## Herald Tribune FORUM

# What Kind of Government Ahead?



... The Responsibility of Every Citizen

Monday • Tuesday • Wednesday OCTOBER 24TH • 25TH • 26TH The Waldorf-Astoria

## ST SESSION Monday-7:45 P. M. October 24, 1949

## Opening the Forum

Mrs. OGDEN REID

## The Individual's Responsibility for Government

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER General of the Army President, Columbia University

### Frames of Reference



LINDSAY ROGERS
Burgess Professor of Public Law, Columbia University

## THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY-

## A Political Program for Democracy

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, JR. Senator from Minnesota

## Resolved: That the Democratic Party Should Seek to Become a Farmer-Labor Coalition

Affirmative: James G. Patton

President, National Farmers Union

Negative: CLIFFORD P. CASE

Representative from New Jersey

## French Songs

EDITH PIAF

Accompanied by the Versailles Restaurant Orchestra

## How and Why the Democrats Will Win in 1950

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. Representative from New York

## The Philosophy of the Fair Deal

OSCAR R. EWING Federal Security Administrator

## Panel: The Kind of Democrat I Am

HOWARD W. SMITH Representative from Virginia

FRANK P. GRAHAM Senator from North Carolina

Adlai E. Stevenson Governor of Illinois

## A Blueprint for Democracy

HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Democratic-Liberal Party Candidate for the
United States Senate

## ND SESSION Tuesday-7:45 P. M. October 25, 1949

## The Hoover Commission Recommendations

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING President, Ohio Wesleyan University

## The Hoover Report is Up to You

ROBERT L. JOHNSON President, Temple University

## THE REPUBLICAN PARTY-

## The Heart of a Republican Program

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR. Senator from Massachusetts

## The Republican National Committee's Job in 1950 and 1952

GUY G. GABRIELSON Chairman, Republican National Committee

## A Middle Way

PHILIP H. WILLKIE Member, Indiana State Legislature

## Rallying New Republicans

ALEXANDER M. LANKLER Director, Youth Activities, New York State Republican Committee

## Music

PATRICE MUNSEL
Soprano, Metropolitan Opera Association
Stuart Ross, Accompanist

## Instrumentality of the People

VAL PETERSON Governor of Nebraska

## How Can the Democrats Help the Republican Party?

ESTES KEFAUVER Senator from Tennessee

## Panel: How much Should Government Do—on Health, Education and Housing?

HAROLD RUSSELL Commander of Amvets

JAMES P. KEM Senator from Missouri

MARGARET CHASE SMITH

WAYNE L. MORSE Senator from Oregon

JAMES G. BLAINE
President, Chamber of Commerce of
the State of New York
President, Marine Midland Trust
Company of New York

Discussion led by
TEX McCrary
NBC and New York Herald Tribune

### The Free Man

JOHN FOSTER DULLES Senator from New York

## RD SESSION Wednesday-1:45 P. M. October 26, 1949

## THE CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY

## **Opening Statement**

DR. PETER H. ODEGARD.
Chairman, Political Science Department, University
of California

## **Discussion Outline**

- 1 How Can the Average Citizen in his Community Exert a Maximum Influence on Government Policy?
- 2 Can American Political Parties be Made More Efficient Tools of Democracy?
- 3 What Are the Most Effective Ways of Building Political Support?

## Participants:

JACOB M. ARVEY
Chairman, Democratic Party of Cook County, Illinois

WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR. Chairman, Democratic National Committee

MRS. J. L. BLAIR BUCK President, General Federation of Women's Clubs

Mrs. LaFell Dickinson
Republican National Committee Woman from New
Hampshire

MRS. INDIA EDWARDS

Executive Director, Women's Division, Democratic

National Committee

MRS. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
President, National Federation of Women's
Republican Clubs

## Participants (cont'd):

MRS. ELIZABETH HEFFELFINGER
Republican National Committee Woman from
Minnesota

DR. ALTHEA K. HOTTEL
President, American Association of University Women

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON
Campaign Director, National Republican Senatorial
Committee

MICKEY LEVINE
Member, State Executive Committee, Americans for
Democratic Action

MRS. OSWALD B. LORD
Chairman, United States Committee for the United
Nations International Children's Emergency Fund

DR. ROBERT F. RAY
Director, Institute of Public Affairs, State University
of Iowa

MRS. GEREL RUBIEN
President, New York Women's Trade Union League

K. Frances Scott, M.D.

President, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

MISS ANNA LORD STRAUSS
President, League of Women Voters of the
United States

Mrs. Cynthia Zimmerman Assistant to the Campaign Director, National Republican Senatorial Committee

### Music

EUGENE CONLEY
Tenor, Metropolitan Opera Association

Marcel Frank, Accompanist

Salut, demeure chaste e	t	pur	e'	(F	av	st)		Gounod
A Ballynure Ballad								arr. Hughes
Know Where I'm Goin'								arr. Hughes
Cossack Love Song								Kountz

## TH SESSION Wednesday-7:45 P. M. October 26, 1949

## THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF WORLD PROBLEMS

## "Faith and Works" in the United Nations

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER Member, United States Delegation to the United Nations

## Asia's Red Riddle

A. T. STEELE New York Herald Tribune Correspondent in the Far East

MRS. DOROTHY BRANDON
New York Herald Tribune Correspondent
Recently returned from Indonesia,
will answer a few questions

## Message to the Forum

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU Prime Minister of India

### Free India in World Affairs

MADAME V. L. PANDIT Indian Ambassador to the United States

## Towards a Better Life for Underdeveloped Countries

DAVID OWEN

Assistant Secretary-General in Charge of Economic Affairs, United Nations

## Collegiate Chorale

WILLIAM JONSON

Director

Don Smith, Accompanist

Alleluia.										. Randall Thompson
										William Billings
										William Billings
My Lord,	W	/hc	at.	A	Mo	ur	nin	g		<ul> <li>William Dawson</li> </ul>
Ain'-a The	11	G	00	d I	Ne	ws				. William Dawson

## The World is our Framework

DOROTHY FOSDICK Member, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State

## What Lies Ahead in Germany?

LUCIUS D. CLAY
General, United States Army (Retired)
Former Military Governor of the United States
Zone in Germany

## The Council of Europe

SFORZINO SFORZA Staff Member of The Council of Europe Secretariat

## Partnership for Survival

BARBARA WARD
Assistant Editor, "The Economist" of London

## The Interdependence of World Problems

Louis A. Johnson Secretary of Defense Herald Tribune

Correct speech make clear that consenting gon policy - conver only coming cut play-platger show he local grount led on visus not only peranlety. cit part in four ? not just july not be on y tack ? paily. Con delay not only party ellean, let as represt of a policy 1 cover. wear pupo - ather ails per Party - foour or well an who

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its deferred character is indicated by a suitable symbol above or preceding the address.

## WESTERN 1201 UNION (01)

W P MARSHALL PRESIDENT

SYMBOLS

DL = Day Letter

NL=Night Letter

LC=Deferred Cable

NLT = Cable Night Letter
Ship Radiogram

The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is STANDARD TIME at point of origin. Time of receipt is STANDARD TIME at point of destination

WZ 041 PD=TB NEWYORK NY 29 350P=

HON HUBERT H HUMPHREY JRE

1949 OCT 29 PM 5 03

SENATE OFFICE BLD G=1

PLEASE WIRE ME COLLECT WHETHER YOUR FORUM SPEECH AS PRINTED IN THE FORUM SECTION OF OCTOBER THIRTIETH IS CORRECT FOR PUBLICATION IN FORUM BOOKS

HELEN HIETT WALLER NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Heiald Tubane

nur heur & steries

HUMPHREY

First Session

ADVANCE TEXT of an address to be delivered at approximately 8:30 P.M., Monday evening, October 24th, 1949 at the first session of the 18th ANNUAL NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE FORUM at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

by

Hubert H. Humphrey, Jr.

Senator from Minnesota

"A Political Program for Democracy"

This speech will be broadcast by Station WNYC and Station WFDR-FM.

It will be rebroadcast over Station WJZ from 11:45 to 12:00 P.M.

anight

I appreciate your invitation to participate in this stimulating forum, to speak on the very important subject of the political program for our democracy.

Professor Rogers has given us a good, succinct statement of the conditions that confront us in America as we attempt political reform. He lists "federalism, parochialism, and seniority" as formidable facts of our polity to be reckoned with. I agree. These conditions are obstacles to effective political leadership in this country. But the conduct of public affairs in these crucial days calls for forth-right and positive direction and responsibility if we are to achieve the promises of the American lives at home, and safeguard democracy in the world at large. What we seek, within the framework of our inherited form of government, is a series of arrangements which will at once promote better teamwork between the Congress and the President, avoid dangerous deadlocks, inculcate national rather than provincial loyalties, and give the spirit of youth a larger place in Legislative halls.

Ours is a federal system in constitutional theory, but it is increasingly becoming a national system in actual practice. While we have 48 state legislatures, we have one national economic and industrial system. The trend from state government to national government has been fortified and accelerated by the Civil War, by the onward sweep of science and technology, by the unifying forces of transportation and communication, and by a long series of Supreme Court decisions. The same evolutionary influences are operating in our political system. There are still lags here and there, particularly in the South, but state bosses and local party machines are slipping, as in Jersey City, Kansas City and Virginia, While national party organizations gain force and strength under the stimulating influence of groups like Americans for Democratic Action and activities of such groups as the League of Women Voters, the organized labor movement and the National Association of Christians and Jews. This is a healthy trend, and one that is helping to dissolve the traditional sectional divisions and political alignments of the American people.

One of the traditional articles of our political faith in America has been our belief in the bi-party system. We believe that political parties are the principal instruments of democratic government and that the party which wins a majority of the popular vote should have the responsibility and the power to govern the country.

The major party is the only political organization in American life which is in a position to claim that it can measure up to the requirements of modern public policy. It has sought and won a general control of the government. It alone possesses the kind of peres required to make the government work. It alone may reasonably be held responsible for the general state of public policy. Of all the varieties of political organization, it alone gets a mandate from the people to govern the country. Party government is therefore as right as democracy itself. The American people have long accepted the principle of party responsibility for the conduct of our national government. We must translate that principle into practice.

But why has the American party system not yet produced that fullness of authority which is necessary to make the government work without recurring deadlocks and without lag, leak and friction? The Democratic Party capture control of the Presidency and of both houses of Congress in the 1948 elections. It succeeded in electing a majority of its candidates to Congress; nevertheless, major planks in its legislative platform have met defeat. Why is this so?

There are several explanations. The federal structure, our inherited system of separated powers, and the piecemeal practices of American government create formidable obstacles to effective government. Part of the explanation is to be found in the deep internal divisions within the majority party. Like the Republican Party, the Democratic Party has both conservative and liberal members who wear the same party emblem, but lack a common political philosophy.

Another contributing cause is the influence of special and sectional interests which

receive a loyalty that transcends a sense of responsibility to the national interest; as in the tidelands oil controversy. The part is often valued above the whole; the district above the state; the state above the nation.

Furthermore, legislative procedure, especially in the Senate, is such as to give every advantage to the tactics of obstruction by individual members and minority blocs. The choice of committee chairman by seniority rather than party regularity and the unrepresentative character of the congressional committees are also part of the explanation. The fact that Senators and Representatives are responsible to state and local electorates, while the President is responsible to a national electorate, presents a basic difficulty, of our system.

I have been a member of the United States Senate for ten months - not long enough to become indoctrinated and reconciled to the ancient ways of that body - but long enough to have observed a fundamental obstacle to effective party government in Congress. I refer to the diffusion of party responsibility for legislative action in both houses among a variety of political mechanisms.

I had not long been a member of the Senate before I made two discoveries: (1) that there are 28 stages in the enactment of a law and that at each of these stages on the legislative highway a few legislators can lurk, like the pirates of Tripoli, and take toll of the passing traffic; and (2) that the power structure of Congress has been so constructed over the passing years that the control of legislative action in both chambers is scattered and splintered so that effective party leadership is almost impossible to achieve.

Before the "revolution of 1910", control of the House of Representatives was in the party caucus, practically the only organ in Congress for formulating the party will; and the Speaker was the only agency for carrying out the party will. The caucus was composed of the entire membership of the party. Each party had its own caucus and

there were separate caucuses for the two houses. The caucus selected the party's candidates for office in the chamber and formulated and enforced the party's will with respect to legislative action. Decisions reached in caucus concerning legislative policy and program were binding upon the entire membership of the party in the chamber and controlled their votes. Caucus decisions of the majority party in the chamber determined the action of the chamber itself. The majority caucus could also frame legislation and, by binding all of its members, prevent amendment of the legislative on the floor. Thus, the line of party responsibility ran straight from the electorate through the majority caucus to the party leadership in Congress.

This type of party government actually existed in both houses of Congress during the first administration of President Wilson. The success that he had during this administration, in having Congress adopt the greater part of his legislative program, had always been considered one of his great achievements. Undoubtedly he deserved credit for the masterly way in which he held together and led the Democratic Party. But the real credit for this achievement is due to the effective way in which the Democratic Party made use of its caucuses in both houses of Congress. To an extent never equalled before or since, it adopted the policy of having all major legislative proposals first considered in caucus, and of binding its members to abide by the action of the caucus. As a result, a majority vote was assured when they were taken up for consideration on the floor of the two chambers.

Contrast that situation with the conditions of today. The caucus has degenerated into a "conference". Little attempt is made to unite the party membership and hold them responsible to vote for measures designed to carry out platform pledges. And the powers formerly concentrated in responsible party leadership are now split up in both chambers and both parties among the committees on committees, the steering or policy committees, the floor leaders, and the party whips.

The function of leadership has been transferred from the Chair to the Floor. The



power of direction, which had been centralized in the hends of a single agency, was broken up and diffused among a number of agencies; the appointing power to the committee on committees, the strategy function to the steering or policy committee, and the tactical function to the floor leader. Two of these functions were still further distributed by vesting them in collegiate bodies rather than a single individual. Effective leadership was made much more difficult and responsibility for party action was widely scattered.

Moreover, the standing committees of Congress exercise large powers over legislation. They have the very important power of determining the whole agenda of
the two houses, as a result of the rule which provides that all bills and resolutions, immediately upon their introduction, shall be referred to the appropriate
standing committees for consideration and report. By this rule the House and
Senate have declared that they will refrain from the consideration of any bill or
resolution until it has been examined by its proper committee and has been reported
back to the House or Senate with recommendations for action.

This rule gives great power to the committees because (1) It does not require them to consider or report back bills referred to them; and (2) in practice only those bills are reported back which the committees favor. Thus, the DP bill and the D.C. home rule bill were pigeon-holed in committee for several months, despite party promises to pass them. In short, back committee, acting within its own jurisdiction, is almost severeign with respect to the determination of the bills that shall come before the two chambers for action. And their chairmen are immune to party discipline.

The standing committees also play a dominant part in controlling and directing proceedings on the floor when their bills are under consideration. This dominance is partly the result of formal rules and partly that of conventions which have acquired the force of written rules.

The long-standing custom of unlimited and irrelevant debate in the Senate is an ad-



2 Y

ditional heavy handicap to the development of effective party leadership in the upper chamber.

Thus, the dispersion of political responsibility in Congress, together with its archaic rules and conventions, go far in my opinion to explain its repeated difficult ties, regardless of which party is in control, in translating the will of the people into public policy. The party leadership is not to blame. Who can lead where others will not follow? The central difficulty, as I see it, is a deficiency of the power to govern, a failure to achieve an effective organization of the majority will.

## A Democratic Solution

There is a growing recognition among political leaders of the need of a more responsible and effective party system in the United States. Various proposals to this end are being advanced. In a forthcoming report a committee of the American Political Science Association crystallizes informed opinion on the means of strengthening party government. Their recommendations impress me as constructive and worthy of wide consideration.

I have time here only to outline the steps which might well be taken toward the new party system. They are three-fold:

First, I believe that we must try to integrate party membership and keep that membership at all levels informed through the discussions of party policy and the development of explicit party programs. Each party should be encouraged, I think, to reformulate its platform every two years, - it might be that National Conventions should be held every two years, - and the platform should be regarded as commitments by all candidates for office and office helders of the party. This would go far to make our congressional elections, as well as our Presidental elections, more meaningful to the American people in giving the American people an opportunity effectively to choose on basic issues facing our government. Party elections must increasingly become issue



3328

elections, otherwise more and more people may lose faith in representative government, and become impatient with democratic processes. Despite platform pledges, for three decades now civil rights bills have been repeatedly defeated in the Senate by various parliamentary strategies.

Second, our political parties must become more responsible to the American people and to their own membership. I believe we must focus and reinvigorate party leadership at the national level by making that leadership more representative of the national committees, the Congressional Party Policy Committees, and other elected state party leaders. It should be the function of such a party leadership, perhaps a new National Party Council, to draft party declarations for the National Conventions, to formulate and interpret party policy, to map party strategy and to promote party research and education.

Third, I believe that We must reorganize and modernize the machinery of party responsibility in Congress. This step calls for a number of subsidiary steps, none of which seems to me to be beyond the realm of practical politics, and seem worthy of further consideration and discussion.

- 1) We should revive and make more extensive use of the caucus as an instrument for the formation and promotion of party policy, for the caucus is the only known means by which the parties can formulate their policies into legislation, and by which the parties can execute their decisions. The congressional committees should work closely with the responsible national party leadership.
- 2) A joint Congressional Policy Committee for both houses of Congress should be created with their offices rotating between the members of the two houses, and with expert staffs. It should be the function of these joint Congressional Policy Committees to plan legislative strategy and programs, and to be held responsible for the legislative implementation of party policy.
- 3) The party Policy Committees, after consultation with the responsible party leader-

Party Policy Committees, too, or the membership of each committee, might well be allocated the function of selecting standing committee chairmen. Seniority is the most "sacred cow" in the legislative zoo, especially among the older members, but it is not imbedded in the granite of the constitution, the statutes or the standing always rules. It has not always been the custom in Congress, nor has the custom/been held inviolate, and it is a custom that can be changed in party caucus.

Twentieth century America is a dynamic society facing dynamic problems. Our task is to evolve a twentieth century political mechanism which will utilize the virility of our democratic process as it meets those problems.

# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.

