

REMARKS OF HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
9th ANNUAL EDWIN A. MOOERS LECTURE  
METROPOLITAN MEMORIAL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1970

FOR RELEASE AFTER 8 P.M., FRIDAY, FEB. 20, 1970

FOUR LAWS THAT MADE A DIFFERENCE

We are privileged as a people to have grown in the traditions of Anglo-Saxon law. We are privileged as a people to have had forebears : who were unique and scholarly students of social structure. They were the scholars of Locke, and they were the scholars of Rousseau. They were the scholars of the Greeks and the Romans and the great philosophers of the Middle Ages.

The authors of our Constitution wrote for all generations to come--and the key to the federal system in this country is that our Constitution is written in the present tense.

The preamble of the Constitution of the United States says "we the people of these United States do ordain and establish"--at this hour, today, here in Washington, D.C. and in communities throughout

(MORE)

News Release



**THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY**

*Washington, D. C. 20016 / 202-244-6800, Ext. 234*

**Office of Information Services**

the nation. It did not say "did ordain and establish" in Philadelphia.

It is in the present tense. It is a contemporary document. It is a living instrument; and because it is that, it changes just like the human body and the human mind and the emotions of human beings, and all living organisms.

The government of the United States draws its powers from that Constitution and the Constitution draws its powers from the people--so that government must change and the social structure must change to keep pace with the changing needs of our people.

And what we seek is change with order and order with change. It is a tremendous assignment. And it requires that we understand the differences between dissent on the one hand and violence on the other; the difference between liberty and license; the difference between rights and privileges.

Now, we all know that in the early days of our country, communication didn't amount to much. And the government most responsive and responsible to the people was the local government.

If I asked a student of mine at the University of Minnesota or Macalester College to write a paper on the government of the United States in the year 1825 and he spent over one paragraph on the national government in Washington, I would flunk him--because the government of the United States in 1825 was in the townships and the villages and the cities, in the county courthouses and in the statehouses of the nation.

But communication changed that in our country. And communication brought us together as a people in a pluralistic society, a multi-racial

Humphrey Remarks  
Add 2  
AU Information Services

society, with common goals and purposes. It is not difficult to govern a homogeneous people, but remember that this is one of the few countries in the world with representative government - with free elections - that has a multi-racial base.

Our people are drawn from every area of the world. And the task of bringing about responsible, responsive, representative, broadly participating government in such a society is no small task - and there are no instant ways to achieve it.

We have had presidents who have been talking to us about these things. President Kennedy and President Johnson talked about what they called Creative Federalism. One of them called it the New Frontier, one of them called it the Great Society. President Nixon has talked about the New Federalism.

They are all saying that things have changed, that today federalism is not a limitation on the powers of the federal government, but a positive assertion of the cooperative relationships between federal government, state governments, city, county, and other local government units; between universities and governments; between voluntary agencies, professional and trade associations, labor associations, and the whole spectrum of the private sector,

Now why do I give you that broad description? Because today there isn't a single problem that confronts this country that can be handled successfully by these governmental structures without cooperation from the others. No problem.

Racism cannot be handled by the trade unions--or by business, or the churches, or the universities. It requires both legal sanctions and a change of heart and attitude and perspective.

The congestion of our cities, of our highways, of our traffic lanes, cannot be handled by any one level of government.

So what we are talking about is a great new partnership.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the space program is not the first great step on the moon, but the demonstration that modern society requires a partnership of private and public sectors, a partnership of the university with the private economic community, and the government and all other segments of society.

And it requires new management methods. The space program was more than science and technology. It was a demonstration of the mobilization of resources and of commitment to a goal - and the willingness to pursue that goal relentlessly.

Ladies and gentlemen, while we cannot always translate the facts of science and technology into the social sciences, we can concentrate the commitment, the sense of decision, the mobilization of resources and the national goal. In these ways the space program showed us what we can do.

A nation that can achieve so much in less than a decade of space science and technology can surely put man on his feet right here on earth.

The 1960's showed us the possibilities.

The new federalism is not so much a delineation of power between national and state government as it is a pattern of cooperative partnership of all levels of government working in concert with private resources.

Our government was designed to maximize and mobilize the nation's resources for the achievement of national goals and the solution of increasingly complex problems.

We do not have unlimited resources. We need to define our goals, we need to determine our priorities.

We made a good start in the 1960's. I had a good deal of involvement in the new legislation of the sixties, legislation that for the first time carried broad statements of national purpose.

In a whole basketful of categories, the federal government made clear its determination to improve the conditions and opportunities of life for all the citizens in our society, for each of us is a citizen not only of the state or local community, but above all, of the United States of America and, as such, is entitled to every protection and every guarantee of the Constitution.

The emphasis of the sixties - an emphasis that will carry forward for the rest of this century - is upon that citizenship, that national citizenship, and the federal policy is to emphasize that United States citizenship.

In the 1960's Congress once and for all asserted the primacy of the national interest in a broad range of activities. There are obvious reasons for this dramatic change. We have become a mobile nation, we are on the move. State loyalties have diminished. Our ties are to country, to family and, often, to a corporation. Provincial local loyalties are vanishing. No longer do families remain in the towns of their forebears. No longer do children live in the cities where they were born or raised.

Migration to our cities - and particularly to the sea coasts and to the sunny states of Florida and California--are in large part the result of improved communication.

Rural families, once isolated from the general culture, were able to see New York and Chicago, New Orleans and Los Angeles close up on their television screen. These places looked good to many Americans, and many migrated before there were services to meet their needs. The poorly schooled boy from South Carolina began showing up as a welfare statistic in New York City.

Humphrey Remarks  
Add 5  
AU Information Services

The malnourished child from Appalachia showed up in a hospital in Detroit.

This mobility among our people made health and welfare, the physical environment, education and economic development matters of national, rather than just local, concern.

We were forced to recognize that no city can protect itself from pollution by itself.

We were forced to recognize the inability of minority groups to achieve first class citizenship without the help of all of us. There was clear need for a legal statement of national conscience and for federal enforcement of national standards.

Four major pieces of legislation in the 1960's revolutionized American politics and the social order, and we are yet to fully sense their impact.

The first is the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which for the first time put the full power of the Federal government on the side of the citizen. This could not eliminate prejudice - but it could - and did make the acts which flow from prejudice illegal. Our job for the future is to eliminate the residual prejudice that results from two centuries of depredation and segregation.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 - which uses the power of the federal government to protect the right of every citizen to vote - these will change the American political structure far beyond what we sense today.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 said that the government of the United States is going to wage war on man's most ancient enemy - poverty. And with the Economic Opportunity Act came the controversial Community Action Program.

Ladies and gentleman, the Community Action Program, the community council concept, is built on the premise that those who are to be affected by programs

Humphrey Remarks  
Add 6

should have something to say about them. Thus, the act called for maximum feasible participation by the poor.

There is always a gap between man's pronouncements and his performance, and we haven't achieved this yet. But we have set a pattern, and the avenues of participation have been opened.

The last Act I want to mention is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which, for the first time, permitted the federal government to pump billions of dollars into the needy educational system of this country.

Today we are looking not only at the financial needs of our educational system, but at the need for change in the methods and the technology of education.

These four legislative enactments represent a whole new dimension in the continuing revolution of American democracy. In this series of acts, the federal government identified national goals - and committed federal funds to achieve them.

The central premise of all these new "people programs" is that they are designed to meet local needs - but local needs that are in the national interests.

The government does more than pump in money. It also established the programs and the standards to achieve national policy.

But it is in the county courthouse, the city hall, and the state capital, that the success or failure of these programs will be determined.

You can't legislate good administration; and you can't legislate creative government. But you can provide the resources and the direction that make it possible.

We can maximize the programs of government as never before; and this requires coordination. With thousands of government units, with hundreds of federal grant programs, coordination is essential.

This is why I have proposed a Domestic Policy Council which would coordinate domestic programs just as the National Security Council coordinates issues of national security.

I also suggested that there be, at a regional level, a presidential ambassador who would be the President's personal representative to the multitude of federal agencies within that region - just exactly as an ambassador to a foreign country represents your nation in all of its aspects abroad.

We can't afford to isolate any level of government if we are to succeed in our great national undertakings. In our growing and demanding United States, we need the wisdom to create, to control, and to support a government that is sufficiently strong to achieve its objectives while protecting our liberties - a government that is sufficiently sensitive and concerned to meet the needs of all of our citizens.

I look to the decade of the seventies with optimism. For, just as war has its own built-in escalation, so does peace have a built in escalation, and the first priority of this nation must be the search - and the attainment - of peace.

Until we can achieve peace, many of our domestic priorities will be set aside.

There is good reason to hope that we can achieve peace in the early days of the seventies. But America must have a broader vision than that. If we got out of Viet Nam this afternoon, we would still face great problems.

Let us not use Viet Nam to escape from the realities of our time. We need to build in America an open society in which people of every race, creed, and color can move freely without prejudice and without discrimination. We need to cleanse ourselves of every vestige of racism.

We can't have two Americas.

The strength of this nation is not in its arms or in its industry, it is in its people. The wealth of this nation is not in its banks or its insurance companies, it is in its people. We must cherish and develop our human resources.

And we must conserve the physical resources not only of our nation, but of our world. When six percent of the people of the world - which we represent - consume forty percent of the produce of the world - which we do - six percent of the people consume forty percent of all that the world produces - then I think the rest of the world might consider us over indulgent.

If there is one focus for the seventies, it must be the protection of our physical environment.

The danger that faces us today comes right out of the exhaust pipe of our automobiles and our buses, out of the water that flows from industrial plants into the rivers, and out of the smoke stacks that spew poisonous gases into the once pure air.

If young America will become as excited about this kind of violence as it has been about violence abroad, maybe we can save ourselves.

So this is our legacy from the sixties, as we head optimistically into the seventies:

We have a Civil Rights Act - and if it isn't yet enough, it is at least the foundation for the future.

We have a Voting Rights Act--and three quarters of a million black citizens have become voters under this tough, effective legislation.

We have an Economic Opportunity Act - and Vista Volunteers, Job Corps graduates and Head Start youngsters are among the productive results of this creative legislation.

Ad 9

We have the Elementary and Secondary Education Act - and it offers tangible evidence of our national concern for excellent education.

These four laws have made a difference and they will continue to make a difference as they evolve and change with our changing national needs. They have become part of the fabric of our political life and will contribute measurably to our future.

But whatever we do, an open society is at the heart of an effort to insure justice and expand opportunities for our citizens.

And access to political power is at the heart of an open society.

Legislation is the result of political action and political action is inextricably tied to the election process.

Therefore-- if we are to have progressive legislation-- the first step is to open our political parties and broaden their base of participation.

These things will help achieve this end:

...a national registration act that will make access to the polling booth as simple as access to an income tax form.

...direct election of the President and Vice President so the populace will continue-- by accident or design-- be subverted or diverted.

...lowering the voting age to eighteen for national elections so the young men who are old enough to die for this country can have some voice in choosing the men who lead it.

...a better method of financing our election campaigns so that our political choices are not determined by the size of the candidate's pocketbook-- nor by the pocketbook of his backers.

more

AU Information Services  
Humphrey Remarks

10th and last ad

These four changes-- non-revolutionary in themselves-- can revolutionize our political process and guarantee that we can continue to be a nation that governs with the consent of the governed.

Cal PWS SP-

50 bill index  
with 50 mill revenue

Budgets

001466

Mr. Moore

wants so much  
applause when  
get my grades  
in contracts.

REMARKS

BY

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL

WASHINGTON, D. C.

FEBRUARY 20, 1970

↳ We are privileged as a people to have grown in the traditions of Anglo-Saxon law. We are privileged as a people to have had forebears who were unique and scholarly students of social structure. They were the scholars of Locke, and they were the scholars of Rousseau. They were the scholars of the Greeks and the Romans and the great philosophers of the Middle Ages.

↳ The authors of our Constitution wrote for all generations to come - and the key to the federal system in this country is that our Constitution is written in the present tense.

The preamble of the Constitution of the United States says "we the people of these United States do ordain and establish" -- at this hour, today, here in Washington, D. C. and in communities throughout the nation. It did not say "did ordain and establish" in Philadelphia.

↳ It is in the present tense, ↳ It is a contemporary document. It is a living instrument; and because it is that, it changes just like the human body and the human mind and the emotions of human beings, and all living organisms.

↳ The government of the United States draws its powers from that Constitution and the Constitution draws its powers from the people -- so that government must change and the social structure must change to keep pace with the changing needs of our people.

↳ And what we seek is change with order and order with change. It is a tremendous assignment. And it requires that we understand

the difference between dissent on the one hand and violence on the other; the difference between liberty and license; the difference between rights and privileges.

Now, we all know that in the early days of our country, communication didn't amount to much. And the government most responsive and responsible to the people was local government.

If I asked a student of mine at the University of Minnesota or Macalester College to write a paper on the government of the United States in the year 1825 and he spent over one paragraph on the national government in Washington, I would flunk him - because the government of the United States in 1825 was in the townships and the villages and the cities, in the county courthouses and in the statehouses of the nation.

But communication <sup>has</sup> changed ~~that in our country.~~ <sup>all of it.</sup> And communication brought us together as a people in a pluralistic society, a multi-racial

society, with common goals and purposes. It is not difficult to govern a homogeneous people, but remember that this is one of the few countries in the world with representative government - with free elections - that has a multi-racial base.

Our people are drawn from every area of the world. And the task of bringing about responsible, responsive, representative, broadly participating government in such a society is no small task - and there are no <sup>~ easy</sup> instant ways to achieve it.

We have had presidents who have been talking to us about these things. President Kennedy and President Johnson talked about what they called Creative Federalism. One of them called it the New Frontier, one of them called it the Great Society. President Nixon has talked about the New Federalism.

They are all saying that things have changed, that today federalism is not <sup>only a</sup> limitation on the powers of the federal government, but a positive assertion of the cooperative relationships between federal government, state governments, city, county, and other local government units; between universities and governments; between voluntary agencies, professional and trade associations, labor

associations, and the whole spectrum of the private sector.

~~How~~ Why do I give you that broad description? Because today there isn't a single problem that confronts this country that can be handled successfully by these governmental structures without cooperation from the others. No problem.

↳ Racism cannot be handled by the trade unions -- or by business, or the churches, or the universities, ~~alone~~. It requires both legal sanctions and a change of heart and attitude and perspective.

↳ The congestion of our cities, of our highways, of our traffic lanes, cannot be handled by any one level of government.

↳ So what we are talking about is a great new partnership.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the space program is not that first great step on the moon, but the demonstration that modern

society requires a partnership of private and public sectors, a partnership of the university with the private economic community, and the government and all other segments of society.

And it requires new management methods. The space program was more than science and technology. It was a demonstration of the mobilization of resources and of commitment to a goal - and the willingness to pursue that goal relentlessly.

Ladies and gentlemen, while we cannot always translate the facts of science and technology into the social sciences, we can concentrate the commitment, the sense of decision, the mobilization of resources and the national goal. In these ways the space program showed us what we can do.

A nation that can achieve so much in less than a decade of space science and technology can surely put man on his feet right here on earth.

The 1960's showed us the possibilities.

The new federalism is not so much a delineation of power between national and state government as it is a pattern of cooperative partnership of all levels of government working in concert with private resources.

Our government was designed to maximize and mobilize the nation's resources for the achievement of national goals and the solution of increasingly complex problems.

We do not have unlimited resources. We need to define our goals, we need to determine our priorities.

We made a good start in the 1960's. I had a good deal of involvement in the new legislation of the sixties, legislation that for the first time carried broad statements of national purpose.

In a whole basketful of categories, the federal government made clear its determination to improve the conditions and opportunities of life for all the citizens in our society, for each of us is a citizen not only of the state or local community, but above all, of the United States of America and, as such, is entitled to every protection and every guarantee of the Constitution.

The emphasis of the sixties - an emphasis that will carry forward for the rest of this century - is upon that citizenship, that national citizenship, and the federal policy is to emphasize that United States citizenship.

In the 1960's Congress once and for all asserted the primacy of the national interest in a broad range of activities. There are obvious reasons for this dramatic change. We have become a mobile nation, we are on the move. State loyalties have diminished. Our ties are to country, to family and, often, to a corporation. Provincial local loyalties are vanishing. No longer do families remain in the towns of their forebears. No longer do children live in the cities where they were born or raised.

Migration to our cities - and particularly to the sea coasts and to the sunny states of Florida and California -- are in large part the result of improved communication.

Rural families, once isolated from the general culture, were able to see New York and Chicago, New Orleans and Los Angeles close

up on their television screen. These places looked good to many Americans, and many migrated before there were services to meet their needs. The poorly schooled boy from South Carolina began showing up as a welfare statistic in New York City. The malnourished child from Appalachia showed up in a hospital in Detroit .

This mobility among our people made health and welfare, the physical environment , education and economic development matters of national, rather than just local, concern.

We were forced to recognize that no city can protect itself from pollution by itself.

We were forced to recognize the inability of minority groups to achieve first class citizenship without the help of all of us. There was clear need for a legal statement of national conscience and for federal enforcement of national standards.

Four major pieces of legislation in the 1960's revolutionized American politics and the social order, and we are yet to fully sense their impact.

The first is the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which for the first time put the full power of the Federal government on the side of the citizen. This could not eliminate prejudice - but it could -- and did - make the acts which flow from prejudice illegal. Our job for the future is to eliminate the residual prejudice that results from two centuries of depredation and segregation.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 - which uses the power of the federal government to protect the right of every citizen to vote - these will change the American political structure far beyond what we sense today.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 said that the government of the United States is going to wage war on man's most ancient enemy - poverty. And with the Economic Opportunity Act came the controversial Community Action Program.

Ladies and gentleman, the Community Action Program, the community council concept, is built on the premise that those who are to be affected by programs should have something to say about them. Thus, the act called for maximum feasible participation by the poor.

There is always a gap between man's pronouncements and his performance, and we haven't achieved this yet. But we have set a pattern, and the avenues of participation have been opened.

The last Act I want to mention is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which, for the first time, permitted the federal government to pump billions of dollars into the needy educational system of this country.

Today we are looking not only at the financial needs of our education system, but at the need for change in the methods and the technology of education.

These four legislative enactments represent a whole new dimension in the continuing revolution of American democracy. In this series of acts, the federal government identified national goals - and committed federal funds to achieve them.

The central premise of all these new "people programs" is that they are designed to meet local needs - but local needs that are in the national interest.

The government does more than pump in money. It also establishes the programs and the standards to achieve national policy.

But it is in the county courthouse, the city hall, and the state capital, that the success or failure of these programs will be determined.

You can't legislate good administration; and you can't legislate creative government. But you can provide the resources and the direction that make it possible.

We can maximize the programs of government as never before; and this requires coordination. With thousands of government units, with hundreds of federal grant programs, coordination is essential.

This is why I have proposed a Domestic Policy Council which would coordinate domestic programs just as the National Security Council coordinates issues of national security.

I also suggested that there be, at a regional level, a presidential ambassador who would be the President's personal representative to the multitude of federal agencies within that region - just exactly as an ambassador to a foreign country represents your nation in all of its aspects abroad.

↳ We can't afford to isolate any level of government if we are to succeed in our great national undertakings. ↳ In our growing and demanding United States, we need the wisdom to create, to control, and to support a government that is sufficiently strong to achieve its objectives while protecting our liberties - a government that is sufficiently sensitive and concerned to meet the needs of all of our citizens.

↳ I look to the decade of the seventies with optimism. For, just as war has its own built-in escalation, so does peace have a built in escalation, and the first priority of this nation must be the search -- and the attainment - of peace.

Until we can achieve peace, many of our domestic priorities will be set aside.

There is good reason to hope that we can achieve peace in the early days of the seventies. But America must have a broader vision than that. If we got out of Viet Nam this afternoon, we would still face great problems.

Let us not use Viet Nam to escape from the realities of our time. We need to build in America an open society in which people of every race, creed, and color can move freely without prejudice and without discrimination. We need to cleanse ourselves of every vestige of racism.

↳ We can't have two Americas.

↳ The strength of this nation is not in its arms or in its industry, it is in its people. The wealth of this nation is not in its banks or its insurance companies, it is in its people. ↳ We must cherish and develop our human resources.

↳ And we must conserve the physical resources not only of our nation, but of our world. ↳ When six percent of the people of the world - which we represent - consume forty percent of the produce of the world. which we do - six percent of the people consume forty percent of all that the world produces - then I think the rest of the world might consider us over indulgent.

↳ If there is one focus for the seventies, it must be the protection of our physical environment.

↳ The danger that faces us today comes right out of the exhaust pipe of our automobiles and our buses, out of the water that flows from industrial plants into the rivers, and out of the smoke stacks that spew poisonous gases into the once pure air.

↳ If young America will become as excited about this kind of violence as it has been about violence abroad, maybe we can save ourselves.

So this is our legacy from the sixties, as we head optimistically into the seventies:

We have a Civil Rights Act - and if it isn't yet enough, it is at least the foundation for the future.

We have a Voting Rights Act -- and three quarters of a million black citizens have become voters under this tough, effective legislation.

We have an Economic Opportunity Act - and Vista Volunteers, Job Corps graduates and Head Start youngsters are among the productive results of this creative legislation.

We have the Elementary and Secondary Education Act - and it offers tangible evidence of our national concern for excellent education.

↳ These four laws have made a difference and they will continue to make a difference as they evolve and change with our changing national needs. ↳ They have become part of the fabric of our political life and will contribute measurably to our future.

↳ But whatever we do, an open society is at the heart of any effort to ensure justice and expand opportunities.

↳ And access to political power is at the heart of an open society.

↳ Legislation is the result of political action and political action is inextricably tied to the election process.

- 17 -

Therefore -- if we are to have progressive legislation -- the first step is to open our political parties and broaden their base of participation.

These things will help achieve this end:

- ... A National Registration Act that will make access to the polling booth as simple as access to an income tax form.
- ... direct election of the President and Vice President so that the will of the people cannot -- by accident or design -- be subverted or diverted.
- ... lowering the voting age to 18 for national elections so the young men who are old enough to die for this country can have some voice in choosing the men who lead it.

- 18 -

... a better method of financing our election campaigns so that our political choices are not determined by the size of a candidate's pocketbook -- nor by the pocketbook of his backers.

These four changes - none revolutionary in themselves - can revolutionize our political process and guarantee that we continue to be a nation that governs with the consent of the governed.

# # # # #

Humphrey -2/20

Introduction by Dean Tenney - WCL

You will forgive our slight delay. President Williams, members of the faculty, our distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and dear friends. It is my distinct pleasure to be with you and to welcome you to the Ninth <sup>Edwin Mooers</sup> ~~Edmund A. Mors~~ lecture. This has developed into a distinguished lecture series over the years since we inaugurated it in 1961 with the late Dean Roscoe Pound. I think it would not be unfair to state that the <sup>Mooers</sup> ~~Mors~~ lecture is the intellectual highlight of the year in the traditional sense for our law school as it provides a platform for a distinguished person associated with the law to give his reflective view of an important concern to not only those in the law but society in general. And by subsequent publication, it allows us to ponder the projections which take place on these occasions. Now, it is not my function tonight to make a speech. I may have to do that later, but merely to welcome you and to thank you for coming and to introduce our lecturer. Before I do so, however, I would like to introduce our platform guest but before that I would like to say just a few words of tribute and affection for the gentlemen for whom this lecture is named. It is Dr. <sup>Edwin Mooers</sup> ~~Edmund A. Mors~~, Jr. There

is little I could add or would add or can add to what is not already said about Dr. <sup>Mooers</sup> ~~Mors~~. Ed is a very quiet and gentle scholar. He is probably and undoubtedly the most devoted teacher we've ever had. His teaching span has covered from 1918 to date and almost every living law graduate we have has set <sup>at</sup> ~~of~~ Ed's feet and listened to the parables of Marlene Dietrich or whomever her predecessor was back in the 1920's. He had and has <sup>the</sup> ~~a~~ respect and affection of all his graduates, including me. Now, our platform guest, tonight, I would like you to meet -- we have Dr. Williams, the president of the university -- Dr. Williams (applause). We have a Miss Judy <sup>Loeb</sup> ~~Lobe~~ who will make the presentation (applause). Judy. And we have Dr. <sup>Mooers</sup> ~~Mors~~ (applause). Before I introduce our speaker, I want to present Miss <sup>Loeb</sup> ~~Lobe~~ to you who represents the International Week at the American University who has a presentation to make to our speaker tonight. Judy:

Judy: Last year, the foreign students of the American University participated in the selection of the first recipient of the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Award for world understanding. This award was established in the late Senator's memory for a

variety of reasons. Robert Francis Kennedy was a man of many dreams. One of the greatest dreams that he had was that our generation would somehow, some way, find a means of bring<sup>g</sup><sub>^</sub>ing everlasting peace to this planet. He held high hopes for our generation. He realized that we would ultimately be responsible for our own destiny and the destiny of all future generations. When Robert Kennedy spoke, he spoke primarily to you, not just to the youth of America, but to the youth around the world. He not only affected them, but he was greatly affected by them. The crowds in Johannesburg, in Warsaw and in Washington, D. C. were primarily composed of young adults. He met every outstretched hand with a firm grip and a warm smile. His ideals and dreams were mighty and the world's youth sought to meet the challenge. Because his methods touched students around the world, the International Week committee in 1969 thought that it was appropriate that an award be established in his memory. This award is to be given annually to a living American citizen that the foreign students of this University feels most strongly exemplifies the ideals embodied in Robert Kennedy. The distinguished individual the foreign students selected to receive this award most certainly reveals many of Robert Kennedy's ideals. He was a man who for many years has fought for the

decency of mankind, who has tried to touch the young and the old, who has sought to make this a better world in which to live and whose hopes and dreams are an everlasting inspiration for our lives. In 1967 the recipient of tonight's award wrote to Petrie Kelley, a foreign student whose limitless energies went into the creation <sup>of International Week</sup> ~~internationally~~ the following message:

"The United States is proud to have present in our land so many students from so many foreign country<sup>ies</sup>. We do have so much to learn from them, just as we would like to do our utmost to help them achieve their highest ideals of study to serve their respective lands in the family of men. In turn, we would not only like to honor the foreign student body and the office of the foreign student advisor under Mr. Joseph Neal, but the man who, as us, has a desire to make gentle the life of this world. On behalf of the 1969 International Week committee and the foreign students of this University, it is my honor to present the first Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Award toward world understanding to the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey. (applause) In addition to the award I am presenting to Mr. Humphrey tonight, we will be placing a plaque in the lounge of the School of International Service which will hold the names of all the

future recipients of the award, including Mr. Humphrey. The plaque that will be placed in this lounge will read as follows, taken from a speech given by Robert Kennedy in 1966 in South Africa on the day of affirmation. It says:

All of us will ultimately be judged and as the years pass, we will surely judge ourselves on the effort we have contributed to building a new world society and the extent to which our ideals and goals have shaped that effort.

It is by these words that Mr. Humphrey has been, and will continue to be, tested, as will future recipients of this award, and this award which I present to you reads as follows: ~~As~~<sup>As</sup> <sup>Kennedy</sup> Senator said so many times in so many places:

Some men see things as they are and say why.  
I dream things that never were and say why not.

We give you this award and hope that it will continue to inspire and designate those men who along with you are searching for peace and understanding throughout this world.

MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you, Judy, thank you very, very much. (applause)

DEAN TENNESY<sup>R</sup>: The traditional <sup>Mooers</sup> ~~Mors~~ lectures<sup>F</sup> has been an eminent jurist <sup>or</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~scholaring~~ the law. We have long talked in the law school that the need for greater interdisciplinary

input into the law school. Tonight, we are taking a very major step in that direction as we have gone into another area of academe for our <sup>Moers</sup>~~Mors~~ lecture. We have invited a professor of political science and I think that we are quite fortunate that we have a professor, a full professor, from those great institutions of <sup>Macalester</sup>~~McAllister~~ College <sup>and</sup>~~in~~ the University of Minnesota to be with us tonight, and I hope that he has found university life to be serene and contemplative as compared with his former pursuits. Perhaps not former. I shouldn't be predictive. Seriously, I am sure Mr. Humphrey will forgive me, if no one else. Seriously, it is a great honor to introduce and a great personal privilege to me, to introduce a person who is really one, and I am a Republican, but one of the truly distinguished men of our time. He really is. Now, I don't need to detail the career, the details of his life. I couldn't try and I don't need to. It is truly an extraordinary career, so ladies and gentlemen, with the deepest of personal pleasure, let me introduce our <sup>Moers</sup>~~Mors~~ lecturer for tonight, Professor and the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey (applause).

MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you, Dean Tennery, for your gracious introduction. It is doubly meaningful to me since you have

confessed your political sin in this church. And President Williams, I recall the last time we were together, why the announcement was just being made of your presidency of this fine university and of course, I am highly honored to be in the presence of a real professor, a professor for all seasons and all men, Dr. <sup>Moers</sup> ~~Mors~~, the Mr. Chips I would imagine of American University and then some. I should add, though, that as you were applauding Dr. <sup>Moers</sup> ~~Mors~~, he leaned over to say to me, "There won't be so much applause when they get their grades on that contracts course." Well, I see that there are a few of you that are taking that course and I am glad that you have smiled and laughed again -- it may help a bit. To Judy <sup>Loeb</sup> ~~Lobe~~, I want to express a very personal thanks for the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Award. This is a high honor, one that I cherish, and one that I hope that I may in due time fully merit, and you have made my night a pleasant one and a happy one by the presentation, and I wish to thank all of those who had any part in it and particularly a young on this campus, Miss Kelley, who I know is away because of the death of her sister. It is good to come back to American University. We have some special connections here. I have a son, my first son, that is a graduate of this university and I was privileged to give the Commencement <sup>a</sup> Address

but like most Commencement <sup>a</sup>Addresses, nobody remembers what you said or that you gave it, so I thought I would remind you that I did do it. Tonight, I have an equally or even a higher assignment and that is to deliver the <sup>Edwin Mooers</sup>~~Edmund Mors~~ lecture and when I saw who were my predecessors, I began to wonder if they had a little trouble finding a speaker this year, but I appreciate the opportunity that is mine. As has been indicated, I am not a lawyer. I think I would have liked to have been but my education wasn't a well-planned one, so since I couldn't be a lawyer, which is a profession which seeks to bring some order out of legal confusion, let me say that I was one of the confusers. I have been a legislator and am now a teacher of political science. I think I should correct the record. This was not my highest ambition, but it's a good second best. I can recall travelling around the nation during the years that I served as Vice President, when I would go to a college campus, I would try to ingratiate myself with the student body and the faculty and the administration by saying that I am a refugee from a classroom and I would chuckle a little bit like it was supposed to be a joke and then I would look around to see if I could find the Dean of faculty or the President of the University, if any of them were within earshot, and sometimes they were

outside taking care of other matters at the time, but I would look around and if they were around, I would say that I want you to know that in case things should go wrong in the political processes of this great democracy, that my teaching credentials are in good order and I want you to keep me in mind, then I would laugh again at my own joke. I never knew that I was so persuasive. I convinced a substantial body of the American public that that's exactly where I belonged, so I've accepted the verdict, not without protest, not happily, but I've accepted it and here I am tonight, and I am really quite happy that I am here and I hope that I might have something that is of some interest to you.

I come, as I say, as a former legislator, as one deeply interested in the political processes of our country and I want to talk a little bit about the political processes as I see it and some of the developments that have taken place and particularly some of the legislation that I believe has or will have a great impact upon the social and political structure of this country -- an impact yet to be fully understood or even to be fully a part of our present political structure. We are privileged as a people to have grown in the traditions of Anglo-Saxon law and I hope that we will always have deep respect

for those traditions. We are privileged as a people to have had forebear<sup>s</sup>~~ers~~ who were unique and scholarly students of social structure. I guess that maybe one of the reasons they were such good students was that they didn't have to be in such a hurry. When you came for a visit with Thomas Jefferson, you spent two or three days, not two to three minutes and you were not constantly interrupted either by telephone or television or even somebody dropping by. The time for thought, for dialogue, for discussion, which is so vital to a society that is supposed to be based on reason. I am afraid that one of our weaknesses today is that while the time is here, we are not selective in its use and we seem to be constantly a step behind reality. Now, these men that I speak of, those that we look back to and I would in a sense say even now look up to, were the scholars of Locke. Yes, they were the scholars of English, French, political philosophers, men like <sup>Rousseau</sup>~~Russe~~. They were the scholars of the Greeks and the Romans and the great philosophers of the Middle Ages. As a professor of government, I try to encourage my students to become involved in the writings of the great prophets and the great philosophers and the great students of government and law of centuries gone by. I believe that one of the weaknesses today in education is the overemphasis upon

current events without the perspective that comes from the knowledge of history. It has been said that those who failed to study history have to live through the pain of ~~the~~ living the history and I've hoped that we are good students of it. Now, the authors of our Constitution wrote for all generations -- all generations to come and the key to the Federal system and that's about what I wish to discuss with you this evening, is that our Constitution is written in the present tense. I recall as a young student, as an earlier, one of these poorly paid, overworked assistants or assistant instructors, reading McBain's broken title, "The Living Constitution." I have never forgotten it and indeed, the Constitution is a living document, not a historical document. The Preamble of the Constitution of the United States says "We the people of these United States do ordain and establish" not "did" -- do at this hour, today, tonight, in this city, here in Washington, D. C. and communities throughout the nation. It did not say, as I said, "did ordain and establish" in Philadelphia. It's a living instrument, pulsating with life. It's in the present tense, it is a contemporary document and it is a living instrument because it changes just like the human body and the human mind and the emotions of human beings and all living organisms. This is why I happen to

believe that those who were appointed to the Courts of our land must be in tune with the fact that the life of the nation, not its history alone, but its purpose and its future. Now, the government of the United States draws its powers, as we have been taught, from that Constitution and that Constitution draws its powers from the people, so that government must change and social structure must change to keep pace with the changing needs of our people and what we seek, if we can have it as we wish it, is change with order and order with change and possibly representative government can come somewhere near meeting that rather high standard. At least we should hope so. It's a tremendous assignment and it requires that we understand the difference between dissent on the one hand, and violence on the other, the difference between liberty and license and the difference between rights and privileges. Now, surely, the students of the law should be the first to help define those differences. I digress for a moment to say that I can think of no time in at least recent history, in the last 100 years, when lawyers and students of the law had a greater responsibility to once again make the law both responsible and responsive and just and also to engender respect for the processes of law, for judicial processes and legislative processes. I think it is so important that the lay

public be brought to understand what we mean by due process of law, what we mean by Anglo-Saxon traditions and even if I may say, if it's not too dangerous, what we mean by being innocent until proven guilty. These are desperately needed today. These new definitions are old definitions restated. Now, we all know that in the early days of our country, communication was primitive or to put it frankly, didn't amount to much and the government most responsible and responsive to the people was local government. Therefore, the emphasis of our early great Americans upon keeping government close to the people. If I were to ask a student of mine at McAllister College or at the University of Minnesota to write a paper on the government of the United States in the year 1825 and he spent over one paragraph writing about Washington, D. C. and the nation's capital, I'm afraid that I would be compelled to fail him, or as we put it, to flunk him. Because the government of the United States in 1825 was not really in Washington, D. C. There was some government here, but it was in the townships and the villages and the counties, and yes in the cities and even in the States of the nation. It was the sum total of those local units that made for the government. But communication has changed that and communication has brought us together as a people in an

integrated and pluralistic society -- a multi-racial society I might add too, with what we hope are common goals and purposes. Now, some people have said that it is not too difficult to govern a homogenous people. I recall a recent visit to Japan and I was talking with some of their members of their intellectual and academic communities and we were visiting about the differences in our respective societies. And one point that they made to me was that, with a homogenous people, it is a bit easier to be able to rally a people, to find common purpose, but I must say that it is not easy nor is it less than difficult to govern a multi-racial people, a people of many races and many attitudes, and we are one of the few countries in the world with representative government, with free elections that has built or that has a multi-racial base. Now, our people are drawn in other words, from every area of the world and the task of bringing about responsible, responsive and representative broadly participating government in such a society is no small task and I must say that I see no instant ways to achieve it. The task, the challenge, is to constantly move along the path of making the government more responsive and more representative. Now, we've had Presidents who have been talking to us about these things over the many years and I believe that the

first duty of a President is to talk with the people, to establish a rapport with the citizens, to have as Teddy Roosevelt put it, the White House to become a bully pulpit or as Woodrow Wilson would have had it, the world's classroom. I think that is the beginning of popular government, the real meaning of it.

President Kennedy and President Johnson talked about what they called Creative Federalism. One of them called it "the new frontier." One other called it "the great society." President Nixon has talked about the new federalism, but they are all talking about the same thing. They are all saying that things have changed and that today federalism is not only a limitation on the powers of the central government, but a positive assertion of the cooperative relationship between Federal Government, state governments, city, county and other local government units and in this day and age significantly between universities and governments, between voluntary agencies and governments, between professional and trade associations, labor and industrial associations and the whole spectrum of the private sector, all involved in what we might call "a new federalism." Now, why do I give this broad description, because today there isn't a single problem that confronts this nation that can be handled successfully by any one of the governmental structures without

the cooperation of the others. No problem of any significance. Surely racism, which is a prevalent virus in the American body politic, cannot be handled alone by trade unions or by business, or by churches or by universities, even though each of them has a special responsibility to do its part. The fact is that to meet this crisis or this difficulty, requires both legal sanctions on the part of government and a change of heart and attitude and perspective on the part of society. The congestion of our cities, of our highways, of our traffic lanes cannot be handled by any one level of government anymore. So what we are talking about is a great new social partnership, a partnership between the elements of our society and the private sector and the public authority. Perhaps the greatest contribution of the space program is not that first great step of man on the moon, but the demonstration that modern society requires a partnership of private and public sectors, a partnership of the university with the private economic community and government and all other segments of society and it requires also new management methods. The space program was much more than science and technology. I served as chairman of the Space <sup>Council</sup> ~~Consul~~ and I learned a great deal about government organization, about management, from that privilege or that vantage point of chairmanship of the Space

Council

Consul. It was, in other words, the space program was a demonstration of the mobilization of resources and of commitment to a goal and a management structure capable of mobilizing the resources and fulfilling the goal, a willingness on the part of a government and a society to pursue that goal relentlessly. Now, ladies and gentlemen, while we cannot always translate the fields of science and technology and the social sciences, and therefore, analogies are sometimes anything but accurate, we can however concentrate the commitment, the sense of decision, the mobilization of resources and the national goal. In these ways, the space program showed us what we can do. It demonstrated that if we had the will and were willing to apply our will to the resources and the technology that was available and were willing to make the commitment, that we could not only put a man on the moon and take that first step, form that great first step and that great stride for mankind, but we could put a man on his feet right here on earth. Now, a nation that can achieve so much in less than a decade of space science and technology can surely do a whole lot more about our problems in this, our own satellite called earth. The 1960's, full and disorder and dissent, disarray, was also a decade of development and of discovery. Discovery of what we could do, discovery of the

problems of our society, even a discovery of the fact that we were an urbanized nation, discovery of poverty in the midst of affluence, discovery of illiteracy, vast amounts of it in the midst of a great educational structure, discovery of hunger in the midst of plenty and most of all a discovery of ourselves, what we are, what we can be, what we have been, and it's to this discovery that the new federalism must direct its attention, the discovery to make the decisions in this period of the seventies that are required to remedy some of the inadequacies of the sixties. So I looked at this new federalism, not so much as a delineation of power between national and state governments, as it is a pattern of cooperative relationships, partnerships of all levels of government, working in concert with private resources and I am sure that we haven't yet worked out all the technique and this is why we need today innovators in government. We simply must be thinking about new governmental structures, new ways to utilize the great resources that are available to meet the problems that are here and yet to come, the old federal system with its limitations, with its basic negative attitude, is not adequate for the times of today and tomorrow. Our government was designed to maximize and mobilize the nation's resources. That's why we speak to promote the general welfare, to provide

for the common defense, to ensure justice. These things cannot be done with half-hearted methods or half-hearted commitments. We do not have, of course, unlimited resources. We need to define our goals and we need to determine our priorities. I said we made a good start in the sixties and I had a good deal of involvement in the new legislation of the sixties, legislation that for the first time carried broad statements of national purpose. In a whole basketful of categories the Federal Government made clear its determination to improve the conditions and the opportunities of life for all of the citizens in our country, for each of us as a citizen, not only of his state, or his local community, but above all of the United States of America and as such, is entitled to every protection and every guarantee of the Constitution. The emphasis of the sixties and emphasis that will carry forward for the rest of this century, is upon that national citizenship and the Federal policy is designed to emphasize that United States citizenship. In the 1960's, Congress once and for all asserted the primacy of the national interest in a broad range of activities, and this comes now into the whole interpretation of law and indeed in the design of new law. There are obvious reasons for the dramatic change. We have become a mobile nation, on the move, state loyalties

have really diminished, our ties are to the country, the nation, to a family and even often to a corporation. Provincial local loyalties are vanishing. No longer do families remain in the towns of their forebearers. No longer do children live in the cities where they were born or raised. When we find, for example, that in the last election 47 million eligible voters did not vote and of that number about 40% did not vote because they could not vote, because of state registration laws that were out of date, that no longer had any relationship to a mobile, to a fluid moving in society in which there was a great transfer of people, a constant migration. Migration to our cities and particularly to the sea coasts and to the sunny states of Florida and California are in large part a result of improved communication. Rural families, once isolated from the general culture, were able to see New York and Chicago, New Orleans and Los Angeles, close up on their television screen. These places looked good to many Americans, particularly when the local Chamber of Commerce had a chance to get the best shots of the local countryside, and many of the people migrated to these areas particularly of our great cities before there were services to meet their needs. The poorly school<sup>ed</sup> boy from South Carolina began to show up as a welfare statistic in New York

City. The malnourished child from Appalachia showed up in a hospital in Detroit. This mobility among our people made health and welfare the physical environment, education and economic development, matters of national priority, not just local concern and laws were designed to meet the reality of the times. We were forced to recognize that no city can protect itself from pollution by itself. We have been forced to recognize the inability of minority groups to achieve first class citizenship without the help of all of us. There was a clear need for a local or for a legal statement of national conscience and for federal enforcement of national standards, and may I say that need still exists in 1970, particularly as it relates to the rights of our people, and particularly as it relates to the decisions of the Supreme Court in the field of one America, not two, of an integrated society. This is no time to retreat. At least at a minimum, we should hold the ground that we have gained and hopefully with proper leadership, move to higher ground.

Now, four major pieces of legislation in the 1960's revolutionized American politics and the social order and we are yet to fully sense their impact. Now, I say revolutionized, because it is an unfinished revolution as the American revolution

is itself, it's a continuing one. But I venture to say that most people as yet, particularly in our elementary and secondary schools and even in our institutions of higher learning, have not yet fully comprehended what was involved in some basic legislative enactments, simply because much of what those legislative enactments was directed towards, has not been realized, but the law is there and forces have been set in motion which are changing this society and will change it far beyond anything that we have witnessed thus far. The first was the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which gave real meaning to the Emancipation Proclamation and to the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. This Act, which for the first time, put the full power of the Federal Government on the side of the citizen, at least it was supposed to, unless we dilute it, weaken it by lack of use, lack of enforcement or by specific amendments. This could not, of course, by a legislative enactment, eliminate prejudice which is an attitude of mind. But it could and it did make the acts which flow from prejudice illegal. Our job for the future is to eliminate the residual prejudice that results from two centuries of deprivation and segregation and let me take a moment here in this great church to say that there is no greater assignment to the American people than to eliminate every

trace of prejudice and racism that may be found in any part of our body politic or in our psychic make-up. We need to remember that there are many people in this land who have been the victims a long, long time, yes, two centuries or more, of anything but decent treatment, the victims of oppression and unequal treatment and a form of social and psychological oppression that has left a deep imprint upon their lives and indeed their behavioral patterns. Therefore, it is imperative that we not only have forbearance in judging those who now feel a new sense of freedom, but also that we recognize that we must walk the extra mile with them. I even go so far to say that it is not just enough to tell a man that he no longer needs to sit in the back of the bus. You must be willing to even help him come to the front of the bus and even if he is untrained to let him drive it. Everybody is entitled to make mistakes in freedom and particularly when they have long been denied the opportunity to do anything on their own. That's what the Civil Rights Act is all about.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, known as the war on poverty said that the Government of the United States is going to wage war on man's most ancient enemy, poverty and with that Economic Opportunity Act, tame the highly controversial

Community Action Program. The maximum, feasible participation of the poor. In other words, a new form of representative government for expanding the meaning of representation.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the Community Action Program, the community consul concept, is built on the premise that those who are to be affected by programs should have something to say about them. In other words, fraternalism is to give way to representation. Thus, the Act called for maximum, feasible participation by the poor. And it means trial and error. It may result in mistakes, even malfeasance, but I submit that people do not learn instantly or even quickly. They are entitled to what the rest of us have had, to learn from trial and error, the pragmatic approach. There is always a gap between man's pronouncement and his performance and I know that we haven't achieved the goals of this Act, but we have set a pattern and the avenues of participation have been opened legally and it is important that that ground be held.

The last Act I want to mention or one other Act I should say that I would like to mention is the Voting Rights Act, which again protected and extended the protection of the Federal Government to the citizens of the United States, to remove the impediment from their right to exercise their franchise. And

the Voting Rights Act is another one of the great revolutionary legislative enactments that is directed towards broader participation by people, all people, in both public and private affairs. The last Act I mentioned is the Elementary<sup>and</sup>/Secondary Education Act, which for the first time, permitted the Federal Government to pump billions of dollars into the needy educational system of this country and make no mistake about it, it needed it. The property tax base for public education has been very heavily loaded with very high rates of taxation until the rate of property tax has become almost confiscatory in some areas. If there is to be the funding of education, that I think modern education requires, it will have to come in a large ~~major~~<sup>nature measure</sup> from Federal assistance or in a substantial ~~major~~<sup>nature measure</sup> and by the way, it ought to come on the central principal and the only justifiable principal of taxation on the ability to pay and I am hopeful that the Congress once having made this breakthrough, getting rid of the arguments of church and state and of race, which for years kept back any possible action for Federal aid to education or assistance to education that we will now hold the ground that we've made and proceed to higher ground. Well, today, we are looking not only at the financial needs of our educational system, but I suggest that we also need to look at

the change in methods, the need for change in methods and in the technology of education. In fact, we need a great deal of research in the great learning process itself and very little of it is being done. A 50 billion dollar industry with a 50 million research program, that's education in America. No private enterprise could survive one year on that. Is it any wonder that public education is in trouble? Because we have refused over the long term of time to carefully examine both technology and methods of education and we have been blind to many of the requirements of understanding the learning process itself. Much more must be done. Now these legislative enactments that I have spoken of, and there are many more, represent a whole new dimension in the continuing revolution of the American democracy. In this series of Acts, the Federal Government identified national goals and committed Federal funds to achieve them and that's why when I hear people say that they may be bad programs, I have serious worry and concern. Because it has taken a long time for America to come this far and in the name of dollars or even inflation, I do not wish to stand idly by nor shall I, and see these basic programs of social progress and development either corrupted by amendment that weakens them or ~~stifled~~ and stymied by the lack of appropriation

that could effectuate them. I must say that I think it's time that young Americans realize that we are talking about your lives and your future. Everyone of these Acts is anywhere from 25 to a 100 years late in its fulfillment or its accomplishment. We have no time to tarry, no time to rest. I am not opposed to lowering your voices, but hurry up on the job that you are supposed to do. If you can do it less noisily, fine. But don't let lowering your voices lower your determination to get something done, or to gain higher ground. Now, the central premise of all of these new people programs is that their designed to meet human needs at the point where human needs are to be found with the individual in the locality, but they are human needs and local needs that are in the national interest. When you speak of the people, you speak of a citizen and when you speak of the nation, you speak of its parts. It isn't good enough to merely articulate the hopes and dreams of a nation, you have to addup the sum total of the parts to see whether or not those hopes and dreams are being realized. Now the Government under these programs does much more than pump in money. It also establishes the programs and the standards to achieve national policy, but it is in the county courthouse, even in the city hall and the State Capitol that the success or the failure of

the programs that I have just mentioned will be determined, as well as in the Congress. I know that you can't legislate good administration and you can't legislate creative government, but you can provide the resources in the direction that makes this possible. We can maximize the programs of government as never before and this requires commitment and coordination with thousands of government units and hundreds of Federal grant programs. Coordination is not only essential, it is the difference between success and failure. This is why I once proposed what we call a domestic policy <sup>council</sup> ~~consult~~, which would coordinate domestic programs at the Federal level just as the National Security Council seeks to coordinate and advise the President on matters of national security. I have also suggested that there be a regional level in this vast land of ours as a way of strengthening and activating the Federal system, a presidential ambassador, who would be the President's personal representative to the multitude of Federal agencies within that region, speaking with the voice of the President, as the extension of the power of the President to coordinate the programs of the Federal establishment just exactly as an ambassador assigned to a foreign land is responsible for the coordination of every United States activity in that land from the military

assistance, to the foreign aid, to the cultural program, to the commercial attache or the agriculturalattache and etc. The ambassador is in charge. One can ask who is in charge throughout the regions of America and the answer is no one and therefore we rely upon what we call hopefully some kind of Federal understanding amongst the respective officers that things will be done. Now we can't afford to isolate any level of government, if we are to succeed in our great national undertaking. In our growing, demanding United States, we need the wisdom to create, to control and to support a government that is sufficiently strong to achieve its objectives while protecting our liberties, a government that is sufficiently sensitive and concerned to meet the needs of all of our citizens. So I look to the decade of the seventies with a degree of optimism, not foolish optimism, recognizing that we will be tested and challenged all along the way. For just as war has its own built-in escalation, so does peace and the pursuit of it have its built-in escalation and the first priority of this nation, of course, surely in this decade and in any decade, must be the search and the attainment of peace. Until we can achieve peace, many of our domestic priorities will either have to be set aside or at least the resources for them are diminished. Now there is good reason to

hope and not only should we hope, but we must insist upon it, that we can achieve peace in the early days of the seventies. But America must have a broader vision than just that -- important as that is -- because even if we got out of Vietnam tonight, we would still face grave, almost overwhelming, national problems and I am not at all sure that if we got out that the temper of the country is such today that we would dedicate the resources to domestic priorities. I served in the Congress after Korea and not a dollar went to our cities. The war was over, the military budget was cut and education was starved and the cities were ignored, the poor were forgotten and the taxes were reduced and we suffered three recessions in eight years. That is not partisan talk, it is a political economic fact. So that when I hear people say if we could only get it over with, then we can do things. Yes, my friends, if we can reduce our military commitments, save our resources for other things and then have the will to use them, we can do great things. But what America lacks today is not money. America doesn't lack resources or science or technology, it surely doesn't lack gadgetry, it lacks will and that will must be mobilized, energized. It is a sleeping giant to be aroused and there can be no uncertain bugle. The call must be clear. So let us not use Vietnam or the Middle

East or the arms race as an escape from the realities of our time. The first thing we need in this nation is to build an open society in which people of every race, creed or color can move freely without prejudice and without discrimination. Somewhere it ought to be carved in marble in every place we can put it - what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said about his dream - that his children would be judged not by their color ~~nor~~ their race, but would be judged by the content of their character.

Now that is ~~the~~ only standard worthy of acceptance -- to be judged by the content of one's character, accepted on that basis. We need to cleanse ourselves, literally be born anew, cleanse ourselves of every <sup>vestige</sup> ~~vestigage~~ of racism, because that's the war that is going on in our spiritual makeup and it's more deadly than the rice paddies of Southeast Asia, or at least be free is the vision of this Nation.

2 .  
The strength of this nation is not in its arms, its industry -- it is in its people -- all of its people. The wealth of this nation is not in its banks or in its insurance companies -- it is in its people, who feel that they are a part of - an integral part of a great social structure, a society, people who can be ~~em~~ancipated in a sense from their fears and their doubts and their suspicions, through the

blessing of education--people who will be judged by the content of their character. We must cherish this, and develop our human resources because they are the most priceless of all, and needless to say, we must conserve the physical resources not only of our body, but physical health, but of the physical resources of our nation and of our world. When 6% of the people of the world which we represent consume 40% of the produce of the world -- which we do -- then I think the rest of the world might consider us a bit over-indulgent. If there is one focus for the 70s it must be the protection of our physical environment. This focus plus the focus of our oneness of people - this oneness of the human being. The danger that faces us today comes from the right - comes right out of the exhaust pipe of our automobiles and our buses. We know it, but we just haven't done much about it. I recall that we started to pass legislation about this in 1965, but like a lot of other things, we've done nothing about it. I hear people today concerned about <sup>S</sup> <sub>^</sub> busing - and they forget we had a Supreme Court decision that said that segregated schools were unconstitutional and illegal sixteen years ago and some of the loudest voices in this land today - with some modicum of success - in the legislative halls, were some of the very voices that preached

massive resistance - now they preach - don't go - don't do  
- stop progress. Well, they can't win and even the delay will  
be very costly but to get back we've been knowing for a long  
time and the automobile industry has been told for a long,  
long time that something had to be done - about the bases, <sup>2</sup>  
and the fumes, the emissions from the combustible engine,  
and for years we've been hearing all kinds of excuses until  
we start now to suffocate. I think it is time for American  
industry to not only declare dividends for its stockholders  
but social dividends for the nation, and we need a great  
American coalition for a clean environment. We've had  
urban coalitions now to try to mobilize the resources of  
this land, to deal with some of the problems of the human  
problems and physical problems of our cities. Now I want  
to see a great coalition of public and ~~the~~

~~(end of tape)~~

~~(Tape #2)~~

~~and~~ put an end to violence to our physical environment.  
As it has about violence abroad, we may be able to save  
ourselves.

You know, when I was a young man I worried about smoke  
coming of a smoke stack because my generation was primarily  
concerned about jobs. I hope you understand, my younger friends,

we had no jobs. The nation was prostrate, and it was jobs, business, industry -- just jobs -- and if it meant smoke, a smoke stack that belched forth its fumes it was a symbol of a nation on the move -- jobs. Many young men today have never known what it is to look for a job, and not be able to find one. That was my experience at the University of Minnesota and I might say, there were no Federal scholarships, no loans, no nothing. So I think that my generation overdid it, in the sense that if we could just get jobs, build an economy, just make sure that nothing was ever done again to make a depression, never be again for the banks to close, never again millions of people without work -- jobs -- and we forgot that in producing this economic miracle of a hotly productive economy that you might also be producing a monster in terms of environmental pollution, of water, of air, and of land.

Now it is for the coming generation and the generation now in teens and coming into its maturity to see to it that not only that those factories produce but that the smoke which deadened the countryside be somehow harnessed for good, be cleansed. And it can be done. We do not need to act in recrimination against the yesterdays, we need to build on the yesterdays, cast aside that which no longer is useful and

much of which is detrimental - and build, not to destroy, but to build.

So this is the legacy, it seems to me, that we have, as we head now into the 70s. We have a Civil Rights Act and if that isn't yet enough, it at least is the foundation for the future. Build on it. Don't let them put it down, by inaction, or by distortion or by lack of resources. And I would be less than honest with this audience and with myself if I didn't say that I see the signs of the times. This is not the time to <sup>t</sup>urn back from the goal of an open society. And it is not good enough to merely say you are for it, we shall be judged by our deeds. We do not need public relations - we need public policy and performance - public relations can help, but it is fulfillment, commitment, doing the job. We have an Economic Opportunity Act - yes, we have VISTA Volunteers and Job Corps graduates and Head Start youngsters - they are among the productive results of this creative legislation. Surely we haven't done well enough - surely there have been many mistakes but the greatest mistake would be to retreat -- to give up. Any nation that can fight a war for ten years - and we will be going into the 10th year of our direct military involvement in Southeast Asia - surely shouldn't give up after four years of the War on Poverty, particularly when

I think of what a small downpayment we are making.

We have an Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Higher Education Act, and a Vocational Education Act. And <sup>h</sup> these pieces of legislation offer tangible evidence of our national concern for excellent education, but I would be ~~be~~ less than honest with this audience if I didn't say that pumping money into education is not inflationary - it is - beyond anything else - a contribution to the productivity of the land, if you want to talk about it in economic terms. But most of all, it is just honoring the concept of human dignity. There is very little dignity in ignorance, and there is very little dignity <sup>and</sup> ~~in~~ self-respect <sup>in</sup> ~~and~~ illiteracy. And surely this nation has no right to cure the ills of in-~~in~~flation by penalizing the poor and taking it out on the sick and the needy and the children of the land. There are other ways - other ways, and I weary of those who pontificate from high places in government and in industry who profit well as they tell us about the curse of inflation and say that it is to be cured by people losing their jobs - unemployment, or by children having less education than they justly need or deserve, or by the afflicted having the resources directed toward their needs to give them at least a chance. There must be a better way, and what is a university for except to find a

better way? I want the conscience of young America to be stirred not only on one or two things, but above all to be stirred about what happens to our people because it is the people for which all institutions should be designed.

Now these laws that I have spoken of including, of course, the Voting Rights Act, which by itself today stands in jeopardy, have made a difference and that is what is important. Democracy is not so much the endings as the beginnings - these laws have made a difference as they evolve in change with our changing national needs. These legislative enactments - a part of the legislative process, from the mind of the lawyer and the legislator and the socially concerned citizen. These laws are designed primarily to broaden the opportunities of people - to open the society - at least by public policy and public act, to strike down barriers to human fulfillment. They become a part of the fabric of our political life and will contribute, I think, measurably to our future. But whatever we do - an open society is at the heart of any effort to insure justice and expand opportunities, and access to political power is at the heart of an open society. Legislation is the result of political action, and political action is inextricably tied to the election or the political process. Therefore, if we are to have

progressive, forward looking legislation, if we are to have government that is responsible and responsive, the first step is to open up the political process and particularly our political parties to broaden their base of participation. Efforts<sup>s</sup> are underway to do that, but more is needed. Somethings I think will help to speed this end. For example, a national registration act that will make access to the polling booth as simple as access to an income tax form. Federal Government doesn't ask you to come down and ask for the income tax form. I saw in the State of Minnesota the other day where they said they mailed out 1½ million state income tax forms. The same state that can mail out tax form and collect the taxes can also register the voters. No taxation without representation! And I submit the taxpayers ought to insist that it is as easy to register as it is for the government to get you on the tax rolls, and make no mistake about it, there isn't a county government in the United States that doesn't know how to register you for tax purposes.

Secondly, we need to direct election of the President and the Vice President of the United States. For those who wish to abolish the college, I give you one -- the Electoral College -- I don't even ask for its reform. This way the will of the people can be measured, not by accident, but by direct

ballot.

A third reform that is necessary in the political process is the lowering of the voting age. Some of us have thought this a long, long time. I recall that one of my first acts as a United States Senator in 1951 was to introduce a Constitutional Amendment to lower the voting age in the National Elections to the age of 18. I want to say to my lawyer friends, at that time the Bar Association was not friendly to the suggestion of either that or the direct election of the President, which I also ventured to offer as an amendment. I am happy to note that the American Bar Association now feels that the direct election of the President and the Vice President has great merit and I am so pleased to see that we get change with order and order with change. It is much needed. I won't just say that those who are called upon to die should also have the right to vote - I'll simply say that when decisions are made affecting one's life that can result in life or death, that you ought to have the right to participate in that process. <sup>A</sup> And surely we need a much better method of financing political campaigns.

I can speak with some feeling about this. But let me say to the young men of America - young men and women who are very discouraged with political parties and politics, and I note

the polls that are taken about college students - it is very discouraging, I might say, to the political process - they don't want to belong to political parties. They are very much upset about political - about politics and politicians. Well, I have a few comments that I'd like to offer to you - I have done this before.

For these people who like to sit up in the bleachers and talk about the people that are down in the field, I don't have much time for them. If you really want to know how to fix up the political process, get down in the arena and bat it around a bit. Get a few scars on you. Everybody is a brilliant Monday morning quarterback - get down and have to pay the game - get messed up a bit, and above all, if you think politics is corrupt and dirty, get yourself of political Ivory soap and dash in and clean it up. Don't give me those commercials, sitting way off on the sidelines.

One of the sources of political difficulty in this country and political corruption is political financing, and it is the bed of infection and it takes more than Band-aid to control it or to correct it. We've simply got to come to some better way of financing political parties than the large contributor and maybe we ought to be looking upon the political process in a democracy as important as any other

aspect of life. We are permitted to have charitable deductions for almost anything you can think of - from the well being of the hummingbird to the preservation of the last vestiges of the dinosaur if you put it into a philanthropic enterprise, you can deduct for it. I think there ought to be some way for tax credits, deductions and if need be, some public financing for political parties, so that political choices are not determined by the size of the candidate's pocketbook or the number of his large contributors, and then we can add on just ~~for~~ extras that since the medium of electronics, radio and television are publicly licensed, that I think it is fair to say that in the public interest a certain block of time as a part payment for a license for which they now pay nothing, except lawyer's fees, and I say this to law school graduates, that they will be required to set aside a certain amount of time for each political party, minority parties as well as the so-called majority parties, so that there can be at least some fair presentation in terms of time to the American public.

I have no particular formula but I'm sure that this is something that can be worked out.

Now these changes - none revolutionary in themselves - I think can help revitalize our political process and guarantee

that we continue to be a nation that governs with the consent of the government and to make the social contract really binding.

Now these are some of the thoughts that I want to bring you tonight - thoughts about the domestic scene, because I must say that unless we can do something to promote peace within our midst - and I mean by peace more than the absence of violence - a harmonious relationship amongst ~~our~~ <sup>our</sup> peoples with mutual trust. Unless we can do this at home I don't think we are in much of a position to be an apostle of peace abroad -- peace is a commodity which must first - or is something which must first come in ones self and if it isn't there, it is apt not to be with your neighbor. And then, too, we need to understand the total interdependency or interrelationship between what we do at home and what we seek to do abroad. If a man is as he thinketh, then a nation is as it lives.

We are now vested with the responsibility in this new decade to set high national goals - to realign or to at least restate our priorities, and as the men who penetrate outer space - to set up the mobilization of our physical and human resources to accomplish those goals. I think that America

has to do to the world -- for the world -- is not so much to be the peace-keeper in the sense that of a military power, but above all, to prove that government by the consent of the governed can work for the governed and that those who give consent are all of the people which makes representative government a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

Thank you very much.

(Thunderous applause)

CHAIRMAN: I have the feeling that Professor Humphrey is no great desire to stay long enough to get tenure.

(Laughter) Will the faculty join me in the Library?

Thank you and goodnight.



# 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)