an example—that they should be among our best trained, our best prepared and our best rewarded.