



---

**OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT**

---

REMARKS  
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY  
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION  
LEWISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

MAY 4, 1968

This year's political campaign trails lead increasingly across college and university campuses.

This is a constructive compliment to youth's healthy insisting on being included in democracy's processes -- and it is good for politics' chronic arthritis.

There is a critical difference, though, between politicians coming to the universities to talk politics and their coming to talk universalities. If the first is healthy, the second is dangerous -- at least for the politicians -- whose campaign commitments to talk incessantly leave too little time to think proportionately.

This danger is compounded when the assigned subject matter -- such as Individual Responsibility in a Free Society -- is a handful of political fish-hooks concealed only slightly in philosophy's feathers.

The danger is greatest when the peripatetic politician must follow, in the convocation batting order, such distinguished hitters -- in the field of ideas -- as you have listened to these past two days.

So "I need your help." Not just as President next year. As speaker -- now. My remarks can be only superficial reactions to the obviously central question you raise -- making no pretense at either full understanding or complete development.

Individual Responsibility in a Free Society is a more elusive theme than it admits on its face. Indeed it is democracy's basic equation.

The key words here are variables, impertinently pretending to be absolutes -- so as to intimidate anyone using them. They prompt the advice that you read George Orwell's essay on Politics and the English Language -- where he suggests that politics is largely push-button warfare in semantics, with the adversaries only selecting the words which set off desired reactions -- mostly wrong -- in people's minds.

Would your question be different if you turned it around and inquired about individual Freedom in a Responsible Society? I suppose a little.

Or you might have made it Individual Responsibility versus a Free Society -- which would perhaps have pushed faster down through the crust -- and rust -- of these words, and closer to the imponderables that make democracy less a precise equation than an essential act of faith.

You speak of the free society.

Which one?

I have always assumed that freedom is something permanently imperfect -- probably improving -- certainly changing -- perhaps definable only as what people will insist on and settle for as the terms for living with each other -- for the moment.

Once upon a time -- a walled city was freedom.

Once upon a time -- slavery was freedom.

Once upon a time -- three-fifths of a man was freedom -- under the Constitution.

Once upon a time -- 16 hours work a day -- or 16 tons -- was freedom.

Once upon a time -- "separate but equal" was freedom.

Once upon a time -- in Victor Hugo's observing of it -- freedom was the equal right of the rich and poor to sleep under the bridge at night.

Sir Henry Maine marked it as the whale's privilege to swallow the minnow.

Adam Smith made it mean, very simply, hands off -- laissez faire.

Yet today, of course, freedom means so much more than any of these things -- for most people -- especially the minnows -- and quite a bit less for the whales.

You did not really mean, however, that we should get hung up on what the Free Society is.

It is Individual Responsibility you really inquire about -- and what you mean is riots in the ghettos, and sit-ins at Columbia, and draft card burners, possibly the working of the welfare programs -- and even conceivably, at least this afternoon, the obligations of those who seek a role in the nation's stewardship to speak out bluntly on the issues of the day.

These are good questions. (Do you know any more good questions?)

Let me say first a little about some things Responsibility isn't, but is sometimes counted to be -- and some things it is but isn't always recognized as being.

Responsibility isn't Conformity. In fact, to whatever extent at any particular time the mores are wrong, or the status quo out of balance or kilter -- by some standard we won't stop to define -- Conformity is plainly Irresponsibility.

This is especially true at a time of unparalleled Change -- like right now.

And what I have said of Conformity goes double for Apathy.

You wonder why it is that "responsibility" has so much more of habit and inertia in its meaning when it comes to public affairs than it does in business -- or art -- or science.

Tom Watson isn't "irresponsible" because IBM is changing the whole relationship between men and machines.

Or Ben Shahn because he expresses himself with so little regard for Michelangelo.

Or Frederick Seitz because he owes so little -- at least directly -- to Sir Issac Newton.

Yet I suspect that when Sol Linowitz -- one of the most imaginative people I know -- talked with you about The Individual and Public Policy he took at least some of his premises fairly directly from Pericles.

For the fact is that we proceed very largely on the convenient but petty conceit that most of the essential and controlling principles of human relationships were identified by Hammurabi and developed fully in the Golden Age of Athens.

This makes us dangerously traditionalist in our attitude toward responsibility, as citizens, in the free society -- which has probably contributed greatly to today's proper concerns about the Civil Disorders Commission's two societies, and C. P. Snow's two cultures.

So I suggest that in this rapidly developing society part of freedom's essential condition is the exercise of individual responsibility -- not to hold back, as the concept of "responsibility" seems to imply -- but to be protagonists of institutional change.

This gets us, of course, into the area of the ways and means of such "protagonism."

A good deal of democracy's dialogue this year will be directed at the relationship between justice and equity on the one hand and law and order on the other.

It is not an evasion of today's assignment, at this convocation, to recognize this as too broad a subject for full treatment here.

It is easy enough -- and important -- to reject flatly the false arguments that are mustered to either support or excuse the resort in any form to violence -- or to force except as it is essential to counteract force.

Riots are wrong. Period!

What has happened this past week at Columbia University makes me sick all the way through.

Surely part of individual responsibility in a free society is tolerance for the contrary view -- even if that view appears -- at the moment -- unalterably wrong. And surely the university is the citadel of tolerance. To insist that something be done my way -- or I strike or lock the other fellow out -- is a part of the idea of the market place; but it is abhorrent in the market place of ideas.

To believe deeply in the idea of change -- and that part of Responsibility is to foment and promote change -- is still, for me, to count for the use of force and ultimatums on the campuses a form not of courage but of intellectual cowardice.

We better drive deep and fast, however, into why it is that so many -- at least a significant number -- of American youth hold a different view.

I suggest that it is in large part because of what they feel is an insufferable denial of sufficient opportunity to participate in things to the extent they want to.

I think there will probably be individual Responsibility -- in at least a sufficiently orthodox sense -- to whatever extent there is the opportunity for Participation -- perhaps in some fairly unorthodox, or at least new, forms.

It is significant that the two areas in which there are today the most extreme manifestations of what is commonly thought of as "irresponsibility" -- on the campuses and in the slums -- are at the opposite poles of opportunity as we normally think of it -- which is in terms of material advantage or disadvantage.

What these two areas have in common is that in both of them there is the strongest feeling -- with the largest justification -- that the people involved, especially the young people, have inadequate opportunity to participate in handling their own and their community's affairs.

They are rebelling, in a very real sense, against the denial to them of the opportunity to assume responsibility.

Their idea of the free society is enlarged responsibility -- at least in the sense of participating in the decision-making process -- whether the issues are war, or civil rights, or the regulation of "morality."

The likelihood is that if we disagree with some of them on some points -- from either the prejudice of age or the wisdom of experience -- we will be more effective in our persuasion ( to whatever extent it is right ) through processes and programs which give them an effective voice and role, instead of excluding them.

It is an oversimplification: but I suspect that the essential condition of individual responsibility is individual participation -- just as much as it is the other way around.

A little, in conclusion, about the special application of the idea of individual responsibility in the political forum:

The standard ought to be higher in politics than in any other process.

By reputation, it is lower.

I do ask your help in correcting this.

I mean, here again, by declaring our independence of words -- and the slavery the catch-phrases impose on our thoughts.

I mean the exercise of the responsibility of participation.

I mean the exercise of the responsibility to make change the instrument not of our destruction, but of our fulfillment as human beings.

I mean especially, in this particular year, the exercise of the responsibility not only to consider what is wrong with America -- and to correct it; but to consider what is right with America -- and strengthen it.

Ed Charles Watts  
His Reception  
Hope I can do as well  
Sol Linowitz

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION

LEWISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

MAY 4, 1968

L This year's political campaign trails lead increasingly across college and university campuses.

L This is a constructive compliment to youth's healthy insisting on being included in democracy's processes -- and it is good for the politics' chronic arthritis of Politics.

↳ There is a critical difference, though, between politicians coming to the universities to talk politics and their coming to talk universalities. If the first is healthy, the second is dangerous -- at least for the politicians -- whose campaign commitments to talk incessantly leave too little time to think proportionately. !

↳ This danger is compounded when the assigned subject matter -- such as Individual Responsibility in a Free Society -- is a handful of political fish-hooks concealed only slightly in philosophy's feathers.

↳ The danger is greatest when the Peripatetic politician must follow, in the convocation batting order, such distinguished hitters -- in the field of ideas -- as you have listened to these past two days.

*Candidate now, & hopefully*

So "I need your help." Not just as President next year. <sup>but</sup> As speaker -- now. My remarks can be only superficial reactions to the obviously central question you raise -- making no pretense at either full understanding or complete development.!

Individual Responsibility in a Free Society is a more elusive theme than it admits on its face. <sup>Indeed it is</sup> democracy's basic equation.

The key words here are variables, impertinently pretending to be absolutes -- so as to intimidate anyone using them.

<sup>Suggest</sup> They prompt the advice that you read Goerge Orwell's essay on Politics and the English Language -- where he suggests that politics is largely push-button warfare in semantics, with the adversaries only selecting the words which set off desired reactions -- mostly wrong -- in people's minds.

↳ Would your question be different if you turned it around and inquired about Individual Freedom in a Responsible Society? I suppose a little.

↳ Or you might have made it Individual Responsibility versus a Free Society -- which would perhaps have pushed faster down through the crust -- and rust -- of these words and closer to the imponderables that make democracy less a precise equation than an essential act of faith.

↳ You speak of the free society.

Which one?

↳ I have always assumed that freedom is something permanently imperfect -- probably improving -- certainly changing -- perhaps definable only as what people will insist on and settle for as the terms for living with each other -- for the moment.

~~the limit~~  
the limit of

Once upon a time -- a walled city was freedom.

Once upon a time -- slavery was freedom.

~~up / man - 1000 -~~  
Once upon a time -- three-fifths of a man was

freedom -- under the Constitution.

Once upon a time -- 16 hours work a day -- or  
16 tons -- was freedom.

Once upon a time -- "separate but equal" was freedom.

↳ Once upon a time -- in ~~Victor Hugo's~~ <sup>as one author</sup> observing of ~~put~~  
it -- freedom was the equal right of the rich and poor  
to sleep under the bridge at night.

↳ Sir Henry Maine marked it as the whale's privilege  
to swallow the minnow.

↳ Adam Smith made it mean, very simply, hands off --  
laissez faire.

↳ Yet today, ~~of course~~, freedom means so much more than any of these things -- for most people -- especially the minnows -- and quite a bit less for the whales.

You did not really mean, however, that we should get hung up on what the Free Society is.

It is Individual Responsibility you really inquire about -- and what you mean is riots in the ghettos, and sit-ins at Columbia, and draft card burners, possibly the working of the welfare programs -- and even conceivably, at least this afternoon, the obligations of those who seek a role in the nation's stewardship to speak out ~~bluntly~~ <sup>frankly</sup> on the issues of the day.

↳ These are good questions. (~~Do you know any more good questions?~~)

Let me say first a little about some things

Responsibility isn't, but is sometimes counted to be --  
and some things it is but isn't always recognized  
as being.

↳ Responsibility isn't Conformity. In fact, to whatever  
extent at any particular time the mores are wrong,  
or the status quo out of balance or kilter -- by some  
standard we won't stop to define -- Conformity is plainly  
Irresponsibility.

↳ This is especially true at a time of unparalleled Change --  
like right now.

And what I have said of Conformity goes double  
for Apathy.

*Can't help but*

You wonder why it is that "responsibility" has so much more of habit and inertia in its meaning when it comes to public affairs than it does in business -- or art -- or science.

↳ Tom Watson isn't "irresponsible" because IBM is changing the whole relationship between men and machines.

↳ Or Ben Shahn because he expresses himself with so little regard for Michelangelo.

↳ Or Frederick Seitz because he owes so little -- at least directly -- to Sir Issac Newton.

↳ Yet I suspect that when Sol Linowitz -- one of the most imaginative people I know -- talked with you about The Individual and Public Policy he took at least some of his premises fairly directly from Pericles.

↳ For the fact is that we proceed very largely on the convenient but petty conceit that most of the essential and controlling principles of human relationships were identified by Hammurabi and developed fully in the Golden Age of Athens.

↳ This makes us dangerously traditionalist in our attitude toward responsibility, as citizens, in the free society -- which has probably contributed greatly to today's proper concerns about the Civil Disorders Commission's two societies, and C. P. Snow's two cultures.

↳ So I suggest that in this rapidly developing society part of freedom's essential condition is the exercise of individual responsibility -- not to hold back, as the concept of "responsibility" seems to imply -- but to be protagonists of institutional change.

↳ This gets us, of course, into the area of the ways and means of such "protagonism."

↳ A good deal of democracy's dialogue this year will be directed at the relationship between justice and equity on the one hand and law and order on the other.

↳ It is not an evasion of today's assignment, at this convocation, to recognize this as too broad a subject for full treatment here.

↳ It is easy enough -- and important -- to reject flatly the false arguments that are mustered to either support or excuse the resort in any form to violence -- or to force except as it is essential to counteract force!

↳ Riots are wrong. Period!

↳ What has happened this past week at Columbia University makes me sick all the way through!

Surely part of individual responsibility in a free society is tolerance for the contrary view -- even if that view appears -- at the moment -- unalterably wrong. And surely the university is the citadel of tolerance. To insist that something be done "my way" -- or I strike or I lock the other fellow out -- is a part of the idea of the market place of Commerce but it is abhorrent in the market place of ideas.

To believe deeply in the idea of change -- and that part of Responsibility is to foment and promote change -- is still, for me, to count the use of force and ultimatums on the campuses a form not of courage but of intellectual cowardice.

We better drive deep and fast, however, into why it is that so many -- at least a significant number -- of American youth hold a different view.

∟ I suggest that it is in large part because of what they feel is an insufferable denial of sufficient opportunity to participate in things to the extent they want to.

∟ I think there will probably be individual Responsibility in at least a sufficiently orthodox sense -- to whatever extent there is the opportunity for Participation -- perhaps in some fairly unorthodox, or at least new, forms.

∟ It is significant that the two areas in which there are today the most extreme manifestations of what is commonly thought of as "irresponsibility" -- on the campuses and in the slums -- are at the opposite poles of opportunity as we normally think of it -- which is in terms of material advantage or disadvantage.

What these two areas have in common is that in both of them there is the strongest feeling -- with the largest justification -- that the people involved, especially the young people, have inadequate opportunity to participate in handling their own and their community's affairs,

They are rebelling, in a very real sense, against the denial to them of the opportunity to assume responsibility.

Their idea of the free society is enlarged responsibility -- at least in the sense of participating in the decision-making process -- whether the issues are war, or civil rights, or the regulation of "morality." -- 18 years old UBT

The likelihood is that if we disagree with some of them on some points -- from either the prejudices of age or the wisdom of experience -- we will be more effective in our persuasion (~~to whatever extent it is right~~) through processes and programs which give them an effective voice and role, instead of excluding them.

↳ It is an oversimplification, but I suspect that the essential condition of individual responsibility is individual participation -- just as much as it is the other way around.

*Nwafor Uke*  
A little, in conclusion, about the special application of the idea of individual responsibility in the political forum:

↳ The standard ought to be higher in politics than in any other process.

↳ By reputation, it is lower.

I do ask your help in correcting this.

↳ I mean, here again, by declaring our independence of words -- and the slavery the catch-phrases impose on our thoughts.

↳ I mean the exercise of the responsibility of participation.

↳ I mean the exercise of the responsibility to make change the instrument not of our destruction, but of our fulfillment as human beings.

I mean especially, in this particular year, the  
exercise of the responsibility not only to consider what  
is wrong with America -- and to correct it; but to consider  
what is right with America -- and strengthen it. !

I propose to do this - and  
I invite you to join me.

# # #

Address by the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey  
Vice President of the United States  
to the  
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION  
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania  
Saturday, The Fourth Of May  
NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHT

Thank you very much, President Watts, and thank you all those who added just a little extra to this meeting.

I want this distinguished assemblage to know how vehemently grateful I am for your warm and cordial welcome, and how much I appreciate the contribution that you have made not to me, but to your great University that believes in academic freedom, the search for truth, and to do it with good manners which is the first character and quality of an educated man or woman.

President Watts, after I saw the reception and heard the respect you received I began to think I am running for the wrong office. How does your Vice President do around here?

You really ganged up on me today. You know the office of the Vice Presidency, I have often said, is the only office which has legal status to have enforced humility, and when I listened to the wonderfully generous and sincere ovation that your President received from the student body and faculty and friends of Bucknell University, my heart was warmed, and I was glad.

And when I was told that a good friend of mine was here this morning, along with others, and he had given a remarkable address - - I don't even know why they permit Vice Presidents on these campuses at all, but I come here today in the spirit not so much a public official, but as a teacher.

The happiest days I believe of my private life were spent on the campuses of the University of Minnesota, Macalester College, and Louisiana State University, and other places and institutions of higher learning where I have been privileged to either study or to teach. And I'd like to cast myself today in the role not as a political spokesman, but rather hopefully as a teacher. You never can tell, Doctor Watts, I may need a job.

There are so many here that I should like to pay my respects to. Distinguished scholars here before you are men that have demanded the respect and attention of not only our own country, but of scholars and educator, of citizens throughout the world.

This year's political campaign trails lead increasingly across College and University campuses. Sometimes those trails are rather rocky as you can see.

This is a constructive compliment to youth's healthy insisting on being included in Democracy's processes, and I think that its all very good for the cronic arthritis that seems to be the lingering infection of politics.

There is a critical difference, though, between politicians coming to the Universities to talk politics and their coming to talk Universalities or generalities. If the first is

healthy, and I think it is, then the second is dangerous - - at least for the politicians - - whose campaign commitments to talk incessantly leave too little time for us to think proportionately.

This danger is compounded when the assigned subject matter, such as Individual Responsibility In A Free Society, is a handful of political fish-hooks concealed only slightly in Philosophy's feathers, and I have already reached in and know of what I speak.

The danger is greatest when the peripatetic politician must follow, in the Convocation batting order which I have seen. Such distinguished hitters, in the field of ideas, as you have listened to these past two days.

So, as men on the campaign trail say these days, "I need your help." Not as a candidate or hopefully as a President, but as a speaker. My remarks can be only at best superficial reactions to the obviously central question that you raise, making no pretense at either full understanding or complete development.

Individual Responsibility In A Free Society is a more elusive theme than it admits on its face. Indeed it is Democracy's basic equation and the key word here.

The key words here are variables, impertinently pretending to be absolutes so as to intimidate everyone using them. They prompt the advice that you read George Orwell's essay on politics, and the English language, where he suggests that politics is largely push-button warfare in semantics, with the adversaries only selecting the words which set off desired reactions and, I might add, mostly running in people's minds.

Would your question be different if you turned it around and inquired about individual freedom in a responsible society? I suppose it would be a little different or you might have made it an individual responsibility versus a free society, which would perhaps have pushed faster down through the crust, and rust of these words, and closer to the imponderables that make Democracy less a precise equation than an essential act of faith.

You speak of the free society, and you ask which one.

I have always assumed that freedom is something permanently imperfect - - probably improving - - certainly always changing and perhaps definable as to what people will insist on and settle for as the terms for living with each other; at least for the moment.

Once upon a time a walled city was the limit of freedom.

Once upon a time, paradoxically at it seems, slavery passed for freedom.

Once upon a time, before the one man, one vote ruling, three-fifths of a man was freedom under the Constitution.

Once upon a time sixteenhours work a day - - or sixteen tons- was freedom.

Once upon a time, as one author put it, and I believe it was Victor Hugo's observing of it, freedom was the equal right of the rich and poor to sleep under the bridge at night.

Sir Henry Maine marked it as the whale's privilege to swallow the minnow.

Adam Smith made it mean, very simply, hands off - laissez faire.

Yet with all of those definitions of freedom, freedom means so much more than any of these things, for most people - especially the minnows, and quite a bit less for the whales.

You did not really mean, however, that we should get hung up on what the free society is.

It is individual responsibility you really inquire about, and

what you mean is riots in the ghettos, and sit-ins at Columbia, and draft card burners, possibly the working of the Government Welfare Programs, and even conceivably, at least this afternoon, the obligations of those who seek a role in the Nations stewardship to speak out frankly on the issues of the day.

These are good questions; at least some of the good questions.

Let me say first a little about some things responsibility isn't, but is sometimes counted to be, and some things that responsibility is but isn't always recognized as being.

Responsibility isn't conformity. In fact, to whatever extent at any particular time the mores are wrong, and the status quo is out of balance or kilter, by some standard we won't stop to define, conformity is plainly, under those circumstances, irresponsibility.

This is especially true at a time of unparalleled change - like right now.

And what I have said of conformity goes double for apathy. Apathy is the very empathy for responsibility.

You can't help wonder why it is that responsibility has so much more of habit and inertia in its meaning when it comes to public affairs than it does in business, or art, or science.

Thomas Watson isn't irresponsible because I.B.M. is changing the whole relationship between men and machines. I think he exemplifies the changing times.

Or a man who could not be with you, Ben Shawn, is not irresponsible because he expresses himself with so little regard for Michelangelo.

Or Frederick Seitz, because he owes so little, at least directly, to Sir Issac Newton.

For the fact is that we proceed very largely on the convenient but petty conceit that most of the essential and controlling principles of human relationships were identified by Hammurabi and developed fully in the golden age of Athens.

This makes us dangerously traditionalist in our attitude toward responsibility, as citizens, in the free society which has probably contributed greatly to today's proper concerns about the civil disorders commission's two societies, and C. P. Snow's two cultures.

So I suggest that in this rapidly developing society, part of freedom's essential condition is the exercise of individual responsibility not to hold back, as the concept of responsibility seems to imply, but to be protagonists of institutional change.

This gets us, of course, into the area of the ways and means of such protagonism.

A good deal of Democracy's dialogue this year will be directed at the relationship between justice and equity on the one hand, and law and order on the other.

It is not an evasion of today's assignment, at this convocation, to recognize this as too broad a subject for full treatment here.

It is easy enough, and important, to reject flatly the false arguments that are mustered to either support or excuse the resort in any form to violence, or to force except as it is essential to counteract force.

To put it bluntly, riots are wrong, period. They are not responsibility.

What has happened this past week at Columbia University makes me sick all the way through. What an ugly situation for a university campus to become like an armed camp; to see the inter-mingling of the policeman with his club and the angry student lying down, barricading himself as if somehow or other all of society ganged up against him.

One of our contemporaries said as we were coming into this

assemblage, that in this land of diversities in this country of freedom of choice, if you can't find what you want at one place, shop around, there are lots of other places to go. The university ought to set the example for the nation. It should be the intellectual cathedral.

Surely part of Individual Responsibility In A Free Society is tolerance for the contrary view, even if that view appears, at the moment, unalterably wrong. A university must never be guilty of censureship; the censureship of closed minds. May I say even the censureship of walking out.

And surely the university is the citidel of tolerance. To insist that something be done my way, or I strike or lock the other fellow out, is a part of the idea of the market place. But I submit it is abhorrent in the market place of ideas. What is more you can't lock out an idea. No one has ever built walls high enough or strong enough that will stop an idea leaping over them.

To believe deeply in the idea of change, and that part of responsibility is to forment and promote change is still, for me, to count for the use of force and ultimatum on the campus - es a form not of courage but of intellectual cowardice.

We better drive deep and fast, however, into why it is that so many, at least a significant number, of American youth hold a

different view. And permit me to direct my attention for a moment to that.

I think there will probably be individual responsibility in at least a sufficiently orthodox sense, to whatever extent there is opportunity for participation; perhaps in some fairly unorthodox, or at least new, forms.

It is my considered judgement that responsibility and participation run hand in hand; they are not separable. As John Stewart Mill once said, let a man have nothing to do for his country and he shall have no love for it. Let a person have no chance to participate in the decisions that affect their lives, they will inevitably act irresponsibly, either by direct acts or total apathy.

It is significant that the two areas in which there are today the most extreme manifestations of what is commonly thought of as irresponsibility on the campuses and in the slums, are at the opposite poles of opportunity as we normally think of it, which is in terms of material advantage or disadvantage.

What these two areas have in common, however, is that in both of them there is the strongest feeling with the largest justification, that the people involved, especially the young people, have inadequate opportunity to participate in handling their own and their community's affairs.

I happen to believe, therefore, that some of the student protests that we have seen that takes the form of honest dialog, or of heated debate, has a just and responsible purpose if it is kept within those bounds of reason that permit us to arrive at fair decisions.

These people greatly separated by circumstance and distance, the fortunate at the university, the disadvantaged in the slum, are rebelling against the denial, the denial to them of an opportunity to assume responsibility, and what a healthy sign this is. What a sign of our maturity, that all people, all over America are wanting to be a part of, involved in, voiced in, participating in, the decision making processes of our country.

Their idea of the free society is enlarged responsibility, at least in the sense of participating in the decision making process, whether the issues are war or civil rights, or the regulation of morality. And I've been to many, many campuses, I've gone through the fire of debate; even humiliation at times of ugly words, but I find across this land of ours a healthy spirit, a basically wholesome attitude. I find people today that are deeply concerned, but are not willing to let that concern result in the raising of that hand, and the moaning and the groaning of people who know not what they do.

It is a concern backed by arguments, just as everyone of us

who are privileged to have a higher education should know that the ultimate purpose of knowledge is not knowledge, but action.

And the purpose of a university is to emancipate man from his limitations to arouse his spirit, to higher purposes, to permit him to develop. He has to enrich those God given qualities that are to be found in each and every one of us.

If our only purpose is the accumulation of facts and statistics, then a university has failed. In fact you are denying the world almanac its legitimate right on the world bookshelf..

We are here to develop and increase our sensitivity; to make ourself a more civilized human being; to make us a more sensitive and responsible person; responsible in the spirit of change or as one put it, progress with order, and order with progress.

I happen to have a great deal of faith in these young men and women. In fact I happen to have so much over the years that I believe a practical way in enlarging this sense of responsibility is to give it to them, and one way is to extend, as I have said in the Congress Of The United States, an early age at the ballot box; a right to vote.

Even this is not particularly a new revolutionary thought, but

but in 1952 I introduced then a Constitutional Amendment, or a proposal for an amendment, to extend the right to vote in national elections, for those in all national offices at the age of eighteen.

I still believe there is great merit to it, not merely because of the right to vote, but one thing that every man has found that has ever served in public life, or university life which is public too, if you want a man to act responsibly, give him responsibility.

So as I was saying to you, this idea of the free society is enlarged responsibility, and this being a part of decision making on all of the great issues, every one of them, the likelihood is that we disagree with them on some points from either the prejudices of age or the wisdom of experience, we will be more effective in our persuasion through processes and programs which give them an effective voice and role, instead of excluding them.

It is an oversimplification, but I suspect that the essential condition of individual responsibility is, to repeat and underscore, individual participation.

Now a few words in conclusion about the special application of the idea of individual responsibility in the political forum:

The standard ought to be higher in politics than in any other process, because it is the politics of a nation that finally, finally states its purpose, and you cannot have a high and noble purpose out of less than high and noble acts and application for that purpose. The means do condition the end and there is no way to ignore it.

Speaking of reputation of politics, I know it is lower. And therefore I come to this assembly to secure help in correcting this.

As a professor once said to a class, if you believe that politics is dirty you self appointed judges of purity, get yourselves involved and clean it up. How easy it is to stand on the side lines and judge the players on the field. How comforting it is to be the Monday morning quarterback and know how wrong everybody was on Saturday.

Join me in helping us to correct some of our mistakes, and you will help alot by making some of your own.

Government by the consent of the governed needs an elevation to higher standards, and I have asked your help now, and I am here again by declaring our independence of words, and the phrases , the slavery the catch-phrases impose on our thoughts.

I mean the exercise of the responsibility of participation.

I mean the exercise of responsibility to make change the instrument not of our destruction, but of our fulfillment as human beings.

I mean to understand the democracy's houses never completed; that each generation has a heritage that it must add on to.

And I mean to have great faith in the capacity of people to govern themselves.

I mean especially, in this particular year, the exercise of responsibility in a free society, not only to consider what is wrong with America - you don't have to come to a university to find that out - its well known, and my how some people glory in telling us about it, not to find out only what is wrong, but find out how to correct it. And to consider for our own hope, and our own inspiration what is right with America; what is right with this land of ours and to strengthen it.

We can draw tremendous strength and purpose from what is right in this country, not to be content with it; to have a restless sense; to have a desire for change.

To seek ways and means to improve and , all the time, we can be really praising what this nation stands for, because this nation's work is never done.

Woodrow Wilson once said that America's work would never be

done until the flag of America stood as the symbol of humanity.

I think so, and I propose to talk this way to the American people; not to gloss over our sense and ego, and limitations, but to appeal to the best that is in us, and to arouse within the American People, if I can, as one man, and one of many.

To arouse in them a desire to build this into one nation with a full recognition of our humility before God Almighty, and to try somehow to build this nation, at least to instill a spirit in the people of this nation to know that it is indivisible; that it can not be separate nations.

And finally to recognize what all free men must accept - sacrifice; that there is no liberty for you and for me unless there is liberty for the other man and, therefore, liberty and justice for all is not a child read line or a child read phrase to be repeated in the third and fourth grades. It is a fundamental truth. It tells us of the inner depths of man himself. Recognizing the brotherhood of man as it recognizes the individual human dignities of man.

There is no brotherhood without individuals. There is no brotherhood without human dignity, and there can be no human dignity without all the restraints and all of the forces, all of the noble forces that bring about a true meaning of human brotherhood. Thank you for letting me participate.

W.W. -  
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY  
Draft -- May 3

This year's political campaign trails lead increasingly across college and university campuses.

This is a constructive compliment to youth's healthy insisting on being included in democracy's processes -- and it is good for politics' chronic arthritis.

There is a critical difference, though, between politicians' coming to the universities to talk politics and their coming to talk universalities. If the first is healthy, the second is dangerous -- at least for the politicians -- whose campaign commitments to talk incessantly leave too little time to think proportionately.

This danger is compounded when the assigned subject matter -- such as Individual Responsibility in a Free Society -- is <sup>a</sup> ~~an obvious~~ handful of political fish-hooks concealed only slightly in philosophy's feathers.

The danger is greatest when the peripatetic politician must follow, in the convocation batting order, such distinguished hitters -- in the field of ideas -- as you have listened to these past two days.

So "I need your help." Not just as President next year. As speaker -- now. My remarks can be only superficial reactions to the obviously central question you raise -- making no pretense at either full understanding or complete development.

Individual Responsibility in a Free Society is a more elusive theme than it admits on its face. Indeed it is democracy's basic equation.

The key words here are variables, impertinently pretending to be absolutes -- so as to intimidate anyone using them. They prompt the advice that you read George Orwell's essay on Politics and the English Language -- where he suggests that politics is

largely push-button warfare in semantics, with the adversaries only selecting the words which set off <sup>desired</sup> ~~denied~~ reactions -- mostly wrong -- in people's minds.

Would your question be different if you turned it around and inquired about Individual Freedom in a Responsible Society? I suppose a little.

Or you might have made it Individual Responsibility versus a Free Society -- which would perhaps have pushed faster down through the crust -- and rust -- of these words, and closer to the imponderables that make democracy less a precise equation than an essential act of faith.

You speak of the free society.

Which one?

I have always assumed that freedom is something permanently imperfect -- probably improving -- certainly changing -- perhaps definable only as what people will insist on and settle for as the terms for living with each other -- for the moment.

Once upon a time -- a walled city was freedom.

Once upon a time -- slavery was freedom.

Once upon a time -- three-fifths of a man was freedom -- under the Constitution.

Once upon a time -- 16 hours work a day -- or 16 tons -- was freedom.

Once upon a time -- "separate but equal was freedom."

Once upon a time -- in Victor Hugo's observing of it -- freedom was the equal right of the rich and the poor to sleep under the bridge at night.

Sir Henry Maine marked it as the whale's privilege to swallow the minnow.

Adam Smith made it mean, very simply, hands off -- laissez faire.

Yet today, of course, freedom means so much more than any of these things -- for most people -- especially the minnows -- and quite a bit less for the whales .

You did not really mean, however, that we should get hung up on what the Free Society is.

It is Individual Responsibility you really inquire about -- and what you mean is riots in the ghettos, and sit-ins at Columbia, and draft card burners, possibly the working of the welfare programs -- and even conceivably, at least this afternoon, the obligations of those who seek a role in the nation's stewardship to speak out bluntly on the issues of the day.

These are good questions. (Do you know any more good questions?)

Let me say first a little about some things Responsibility isn't, but is sometimes counted to be -- and some things it is but isn't always recognized as being.

Responsibility isn't Conformity. In fact, to whatever extent at any particular time the mores are wrong, or the status quo out of balance or kilter -- by some standard we won't stop to define -- Conformity is plainly Irresponsibility.

This is especially true at a time of unparalleled Change -- like right now.

And what I have said of Conformity goes double for Apathy.

You wonder why it is that "responsibility" has so much more of habit and inertia in its meaning when it comes to public affairs than it does in business -- or art -- or science.

Tom Watson isn't "irresponsible" because IBM is changing the whole relationship between men and machines.

Or Ben Shahn because he expresses himself with so little regard for Michelangelo.

Or Frederick Seitz because he owes so little -- at least directly -- to Sir Isaac Newton.

Yet I suspect that when Sol Linowitz -- one of the most imaginative people I know -- talked with you about The Individual and Public Policy he took at least some of his premises fairly directly from Pericles.

For the fact is that we proceed very largely on the convenient but petty conceit that most of the essential and controlling principles

of human relationships were identified by Hammurabi and developed fully in the Golden Age of Athens.

This makes us dangerously traditionalist in our attitude toward responsibility, as citizens, in the free society -- which has probably contributed greatly to today's proper concerns about the Civil Disorders Commission's two societies, and C. P. Snow's two cultures.

So I suggest that in this rapidly developing society part of freedom's essential condition is the exercise of individual responsibility -- not to hold back, as the concept of "responsibility" seems to imply -- but to be protagonists of institutional change.

This gets us, of course, into the area of the ways and means of such "protagonism."

A good deal of democracy's dialogue this year will be directed at the relationship between justice and equity on the one hand and law and order on the other.

It is not an evasion of today's assignment, at this convocation, to recognize this as too broad a subject for full treatment here.

It is easy enough ~~to~~ -- and important -- to reject flatly the false arguments that are mustered to either support or excuse the resort in any form to violence -- or to force except as it is essential to counteract force.

Riots are wrong. Period!

~~So, in my judgment, are campus sit-ins and strikes.~~ What has happened this past week at Columbia University makes me sick all the way through.

Surely part of ~~the~~ individual responsibility ~~essential~~ in a free society is tolerance for the contrary view -- even if that view appears -- at the moment -- unalterably wrong. And surely the university is the citadel of tolerance. To insist that something be done my way -- or I strike or I lock the other fellow out -- is a part of the idea of the market-place; but it is abhorrent in the market-place of ideas.

*mean violence*  
*what they are for*  
*the*  
*1969*

To believe deeply in the idea of change -- and that part of Responsibility is to foment and promote change -- is still, for me, to count the use of force and ultimatums on the campuses a form not of courage but of intellectual cowardice.

We better drive deep and fast, however, into why it is that so many -- at least a significant number -- of American youth hold a different view.

I suggest that it is in large part because of what they feel is an insufferable denial of sufficient opportunity to participate in things to the extent they want to ~~in any other way.~~ *if they don't want to do it, they don't*

I think there will probably be individual Responsibility -- in at least a sufficiently orthodox sense -- to whatever extent there is the opportunity for Participation -- perhaps in some fairly unorthodox, or at least new, forms.

It is significant that the two areas in which there are today the most extreme manifestations of what is commonly thought of as

"irresponsibility" -- on the campuses and in the slums -- are at the opposite poles of opportunity as we normally think of it -- which is in terms of material advantage or disadvantage.

What these two areas have in common is that in both of them there is the strongest feeling -- with the largest justification -- that the people involved, especially the young people, have ~~an~~ <sup>in</sup> adequate opportunity to participate in handling their own and their community's affairs.

They are rebelling, in a very real sense, against the denial to them of the opportunity to assume responsibility.

Their idea of the free society is enlarged responsibility -- at least in the sense of participating in the decision-making process -- whether the issues are war, or civil rights, or the regulation of "morality."

The likelihood is that if we disagree with some of them on some points -- from either the prejudices of age or the wisdom of experience --

we will be more effective in our persuasion (to whatever extent it is right) through processes and programs which give them an effective voice and role, instead of excluding them.

It is an oversimplification: but I suspect that the essential condition of individual responsibility is individual participation -- just as much as it is the other way around.

A little, in conclusion, about the special application of the idea of individual responsibility in the political forum:

The standard ought to be higher in "politics" than in any other process.

By reputation, it is lower.

I do ask your help in correcting this.

I mean, here again, by declaring our independence of words -- and the slavery the catch-phrases impose on our thoughts.

I mean the exercise of the responsibility of participation.

I mean the exercise of the responsibility to make change the instrument not of our destruction, but of our fulfillment as human beings.

I mean especially, in this particular year, the exercise of the responsibility not only to consider what is wrong with America -- and to correct it; but to consider what is right with America -- and strengthen it.

I come here today, not so much as a public official or political spokesman, but as a teacher. The happiest days of my private life and, in a sense, of my public life were the days on the campuses of the University of Minnesota, McAlister College, Louisiana State University and other places and institutions of higher learning where I have been privileged either to study or to teach.

This year's political campaign trails lead increasingly across college and university campuses. Sometimes those trails are rather rocky.

This new attention to the universities is, however, a constructive compliment to American youth's healthy insisting on being included in Democracy's processes -- and I think that is all very good for the chronic arthritis that seems to be the lingering infection of politics.

There is a critical difference, though, between politicians coming to universities to talk politics and their coming to talk universalities or generalities. If the first is healthy, and I think it is, then the second is dangerous, at least for the politicians, whose campaign commitments to talk incessantly leave too little time for us to think proportionately.

This danger is compounded when the assigned subject matter -- such as Individual Responsibility In A Free Society -- is a handful of political fish-hooks concealed only slightly in Philosophy's feathers. And I have already reached in and know of what I speak.

The danger is the greatest when the peripatetic politician must follow, in the Convocation batting order which I've seen, such distinguished hitters in the field of ideas as you have listened to these past two days.

So as men on the campaign trail say these days, "I need your help." Not as a candidate and, hopefully, as President, but as a speaker. My remarks can be at best only superficial reactions to the obviously central question that you raise -- making no pretense at either full understanding or complete development.

Individual Responsibility in a Free Society is a more elusive theme than it admits on its face. Indeed it is Democracy's basic equation.

The key words here are variables, impertinently pretending to be absolutes -- so as to intimidate anyone using them. They suggest the advice that you read George Orwell's essay on "Politics and the English Language," where he suggests that politics is largely push-button warfare in semantics, with the adversaries only selecting the words which set off desired reactions, and I might add -- mostly wrong -- in people's minds.

Would your question be different if you turned it around and inquired about individual freedom in a responsible society? I suppose it would be a little different.

Or you might have made it individual responsibility versus a free society -- which would perhaps have pushed faster down through the crust-- and the rust-- of these words, and closer to the imponderables that make Democracy less a precise equation than an essential act of faith.

You speak of the free society.

And I ask which one?

I have always assumed that freedom is something permanently imperfect-- probably and hopefully improving--certainly always changing--perhaps definable only as what people will insist on and settle for as the terms for living with each other -- at least for the moment.

Once upon a time, a walled city was the limit of freedom.

Once upon a time, paradoxical as it seems, slavery was freedom.

Once upon a time -- before the one man, one vote belief -- three-fifths of a man was freedom, under the Constitution.

Once upon a time, 16 hours work a day--or 16 tons--was freedom.

Once upon a time, "separate but equal" was called freedom.

Once upon a time, as one author put it -- and I believe it was Anatol France -- freedom was the equal right of the rich and poor to sleep under the bridge at night.

Sir Henry Maine marked it as the whale's privilege to swallow the minnow.

Adam Smith made it mean, very simply, hands off--laissez faire.

Yet, with all of those definitions of freedom, freedom means so much more than any of these things for most people -- especially the minnows -- and quite a little less for the whales.

You did not mean, however, that we should get hung up on what the free society is.

It is individual responsibility I gather that you really inquire about-- and what you mean is riots in the ghettos, sit-ins at Columbia, draft card burners, possibly the working of the government welfare programs--and even conceivably, at least this afternoon, the obligations of those who seek a role in the nation's stewardship to speak out frankly on the issues of the day.

These are good questions. At least some of the good questions.

Let me say first a little about some things responsibility isn't, but is sometimes counted to be--and some things that responsibility is but isn't always recognized as being.

Responsibility isn't conformity. In fact, to whatever extent at any particular time the mores are wrong, and the status quo is out of balance or kilter--by some standard we won't stop to define--conformity is plainly under those circumstances irresponsibility.

This is especially true at a time of unparalleled change--like right now.

And what I have said about conformity goes double for apathy. Apathy is the very antithesis of responsibility.

You can't help wondering why it is that "responsibility" has so much more of habit and inertia in its meaning when it comes to public affairs than it does in business--or art--or science.

Now Tom Watson isn't "irresponsible" because IBM is changing the whole relationship between men and machines. I think he exemplified the responsibility in changing times.

Or a gentleman who could not be with you, Ben Shahn, is not irresponsible because he expresses himself with so little regard for Michaelangelo.

Or Frederick Seitz because he owes so little--at least directly--to Sir Issac Newton.

Yet I suspect that when Sol Linowitz--one of the most imaginative people that I know--talked with you about The Individual and Public Policy he took at least some of his premises fairly directly from Pericles.

For the fact is that we proceed very largely on the convenient but petty conceit that most of the essential and controlling principles of human relationships were identified by Hammurabi and developed fully in the golden age of Athens.

This makes us dangerously traditionalist in our attitude toward responsibility, as citizens, in the free society--which has probably contributed greatly to today's proper concerns about the civil disorders commission's two societies, separate and unequal, and C. P. Snow's two cultures.

So I suggest that in this rapidly developing society part of freedom's essential condition is the exercise of individual responsibility--not to hold back, as the concept of "responsibility" often seems to imply--but to be protagonists of institutional change.

Now this get us, of course, into the area of the ways and means of such "protagonism."

A good deal of Democracy's dialogue this year will be directed at the relationship between justice and equity on the one hand and law and order on the other.

It is not an evasion of today's assignment, at this convocation, to recognize that this is too broad a subject for full treatment here.

It is easy enough--and I think important--to reject flatly the false arguments that are mustered to either support or excuse the resort in any form to violence--or to force except as it is essential to counteract force.

To put it directly, violence, riots are wrong, period. They are not responsible.

What has happened this past week at Columbia University makes me sick all the way through. What an ugly situation for a University campus to become like an armed camp -- to see the intermingling, if you please, of the policeman with his club and the angry student lying down barricading himself as if somehow or another all of society had ganged up against him.

One of our contemporaries said as we were coming into this assembly that in this land of diversity, in this country of freedom of choice, if you can't find what you want at one place, shop around. There are lots of other places to go.

The University ought to set the example for the nation. It should be the intellectual cathedral. Surely a part of Individual Responsibility in a Free Society is tolerance for the contrary view--even if that view appears--at the moment--unalterably wrong. The University must never be guilty of censorship--the censorship of closed minds, may I say even the censorship of walking out.

And to me, surely, the University is a citadel of tolerance. To insist that something be done my way--or to strike or lock the other fellow out--may be a part of the idea of the market place of business: but I submit that it is abhorrent in the market place of ideas.

What is more, you can't lock out an idea. No one has ever built walls high enough or strong enough that will keep an idea from leaping over them.

To believe deeply in the idea of change--and that part of responsibility is to ferment and promote change--is still, for me, to count the use of force and ultimatums on the campuses a form not of courage but of intellectual cowardice.

We'd better drive deep and fast, however, into why it is that so many--at least a significant number--of American youth hold a different view.

I suggest that it is in a large part because of what they feel is an insufferable denial of sufficient opportunity to participate in things to the extent that they want to.

I think there will probably be individual responsibility--in at least a sufficiently orthodox sense--to whatever extent there is opportunity for participation--perhaps even in some fairly unorthodox, or at least new, forms.

It is my considered judgment that responsibility and participation run hand in hand. They are inseparable. As John Stuart Mill once said, let a man have nothing to do for his country and he shall have no love for it. Let a person have no chance to participate in the decisions that affect their lives, they will inevitably act irresponsibly, either by direct action or total apathy.

It is significant that the two areas in which there are today the most extreme manifestations of what is commonly thought of as "irresponsibility"--on the campuses and in the slums--are at the opposite poles of opportunity as we normally think of it--which is in terms of material advantage or disadvantage.

What these two areas have in common, however, is that in both of them there is the strongest feeling--with the largest justification--that the people involved, especially the young people, have inadequate opportunity to participate in handling of their own and their community's affairs.

I happen to believe, therefore, that some of the student protests that we have seen that takes the form of honest dialogue, of heated debate has a just and responsible purpose if it is kept within those bonds of reason that permit us to arrive at fair decisions.

These people, greatly separated by circumstances and distance--the fortunate in the University and the disadvantaged in the slums--are rebelling, in a very real sense, against the denial to them of the opportunity to assume responsibility, and what a healthy sign this is. What a sign of our maturity that people all over America are wanting to be a part of, involved in, participate in the decision making processes of our country.

Their idea of the free society is enlarged responsibility--at least in the sense of participating in the decision-making process--whether the issues are war, or civil rights, or the regulation of "morality."

I've been to many, many campuses. I've gone through the fire of dissent, the angry words of debate, even the humiliation at times of ugly words, but I find across this land of ours a healthy spirit, a basically wholesome attitude. I find people today that are deeply concerned but are not willing to let that concern result only in the wringing of their hands and in the moaning and groaning of people who know not what to do. It is a concern backed by action.

Just as everyone of us who is privileged to have a higher education should know, the ultimate purpose of knowledge is not knowledge, but action. And the purpose of the university is to emancipate man from his limitations, to arouse his spirit to higher purposes, to permit him to develop, yes, to enrich those God-given qualities which are to be found in each and everyone of us.

If our only purpose is the accumulation of facts and statistics, then the university has failed. In fact, you are denying the world almanac its legitimate right on every book store shelf.

We are here to increase and develop our sensitivity, to make us a more civilized human being, to make us more sensible and responsible people.

I happen to have a great deal of faith in these young men and women. In fact, I have had so much over the years that I believe the practical way of enlarging their sense of responsibility is to give it to them. And one way is to extend, as I have said for years in the Congress, the right to vote at an earlier age. I know this is not particularly a new or revolutionary thought, but in 1952 I introduced then a constitutional amendment, or a proposal for amendment, to extend the right to vote in national elections at the age of 18. I still believe that there is great merit to it. One thing that every man who has ever served in public life or in university life has found is that if you want a man to act responsibly, give him responsibility.

The idea of free society is this enlarged responsibility and being a part of the decision making on all of the great issues -- every one of them. The likelihood is that if young and old disagree on some points -- from either the prejudices of age or the wisdom of experience -- we will be more effective in our persuasion through processes and programs which give everyone an effective voice and role, instead of excluding them.

It is an oversimplification, but I suspect that the essential condition of individual responsibility is, to repeat and underscore, individual participation.

Now a few words in conclusion about the special application of the idea of individual responsibility in the political forum:

The standard ought to be higher in politics than in any other process. Because it is the politics of a nation that finally states its purpose, and you cannot have a high and noble purpose out of less than high and noble actions and applications for that purpose. The means do condition the ends and there is no way to ignore it.

The standard of politics, by reputation, is lower; and, therefore, I come to this assembly to ask your help in correcting this. As a professor once I said to a class, if you believe that politics is dirty, you self-appointed judges of purity, get yourself involved and clean it up.

How easy it is to stand on the side lines and judge the players on the field. How comforting it is to be the Monday morning quarterback and know how wrong everybody was on Saturday. Join me in helping us overcome our mistakes and you will learn a lot by making some of your own.

Government by the consent of the governed needs elevation to a higher standard; and I have asked your help now to declare our independence of words, and the slavery catch-phrases impose on our thoughts.

I mean the exercise of the responsibility of participation.

I mean the exercise of the responsibility to make change the instrument not of our destruction, but of our fulfillment as human beings.

I mean to understand the Democracy's house is never completed and that each generation has a heritage that it must add onto and I mean to have great faith in the capacity of people to govern themselves.

I mean especially, in this particular year, the exercise of responsibility, Individual Responsibility In a Free Society, not only to consider what is wrong with America. (You didn't have to come to a University to find that out. It's well known, and my how some people glory in telling us about it.) Not to find out only what is wrong but find out how to correct it and to consider for our own hope and our own inspiration what is right with America -- what is right with this land of ours, and to strengthen it.

We can draw tremendous strength and purpose from what is right in this country -- not by being content with it, but by having a restless sense, a desire for change, a will to seek ways and means to improve. And all the time we can praise what this nation really stands for because its work is never done.

Woodrow Wilson once said that America's work would never be done until the flag of America stood as the flag of humanity. I think so, and I propose to talk this way to the American people -- not to gloss over our sins, our evils and our limitations, but to appeal to the best that is within us and to arouse in the American people a desire to build this into one nation with a full recognition of our humility before God almighty...to instill in people

a recognition of what all free men must accept as a fact: There is no liberty for you or for me unless there is liberty for the other man, and therefore liberty and justice for all is not child's rhetoric or a child-like phrase to be repeated in the third or fourth grade, but a fundamental truth. It recognizes the brotherhood of man as it recognizes the individual human dignity of man. There is no brotherhood without individuality. There is no brotherhood without human dignity and there can be no human dignity without all of the restraints and all of the noble forces that bring about a true meaning of brotherhood.

Thank you for letting me participate.



# 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.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)