

VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: "CONTRACTS," MYTHS AND HISTORY†

A. LEON HIGGINBOTHAM, JR.*

We meet today at a significant conference on an issue that haunts all Americans. The topic of violence generally, or its significant subset, youth violence, invokes dreadful fears from which practically no one in America can escape—regardless of one's race, gender, sexual preference, economic status, religion, ethnicity or geographic location.

The headlines and news stories of 1994 reflect our anxieties: armed FBI Agents and local policemen murdered at a police station in the nation's capital; a gentle woman like Rosa Parks, the mother of the modern civil rights movement, assaulted in her own home in Detroit; hundreds of children and teenagers murder children their own age; elementary, junior and senior high school students cannot learn in their classrooms because of fears as to whether they will be beaten, assaulted, stabbed, killed or robbed on their way home. Practically no one in either urban or suburban settings feels totally secure in their homes. Politicians and talk show hosts have so exacerbated our most serious anxieties on the issue of crime and violence that the American public has been pushed to an all-time frenzy. The statistics are shocking: 5,379 children and teens were killed by gunfire in 1992—one child every ninety-eight minutes.¹ Thus, I start out by conceding

† Copyright © 1995, A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr.

* Chief Judge Emeritus (Retired), United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; Public Service Professor of Jurisprudence, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University; Of Counsel to Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison. Presented at the Conference on Youth Violence Co-Sponsored by the Harvard Law School Criminal Justice Institute and Boston College Law School, Harvard Law School, Friday, December 2, 1994.

I would like to thank Rubin M. Sinins, Esq., Research Associate, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University; Professor Catherine J. Ross, Visiting Professor of Law, Boston College Law School; Patricia Puritz, Esq., Project Director, Juvenile Justice Center, American Bar Association Criminal Justice Section; E. Bruce Nicholson, Esq., Legislative Counsel, American Bar Association Governmental Affairs Office; and the Children's Defense Fund, for their invaluable assistance and thoughtful comments.

I would also like to thank the Ford Foundation and the Mellon Foundation for their support on my Race and the American Legal Process Projects.

¹ CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND, *THE STATE OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN YEARBOOK* 1995, at 54 (1995).

and recognizing that we have momentous problems in this nation pertaining to violence and particularly violence among youth.²

I. WHY ARE WE HERE? TO ENTER THE ARENA

With this alarming and depressing state of affairs, perhaps some rational persons would ask: Why are we here? Will anything we say or do make any difference toward reaching present, or, more importantly, *long-term* solutions? In short, is it a waste of our time to create a setting for extraordinary academicians and experienced practitioners desperately groping for solutions to share their experiences and insights? My response is one that Theodore Roosevelt gave many decades ago. He once said:

It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the [person] who is *actually in the arena*, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs, and comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcomings; but who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with *those cold and timid souls who knew neither victory nor defeat*.³

To paraphrase Theodore Roosevelt, I am not here because I am a new entry into the "arena." Even after my many frustrations during more than forty years of dealing with problems pertaining to crime and violence, I am here because I want to stay in the arena. I want to participate in meaningful efforts that can bring America to a sense of rationality as a nation. We must strive to deal constructively with the containment of crime and violence, while at the same time build a

² According to the National Education Association, 40 children are killed or injured by guns every day. ABA PRESIDENTIAL WORKING GROUP ON THE UNMET LEGAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES, *AMERICA'S CHILDREN AT RISK: A NATIONAL AGENDA FOR LEGAL ACTION* 38 (1993) [hereinafter *CHILDREN AT RISK*].

³ Theodore Roosevelt, *Citizenship in a Republic* (address delivered at the Sorbonne, Paris, Apr. 23, 1910), in *PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES AND STATE PAPERS AND EUROPEAN ADDRESSES* DECEMBER 8, 1908 TO JUNE 7, 1910, at 2185, 2191 (1910) (emphasis added).

society that is fundamentally fair to all citizens and particularly to the weak, the poor and the dispossessed.

II. REJECTING THE CONTRACT MYTH

Our starting point in the arena must be rejecting the easy roles of mere critics of the present order and focusing on the more perplexing challenge of implementing rational solutions. We must reject those deceptive rhetorical myths that offer no substance, but merely oversimplify America's history and the discipline of criminology. As an example, one of the most adroit, though deceptive, political *myths* ever successfully sold in our nation has been Newt Gingrich's "Contract With America" slogan.⁴

As the election returns of 1994 demonstrate, the surest way to get elected to public office is to convey a dramatic, even if deceptive, image that you are angrier about crime than your opponent or any of the present politicians in office. The image of toughness on crime becomes more important than whether you plan to inspire the youth, feed the hungry, cure the ill, or whether you believe that racial, religious, gender and ethnic polarization should be halted.

All you need to do is employ shrewd public relations strategists who come up with a deceptive slogan such as "Contract With America." You can win an election with no one knowing the terms within that contract. The public does not need to know whether the contract excludes the weak, the poor and the minorities from fundamental human rights. You do not have to explain that there will be a default on the contract for poor children, when Head Start programs, which have saved the lives of many poor children, will close. You do not reveal that the contract will cause a bankruptcy of nutrition assistance funding, because Food Stamp programs will be eliminated and many of the poor will not be fed.

I know that I may seem dubious about the Republicans' new contract, but I speak in the milieu of Harvard Law School, where for years, Professor Samuel Williston taught that a document that provides neither rights nor remedies is not a contract. Furthermore, from the days that they arrived here in slave ships, African Americans have often been skeptical about some of the "contracts with America" implemented by adroit politicians, statesmen and even the revered forefathers.

⁴ See REPUBLICAN NAT'L COMM., *CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: THE BOLD PLAN BY REP. NEWT GINGRICH, REP. DICK ARMEY, AND THE HOUSE REPUBLICANS TO CHANGE THE NATION* (Ed Gillespie & Bob Schellhas eds., 1994).

As the Republicans prepare to enforce or implement their "Contract With America," I trust that they will not be oblivious to the lessons of history and that they will not forget this nation's first three-and-a-half centuries of race relations history. No one has summarized this sad history of injustice as eloquently as Martin Luther King, Jr., who stated on August 28, 1963, at the March on Washington:

So we've come here today to dramatize a shameful condition. In a sense we've come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was the promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note in so far as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check; a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds." We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. And so we've come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.⁵

Today, many African Americans and other persons of good will are hoping that the Republicans' "Contract With America" will not constitute a diminution of rights for the young, the weak, the poor, the powerless and minorities. We trust that Mr. Gingrich and his colleagues will reflect on the injustices of the white supremacy contracts sanctioned in the state of Georgia and the nation three decades ago, which prevented African Americans from staying in major hotels, eating at many restaurants and which allowed employers to deny people jobs solely because of their race, religion, gender or national origin.

We trust that the advocates for the Republican contract will not bring to the negotiating table the same brand of conservatism that opposed the civil rights movement, and even opposed the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination on the basis

⁵ Martin Luther King, Jr., *I Have a Dream* (delivered at the Lincoln Memorial at the March on Washington, Aug. 28, 1963), in *A TESTAMENT OF HOPE: THE ESSENTIAL WRITINGS OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.* 217, 217 (James M. Washington ed., 1986).

of race, gender, religion and national origin in employment, public accommodation, and other areas, and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which prohibits the continued disenfranchisement of many African Americans. In short, as the Republicans negotiate and enforce their contract, we ask: what is the difference between their conservative position of today and the conservative position of 1964, when George Bush, Strom Thurmond and Ronald Reagan opposed the Civil Rights Acts and claimed that those statutes were unconstitutional?⁶

Our nation must focus on the abuse of all persons in the 1990s, whether they are victims of violence, poverty, despair, racism, gender, religious or ethnic discrimination. At its core, the civil rights movement sought dignity and justice for *all* people. The heirs of the civil rights movement, the youth of this country, and most African Americans will support those rational policies that can decrease the escalation of crime, increase the chance for all to lead constructive lives, and at the same time decelerate racial, religious and gender hostilities. Any "contract with America" that does *not* ensure justice for all Americans must be rejected as a myth, a false promise for our nation's betterment, and a venal masquerade of any real attempt to root out the causes of our violence and despair.

Hopefully, the enforcers of the Gingrich contract will not take the cheap political route and declare that most poor young people in inner cities should be put in orphanages, or jails, or left to fend for themselves, if they do not have a strong family support system.⁷ What rationality is there in suggesting that the only alternative for dealing with the family that is poor is to keep all of its children in orphanages?

Now is the time for the leaders and followers in our nation to pause and seek honest resolutions. With the shocking lapses in our national agenda, illustrated by the disturbing disparity in health care for poor children and incredible poverty rates and disproportionate unemployment for millions of young people in this country,⁸ it is not surprising that some leaders are attempting to shift our focus away from these realities and to place the blame on demons—such as "liberals" or welfare recipients—who are pictured as the primary cause of all of society's ills.

⁶ See A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., *An Open Letter to Justice Clarence Thomas from a Federal Judicial Colleague*, 140 U. PA. L. REV. 1005, 1019 & nn.50-52 (1992).

⁷ See, e.g., *GOP Welfare Plan Would Take Cash from Unwed Mothers to Aid Adoptions*, CHI. TRIB., Nov. 14, 1994, at 7 (outlining Republican welfare proposal, including establishment of orphanages); *The Anti-Family Plan*, ATLANTA J. & CONST., Nov. 18, 1994, at A14 (describing Republican welfare proposal and terming it an "anti-family plan").

⁸ See CHILDREN AT RISK, *supra* note 2, at 9-10, 35.

Civility, dignity and compassion are the spiritual values that any new "contract with America" should have. Those who seek to enforce a new contract with America, if they truly want justice for all, must strive as valiantly as possible to achieve the kind of world that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. envisioned when he 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.*"⁹

III. AHISTORICAL MYTHS AND THE LESSONS OF HISTORY

We should not let anyone deceive us into believing that our generation is the first one to experience the nightmare of violence or that it is the first generation to give thought to containing crime. The most significant advantage of my present age of sixty-six is not that I am wiser; it is just that I have been involved in this journey longer than most of the present scholars and activists. Thus, in an autobiographical sense, I would like to share with you some of my thinking and experiences of more than forty years, as they pertain to my perceptions of crime and escalating violence in America.

We must reject the myth that there is some virtue in minorities or the poor remaining silent about the violence in their communities. In 1960, I was President of the Philadelphia NAACP. At that time, it was the largest NAACP branch in the nation, and, we believed, one of the most militant, thoughtful and well organized. We were concerned primarily about eradicating all aspects of racial segregation and racial discrimination. We were particularly offended by villains such as Governor George Wallace and other similar public officials who pledged to defy the *Brown* decision and perpetuate *racial segregation today and segregation forever*. Governor Wallace's battle cry for segregationists served as a rallying point for those of us who sought equal justice for all. Wallace urged:

Let us rise to the call of freedom-loving blood that is in us and send our answer to the tyranny that clanks its chains upon the South. In the name of the greatest people that have ever trod this earth, I draw the line in the dust and toss the

⁹ Martin Luther King, Jr., Nobel Prize Acceptance Speech (delivered at Oslo, Nor., Dec. 10, 1964), in *A TESTAMENT OF HOPE: THE ESSENTIAL WRITINGS OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.* 224, 226 (James M. Washington ed., 1986) (emphasis added).

gauntlet before the feet of tyranny . . . and I say . . . segregation now . . . segregation tomorrow . . . segregation forever.¹⁰

Besides being opposed to racism and hypocrisy, I was also concerned, even in the 1950s, about the problem of disproportionate violence in the African-American community, although it was relatively minuscule then when compared with the level of violence today, which seems at least fifty times more intense. Having been an Assistant District Attorney and a law clerk to a distinguished trial judge who presided over many major felony trials, I had seen far too many instances of angry people taking their pent-up frustrations out, in a violent fashion, on society at large and particularly on members of their own race. As I observed these cases and as I prosecuted or defended them, I recognized that there was a significant sociological explanation as to why some had become so angry and why some African Americans had become so violent.

It was in this context and with this experience that I thought that we could simultaneously advocate civil rights for all, while at the same time advocate civility, civic responsibility and the containment of violent crime. I thought that, with such simultaneous advocacy for these goals, we would be able to make America the nation it should be for all of its citizens.

When the NAACP met at a regional convention in the early 1960s, many resolutions were being presented on the floor; these resolutions were masterpieces in their rhetoric and condemnation of racism and in their description of the disadvantages which African Americans suffered. In this highly charged atmosphere, I had the temerity to propose a somewhat unique resolution, which suggested that, in addition to our fight against economic discrimination, racial discrimination and racial denigration, we should also be concerned about the containment and the elimination of *violent* crime wherever it might exist in our community.¹¹ When I presented the resolution, a person who

¹⁰ JODY CARLSON, *GEORGE C. WALLACE AND THE POLITICS OF POWERLESSNESS: THE WALLACE CAMPAIGNS FOR THE PRESIDENCY, 1964-1976*, at 24 (1981).

¹¹ Please note that I used the phrase "violent crime"; there were individuals who "ran the numbers," "played the numbers" and "banked the numbers" who were being prosecuted by police when certain police officers were not on the unofficial payroll of the number bankers. Actually, the number bankers were doing the same thing which is now legitimized by state-monopolized lotteries and which states vigorously promote for supplemental revenue purposes. At that time, I did not want to become involved in a debate about which minor offenses should or should not be legitimized by the criminal law. I was concerned only about the escalation of violence in the 1960s.

was then the Regional Director of the NAACP took over the microphone and said that my motion was out of order and that I was playing into the hands of racists, such as Governor Wallace and other individuals who were trying to scare America and to suggest that African Americans were not worthy of first-class citizenship. He suggested that any NAACP resolution commenting on crimes committed by African Americans would provide fodder for venal racists who would use our comments and statistical data on race as a basis to argue that African Americans were not worthy of first-class citizenship rights. I did not agree with the notion that we should focus only on racial discrimination and racial denigration, and I did not believe that a discussion of crime in our communities was an implicit condemnation of African Americans. I realized that if we did not take a strong stand on violence, that violence would escalate, and that the place it would be entrenched first and most pervasively would be the black community. With the intensity of the opposition, I did not press my resolution on the floor of the convention; I did not want what was a somewhat tangential resolution to become the major news story about the NAACP conference.

Some years later, the same individual who had criticized me for raising the issue of violent crime at the conference was then a ranking individual in a federal government agency dealing primarily with the problem of welfare and public housing. He told me that he now recognized that my commentary on violence in the 1960s was very relevant. He apologized and said that my trouble was that I was too far ahead of my time. Today, we deal with an even more acute problem of violence because not enough of us anticipated the magnitude it would reach, and not enough of us were willing to discuss this issue publicly.

Why did I start out my discussion with personal experiences from the 1960s? Because, as Justice Holmes has stated, "a page of history is worth a volume of logic."¹² I believe that answers to even our most pressing problems may be found in suggestions made by those who preceded us in thinking about these problems. Let me share another of my personal experiences, an experience in another context which hopefully will shed some light on how we should proceed to deal with the problem of violence in America today.

IV. THE PROBLEM OF POLITICAL AND PUBLIC VIOLENCE IN THE 1960s

On November 22, 1963, President Kennedy was assassinated. On February 21, 1965, Malcolm X was assassinated. On April 4, 1968,

¹² *New York Trust Co. v. Eisner*, 256 U.S. 345, 349 (1921).

Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated. On June 4, 1968, Robert Kennedy was assassinated. With what seemed like a terrifying escalation of violence in this country directed against public officials and public figures, many began to question whether our nation could survive. In response to these tensions—only days after Senator Kennedy was assassinated—President Lyndon Johnson created a commission known as the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, brother of former President Dwight Eisenhower and former president of Johns Hopkins University, was Chairman of the Commission. I served as Vice Chairman.¹³

In the process of seeking solutions to this national crisis, we wrote a major report which was given to President Johnson's successor, Richard Nixon, on December 10, 1969.¹⁴ I shall read to you excerpts from that report of twenty-five years ago and also excerpts from my supplemental statement to that report. Our Commission's work twenty-five years ago demonstrates that the problems and concerns about violence in America are not unique to this generation. My experiences then, and our nation's history since that time, reveal also that it is much easier to condemn violence and to be angry about it than to obtain the national commitment to take responsible action that will, in the long run, decrease violence and create within our society a mutual respect that makes violence and racism and sexism incompatible with the daily practices of American life. Our Commission concluded that:

When in man's long history other great civilizations fell, it was less often from external assault than from internal decay. Our own civilization has shown a remarkable capacity for responding to crises and for emerging to higher pinnacles of power and achievement. But our most serious challenges to date have been external—the kind this strong and resourceful country could unite against. While serious external dangers remain, the graver threats today are internal: haphazard urbanization, racial discrimination, disfiguring of the environment, unprecedented interdependence, the dislocation of human identity and motivation created by an affluent

¹³ The other members of the Commission were: Hale Boggs, Terence Cardinal Cooke, Philip A. Hart, Eric Hoffer, Roman Lee Hruska, Patricia Roberts Harris, Leon Jaworski, Albert E. Jenner, Jr., William McCulloch, Ernest William McFarland and W. Walter Menninger, M.D. Of the original 13 Commissioners, only three are still living: Roman Lee Hruska, W. Walter Menninger, M.D., and A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr.

¹⁴ See NATIONAL COMM'N ON THE CAUSES & PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE, TO INSURE DOMESTIC TRANQUILITY (1969) [hereinafter, *TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE*].

society—all resulting in a rising tide of individual and group violence.

The greatness and durability of most civilizations has been finally determined by how they have responded to these challenges from within. Ours will be no exception.¹⁵

Because of my personal concern about whether America was willing to do enough in understanding the causes of and in preventing violence, I wrote also a separate, concurring statement. The following pages reproduce some pertinent parts of that statement.¹⁶

V. TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE: THE NEED TO REORDER OUR PRIORITIES AS A NATION

Of course, it is always easier to blame the failures of our society on those who protest than it is to accept our responsibility to create a just society.

Is non-violent civil disobedience, as the majority suggests, the major factor to single out as leading inevitably to the erosion of law and the onset of violence? It was not non-violent civil disobedience which caused the death of the Kennedys and Dr. King. It is not non-violent civil disobedience which causes millions to go to bed ill-housed, ill-fed, and too often with too little hope.

Only last month [November 1969] in their superb report on *Poverty Amid Plenty: The American Paradox*, the President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs found that in 1968, twenty-five million Americans were living in poverty as measured by the federal government's own poverty index. The Commission further found:

[S]evere poverty and its effects throughout the Nation and among all ethnic groups. This poverty is not only relative to rising American living standards, but is often stark and absolute. There are too many American families with inadequate shelter, inadequate clothing, absolute hunger, and unhealthy living conditions. Millions of persons in our society do not have a sufficient share of America's affluence to live decently. They eke out a bare existence under deplorable conditions.¹⁷

¹⁵ *Id.* at xxxii.

¹⁶ The material in the following section is from the author's separate statement contained in TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE, *supra* note 14, at 109-10, 115-18. Although footnotes appear largely as they did in the original statement, some have been altered to reflect current availability of the source material and to fit this material within the current piece.

¹⁷ PRESIDENT'S COMM'N ON INCOME MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS, *POVERTY AMID PLENTY: THE AMERICAN PARADOX* 2 (1969).

The major problem in our country thus is not non-violent civil disobedience, rather, as the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Commission) noted, it has been our failure to have "a realization of common opportunities for all within a single society," and the failure to have a "commitment to national action" which is "compassionate, massive and sustained, backed by the resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on this earth. From every American it will require new attitudes, new understandings and, above all, new will."¹⁸

* * *

A debate on civil disobedience is inexpensive and undemanding. It requires no regeneration of our political and social institutions, no effort to open the doors of opportunity to the disadvantaged, no acts of courage and compassion by dedicated individuals seeking to heal the divisions in our society. It requires neither a reordering of national priorities, nor a reallocation of our immense financial resources.

A debate on civil disobedience can be costly in one sense, however: it can distract attention from the real work and the real contributions of this Commission. Most fervently of all, I further hope that our nation will find the resolve to support, with decisive action, some of the significant programs which we and other national commissions have recommended, and particularly those of sufficient scope and importance to require a reordering of our nation's priorities and a reallocation of our financial resources.

Despite significant contributions which I think this Commission has made, I must confess to a personal sense of increasing "commission frustration." From having served on three previous national fact-finding commissions, I fear that as some of the conditions in America get worse and worse, our reports about these conditions get better and better. There is too little implementation of the rational solutions proposed, and too often the follow-up is only additional studies.

In the last 25 years, our country has been deluged with significant Presidential and national fact-finding commissions, starting with President Truman's Commission to Secure These Rights in 1947. Some of the other great commissions have included the Crime Commission (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice), The Council to the White House Conference to Fulfill These Rights, the Kerner Commission (National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder), the Kaiser Commission (President's Committee on

¹⁸ REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS I (1968).

Urban Housing), and the Douglas Commission (National Commission on Urban Problems). Thus the problems of poverty, racism and crime have been emphasized and re-emphasized, studied and re-studied, probed and re-probed.

Surveying this landscape, littered with the unimplemented recommendations of so many previous commissions, I am compelled to propose a national moratorium on any additional temporary study commissions to probe the causes of racism, or poverty, or crime, or the urban crisis. The rational response to the work of the great commissions of recent years is not the appointment of still more commissions to study the same problems—but rather the prompt implementation of their many valuable recommendations.

The Kerner Commission concluded its report as follows:

One of the first witnesses to be invited to appear before this commission was Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, a distinguished and perceptive scholar. Referring to the reports of earlier riot commissions, he said:

"I read that report . . . of the 1919 riot in Chicago, and it is as if I were reading the report of the investigating committee on the Harlem riot of '35, the report of the investigating committee on the Harlem riot of '43, the report of the McCone Commission on the Watts riot.

"I must again in candor say to you members of this commission—it is a kind of Alice in Wonderland with the same moving picture reshown over and over again, the same analysis, the same recommendations, the same inaction."¹⁹

And I must also conclude my comments with the perceptive statement of a distinguished psychiatrist, Price M. Cobbs, who testified before our Commission. In a foreword to one of the Task Force reports submitted to us, Dr. Cobbs and his colleague, Dr. Grier, note:

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence has a grave task. If violence continues at its present pace, we may well witness the end of the grand experiment of democracy. The unheeded report of the Kerner Commission pinpointed the cause of our urban violence, and this report presents the tragic consequences when those in power fail to act on behalf of the weak as well as the powerful.

. . . .

¹⁹ *Id.* at 265.

. . . This country can no longer tolerate the divisions of black and white, haves and have-nots. The pace of events has quickened and dissatisfactions no longer wait for a remedy. There are fewer great men among us to counsel patience. Their voices have been stilled by the very violence they sought to prevent. Martin Luther King, Jr., the noble advocate of nonviolence, may have been the last great voice warning the country to cancel its rendezvous with violence before it is too late.

The truth is plain to see. If the racial situation remains inflammatory and the conditions perpetuating poverty remain unchanged, and if vast numbers of our young see small hope for improvement in the quality of their lives, then this country will remain in danger. Violence will not go away because we will it and any superficial whitewash will sooner or later be recognized.²⁰

CONCLUSION

Although written years ago, these excerpts speak to the problems we face today. Will Newt Gingrich's "Contract With America" be an inclusive contract to aid all Americans, or will it become some superficial "whitewash"? Hopefully, we can learn the lessons history can teach. Some insights from that twenty-five-year-old report are even more valid today. The main lesson of history, and the central conclusion I draw from our Commission's study, is that our success as a nation depends upon making sure that *all Americans* are beneficiaries and none are victims of a "contract with America."

²⁰ Price M. Cobbs & William H. Grier, *Foreword* to JEROME H. SKOLNICK, *THE POLITICS OF PROTEST* at ix-x (1969). Drs. Cobbs and Grier are the authors of *Black Rage* (1968).