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MEETING WITH SENATORS

Monday, May 21, 1979
7:30 p.m. (90 minutes)
The Blue Room

From: Frank Moore
Zbigniew Brzezinski

I. PURPOSE
To discuss SALT

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS & PRESS ARRANGEMENTS

A. Background: This is the second of the SALT evenings with Senators. Once again, the group is mixed and includes supporters as well as those leaning for and against. No one can accuse us of pre-selecting the groups so that we can slant the arguments. In addition to those Senators whom we had planned to invite to this evening, we have asked all those who were unable to attend last week's session. Per your instructions, we invited Senator Goldwater, and he turned us down again.

Scenario:

1. We suggest that you be the only speaker, giving the same type of remarks you made last week. We hope you will find an analysis of last week's meeting useful (Tab A).

2. Secretary Brown, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Deputy Secretary Warren Christopher, and Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering William Perry will be at the front of the room to respond to questions.

3. In the course of your remarks, you might want to touch upon some of the points in the attached Questions and Answers. (Tab B)
B. Participants:

Sen Max Baucus (D-Montana)
Sen Henry Bellmon (R-Okla)
Sen Lloyd Bentsen (D-Texas)
Sen David Boren (D-Okla)
Sen Dale Bumpers (D-Arkansas)
Sen Lawton Chiles (D-Florida)
Sen Thad Cochran (R-Miss)
Sen John Danforth (R-Missouri)
Sen Bob Dole (R-Kansas)
Sen Pete Domenici (R-N.Mexico)
Sen John Durkin (D-N.Hampshire)
Sen Thomas Eagleton (D-Missouri)
Sen Wendell Ford (D-Kentucky)
Sen Mike Gravel (D-Alaska)
Sen John Heinz (R-Pa)
Sen Walter Huddleston (D-Kentucky)
Sen J.Bennet Johnston (D-La)
Sen Nancy Kassebaum (R-Kansas)
Sen Russel Long (D-La)
Sen Robert Morgan (D-N.Carolina)
Sen Gaylord Nelson (D-Wisc)
Sen Donald Riegle (D-Mich)
Sen William Roth (R-Delaware)
Sen James Sasser (D-Tenn)
Sen Harrison Schmitt (R-N.Mexico)
Sen Dick Stone (D-Florida)
Sen Richard Schweiker (R-Pa)
Sen Alan Simpson (R-Wyoming)
Sen Herman Talmadge (D-Georgia)
Sen John Warner (R-Virginia)

Secretary Brown, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Deputy
Secretary Christopher, and Under Secretary Perry
available to answer questions

State: Kathy Smith

DoD: Walt Slocombe, BG James Granger (JCS)

WH/NSC: Frank Moore, Dan Tate, Bob Beckel
Bill Smith, Madeleine Albright
Roger Molander
C. Press Arrangements: White House photographer

III. ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

Questions and Answers attached
MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 21, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI
       FRANK MOORE

SUBJECT: Critique of Tuesday Night's SALT Briefing with Senators

A number of us present at the last meeting with the Senators felt that we could be most helpful to you if we gave you a critique of that meeting. We believe that your overall performance was excellent. You impressed the Senators with your command of the facts and with your deeply felt concern for the need to have a SALT Treaty. We believe that you handled the following points extremely well:

1. The general characterization of the Treaty and the negotiating process.
2. The consultations with JCS.
3. The support of the Allies.
4. The separation of your decisions on deployment of new weapons from SALT II.
5. What systems the Soviets will have to dismantle under SALT II.
7. Verification -- Turner and Brown statements.
8. The beginning of SALT III.
9. The consequences of rejection -- without using the "warmonger" statement.

We would like to suggest some changes in your approach to the following questions:

1. Amendments - We are extremely concerned about "amendment fever." You must be careful to tread the fine line between a take or leave it approach and one which would leave the impression that you could accept even minor amendments which would require going back to the Russians.
2. The value of SALT - With respect to Jackson's question of whether SALT I constrained the Soviets. We suggest you say that were it not for SALT I the Soviets would have:

-- Retained at least some of the SS-7 and SS-8 that they were forced to trade in under SALT I as they built up their SLBM force.

-- They would not be retiring their Y-class submarines -- barely ten years old -- at this point in order to stay within the SALT SLBM and SSBN limits.

-- They would have built at least some SS-18 launchers from scratch rather than undergo the much more difficult process of converting SS-9 launchers to SS-18 launchers.

-- They would probably have a much more vigorous ABM program at this time to include additional ABM deployments.

° By agreeing with Jackson's captious question on SALT I, you also inadvertently put yourself in a position of being critical of Nixon and Kissinger -- something we should avoid.

° You should also be aware that Jackson greatly exaggerated the content of his resolution on SALT I. The Resolution called on the President "... to seek a future treaty that, inter alia, would not limit the United States to levels of intercontinental strategic forces inferior to the limits provided for the Soviet Union ..." It says absolutely nothing about throw-weight and Jackson's effort at that time to make this language more explicit was squelched.

3. You mentioned that the Soviets might agree to further reductions at the Summit. Even though we presumably will make this effort, the prospects are remote and you should avoid this phrasing because we are afraid it may raise expectations in the Senate that are not warranted.

4. You should not be apologetic about our March 1977 proposals. They clearly led to the restrictions on ICBM modernization limits as well as to the reductions to 2250 and the 1200 and 850 sublimits.

5. One of the Administration technicians who attended the meeting believes that in making the point about much lower levels of strategic systems being acceptable, you should reference Nitze's 1000 small warhead ICBM's suggestion, but avoid citing your own views. He says that some believe you are too eager to reduce force levels and that concepts such as 200 50-kiloton single warhead missiles are so unrealistic in a world where many nations have nuclear weapons that it detracts from your credibility as a person who approaches arms control with caution and prudence.
Question: What is the basis for your opposition to any amendments? Do you contend that the Senate does not have a role other than simply voting the Treaty up or down?

Answer:

-- First, modifications are not necessary because the treaty is sound.

-- Individual Senators will have to weigh the risks of creating a situation where SALT II must be renegotiated. When they have an opportunity to study this agreement in detail, they will recognize that it is a delicately balanced package. Its parts are inter-related, the result of over 6 years of intense negotiation.

-- If the Soviets were willing to renegotiate -- and that is highly improbable -- they would wish to reopen many provisions which had been resolved to our advantage. This would cause the entire agreement to come apart.

-- The Senate must judge whether the Soviets would reject outright any request to renegotiate. The Soviets may decide, even contrary to their own real interests, that they cannot allow themselves in the eyes of the world, to be pushed around by the United States. After over six years of hard bargaining, they -- no more than we -- will accept unilateral alterations in the bargains that have been struck.

-- That is the basis for our belief that any significant amendment or reservation would amount, in practical terms, to the same thing as defeat of the treaty.
Fourth, there would be a sharper rise in defense spending to deal with new challenges.

Fifth, we could see the prospect of improved relations with the Soviet Union replaced by heightened tension.

Sixth, our friends and allies would be deeply troubled by what many would see as a rejection of the arms control process.

Seventh, other ongoing arms control negotiations such as CTB (Comprehensive Test Ban), MBFR (Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions), and ASAT (Anti-Satellite weapons restrictions) -- would be jeopardized and the prospects for further agreed limits and reductions in strategic arms would be bleak for the foreseeable future.

Eighth, our ability to work effectively to hold back the proliferation of nuclear weapons would be undermined if nations that could acquire them concluded that the two nuclear superpowers are not serious about restraint.
Question: The President has said that rejection of the SALT II Treaty would cast the United States as a "warmongering" nation in the eyes of the world. What does he mean by that?

Answer:

-- For over a decade, the United States has strived to reduce the risk of nuclear war in two basic ways: we have maintained a strong defense that will serve as an unquestioned deterrent to any potential adversary and we have negotiated progressively broader mutual limits on the strategic arms race with the Soviet Union through the SALT process.

-- Our friends and allies around the world look to us for both; they expect us to maintain a credible deterrent and they want to see steady progress in slowing down the strategic arms race which threatens not only the two superpowers, but the entire world.

-- If the SALT II Treaty were rejected by the Senate, the strategic arms control progress we have already made would be jeopardized and the prospects for further limits and reductions in the foreseeable future would be bleak. A further intensification of the nuclear arms race would be likely. Nations which do not now have nuclear weapons would be more likely to reconsider their position. Tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union would rise.
-- Since this would follow U.S. rejection of the SALT Treaty, we could be seen as primarily responsible.

-- It is inevitable that many of our friends and allies around the world would interpret failure to approve the Treaty as a rejection, not only of what they see as a constructive agreement, but also of the strategic arms control process itself. Many would conclude that we have abandoned the parallel tracks of a strong defense and reasonable arms control and chosen instead to follow the military competition track alone. And they would be concerned at an apparent failure to manage East-West relations.

-- Our reputation as a nation dedicated to reducing the risks of nuclear war would unquestionably suffer a profound blow.
Question: The President has said that if the Treaty is defeated, he will still abide by its terms. But he also said that if it is defeated, we will "drift into a dark nightmare of unrestrained arms competition." Which is correct?

Answer:

-- There is nothing inconsistent in those two statements.

-- If SALT II is defeated, it would be irresponsible for the United States precipitously to launch a massive arms build-up. We would seek to maintain as much moderation and stability in the strategic balance as possible.

-- But we must also recognize that, in the absence of mutually binding limits, the pressures to intensify the arms race would build substantially.

-- Uncertainty fuels the arms race, and the environment in the wake of a SALT defeat would be far more uncertain: there would be no agreed limits on what either side could build and thus the range of possible future threats that we would have to deal with would widen; the provisions of SALT which prevent concealment of each other's strategic forces or interference with national means of verification would no longer be binding and thus we could have far less knowledge of Soviet forces and strategic programs; and overall tensions between our two countries would inevitably increase.

-- Thus, although we would exercise as much restraint as was consistent with our national security
interests, over a period of time it is likely that strategic stability would deteriorate. And we would meet any Soviet increases in their strategic forces with our own.
Question: There have been many statements about the consequences of rejection. What precisely do you see as the consequences?

Answer:

-- First, there would be no limits on the number of strategic launchers that each side could build. Our estimates are that the Soviets could reach 3000 by 1985, instead of 2250. We of course would have to do what is necessary to maintain essential equivalence. Thus we could see a senseless numbers race in which both sides accumulate more and more strategic missile launchers and bombers, with a net loss of security.

-- Second, the Soviets could place 30 or more warheads on their heavy missiles, instead of 10, thus adding considerably to the threats we face and making it far more difficult for us to deal with the vulnerability of land-based missiles.

-- Third, because there would be no restriction on Soviet concealment of their strategic forces or on interference with our monitoring systems, we would have far less knowledge of present and future Soviet strategic forces; this uncertainty would make our defense planning more difficult and our security less certain.
Q: Since the Backfire bomber can reach targets in the continental US, why shouldn't it be included in SALT?

A: The Soviet Union is currently deploying Backfires in both their long-range air force and in naval aviation units. The Backfire bomber has been in production for several years, and current production averages two and a half aircraft a month. We continue to believe that the primary purpose of the Backfire is to perform peripheral attack and naval missions. Undoubtedly, this aircraft has some intercontinental capability in that it can surely reach the United States from home bases on a one-way, high-altitude, subsonic, unrefueled flight; with refueling and Arctic staging it can probably, with certain high-altitude cruise flight profiles, execute a two-way mission to much of the United States.

The ability to strike the territory of the other side is not the criterion for determining whether an aircraft is a "heavy bomber" and, thus, subject to the limitations in the SALT II agreement. For example, the US has 67 FB-111's which are part of our strategic bomber force and dedicated to attack on the Soviet Union. We also have over 500 aircraft deployed in the European and Pacific theaters which have the capability to strike Soviet territory. The Soviet Union at one time tried to get these latter aircraft included in SALT on the
grounds that they could strike the Soviet Union.

With the firm support of our Allies, we adamantly resisted that position on the grounds that these aircraft, whatever their theoretical capability, are deployed for theater missions and, thus, not subject to SALT limitations. The Soviets have used this same argument with respect to the Backfire.

Nevertheless, the Soviets have agreed to furnish specific assurances concerning the Backfire. The US regards the obligations undertaken by these assurances as integral to the Treaty. These assurances, which include a freeze on the current Backfire production rate, are consistent with the US objective of constraining the strategic potential of the Backfire force, while continuing to exclude our own European and Pacific-based theater aircraft from SALT. Those assurances also help to restrict the Backfire to a theater role. In particular, limiting the numbers available means that Soviet diversion of Backfire from its theater and naval missions to a strategic role would substantially reduce Soviet strength in these areas while adding only marginally to overall Soviet strategic capability.
Q: It is claimed that SALT II will be adequately verifiable, but how will the US make sure that the Soviets aren't cheating? Doesn't the loss of intelligence collection sites in Iran undermine our ability to verify the SALT II agreement?

A: The US relies for verification on "national technical means" which is a general term covering a variety of technical collection methods for monitoring Soviet military activities. As the President has publicly confirmed, these national technical means include photographic satellites. There are other collection methods as well. For example, we are able to monitor Soviet telemetry -- that is, the technical data transmitted by radio signals from the Soviet missiles during tests -- from outside Soviet territory. A further example of national technical means are the ships and aircraft which we also use to monitor Soviet missile tests. The sides have also acknowledged that large radars, such as the COBRA DANE radar at Shemya Island in the Aleutians, can be used as a form of national technical means (NTM).

This is not a complete list of the technical devices that constitute our NTM. Still less is it a complete list of US intelligence resources. Many of our intelligence resources are very sensitive. Public acknowledgement of their existence, much less of their technical capabilities and details of how they work or what information they produce, would make it far easier for the Soviets to negate them. Therefore, what we can say publicly about the details of our intelligence facilities is very limited. Members of the Senate who will have
to vote on the Treaty will, of course, have full access to all the details.

However, there is no secret that our NTM enable us to learn a great deal about Soviet military systems, including the strategic nuclear forces that are limited in SALT. We are able to monitor many aspects of the development, testing, production, deployment, training, and operation of Soviet strategic forces, despite the closed nature of Soviet society and Soviet concern with secrecy. A good measure of the capabilities of our systems of intelligence collection is the detailed information we publish on Soviet forces: For example, the Secretary of Defense's Report for FY 80 lists the numbers of Soviet bombers, missiles, and gives estimates of the numbers of weapons carried on Soviet forces. We know that the Soviets have a "fifth generation" of ICBMs under development, and we know a good deal about their characteristics -- this before a single missile has been flight-tested. That this is by no means the full extent of our knowledge of Soviet systems is clear from the mass of unofficial -- but often all-too-accurate -- leaks of detailed information on Soviet programs.

From these sources, then, we are able to assemble a detailed picture of Soviet forces, both overall and in terms of the characteristics of particular systems. No one source is essential; instead we rely on information from a variety of sources -- for example, what we learn
from photography can be checked against information from radar or telemetry monitoring. This means both that loss of a particular source, though it can be important and require replacement, does not "blind" our ability to monitor what the Soviets are doing. Moreover, the use of multiple sources complicates any effort to disguise or conceal a violation. The Soviets know we have a big intelligence operation and know a certain amount about how it works, from our official statements, from leaks, from spies, and from their own NTM. But we know they do not know the full capabilities of our systems -- or, equally important, how we use the information we collect. The result is that efforts to conceal would have to be planned to cope with a number of US collection systems, some of them entirely unknown. (The need to maintain this uncertainty is a major justification for continued secrecy about our intelligence systems and methods.)

As for the loss of the intelligence collection sites in Iran, we are proceeding in an orderly fashion to reestablish that capability. As Secretary of Defense Harold Brown pointed out in his April 5 speech in New York, the issue is not whether the capability will be reestablished but rather how, where, and how quickly. There are a number of alternatives available to us for recovering the capability. Some can be implemented more quickly than others. Some involve consultations with other countries, some do not.
Intelligence of the kind obtained from the Iranian sites provides information on Soviet strategic systems, including some of the aspects of the strategic systems which are limited by SALT. For this reason, we will be moving with all deliberate speed to reestablish the capability. However, as noted above, we have a large number of other technical intelligence collection sources which collect intelligence on Soviet strategic systems. As a consequence, it is not imperative that the Iranian capability be immediately reestablished to ensure that the emerging SALT agreement is adequately verifiable, i.e., that any Soviet cheating that could pose a military risk be detected in time for the US to respond and offset the threat. As long as the capability is reestablished on a timely basis -- as we plan to do -- there will be no impact on SALT verification. We estimate that regaining enough capability to monitor adequately these tests for SALT purposes will take about a year.

The principal information at issue is the nature and characteristics of new or modified Soviet ICBMs. Each such Soviet program will require about 20 flight tests over a period of years. We would be able to monitor testing and detect violations well before the testing programs were complete. On this basis, we are confident that we will be able to verify adequately a SALT agreement from the moment it is signed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM OF DOCUMENT</th>
<th>CORRESPONDENTS/TELEPHONE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>briefing</td>
<td>Re: SALT Treaty (2 pp.)/enclosed in Moore to The President 5/21/79</td>
<td>5/21/79</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

congressional leadership breakfast

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

CONG. BREAKFAST 5/22/79

Vienna, Tokyo, June mtg
Alaska lands
Budget resolution, Support budget con.
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CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP BREAKFAST

Tuesday, May 22, 1979
8:00 a.m.
Family Dining Room

From: Frank Moore

I. INTRODUCTION

You should mention that you will be out of the country for a large part of June due to the SALT II signing and to the Economic Summit. I will be working with the Leadership to set up another meeting with you in June although it may not be two weeks from today.

II. PRESS PLAN

White House photographer.

III. PARTICIPANTS

See attached list.

IV. AGENDA

1. Alaska Lands

You should congratulate the House Leadership for their success in getting a strong Alaska Lands bill through the House. You should express a strong commitment to a similar bill in the Senate. (Do this for the benefit of Senator Byrd who will be inclined to go along with his good friend Senator Stevens).

2. Budget Resolution

The Conference Report is likely to be taken up in the House on Wednesday. Senate action has not yet been scheduled. Urban and labor groups may pull together a large enough coalition to pose problems in the House.
You should say that your approach thus far has been to support the Budget Committees and the Leadership and that you will continue to do so. You might solicit their advice as to how the Administration can be helpful in gaining passage of the Conference Report.

3. Decontrol

As you know, the Speaker disagrees with our posture on extension of controls. You should indicate a general awareness of differences between some of the Leadership and the Administration and encourage all to minimize these differences. You should also state that you feel that neither side would gain from a battle staged in the press on this sensitive issue.

You might also remind the Leadership that you made the difficult decision to decontrol only after your staff consulted widely on the Hill.

4. Windfall Profits Tax

You should encourage the Speaker to continue to work with Chairman Ullman. You should push for action soon after the Memorial Day recess.

5. Gasoline Rationing

I don't think you should raise the subject. If someone else raises it you should repeat your statement that you and members of your Administration stand ready to work with any Member who can put together a new plan that would pass.

6. Welfare Reform

You should tell the Leadership that the proposed Welfare Reform legislation will be announced Wednesday at 11:45 by Stu and Secretaries Califano and Marshall. Bill Cable will ask the Speaker to meet with Stu in his office after the breakfast for a more detailed briefing. You should reinforce your commitment to the proposal and ask for their help in passing it. You should ask Stu to make a few comments about the proposal.

Stu and Califano are ready to brief the Steering and Policy Committee (or whomever the Speaker designates).
7. Hospital Cost Containment

You should encourage the Leadership to continue pushing. Scheduling in Ways and Means, House Commerce and Senate Finance is still uncertain. Of primary concern is Ways and Means where Fowler, Jenkins, Gibbons and Pickle are still wavering.

8. Panama Canal

The Speaker, Wright and Brademas support the implementing legislation. You should let the Leadership know that you have asked the Cabinet Secretaries to call Members and ask them how we can mesh our operation with their operation to ensure success. Brademas is heading up their task force on the issue. You should also thank them for their work up to now and emphasize that you welcome their advice.

9. Assistance to Turkey

You should not raise the issue of assistance to Turkey. Brademas is likely to bring it up, however, and you could reiterate your reasons for believing that we need to give Turkey the $50 million in MAP rather than in FMS credits. FMS credits would only add to Turkey's already serious debt burden. They need grant assistance such as MAP.

You might also mention that you are encouraged by developments over the weekend: the Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders, meeting under Secretary General Waldheim's auspices, agreed to resume the long-stalled intercommunal talks beginning June 15 on the basis of a 10 point accord that marks a step forward in the drawn out effort to find a solution to the Cyprus problem. Among other things, the accord provides that the talks will be based on guidelines reached by the late Archbishop Makarious and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash in 1977 and on relevant U.N. resolutions. It also states that priority should be given to the resettlement of the city of Yarosha by Greek Cypriots and that both sides should take measures to promote good will and confidence.
SUMMARY SCHEDULE

VISIT TO CHEYNEY, PENNSYLVANIA

Sunday, May 20th, 1979

From: Phil Wise

9:45 am    Depart Camp David vis helicopter en route Cheyney, Pennsylvania. (Flying time: 55 minutes) (No time change).

10:40 am   Arrive Cheyney State College helopad. 2-minute motorcade to Emlen Hall.

10:47 am   Arrive Emlen Hall. Proceed to holding room for 8-minutes personal time.

10:58 am   Proceed to Quadrangle for Cheyney State College Commencement Ceremony. REMARKS. FULL PRESS COVERAGE

1:00 pm    Ceremony concludes. Proceed to motorcade for 2-minute drive to helopad.

1:12 pm    Arrive helopad. Board Marine One en route South Lawn. (Flying time: 1 hour) (No time change)

2:15 pm    Arrive South Lawn.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO CHEYNEY, PENNSYLVANIA

Sunday, May 20th, 1979

WEATHER REPORT: Partly cloudy, temperatures in the mid 70's. 25% chance of rain.

9:40 am GUEST & STAFF INSTRUCTION: The following are to board Marine One at Camp David:

   Phil Wise
   Dr. Lukash
   CDR Reason

9:45 am The President proceeds to Marine One for boarding.

MARINE ONE DEPARTS Camp David en route Cheyney, Pennsylvania.

   (Flying time: 55 minutes)

10:40 am MARINE ONE ARRIVES Cheyney State College helopad, Cheyney, Pennsylvania.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE
CLOSED ARRIVAL
The President will be met by:

Rep. William Gray (D-Pa.)
Rep. Robert Edgar (D-Pa.)

Dr. and Mrs. Wade Wilson, President,
Cheyney State College (Naomi)
State Rep. K. LeRoy Irvis (D), Minority
Whip, State House of Representatives
State Rep. David Richardson, Chairman, Black
Caucus, State House of Representatives
Mr. Edgar "Sonny" Harris, President, Cheyney
State College Faculty Union
Ms. Janice Fisher, President, Cheyney State
College Staff Union
Dr. Rufus Johnson, President, Cheyney State
College Alumni Association
Mr. James Morgan, President, Student
Government, 1978-79
Mr. Tim Kinning, President, Student Government, 1979-80
Mr. Edward Lee, Chairman, Board of Trustees
Dr. Rufus Barfield, President, Bowie State
College
Dr. Stanley Smith, President, Shaw University
Dr. Oswald Bronson, President, Bethune
Cookman College
Dr. Cecil Cone, President, Edward Waters College
Rev. and Mrs. William Jones, Director,
Bureau of Staff Services, Pennsylvania
Department of Education, (Patricia)
GUEST & STAFF INSTRUCTION: Proceed to motorcade for boarding. Assignments as follows:

Lead
E. Maddox

President's Car
The President
Dr. Wilson

Follow-up

Control
P. Wise
CDR Reason
B. Fitzpatrick

Spare
Dr. Lukash

Camera 1
Wire 1
Wire 2

WHCA

The President proceeds to motorcade for boarding.

10:45 am MOTOCARDE DEPARTS helopad en route Emlen Hall.
(Driving time: 2 minutes)

10:47 am MOTORCADE ARRIVES Emlen Hall.

PRESS POOL COVERAGE
CLOSED ARRIVAL

The President, escorted by Dr. Wilson, proceeds to holding room.

10:50 am The President arrives holding room.

PERSONAL/STAFF TIME: 8 minutes
10:58 am  The President, escorted by Dr. Wilson, departs holding room en route offstage announcement area.

11:00 am  The President arrives Quadrangle offstage announcement area and pauses.

"Ruffles and Flourishes"
Announcement
"Hail to the Chief"

The President, escorted by Dr. Wilson, proceeds inside Quadrangle en route stage and remains standing for Cheyney State College Commencement Ceremony.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE
ATTENDANCE: 8000

"Lift Every Voice and Sing" by the choir.


11:08 am  Remarks by Stephen Shelton, President of the Senior Class.

11:11 am  Musical selection by the choir.

11:17 am  Introduction of the President by Dr. Wilson.

11:20 am  Presidential remarks.

FULL PRESS COVERAGE

11:40 am  Remarks conclude.

The President takes his seat.

Presentation of candidates for Degree by Bernard Proctor, Vice President for Academic Affairs.
NOTE: Dr. Wilson will confer the Degrees and the President will greet the graduates.

12:05 pm  The President returns to his seat.

Musical selection by the choir.

Presentation of Citation to the President by Dr. Wilson.

Remarks by Antoinette Paula Blango, Class Valedictorian.

Class Honors.

Induction of Graduates into the Alumni Association.

Remarks to the Graduates by Dr. Wilson.

Alma Mater.


1:00 pm  Ceremony concludes.

The President departs stage en route motorcade for boarding, greeting the crowd along the way.

1:10 pm  MOTORCADE DEPARTS Emlen Hall en route helopad.

(Driving time: 2 minutes)

1:12 pm  MOTORCADE ARRIVES helopad.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE
CLOSED DEPARTURE

GUEST & STAFF INSTRUCTION: Board Marine One. Manifest as on arrival.
The President boards Marine One.

1:15 pm MARINE ONE DEPARTS Cheyney State College helopad en route South Lawn.
(Flying time: 1 hour)

2:15 pm MARINE ONE ARRIVES South Lawn.
CHEYNEY STATE COLLEGE

Dr. and Mrs. Wade Wilson (Naomi)
President
Cheyney State College
812 Haverford Road
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010

Mr. Edgar "Sonny" Harris
328 Elder Avenue
Yeadon, PA 19050

Dr. Rufus Johnson
President
Cheyney State College Alumni Association
RD #1
Box 156B
Glen Mills, PA 19342

Dr. Rufus Barfield
President
Bowie State College
Bowie, MD

Mr. James Morgan
President
Student Government Cooperative Association
Cheyney State College
Cheyney, PA 19319

Mr. Tim Kinning
President-Elect
Student Government Cooperative Association
Cheyney State College
Cheyney, PA 19319

Ms. Janice Fisher
Cheyney State College
Cheyney, PA 19319

The Hon. and Mrs. William Gray (Andrea) (2 kids were there)
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.
CHEYNEY STATE COLLEGE:

Mr. Stephen Shelton
Cheyney State College
Cheyney, PA 19319

Ms. Antoinette Paula Biango
Cheyney State College
Cheyney, PA 19319

Rev. and Mrs. William Jones (Patricia Anne) ** NOTE: note of regret that P was unable to meet them
309 North Second Street
Steelton, PA 17113

The Hon. Arthur Early
State Representative

The Hon. Robert Edgar
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Rev. Bill Riley

Mr. Robert Nix, Jr.

Mr. and Mrs. Lucien Blackwell (Jeanne)

Mr. Herbert Hankins

Mr. Pat Swygert

The Hon. Herbert Arlene
State Senator

Mr. Sam Evans ** do note of regret that P was unable to meet him
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Frank Moore

The attached was returned in the President's outbox today and is forwarded to you for appropriate handling.

Rick Hutcheson
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MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: FRANK MOORE
SUBJECT: Leadership Breakfast

I would like to add one item to the Leadership Breakfast Agenda for tomorrow—the Ethics Act Amendments.

Shortly after the breakfast, the House will be voting on the Ethics Act Amendments. Congressman Danielson has advised us against delay; he believes that we have a reasonable chance of getting our amendments approved tomorrow and that delay would work against us. Today, we were unable to get Congressman Eckhardt to recede or compromise on any of his amendments and he will be offering all of them tomorrow.

I think it is important that you bring this matter to the attention of the leadership. They have not focused on the Ethics Act Amendments and are by no means sufficiently sensitive to the importance of prompt approval of our amendments. I recommend that you make the following points:

- The House will be taking up the Ethics Act Amendments today, and it is extremely important that the amendments we proposed be passed. They have already been passed by the Senate.

- If we fail to get the amendments passed, and enacted into law, we will shortly be losing thousands of Federal employees who are concerned about the stringency of the existing Ethics Act post-employment restrictions. We have already lost a number of key employees who did not believe that adequate amendments would be passed by July 1.

- Congressman Eckhardt will be offering a number of amendments today. Most of which attempt to tighten the post-employee restrictions. If those amendments succeed, I believe we will see a prompt exodus of many key Federal employees. I urge you to help us pass Congressman Danielson's amendments.
Dr. Wilson, Congressmen Gray and Edgar, Senior Class President Shelton, Ms. Blango, Members of the Graduating Class of 1979:

As President, I have a special opportunity to study the course of history.

Tonight I will sleep in the room where Abraham Lincoln slept, and a few feet away will be the place where he signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

Thursday

Friday I met in the White House with several hundred black leaders, dozens of whom were civil rights activists who came to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Brown vs. Board of Education decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which struck down the "separate but equal" doctrine that had perpetuated legal separation of the races in our public schools.

-- Not long ago I went.....
Not long ago I went with Mrs. Martin Luther King Jr. to Memphis to visit the spot where her husband had been assassinated.

These are profoundly moving personal experiences, but I also feel a sense of history as I stand here now before you.

Many of you are the first in your families to go to college.

My generation was the first in my father's family to go to college, so I can share the pride you feel. I also know the hardship that went into this achievement for so many of you.

Ours is a very special generation, the generation that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was thinking of when he expressed his dream for America with an eloquence and a moral power that never will be forgotten.

One part of Dr. King's dream had a special meaning for me, because of the state where he and I were born. He said: "I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and sons of former slaveholders will be able to sit down at the table of brotherhood."
Now, when Andrew Young and I, two Georgians, sit down at the table in the White House to hammer out foreign policy for the United States of America, it truly is a table of brotherhood.

I am proud that we are working together for human rights around the world -- and for majority rule, equality and the end of racism and apartheid in Southern Africa.

But I have not come to Cheyney State to boast about what my Administration has done in foreign policy or civil rights or any other field.

I am not here to soothe you with promises that everything is going to be all right just because I am in the White House and we now have a couple of hundred black leaders helping to make policy for our federal government.

Instead, I am here to talk about some problems and to offer a challenge.

Our country does face extremely difficult problems -- problems like inflation, energy shortages, inequality, discrimination, unemployment, and worldwide threats to peace.

Each of these problems brings with it a tendency toward withdrawal from responsibility and crippling fears -- fears that stand in the doorway between us and needed solutions.

-- These fears of an.....
These fears of an uncertain future affect our daily lives.

All of us, for instance, -- consumers, public officials, students, working people and business executives -- hesitate to make individual sacrifices we know are needed to fight inflation, because we are afraid that someone else will get a better deal.

We have seen the panic gasoline buying in California when everyone knows that this only makes our energy problems worse.

Some people are afraid of losing their jobs and this fear gives rise to racial bigotry and hatred.

All of us, if we are sane, are afraid of nuclear war, but the horror of man's capacity to destroy life on this planet does not yet bring us together to work for peace.

If our bellies are full and we are safe and secure, these fears among others contribute to our sense of selfishness and [self-absorption]. Voidance of responsibility.

People are so concerned with getting ahead, with preserving what we have, with beating the system, that we refuse to become involved with anything outside our own personal lives.

By taking refuge in either complacency or hopelessness, we mistakenly believe that we can grab and hold the best deal in a difficult world.
Our problems are serious and they are real. They will not disappear if we ignore them. There are powerful special interests in our country which feed on the apathy of ordinary citizens. They enjoy the special privileges of power and influence, and they are determined to block positive change.

Those among you who believe in change -- in improvement -- those who are committed to making our country greater -- must let your voices be heard if we are to defeat these special interests.

We know we need better programs in welfare, health care, education, and jobs.

We know we need to control inflation, eliminate racial discrimination, have universal voter registration, control nuclear weapons and help to bring about majority rule in Southern Africa.

Can either -- or block

The Congress of the United States makes these decisions -- decisions which affect every person in America.

I usually do not like polls, but I would like to take a little poll right here in the quadrangle.

---

All of you who care....
All of you who care about jobs, peace, eliminating racism, and insuring justice for all men and women, black and white, raise your hands.

Now all of you who voted in the last Congressional election, the 1978 election last November, raise your hands.

Why did you not vote?

Martin Luther King Jr. was willing to give up his life so that you might have the right to vote -- the right to shape the actions of your government.

And he was not the only one.

A lot of brave people suffered to win that basic right.

But that right is hollow -- that right is empty -- unless you use it.

When the Brown decision was handed down twenty-five years ago Friday, the school doors did not open up the next Monday.

Do you know when they really began to let black children enroll in the all-white schools?

When the Voting Rights Bill passed.

Both political candidates and incumbents have got to know that you will vote! -- and act!
How are we going to have the leadership to fight for equal opportunity and affirmative action in jobs, schools, and housing if even the act of voting is too great an effort?

I ask you to join with me in overcoming fear, in battling apathy, in fighting for change.

One place to begin is to keep the pressure on for equal opportunity in jobs and education.

Our economy has added 250,000 jobs for black and other minority teenagers since I became President.

This year, we have committed $3.4 billion for youth employment and training -- twice what we were spending before.

But we must do better.

That is why I have asked Vice President Mondale to head a cabinet-level task force to review everything both government and industry are doing in youth employment and training.

We are going to make sure our programs work, and we are going to look for ways to get private business to do its part as well.

-- As part of that review....
As part of that review, we will take another look at our summer job program, which has been seriously troubled.

The level of jobs in the future will depend on the effectiveness of the program.

In the meanwhile, I am going to make it my business to assure that this summer we have the one million summer jobs we promised.

The struggle for civil rights is not over. Talk to the members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

They are deeply concerned about the attitudes in Congress.

We have made progress but we have not achieved all we need to accomplish.

The Brown decision and the Voting Rights Act tore the mask of legality from the face of racism, and you and I are never going to let it be put back on.
Before these legal actions, there were only a few thousand black students in state colleges all across the country.

Now over a million black students are going to colleges all over America, mostly in publicly-supported schools like this one.

These numbers indicate the progress we have made. These numbers are important because education leads to jobs -- good jobs.

I am going to tell it to you straight because I care about the things you care about, because you and others like you, black Americans are the reason that I am President, and because one of you may someday have my job.

Change does not come easy.

Changing the course of a society is not like switching channels on a television set.

In 1896, for example, the Supreme Court enunciated the evil principle of "separate but equal".

It took 58 years -- more than half a century -- of losing court battles, of marches, of courage and sacrifice before a new court finally killed the ghost of Jim Crow. But it happened because people like you made it happen.
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-- A. Philip Randolph died....
ONE OF THOSE HEROES
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH DIED LAST WEEK.

HE WAS 90 YEARS OLD.

HE SPENT HIS LONG LIFE FIGHTING AGAINST DISCRIMINATION IN JOBS, IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES, IN THE ARMED FORCES OF HIS OWN COUNTRY.

HE FOUGHT MORE BATTLES THAN HE WON, BUT HE WON ENOUGH TO CHANGE THE FACE OF THIS NATION AND THE LIVES OF US ALL.

HIS FIGHT -- YOUR FIGHT -- OUR FIGHT -- GOES ON.

WE HAVE WRITTEN THE PROMISE OF EQUALITY INTO OUR LAWS, BUT WE MUST HAVE THE MEANS AND THE TOOLS TO KEEP THAT PROMISE.

THERE IS STILL UNLAWFUL, DOCUMENTED RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING IN OUR COUNTRY, ESPECIALLY IN OUR CITIES.

THAT IS WHY WE ARE STRUGGLING IN CONGRESS TO GIVE PATRICIA HARRIS, THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, CEASE AND DESIST POWERS, SO THAT THE VICTIMS OF DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING WILL NO LONGER BEAR THE BURDEN OF ENFORCING THE LAWS THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO PROTECT THEM.

WE ARE NOT GOING TO GET THIS CHANGE THROUGH CONGRESS WITHOUT YOUR POLITICAL PARTICIPATION.

THE VERY LEAST WE NEED IS YOUR VOTE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO WILL ENACT LAWS THAT CAN ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION AND GIVE US THE ENFORCEMENT POWERS WE NEED.
WE HAVE AN ENERGY CRISIS IN THIS COUNTRY.  
YET TOO FEW OF OUR PEOPLE AND EVEN FEWER OF OUR POLITICIANS ARE WILLING TO FACE THAT REALITY.

I HAVE PROPOSED A WINDFALL PROFITS TAX TO PREVENT THE OIL COMPANIES FROM POCKETING BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN UNEARNED, EXCESS PROFITS.

THE NATION NEEDS THE REVENUES FROM THAT TAX TO DEVELOP ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES, TO IMPROVE MASS TRANSIT, AND TO HELP THE POOREST AMONG US COPE WITH HIGHER ENERGY PRICES.

WHEN THE TIME COMES FOR A VOTE IN CONGRESS, YOU CAN BE SURE THE OIL COMPANY LOBBYISTS WILL BE THERE.

YOU CAN HELP TO PROVIDE THE COUNTER-VAILING FORCE THAT WILL CURB THEIR POWER.

THE MOST BASIC HUMAN RIGHT IS THE RIGHT TO LIVE IN PEACE.

TODAY, AS YOU MARCH DOWN THE AISLE TO RECEIVE YOUR DIPLOMAS, I AM THANKFUL THAT NONE OF YOU WILL HAVE TO MARCH OFF TO DIE IN BATTLE.

I AM THANKFUL THAT INSTEAD OF FIGHTING A WAR, WE ARE DEBATING A NEW STEP TOWARD LIMITING THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE.

PEACE AND FREEDOM ARE BOTH PRECIOUS GIFTS AND THAT IS WHY THE FIGHT OVER RATIFICATION OF A NEW STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TREATY IS SO IMPORTANT.

AS DID MARTIN LUTHER KING, YOU MUST MAKE YOUR VOICES HEARD IN THIS BATTLE FOR SANITY AND FOR PEACE.
Here at home, inflation threatens all the progress we have made.

Again, I want to tell it to you straight: inflation robs the poor, it robs minorities, and it robs those starting out in life as surely as it robs old people on fixed incomes.

Inflation forces the government to tighten the budget and cut back on many programs that might help some of you, and inflation destroys some of the resources that business and industry could use to hire those who need jobs.

When Congress makes the tough choices on what has to be cut, who will stand with me to put people first unless you use your influence and power?

I did not come here today to ask you to make my job easier.

I came to urge you to help me make the job of every elected leader in America tougher by insisting that government be more responsive, more compassionate, and more open.

That is why I am proud to have people like Andrew Young working alongside me to help me do my job in foreign affairs.

That is why I am proud to have people like John Lewis with me and Eleanor Holmes Norton, pressing the fight against fear and for justice here at home.
THESE ARE POWERFUL PEOPLE IN POWERFUL POSITIONS, BUT THEY CANNOT DO IT UNLESS YOU BACK THEM UP. THEIR EFFECTIVENESS COMES FROM THE FACT THAT THEY SPEAK FOR YOU -- JUST AS MY POWER AS PRESIDENT COMES FROM THE FACT THAT I SPEAK FOR YOU AND FOR ALL AMERICANS.

AND I AM HERE NOT ONLY TO LET YOU HEAR MY VOICE, BUT SO THAT WE IN GOVERNMENT CAN BE SURE TO HEAR YOURS AND THAT TOGETHER OUR VOICES WILL BE TOO STRONG TO BE IGNORED -- SO THAT TOGETHER WE WILL HAVE THE COURAGE TO WIN MORE VICTORIES THAT WE CAN PLACE ALONGSIDE THE GREAT ONES THAT HAVE BEEN WON.

THE LONG STRUGGLE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, FOR EQUAL RIGHTS, AND FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, HAS BEEN A CYCLE OF ACTION AND REACTION, OF LASH AND BACKLASH, FOR THE CANCER OF RACIAL INJUSTICE HAS ALWAYS BEEN NEAR THE HEART OF AMERICA.

THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY YEARS AGO THE FIRST SLAVES WERE BROUGHT TO OUR SHORES IN CHAINS.

ONE YEAR LATER THE FIRST PILGRIMS STEPPED ONTO PLYMOUTH ROCK IN SEARCH OF FREEDOM.

THE STORY OF AMERICA HAS BEEN THE STRUGGLE AND AGONY OF A PEOPLE TRYING TO HEAL THAT CONTRADICTION AND THAT PAIN.

MOST OF THE PROGRESS HAS BEEN INITIATED AND OFTEN CONCLUDED BY THE PEOPLE -- NOT BY THE GOVERNMENT. REMEMBER THIS. -- IT CAN BE DONE. ....
IT CAN BE DONE.

MUCH HAS BEEN DONE ALREADY.

IF IT HAD NOT, WE WOULD NOT BE HERE TOGETHER TODAY.

WE MUST CONTINUE TO FIGHT OUR BATTLES AND TO OVERCOME
OUR FEARS TOGETHER, OR WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO STAND TOGETHER
TOMORROW.

IN HIS NOBEL PRIZE ACCEPTANCE SPEECH DR. KING SAID,
"I HAVE THE AUDACITY TO BELIEVE THAT PEOPLES EVERYWHERE
CAN HAVE THREE MEALS A DAY FOR THEIR BODIES, EDUCATION
AND CULTURE FOR THEIR MINDS, AND DIGNITY, EQUALITY AND
FREEDOM FOR THEIR SPIRITS."

I SHARE THAT AUDACIOUS DREAM.

I ASK YOU TO JOIN EACH OTHER, AND TO JOIN WITH ME
IN THE STRUGGLE TO MAKE THAT DREAM COME TRUE.
As President, I have a special opportunity to study the course of history. Tonight I will sleep in the room where Abraham Lincoln slept, and a few feet away will be the place where he signed the emancipation proclamation.

Today I met in the White House with several hundred black leaders, dozens of whom were civil rights activists who helped to come to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Brown vs. Board of Education decision. The U.S. Supreme Court which struck down the "separate but equal" doctrine that had perpetuated racial separation of the races in our public schools.

Not long ago I went with Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. to
Wagner to visit the spot where her husband had been assassinated.

These are profoundly moving personal experiences, but I also feel a sense of history as I stand here now before you.
We need sound welfare health care, education, and jobs.

We know we need to contain inflation, eliminate racial discrimination, have fairer voter registration, and bring about majority rule in Southern Africa.

Control nuclear weapons

The Congress of the United States makes these decisions which affect every American person in America.
Read.

When the lights flicker
in the dark stale school,
they must begin to fret.

Monday. Do you know this
not at all? Can't see the
shock down below d.p.
Fright. The year ago finding,
lost dim. The Green Decision.
Our economy has added 250,000 jobs for black and other minority teenagers since I became President. This year, we have committed $3.4 billion for youth employment and training -- twice what we were spending before.

But we must do better. That is why I have asked Vice President Mondale to head a Cabinet-level task force to review everything both government and industry are doing in youth employment and training. We are going to make sure our programs work, and we are going to look for ways to get private business to do its part as well.

As part of that review, we will take another look at our summer job program, which has been seriously troubled. The level of jobs in the future will depend on the effectiveness of the program. In the meanwhile, I am going to make it my business to assure that this summer we have the one million summer jobs we promised.
CHEYNEY STATE SPEECH, 5/20

Dr. Wade Wilson, Congressman (William) Gray and
(William) Edgar, (Senior Class) President (Stephen) Shelton,
Ms. (Antoinette) Blango (Valedictorian) members of
the graduating class of 1979:

I am very happy to be with you, your families, your fellow students, and your teachers on this beautiful day, this day of achievement, and I congratulate you all.

Many of you are the first in your families to go to college. I was the first young man in my family to graduate from college, so I know the pride that brings. I know the hardship that went into this achievement for so many of you.

Our
Yours

is a very special generation, the generation that

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was thinking of when he expressed his dream for America with an eloquence and a moral power that never will be forgotten.
One part of Dr. King's dream had a special meaning for me, because of the state where he and I were born. He said: "I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and sons of former slaveholders will be able to sit down at the table of brotherhood."

Now, when Andrew Young and I sit down at the table in the Cabinet Room to hammer out foreign policy for the United States, that table is a table of brotherhood.

I am proud that we are working for human rights, majority rule, equality, and the end of racism and apartheid majorities in Southern Africa.

But I have not come to Cheyney State to boast about what my Administration has done in foreign policy or civil rights or any other field. I am not here to soothe you with promises that everything is going to be all right, just because I am in the White House and we have a couple hundred black leaders helping to make policy for an federal government.
In stead, I am here to offer a challenge. I am here to try to shake you out of the apathy that afflicts so many of our citizens. The only way this great country of ours can fulfill its promise is for all of us to work together and pool our strength and our love and make it happen.

Our country faces extremely difficult problems -- shortages, discrimination, unemployment, problems like inflation, energy inequality, lack of opportunity, worldwide threats to peace, and preventing nuclear war. Each of these problems bring with it a tendency toward withdrawal from responsibility and crippling fears -- fears that stand in the doorway between us and needed solutions.

These fears affect our daily lives. Everyone -- consumers, public officials, students, working people and business executives -- hesitates to make individual sacrifices we know are needed to fight inflation, because we are afraid that someone else will get a better deal, are afraid of losing out to someone else. We have seen the panic gasoline buying in California and elsewhere that only makes our energy problems worse. People are afraid of losing their jobs and this fear gives rise to bigotry and hatred.
All of us, if we are sane, are afraid of nuclear war, but the horror of man's capacity to destroy life on this planet does not bring us together to work.

These fears, contribute to a sense of selfishness and self-absorption. People are so concerned with getting ahead, with preserving what they have, with beating the system, that they refuse to become involved with anything outside their personal lives. By taking refuge in complacency or hopelessness, they mistakenly believe that they have found the road to safety.

Our problems are difficult and real. They will not disappear if we ignore them. There are powerful special interests in our country that feed on the apathy of ordinary citizens. They enjoy the special privileges of power and influence, and they are determined to block positive change. Those who

who believe in change -- those who are committed to making our country greater -- must let their voices be heard if we are to defeat these special interests.
There are almost one hundred million people with jobs in our country. What is shocking is that this is just about the same number of adults who did not vote in last year's Congressional elections.

I do not like polls, but let's take a little poll right here in the quadrangle.

All of you who care about justice for all men and women, black and white, raise your hands.

Now all of you who voted in the last Congressional election, the 1978 election, raise your hands.

Why did you not vote?

Martin Luther King was willing to give up his life so that you might have the right to vote -- the right to shape the actions of your government. And he was not the only one.

A lot of brave people suffered to win that basic right. But that right is hollow -- that right is empty -- unless you use it.

Both candidates and incumbents have got to know that you will vote! How are we going to have the leadership to fight for
equal opportunity and affirmative action in jobs, schools, and housing if even the act of voting is too great an effort?

I ask you to join with me in overcoming fear, in battling apathy, in fighting for change. One place to begin is to keep the pressure on for equal opportunity in jobs and education.

The struggle for civil rights is not over. We have made progress but we have not achieved all we need to accomplish. Nor should we despair because we mistakenly believe that all we won in Brown vs. the Board of Education was lost in the Bakke decision.

That just isn't true.

The Brown decision tore the mask of legality from the face of racism, and you and I are never going to let it be put back on.

Before the Brown decision, there were only a few thousand
black students in state colleges all across the country.

Now over a million black students are going to college all over America, mostly in publicly-supported schools like this one. These numbers indicate the progress we have made. These numbers are important because education leads to jobs -- good jobs.

I am going to tell it to you straight because I care about the things you care about, because you are the reason that I am President, and because one of you may someday have my job. Change does not come easy. Changing the course of a society is not like switching channels on a television set. In 1896, for example, the Supreme Court enunciated the evil principle of separate but equal. It took 58 years -- more than half a century -- of losing court battles, of marches, of courage and sacrifice before a new court finally killed the ghost of Jim Crow. But it happened because people like you made it happen.
A. Philip Randolph died last week, on the eve of the 25th anniversary of Brown vs. Board of Education. He was 90 years old. He spent his long life fighting against discrimination in jobs, in defense industries, in the armed forces of his own country. He fought more battles than he won, but he won enough to change the face of this nation and the lives of us all.

His fight is your fight is our fight goes on. We have written the promise of equality into our laws, but we must have the means and the tools to keep that promise.

There is still unlawful, documented racial discrimination in housing in our country, especially in our cities. That is why we are fighting in Congress to give Patricia Harris, the Secretary of HUD, cease and desist powers, so that the victims of discrimination will no longer bear the burden of enforcing the laws that are supposed to protect them.
We are not going to get that without your political participation. The very least we need is your vote for the kind of Congress that will enact laws that can lessen our fears and give us the enforcement powers we need.

We have an energy crisis in this country. Yet too few of our people and even fewer of our politicians are willing to face that reality. A few days ago the House of Representatives voted to kill my standby gasoline rationing plan. They didn't offer a plan of their own and they are not likely to do so.

I have proposed a windfall profits tax to prevent the oil companies from pocketing billions in unearned, excess profits. The nation needs the revenues from that tax to develop alternative energy sources, to improve mass transit, to help the poorest among us cope with higher energy prices. When the time comes for a vote in Congress, you can be sure the oil company lobbyists will be there. You can provide the only countervailing force that will curb their power.
The most basic human right is the right to live in peace. Today, as you march down the aisle to receive your diplomas, I am thankful that none of you will have to march off to die in battle. I am thankful that instead of fighting a war, we are debating a new step toward limiting the nuclear arms race. Peace and freedom are both precious gifts and that is why the fight over ratification of a new Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty is so important. You must make your voices heard in this battle as well.

Here at home, inflation threatens all the progress we have made. Again, I want to tell it to you straight: inflation robs the poor, it robs minorities, it robs those just starting out in life as surely as it robs old people on fixed incomes. Inflation forces the government to cut back on many programs that might help some of you and destroys some of the resources that business and industry could use to hire those who need jobs. Make no mistake, the budget must be tightened to
fight inflation. But when Congress makes the tough choices on what has to be cut, who will stand with me to put people first unless you use your power?

I did not come here today to ask you to make my job easier. I came to urge you to help me make the job of every elected leader in America tougher by insisting that government be more responsive, more compassionate, more open.

That is why I am proud to have people like Andrew Young working alongside me to help me do my job in foreign affairs. That is why I am proud to have people like John Lewis and Eleanor Holmes Norton pressing the fight against fear here at home.

These are powerful people in powerful positions. But they cannot do it unless you back them up. Their effectiveness comes from the fact that they speak for you — just as my power as President comes from the fact that I speak for all Americans. And I am here not only to let you hear my voice.
but so that I can hear yours and that together our voices will be too strong to be ignored. That, together, they will give us courage to continue some victories that we can place alongside the great ones of the past.

In the long struggle for civil rights, for equal rights, and for human rights, it has always been a cycle of action and reaction, of lash and backlash, for the wound of racial injustice has always been at the heart of America.

Three hundred and sixty years ago the first slaves were brought in chains to our shores. One year later the first pilgrims stepped onto Plymouth Rock in search of freedom. The story of America has been the struggle and agony of a people trying to heal that contradiction and that pain.

It can be done. Much has been done already. If it had not, we would not be here together today. We must continue to fight our fears together, instead of fleeing.
from them individually, or we will not be able to stand together tomorrow.

In his Nobel Prize Acceptance speech Dr. King said, "I have the audacity to believe that peoples everywhere can have three meals a day for their bodies, education and culture for their minds, and dignity, equality and freedom for their spirits."

I share that audacious dream. As President I want to make that dream come true.

I ask you to join me. More important, I ask you to join each other, and to join me in the struggle to make that dream come true.
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THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
May 18, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT
FROM: JODY POWELL
SUBJECT: Interview Request

I recommend that you agree to see Harry Kelly of The Chicago Tribune for about 15 minutes on how you think the job has changed you, how it effects you and your outlook for the remainder of this term.

Kelly is the Tribune's White House correspondent, and is a good, fair reporter who has been working for weeks on this article for the Tribune's magazine. He has never really talked to you at any length, and I think this would be a good opportunity for him to get to know you better.

Agree; work out time with Phil

Disagree

[Handwritten note: I have back-related with him this is shaping up as a good piece.]

J.P.