

City University of New York (CUNY)

## CUNY Academic Works

---

Publications and Research

Hostos Community College

---

2018

### "How Mature Are We? The Enduring Legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s 'Beyond Vietnam' Speech"

Kristopher B. Burrell

*CUNY Hostos Community College*

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ho\\_pubs/64](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ho_pubs/64)

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

---

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: [AcademicWorks@cuny.edu](mailto:AcademicWorks@cuny.edu)

How Mature Are We?

The Enduring Legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “Beyond Vietnam” Speech  
Speech by Dr. Kristopher Burrell, January 15, 2018, St. Paul’s Church—National  
Historic Site, Mount Vernon, NY

Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for attending. As David said, I’m Kristopher Burrell and I am honored to be back here at St. Paul’s-National Historic Site. It is wonderful to have been asked once again to give the King Day address. The title of my talk today is “How Mature Are We? The Enduring Legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s ‘Beyond Vietnam’ Speech.”

In conceiving of this address, I sought to connect Martin Luther King, Jr. to our current social and political moment, as well as to New York City. These desires led me to King’s important, but not-often-enough-discussed, “Beyond Vietnam” speech at Riverside Church in Harlem from April 4, 1967. At Riverside, King delivered a blistering and sophisticated critique of U. S. intervention in Vietnam. In addition, the speech was also prescient in ways that continue to haunt our society into the present day. Before I go into analyzing the speech, however, it is necessary to provide some historical context for the speech, both in terms of King’s intellectual evolution that led him to Riverside Church, as well as some quick background on the connections between the Cold War and the civil rights movement.

Many people, upon hearing the “Beyond Vietnam” speech, were taken aback and accused King of wading into intellectual and political territory that he was ignorant about. That, however, was not the case. In fact, King’s experiences confronting issues of poverty and structural discrimination in the North and West showed him the inextricable link between military involvement in Vietnam and the inability to eradicate social ills at

home.<sup>1</sup> As King spoke about the virtues of nonviolence for bringing about lasting social change, and was trying to combat what he saw as mass alienation among northern blacks, the young people he encountered in places such as Watts and Chicago and Newark pointedly—and King said “rightly”—called attention to U. S. intervention in Vietnam as a counter argument to his position. King said, “Their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today: my own government. For the sake of those boys, for the sake of this government, for the sake of the hundreds of thousands trembling under our violence, I cannot be silent.”<sup>2</sup> Although King had long been opposed to warfare, between his being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964 and his interactions with young African Americans in the urban North and West, he decided that he had to be unequivocally and outspokenly opposed to the Vietnam War in order to remain true to his moral beliefs, remain a relevant crusader for human rights, and remain a true patriot in the battle for the “soul of America.”<sup>3</sup> The stakes could not be any higher as far as King was concerned. Nothing less than the future of America, indeed the world, hung in the balance. His assertion about the U. S. government being the greatest purveyor of violence in the world rankled many Americans at the time, but it is no less true today in many ways than in 1967.

King actually gave a sort of “dry run” of this critique of U. S. involvement in Vietnam in 1965, but in the words of scholar Michael Eric Dyson, King was “soundly defeated” as members of Congress, the national media, and civil rights leaders aligned against him; and even the board of his own Southern Christian Leadership Conference issued a public letter stating that the SCLC did not agree with his view on the war.<sup>4</sup>

“Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, a close ally of [Lyndon] Johnson, attacked Dr. King and cited an obscure 1799 criminal statute, the Logan Act, that prohibited private citizens from interacting with foreign governments” as a way to try and silence him.<sup>5</sup>

By early 1967, however, King determined that he could no longer be silent after seeing pictures of Vietnamese children who had been horribly burned by napalm.<sup>6</sup> As he would ultimately say at Riverside in agreement with an official statement from Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam (CALCAV), the group that invited King to Riverside, “A time comes when silence is betrayal.”<sup>7</sup> King spoke out against the war again in February of 1967 in Los Angeles before his speech at Riverside. The speech, titled “The Casualties of the War in Vietnam,”<sup>8</sup> was only moderately reported on, however. And even the address at Riverside was intended to be, in some senses, a proverbial “soft opening” for an address he was scheduled to give ten days later at the United Nations, where Stokely Carmichael and other black radicals would also be in attendance.<sup>9</sup> However, even what had happened in 1965 did not fully prepare King for the hell he would catch after the “Beyond Vietnam” speech.

Martin Luther King agreed to go to Riverside Church because as he put it, “his conscience [had left him] no other choice.”<sup>10</sup> In the midst of the Cold War and the continually rising tide of the Black Power impulse within the black freedom struggle, King and his co-writer Dr. Vincent Harding crafted the address that he would deliver on that spring evening, to an overflowing crowd of more than 3,000, exactly one year to the day before his assassination on April 4, 1968. King and Harding worked on the speech, poring over each word, hammering out any equivocation, and adding

increasing nuance with each successive revision. By the time Dr. King gave the speech, he did not deviate from the text much at all, and he delivered the speech without many of the characteristic sonic flourishes that were associated with his more celebrated addresses or his sermons. Rather, in this instance, King chose to deliver the address more as “he was speaking a dissertation;”<sup>11</sup> more somber in tone, as if imploring the listener to focus only on the words he was saying, rather than get swept up in the delivery and his oratorical brilliance. King was about to issue a dire warning to the Lyndon Johnson administration, to northern liberals both black and white, and to the country at-large about what continuing to fight this war was doing—and would do in the future—to our country, and he wanted absolutely nothing to obscure or overshadow his message.<sup>12</sup>

I see Dr. King’s speech as having three parts, a number symbolizing the Holy Trinity, and an organizing principle that he also used in other parts of the speech. In the first section, King did three things. He explained why he accepted the invitation to speak at Riverside, addressed the many liberals who questioned why he would criticize the war and the Johnson administration so publicly, and framed the speech by drawing the apt connection between the escalating amount of money being devoted to the war in Vietnam and the declining amount of money being allocated to anti-poverty programs at home.

In addressing his “allies” who wondered why King was taking such a strong public stand in opposition to the Johnson’s administration’s foreign policy, in light of the things that Johnson’s administration had done by that point that benefited African Americans and the poor, King basically told those people that clearly they did not know him very well, nor did they understand how dangerous a world they were living in. As King said, “. . . many persons have questioned me about the wisdom of my path. . . .

‘Why are you speaking about the war, Dr. King?’ ‘Peace and civil rights don’t mix.’ . . . And when I hear them, though I often understand the source of their concern, I am nevertheless greatly saddened, for such questions mean that the inquirers have not really known me, my commitment, or my calling. Indeed, their questions suggest they do not know the world in which they live.”<sup>13</sup> King understood that it was necessary to have a broader view of morality and the struggles for justice around the world in order to improve the condition of humankind. King had said back in early 1965 that he was “much more than a civil-rights leader.”<sup>14</sup> He was much more a radical than is typically acknowledged. He was demonstrating that once again at Riverside Church.

King then went on to show how continued involvement in Vietnam placed a disproportionate burden on poor people of all racial groups. Not only were poor Americans fighting on the front lines of Southeast Asia in larger proportions because they were not in college or eligible for other kinds of exemptions, but the domestic programs designed to help people escape poverty were being slashed to finance the war. King said, “A few years ago there was a shining moment in that struggle [to end poverty]. It seemed as if there was a real promise of hope for the poor, both black and white, through the poverty program. There were experiments, hopes, new beginnings. Then came the buildup in Vietnam, and I watched this program broken and eviscerated as if it were some idle political plaything of a society gone mad on war. And I knew that America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Vietnam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demonic suction tube.”<sup>15</sup> It is significant that he used the word “adventures” in describing the U. S.’s war in Vietnam. King was indicating that the U. S. government was being cavalier

with its use of military force and that the gravity of the destruction that was being caused around the world was not fully being realized, or at least it was not influencing U. S. foreign and domestic policy in the ways King had hoped.

King went onto say, “Perhaps a more tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and their brothers and their husbands to fight and die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them eight thousand miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in southwest Georgia and East Harlem. So we have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools. . . . I could not be silent in the face of such cruel manipulation of the poor.”<sup>16</sup> So, Dr. King increasingly viewed the U. S. “adventure” in Vietnam as an attack on the poor in the United States. The war was both being financed on their backs and contributing to the perpetuation of continuing cycles of poverty. The violence that the U .S. government was purveying was not just occurring in Vietnam, but here at home, as well.

As King transitioned into the next section of his address, he reiterated that he had come to voice his opposition to the war in Vietnam as a child of God and person of faith. He believed that any good Christian had to morally object to the war, and could not condemn others to suffering because they were in some way different from he. “Have they forgotten that my ministry is in obedience to the one who loved his enemies so fully that he died for them?” In this section of the speech, King not only accurately and

succinctly summarized the trajectory of U. S. involvement in Vietnam from 1945 to 1967, he also critiqued the American government’s motivations for being in Vietnam. King inhabited the perspective of the Vietnamese peasants who had been caught in the crosshairs of the political and military battles raging throughout the country destroying most everything that they held dear. Again, this section of the speech fulfilled three functions.

I won’t go into King’s summary of U. S. involvement in the region, although I can say more afterwards if there are questions about that. I will, instead, talk briefly about what King said about how the Vietnamese peasants viewed the U. S. government and military. He probed the government and forced the audience to consider difficult questions about American involvement in Vietnam. King said, “What do the peasants think as we ally ourselves with the landlords and as we refuse to put any action into our many words concerning land reform? What do they think as we test out our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and tortures in the concentration camps of Europe? Where are the roots of the independent Vietnam we claim to be building? Is it among the voiceless ones?”<sup>17</sup> King’s answer was a resounding “no.” He argued that the U. S. was crushing the potential for a non-communist independent Vietnam. “We have destroyed their two most cherished institutions: the family and the village. We have destroyed their land and their crops. We have cooperated in the crushing of the nation’s only noncommunist revolutionary political force, the unified Buddhist Church. We have supported the enemies of the peasants of Saigon. We have corrupted their women and children and killed their men.”<sup>18</sup>

Dr. King was making the point that U. S. foreign policy and military action was increasingly eliminating the potential basis for any kind of constructive alliance between the Vietnamese and the U. S. governments, especially on a noncommunist basis. What reason did the Vietnamese people have to trust the U. S. government? The United States wanted to ensure that Vietnam did not become a communist nation, but King made the point that the government intentionally mischaracterized the opposition movement in South Vietnam to remove their dictatorial leader as predominantly communist, when they were not. The press in South Vietnam was censored by the government, the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam was going to be excluded from peace negotiations led by the U. S., and the American government had previously lied by saying that Ho Chi Minh, the leader of North Vietnam, had never reached out to the U. S. in search of peace when there was concrete evidence to the contrary.<sup>19</sup> The American public had been lied to about the government’s intentions and actions in Vietnam.

In concluding the second section of the speech, King also expressed concern about what effects the war was having on American troops, and what effects the war was having on America’s standing in the world. Dr. King articulated the real benefit of nonviolence, “when it helps us to see the enemy’s point of view, to hear his questions, to know his assessment of ourselves. For from his view we may indeed see the basic weaknesses of our own condition, and if we are mature, we may learn and grow and profit from the wisdom of the brothers who are called the opposition.”<sup>20</sup> How mature were we as a nation in 1967? How much have we matured as a nation today?

Dr. King argued that our continued involvement in Vietnam was diminishing our standing in the world. He said, “If we continue, there will be no doubt in my mind and in

the mind of the world that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam. If we do not stop our war against the people of Vietnam immediately, the world will be left with no other alternative than to see this as some horrible, clumsy, and deadly game we have decided to play.”<sup>21</sup>

And with that warning, King went into the final section of his address, in which he gave concrete ideas about how and why the U. S. should withdraw its troops from Vietnam, called for religious leaders to speak out more courageously against the war, and talked about what Americans needed to do in order to create the kind of society the U. S. professed to be. Dr. King listed five things the U. S. government should do immediately to disentangle the nation from Vietnam, including ending all bombing throughout the country; declaring a cease-fire in order to create the atmosphere for potential negotiations; halt the troop build-up in Thailand and Laos, so as to decrease tensions across the entire region; include the North Vietnamese government in the negotiation process for a future unified Vietnam; and set a date for the removal of all U. S. troops in line with the Geneva Accords.<sup>22</sup> Removing the U. S. presence from Vietnam would, nevertheless, require the U. S. to extend true humanitarian assistance to the nation. He called on the U. S. government to provide asylum to all who sought it, extend medical supplies to Vietnam, and provide reparations for the damage that had been caused.<sup>23</sup>

King offered these policy recommendations for getting the U. S. out of Vietnam in as moral a way as possible, but he was not done with his audience yet because, as he saw it, “[t]he war in Vietnam [was] a symptom of a far deeper malady within the American spirit . . . [there needed to be] a significant and profound change in American life and policy.”<sup>24</sup> As scholar Eric Tang broke down King’s connection between the war

abroad and the abandonment of the poor here at home, “The nation’s capacity for violence in Vietnam was a measure of its capacity for violence at home. One could not expect a nation that behaved with such depravity abroad to take seriously the work of eliminating poverty, joblessness, and environmental racism in its own ghettos.”<sup>25</sup> As Dr. King continued to talk about the need to bring about profound changes in American life and policy, he actually returned to ideas that he had been developing for years; that “we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values. We must rapidly begin the shift from a thing-oriented society to a person-oriented society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights, are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, extreme materialism, and militarism are incapable of being conquered.”<sup>26</sup> The next three paragraphs all began with the phrase, “A true revolution of values will . . .” The symbolism of the trinity continues to abound in this section of his speech.

King made this diagnosis just over fifty years ago, now. For King, Americans had to really address what it means to be just, both in terms of our domestic society and in terms of the kind of world that we were making. As King said, “True compassion is more than just flinging a coin to a beggar. It comes to see that an edifice which produces beggars needs restructuring.” For King, Americans had to really address economic inequality, both at home and globally. King said that, “A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth. With righteous indignation, it will look across the seas and see individual capitalists of the West investing huge sums of money in Asia, Africa, and South America, only to take the profits out with no concern for the betterment of the countries, and say, ‘This is not

just.” For King, Americans had to reject war by saying, ““This way of settling differences is not just.””<sup>27</sup>

Nothing short of this radical revolution of values would elevate democracy to its greatest potential and protect the nation from communist infiltration, according to King.<sup>28</sup> He argued that communism spread during the 1960s because the United States had “failed to make democracy real and follow through on the revolutions we initiated.” As a result, the rest of the world came to believe that “only Marxism has a revolutionary spirit.” The only hope for the U. S. was to recapture that revolutionary democratic spirit and “go out into a sometimes hostile world declaring eternal hostility to poverty, racism, and militarism.”<sup>29</sup> Only then could the country not only rehabilitate its image globally, but also create the kind of society that America professed to have.

Dr. King left the pulpit at Riverside to a standing ovation, but the reaction to the speech outside those church walls the next day was swift and scathing. King was excoriated in the white and black press as nearly 170 newspapers across the country denounced him and the speech.<sup>30</sup> The *New York Times* called Dr. King’s statements “facile” and argued that it was “wasteful” for King to divert his energies and talk about Vietnam because the civil rights movement needed to confront “the intractability of slum mores and habits.” The *Washington Post* called King’s recommendations “sheer inventions of unsupported fantasy” and opined that, “many who have listened to him with respect will never again accord him the same confidence.” The *Pittsburgh Courier*, A black newspaper, warned that King was “tragically misleading” African Americans about the incredibly complex issues associated with the war.<sup>31</sup> President Lyndon Johnson

rescinded an invitation to the White House<sup>32</sup> and authorized the FBI to increase its surveillance campaign to discredit and destroy him.<sup>33</sup> Other civil rights leaders spurned him. Even the NAACP issued a statement disavowing King’s sentiments.<sup>34</sup>

All of these denunciations show that the liberal civil rights establishment, which included the Democratic Party, media, and civil rights organizations were only comfortable with the King that spoke of dreams and racial progress, and that allowed liberals to remain secure in their condescension toward the South, without having to examine their own assumptions or the policies that they had crafted. The liberal establishment did not want to hear a black public intellectual who wasn’t talking about the foibles of black people or how much progress African Americans had made. And civil rights organizations did not want to endanger relationships with the federal government or white philanthropic organizations that provided much of the funding they needed to operate.

The backlash to his remarks, King expected, and it certainly disappointed him, but he was not “soundly defeated” as Michael Eric Dyson said of him back in 1965. As historian Benjamin Hedin wrote, “The Riverside speech seemed to unlock something in him, and he would no longer concern himself with political allegiance and popular opinion.”<sup>35</sup> And the policies of the liberal establishment only proved King’s arguments, rather than dispelled them. Liberals who had previously supported the Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts of the mid-1960s became the same people that supported laws in the late-1960s, such as the Safe Streets Act in 1968, that began the militarization of municipal police forces and put more money into building up the law enforcement and

criminal justice apparatuses than had ever been allocated toward Lyndon Johnson’s anti-poverty programs.<sup>36</sup>

In the fifty years since, the U. S. has entered into new war fronts across the world. And the Democrats have often stood in lockstep with the Republicans in supporting increasing funding for the military industrial complex, even as the wars extended to the domestic front in the forms of “wars” on drugs, crime, and the poor here at home.<sup>37</sup> Increasing funding for military intervention overseas has occurred almost without fail, while attacks on the social safety nets of Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and other social programs have only ramped up over the last fifty years—mostly from Republicans—and are only getting stronger with each passing year. For example, current Speaker of the House Paul Ryan has expressed his desire to cut, if not eliminate Medicare and Medicaid. And the Congress barely passed a temporary resolution to continue funding the Children’s Health Insurance Program, three months after the original bill expired, just before states were going to have to begin kicking children off of the rolls.<sup>38</sup>

The current budget for the 2018 fiscal year allots nearly \$700 billion for defense spending, including \$634 billion for core expenditures and nearly \$66 billion for current overseas missions. These figures represent a significant hike over the Trump administration’s initial requests back in May of \$603 billion for core expenditures and \$65 billion for overseas missions, which still represented a significant increase over the projected budgetary outlay under the Obama administration’s schedule, and can only be implemented if Congress amends the 2011 law that capped federal spending, known as sequestration.<sup>39</sup> The Trump administration wants the cap lifted, only for defense spending.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the current administration’s plans to increase the size and capacity of the military could increase defense spending by \$683 billion more than had been planned by the Obama administration.<sup>40</sup> While non-defense discretionary spending, which includes essentially everything else such as healthcare, social security’s disability program, the federal student loan program, and welfare programs, would be cut by nearly \$1.6 trillion dollars over the next ten years.<sup>41</sup> The president’s budget proposal totaled a \$59 billion allotment for discretionary education spending, a \$9 billion or 13 percent decrease from the 2017 spending level.<sup>42</sup> So, while base defense spending will rise by \$85 billion over the cap allowed under sequestration, education spending will decrease by \$9 billion in fiscal year 2018. Decreasing or eliminating funding to education programs and other kinds of anti-poverty programs, while simultaneously signing bills into law that dramatically increase defense spending and allow tax cuts that will disproportionately benefit the top 1 percent of wealth holders in the United States is antithetical to the kind of society that Dr. King was working to create, and smacks of the same double-burden that he described poor Americans facing back in 1967.

And in light of our president’s comments in the past few days regarding immigrants from Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America, in which he disparaged those seeking to escape violence and persecution by coming to the United States in racist terms, I’d like to end by asking the same question that I asked earlier, “how mature of a society are we today?” In light of our current administration’s policies, attempted policies, and recent statements, I think King would answer, “not very.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Martin Luther King, “‘Beyond Vietnam,’ Address Delivered to the Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam, at Riverside Church,” *A Call to Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther*

King, Jr. (April 4, 1967), [http://www.stanford.edu/group/king/speeches/pub/Beyond\\_Vietnam.htm](http://www.stanford.edu/group/king/speeches/pub/Beyond_Vietnam.htm), 2-3, Accessed on 27 December 2017.

<sup>2</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 3.

<sup>3</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 3.

<sup>4</sup> Michael Eric Dyson, “MLK: A Call to Conscience,” *Tavis Smiley Reports*, March 31, 2010, <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/tavissmiley/tsr/mlk-a-call-to-conscience/>, Accessed on 27 December 2017.

<sup>5</sup> David J. Garrow, “When Martin Luther King Came Out Against Vietnam,” *New York Times*, April 4, 2017, [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/04/opinion/when-martin-luther-king-came-out-against-vietnam.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/04/opinion/when-martin-luther-king-came-out-against-vietnam.html?_r=0), Accessed on 27 December 2017.

<sup>6</sup> Garrow, “When Martin Luther King Came Out Against Vietnam,” *New York Times*, April 4, 2014.

<sup>7</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 1.

<sup>8</sup> Benjamin Hedin, “Martin Luther King, Jr.’s Searing Antiwar Speech, Fifth Years Later,” *The New Yorker*, April 3, 2017, <http://www.newyorker.com/culture/culture-desk/martin-luther-king-jr-s-searing-antiwar-speech-fifty-years-later>, Accessed on 27 December 2017.

<sup>9</sup> Taylor Branch, “MLK: A Call to Conscience,” *Tavis Smiley Reports*, March 31, 2010, <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/tavissmiley/tsr/mlk-a-call-to-conscience/>.

<sup>10</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 1.

<sup>11</sup> Clarence Jones, quoted in Hedin, “Martin Luther King, Jr.’s Searing Antiwar Speech, Fifth Years Later,” April 3, 2017.

<sup>12</sup> Eric Tang, “‘A Society Gone Mad on War’: The Enduring Importance of Martin Luther King’s Riverside Speech,” *The Nation*, April 4, 2017, <https://www.thenation.com/article/a-society-gone-mad-on-war-the-enduring-importance-of-martin-luther-kings-riverside-speech/>, Accessed on 27 December 2017.

<sup>13</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 2.

<sup>14</sup> Garrow, “When Martin Luther King Came Out Against Vietnam.”

<sup>15</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 2.

<sup>16</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 2-3.

<sup>17</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 5.

<sup>18</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 5.

<sup>19</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 6.

<sup>20</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 6.

<sup>21</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 7.

<sup>22</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 7-8.

<sup>23</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 8.

<sup>24</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 8.

<sup>25</sup> Tang, “‘A Society Gone Mad on War’: The Enduring Importance of Martin Luther King’s Riverside Speech,” *The Nation*, April 4, 2017.

<sup>26</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 9.

<sup>27</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 9.

<sup>28</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 9.

<sup>29</sup> King, “Beyond Vietnam,” 10.

<sup>30</sup> Robert Siegel, “50 Years Ago, MLK Delivers a Speech with Dark Vision of the World,” *All Things Considered, National Public Radio*, April 4, 2017, <https://www.npr.org/2017/04/04/522632447/50-years-ago-mlk-delivers-a-speech-with-dark-vision-of-the-world>, Accessed on 8 January 2018.

<sup>31</sup> Garrow, “When Martin Luther King Came Out Against Vietnam.”

<sup>32</sup> Tang, “‘A Society Gone Mad on War’: The Enduring Importance of Martin Luther King’s Riverside Speech.”

<sup>33</sup> Gary May, “Martin Luther King Jr.: Remembering a Committed Life,” *HuffPost*, March 19, 2014, [https://www.huffingtonpost.com/gary-may/martin-luther-king-legacy\\_b\\_4612780.html](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/gary-may/martin-luther-king-legacy_b_4612780.html), Accessed on 8 January 2018.

<sup>34</sup> Hedin, “Martin Luther King, Jr.’s Searing Antiwar Speech, Fifth Years Later,” *The New Yorker*, April 3, 2017.

<sup>35</sup> Hedin, “Martin Luther King, Jr.’s Searing Antiwar Speech, Fifth Years Later.”

<sup>36</sup> Tang, “‘A Society Gone Mad on War’: The Enduring Importance of Martin Luther King’s Riverside Speech.”

---

<sup>37</sup> Tang, “‘A Society Gone Mad on War’: The Enduring Importance of Martin Luther King’s Riverside Speech.”

<sup>38</sup> Nana Matoba and Angira Patel, “How About Health Care as a Gift for Kids—Let’s Pass CHIP This Season,” *The Hill*, December 25, 2017, <http://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/366371-how-about-health-care-as-a-gift-for-kids-lets-pass-chip-this-season>, Accessed on 13 January 2018.

<sup>39</sup> Darlene Superville, “Trump Signs \$700 Billion Military Budget into Law,” *Chicago Tribune*, December 12, 2017, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/politics/ct-trump-military-budget-20171212-story.html>, Accessed on 8 January 2018.

<sup>40</sup> Rebecca Kheel, “CBO: Trump Military Buildup Adds \$683 Billion to Pentagon Budget Over 10 Years,” *The Hill*, December 4, 2017, <https://www.thehill.com/policy/defense/363188-cbo-trumps-military-buildup-would-add-683b-to-pentagon-budget-over-next-decade>, Accessed on 7 January 2018.

<sup>41</sup> Katherine Blakeley, “The Trump Administration’s FY 2018 Defense Budget in Context,” *Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments*, <https://www.csbaonline.org/reports/the-trump-administrations-fy-2018-defense-budget-in-context>, Accessed 7 January 2018.

<sup>42</sup> U. S. Department of Education, “Fact Sheet: President Trump’s FY 2018 Budget,” 1, <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget18/budget-factsheet.pdf>, Accessed on 8 January 2018.