

Speak  
few minutes

Building Phase II  
Project

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Students from  
mine

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

APRIL 2, 1973

- Art McNease

Pres John Stevens

Chancellor Don Morris

(Beckham Bumps)

Tommy Prozza Case

A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS IS AT HAND IN OUR NATION, A CRISIS ARISING NOT FROM THE NORMAL PULLS AND TUGS, CHECKS AND BALANCES BETWEEN THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES, BUT RATHER, A CRISIS DUE TO A DELIBERATE, CONSCIOUS AND MANUFACTURED ATTEMPT TO CONCENTRATE IN THE EXECUTIVE, POWER FORBIDDEN TO IT -- POWER OVER THE PURSE.

AND, THE PURPOSE OF THIS CONFRONTATION IS NOT TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC INTEREST, BUT TO SANCTIFY AN IDEOLOGY AND PROTECT THE SPECIAL INTERESTS SO LONG IDENTIFIED WITH RICHARD NIXON AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

THE POLITICAL STRATEGY OF THE WHITE HOUSE IS CLEAR:

-- ENGINEER A CONFRONTATION BETWEEN THE LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES;

-- BEGIN A COORDINATED HIGH PRESSURE PUBLIC RELATIONS CAMPAIGN DESIGNED TO PICTURE THE CONGRESS AS THE "BIG SPENDERS";

-- DRAW THE BATTLE LINE BY PRESENTING A BUDGET THAT DECIMATES SOCIAL PROGRAMS IN THE NAME OF HOLDING DOWN TAXES;

-- ILLEGALLY IMPOUND BILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF CONGRESSIONALLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS -- ALL IN THE NAME OF THE ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY.

∟ AND, AS A RESULT OF ALL FOUR TACTICS, THE INTENTION IS TO DIVIDE AND OVERWHELM AN EMBITTERED, STALEMATED CONGRESS.

∟ ARTICLE 1, SECTION 1, OF THE CONSTITUTION VESTS ALL LEGISLATIVE POWERS IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

∟ SECTION 9 OF THAT SAME ARTICLE SAYS THAT NO MONEY SHALL BE DRAWN FROM THE TRASURY, BUT IN CONSEQUENCE OF APPROPRIATIONS MADE BY LAW.

∟ ARTICLE 2, SECTION 3, SAYS THAT THE PRESIDENT SHALL TAKE CARE THAT THE LAWS BE FAITHFULLY EXECUTED.

∟ THERE IS A CAREFUL DELINEATION OF FUNCTION HERE -- THE POWER OF THE PURSE BELONGS TO CONGRESS. ∟ THE DUTY OF IMPLEMENTATION IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE EXECUTIVE.

∟ BUT REALITY IS HARDLY THAT SIMPLE. ∟ WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT ONCE REMARKED, "LET ANYONE MAKE THE LAWS OF THE COUNTRY, IF

I CAN CONSTRUE THEM."

↳ THERE PERHAPS IS NO BETTER CASE IN POINT THAN THE  
IMPOUNDMENT OF CONGRESSIONALLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS IMPOUNDMENT

CAN AND DOES ALTER, CHANGE, OR EVEN TERMINATE PROGRAMS

↳ IT CAN AND DOES SIGNIFICANTLY ALTER, CHANGE, OR REVISE, or Terminate  
DECLARED PUBLIC POLICY.

↳ IT CAN AND DOES PERFORM THE FUNCTION OF ITEM VETO WHICH  
IS PROHIBITED BY THE CONSTITUTION.

↳ DURING THE HISTORY OF OUR NATION, PRESIDENTS HAVE WITHHELD  
 FUNDS FROM SUCH CONGRESSIONALLY APPROVED PROGRAMS SUCH AS  
BOMBER AND AIR FORCE GROUPS, FOOD PROGRAMS, FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS,  
MODEL CITIES, HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION, RURAL ELECTRICAL PROGRAMS  
AND HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION.

↳ BUT THERE ARE DIFFERENT KINDS OF IMPOUNDMENTS,

↳ FIRST, FUNDS MAY BE WITHHELD FROM A PROGRAM TO "EFFECT  
SAVINGS OR PREVENT DEFICIENCIES." THIS IS AUTHORIZED BY LAW!

*Classic example - always used to justify impoundment?*

-4-

↳ THOMAS JEFFERSON REFUSED TO SPEND \$50,000 FOR GUN BOATS ON THE MISSISSIPPI -- EVEN THOUGH THIS MONEY WAS APPROPRIATED BY CONGRESS.

↳ JEFFERSON SAID THAT THE MONEY WAS NOT NEEDED.

THE UNITED STATES HAD JUST PURCHASED THE LOUISIANA TERRITORY AND THE THREAT THAT MADE GUNBOATS NECESSARY HAD

ABATED. JEFFERSON WAS SAVING MONEY.

*circumstances had changed after the Congress had appropriated, to have purchased the gun boats would have been foolish, unnecessary*

↳ AND IN 1905 AND 1906, THE CONGRESS ENACTED THE ANTI- *vasteful.*

DEFICIENCY ACTS TO PREVENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES FROM HASTILY

SPENDING THEIR COMPLETE APPROPRIATIONS AND THEN SEEKING ADDITIONAL

APPROPRIATIONS.

↳ THESE ACTS ESTABLISHED A BUDGET TECHNIQUE OF MONTLY ALLOTMENTS TO PREVENT UNDUE EXPENDITURES.

-5-

L In 1950, A CLAUSE WAS ADDED TO THE ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACTS  
 THAT PROVIDED THAT MONEYS COULD BE WITHHELD TO BRING ABOUT  
"GREATER EFFICIENCY OF OPERATION," "TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT  
"CHANGES IN REQUIREMENTS," OR "SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS  
AFTER THE APPROVAL OF THE APPROPRIATIONS."

L THOUGH THESE LAST THREE PHRASES ARE VAGUE -- AND IN MY  
 JUDGMENT DO NOT REPRESENT CLEAR LAW, THEY NEVERTHELESS WERE  
 NOT MEANT TO BE VEHICLES FOR THWARTING THE DECLARED  
POLICY OF CONGRESS. THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY IS NOT VAGUE  
 ON THAT POINT -- THE ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACTS ARE INSTRUMENTS  
OF ACCOUNTING -- NOT OF CHANGING CONGRESSIONAL INTENT  
 OR POLICY.

L NOR WERE THEY MEANT TO <sup>erase</sup> ~~OBVIATE~~ THE SEPARATION OF POWERS  
DOCTRINE IN THE GUISE OF EFFICIENCY. CHIEF JUSTICE

WARREN, IN 1965, DECLARED THAT SEPARATION OF POWERS WAS

"OBVIOUSLY NOT INSTITUTED WITH THE IDEA THAT IT WOULD PROMOTE  
GOVERNMENTAL EFFICIENCY, IT WAS, TO THE CONTRARY, LOOKED TO AS  
A BULWARK AGAINST TYRANNY,"

#2 CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED IMPOUNDMENT IS A SECOND TYPE OF  
FUND WITHHOLDING. IN THE 1968 REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE  
CONTROL ACT, CONGRESS FIXED A SPENDING CEILING AND MADE ABOUT  
HALF THE MANDATED BUDGET CUTS PROVIDED BY THAT ACT. THE  
PRESIDENT WAS DIRECTED TO MAKE THE OTHER HALF OF THE REQUIRED  
REDUCTIONS. HERE THE PRESIDENT WAS CARRYING OUT A CONGRESSIONAL  
DIRECTIVE.

OR ANOTHER EXAMPLE: IN TITLE VI OF THE 1964 CIVIL RIGHTS  
ACT, THE PRESIDENT IS DIRECTED TO WITHHOLD FUNDS FROM FEDERALLY  
FINANCED PROGRAMS IN WHICH THERE IS EVIDENCE OF DISCRIMINATION.

L ALL OF THESE INSTANCES HAVE THESE THINGS IN COMMON! THE  
CONGRESS HAS EXPRESSLY DELEGATED TO THE PRESIDENT, IN STATUTE,  
 AND DEBATE, AND LEGISLATIVE HISTORY, THE POWER TO WITHHOLD  
FUNDS. CONGRESS DIRECTED THE IMPOUNDMENT! THE EXECUTIVE  
DID NOT AUTOMATICALLY ASSUME THE POWER! IN FACT, THE VERY  
 ACT OF CONGRESS DELEGATING OR DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT TO  
IMPOUND FUNDS WAS AN EXPRESSION OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY  
 AND A RECOGNITION THAT THE PRESIDENT DID NOT HAVE INHERENT  
POWER TO ACT ON HIS OWN INITIATIVE. !

#3 L A THIRD KIND OF IMPOUNDMENT I REFER TO AS "DEFENSE  
IMPOUNDMENT." THERE IS LITTLE QUESTION IN MY MIND THAT  
 THE CONSTITUTION GIVES A PRESIDENT BROAD SCOPE TO EXERCISE  
JUDGMENT IN HIS CAPACITY AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF.

L IN FACT, PRESIDENTS HAVE USED IMPOUNDMENT EXTENSIVELY

IN MILITARY MATTERS. PRESIDENT TRUMAN, IN 1949, REQUESTED FUNDS FOR ONLY 48 AIR FORCE GROUPS. THE CONGRESS PROVIDED 58, TRUMAN IMPOUNDED THE FUNDS FOR THE EXTRA TEN GROUPS. BUT HE DID SO UPON AN EXPRESSION OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORT READ: "IF THE MONEY IS APPROPRIATED, IT MAY NOT BE USED." PRESIDENT

EISENHOWER REFUSED TO SPEND MONEY FOR ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILES UNTIL HE WAS SATISFIED THAT THE DEVELOPMENTAL TESTS WOULD

PROVE FRUITFUL.

*This met the Congressionally Criteria for Congressionally sanctioned impoundment under the terms of the 1950 amendments to the Anti-Deficiency Act!*

THERE IS A FOURTH TYPE OF IMPOUNDMENT -- AN IMPOUNDMENT

#4 I CONSIDER TO BE ILLEGAL -- THAT OF POLICY IMPOUNDMENT.

POLICY IMPOUNDMENT IS PRACTISED BY PRESIDENT NIXON. IT IS

THE KIND OF IMPOUNDMENT THAT TERMINATES PROGRAMS ENACTED

BY CONGRESS, SUCH AS THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT; OR

-9-

SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERS A PROGRAM BY SEVERE CUTS IN THE FUNDING,

SUCH AS THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT OF 1972, WHERE

PRESIDENT NIXON'S WITHHOLDING HAS HAD A MAJOR IMPACT ON

POLICY AND PROGRAM OBJECTIVES,

L" POLICY IMPOUNDMENT HAS RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIAL

CUTS IN PROGRAMS ~~such as~~ for HOUSING, WATER AND SEWER GRANTS,

AND MEDICAL FACILITIES AND HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION -- THEREBY CHANGING

LEGISLATIVE INTENT

L UNDER POLICY IMPOUNDMENT, FUNDS ARE WITHHELD NOT *merely to*

EFFECT SAVINGS, NOT AS DIRECTED BY CONGRESS, NOT AS COMMANDER IN

CHIEF, BUT BECAUSE THE PRESIDENT HAS UNILATERALLY DECIDED TO

IMPOUND MONEY FOR PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT HIS PRIORITIES.

L IT IS A METHOD OF SUBSTITUTING EXECUTIVE WILL FOR

-10-

CONGRESSIONAL PURPOSE.

L SINCE 1970, PRESIDENT NIXON HAS CONSISTENTLY IMPOUNDED  
EIGHT TO \$12 BILLION IN CONGRESSIONALLY APPROPRIATED  
FUNDS EACH YEAR.

L AND, UNTIL LAST FALL WHEN CONGRESS PASSED MY IMPOUNDMENT  
INFORMATION ACT, THE PRESIDENT NEITHER EXPLAINED, REPORTED,  
OR JUSTIFIED EXECUTIVE IMPOUNDMENT. HE SIMPLY DID IT.

L POLICY IMPOUNDMENT IS EXECUTIVE ARROGANCE.

L IT ENCROACHES UPON THE CONSTITUTIONAL PREROGATIVES OF CONGRESS.

L IT VIOLATES THE SEPARATION OF POWERS.

L AND, IT GIVES THE PRESIDENT AN ITEM VETO -- NEITHER  
SANCTIONED BY THE CONSTITUTION NOR GRANTED BY CONGRESS.

L BUT, PRESIDENT NIXON CLAIMS THAT HE POSSESSES INHERENT

-11-

CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO IMPOUND, FIRST, TO FIGHT INFLATION,

AND SECOND, TO RESOLVE THE MEANING OF CONTRADICTIONARY LAWS.

↳ THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL --

JOSEPH SNEED -- IN TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS

SUBCOMMITTEE, <sup>*of the Senate,*</sup> SAID THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS INHERENT "LATITUDE"

TO REFUSE TO SPEND OR DEFER SPENDING REGARDLESS OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.

↳ SUCH AN ASSERTION IS TO MY MIND A BLIND READING OF THE CONSTITUTION. ↳ A 1969 JUSTICE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THEN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, NOW SUPREME COURT JUSTICE, WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, SAID:

"WITH RESPECT TO THE SUGGESTION THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS A CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO DECLINE TO SPEND APPROPRIATED

-12-

FUNDS, WE MUST CONCLUDE THAT EXISTENCE OF SUCH A BROAD  
POWER IS SUPPORTED NEITHER BY REASON NOR PRECEDENT."

THOSE ARE UNEQUIVOCAL WORDS

*Justice*

REHNQUIST IS CORRECT. THERE IS NO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

TO IMPOUND FUNDS; TO TERMINATE PROGRAMS; OR <sup>to</sup> SUBSTITUTE

THE PRESIDENT'S JUDGMENT FOR THAT OF THE CONGRESS ON DOMESTIC  
POLICY.

↳ WITH RESPECT TO THE INFLATION CONTROL ARGUMENT, IF IMPOUNDMENT  
IS JUSTIFIED ON THE BASIS OF FIGHTING INFLATION OR PROTECTING  
THE DEBT LIMIT, THEN THE PRESIDENT HAS PICKED A WEAK TOOL  
TO COMBAT A SERIOUS PROBLEM.

↳ THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946 PLACES RESPONSIBILITY TO  
"PROMOTE EMPLOYMENT, PRODUCTION, AND PURCHASING POWER"

-13-

IN THE ENTIRE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT -- NOT EXCLUSIVELY IN THE  
 EXECUTIVE BRANCH. IN ADDITION, THERE ARE OTHER POWERFUL MEANS  
 FOR FIGHTING INFLATION, ANTI-TRUST ACTIONS TO INCREASE COMPETITION,

ECONOMIC CONTROLS, CUTTING IMPORT RESTRICTION, INCREASING  
TRADE, AND GOVERNMENT FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICY,

↳ IMPOUNDMENT OUGHT NOT TO BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THESE WEAPONS  
 IN OUR FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION.

↳ BUT, THE PRESIDENT IS CORRECT WHEN HE NOTES THAT CONGRESS HAS  
 IN SOME INSTANCES PASSED CONTRADICTORY LAWS *↳ But, the*

WAY TO RESOLVE CONFLICTS OVER CONTRADICTORY LAWS IS NOT

TO TAKE UNILATERAL PRESIDENTIAL ACTION, BUT TO RETURN TO

THE CONGRESS AND ASK FOR A CLARIFICATION *↳* THAT IS THE RESPON-

SIBLE WAY -- THE CONSTITUTIONAL WAY -- TO MAKE CHANGES IN

POLICY.

/ BY POLICY IMPOUNDMENT, THE PRESIDENT IS VIOLATING THE  
COMITY THAT HAS SO CHARACTERIZED EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE  
 RELATIONSHIPS FOR TWO HUNDRED YEARS / AND, DESPITE AN OCCASIONAL  
 STATEMENT THAT THE PRESIDENT INDEED WANTS TO COOPERATE WITH  
CONGRESS, HIS ATTITUDE AND ACTIONS SPEAK DIFFERENTLY.

/ INSTEAD OF HIDING BEHIND DUBIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENTS,  
 THE PRESIDENT AND HIS ADVISERS OUGHT TO LEVEL WITH THE  
 AMERICAN PEOPLE, AND TELL THE PEOPLE WHAT THEY ARE REALLY  
 UP TO AND WHAT THEY REALLY DO NOT LIKE.

/ AND WHAT THEY DO NOT LIKE IS QUITE OBVIOUS / THEY DO  
 NOT LIKE THE FACT THAT CONGRESS HAS CHANGED AND CHALLENGED

THEIR PRIORITYES.

*The issue is not how much  
 money we spend, but rather for what  
 We spend the money.*

-15-

L CONGRESS HAS CUT DEFENSE, MILITARY PROCUREMENT, FOREIGN  
AID, AND SPACE SPENDING L IT HAS INCREASED FUNDS FOR HOUSING,  
COMMUNITY FACILITIES, WATER AND AIR POLLUTION, POVERTY  
PROGRAMS, EDUCATION AND HEALTH CARE.

L WHAT ARE THE REMEDIES TO PRESIDENTIAL IMPOUNDMENT?

CAN CONGRESS ASSERT ITS WILL? - *my answer is yes!*

(1) L FIRST, CONGRESS CAN AND HAS IN THE PAST ESTABLISHED  
MINIMUM LEVELS OF WHAT MUST BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH APPROPRIATED  
 MONEY. FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1972 VETERANS ADMINI-  
 STRATION APPROPRIATION, CONGRESS STIPULATED THAT THE FUNDS  
 MUST PROVIDE NOT LESS THAN AN AVERAGE OF 97,500 BEDS FOR  
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS THAT YEAR.

(2) L SECOND, CONGRESS CAN USE MANDATORY LANGUAGE SUCH AS  
 THE PRESIDENT IS "DIRECTED," "SHALL," "MUST," "REQUIRED,"

-16-

OR "ORDERED" TO SPEND APPROPRIATED FUNDS. CONGRESS HAS  
DONE SO BEFORE, SUCH AS IN THE 1970 CONTINUING RESOLUTION  
FOR EDUCATION FUNDS.

CONGRESS, UNDERSTANDABLY, HAS BEEN RELUCTANT TO USE  
SUCH LANGUAGE BECAUSE IT RECOGNIZES THAT CONDITIONS DO  
CHANGE --THAT CHANGES MIGHT BE NECESSARY IN THE SPENDING  
OF FUNDS. BUT, UNTIL THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION CAME INTO  
OFFICE, CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT HAVE ALWAYS HAD A  
RELATIONSHIP THAT WAS INFORMAL BUT CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD  
ON THE USE OF FUNDS. (LBJ)

THAT COMITY NO LONGER EXISTS. PERHAPS MANDATORY LANGUAGE  
WILL HAVE TO BECOME STANDARD IN ALL APPROPRIATION BILLS  
SO THAT THE PRESIDENT WILL CLEARLY FOLLOW AND EXECUTE

THE LAW.

↳ THIRD, CONGRESS CAN ESTABLISH IMPOUNDMENT PROCEDURES  
TO AFFIRM OR REJECT ANY FUND WITHHOLDING LEGISLATION  
PRESENTLY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEPARATION OF POWERS  
WOULD REQUIRE CONGRESS TO AFFIRM THE LEGALITY OF ANY PROPOSED  
IMPOUNDMENT, OTHERWISE THE PRESIDENT WOULD BE DIRECTED  
TO SPEND THE FUNDS.

↳ FOURTH, CONGRESS COULD GO -- AND SOME MEMBERS OF THE  
SENATE AND I HAVE GONE -- TO COURT TO FORCE THE PRESIDENT  
TO USE THE APPROPRIATED FUNDS. THE COURTS HAVE BEEN RELUCTANT  
TO ENTER THIS THICKET OF CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE CONFRONTATION,  
BUT IT IS MY JUDGMENT THAT THEY CAN NO LONGER STAND BACK.

↳ THE COURTS WILL HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION ON THE IMPOUNDMENT

-18-

QUESTION. \* MISSOURI CASE ANNOUNCED tonight --  
Nixon Impoundment of Highway Funds - illegal.

FINALLY, THERE MUST BE CONTINUED POLITICAL PRESSURE  
ON THE ADMINISTRATION. THE ADMINISTRATION HAS A PRACTICE OF  
 HOLDING BACK MONEY AFTER AN ELECTION, ONLY TO RELEASE IT  
 BEFORE THE NEXT ELECTION. THE AMERICAN PEOPLE MUST MOUNT  
 THE SAME KIND OF SUSTAINED POLITICAL CAMPAIGN THAT FORCED  
 THE PRESIDENT IN 1970 TO RELEASE EDUCATION FUNDS AND IN  
1972 TO RELEASE FOOD STAMPS MONEY. PUBLIC OPINION IS A  
POWERFUL FORCE, EVEN ON A STUBBORN PRESIDENT.

HOW WILL THIS CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS BE RESOLVED?

I WOULD BE LESS THAN CANDID IF I SAID I KNEW THE ANSWER.

I DO KNOW THAT THE CRISIS IS SERIOUS.

AND, OF ONE MORE THING I AM CERTAIN, THE PRESIDENT'S VISION  
 OF AMERICA EVIDENCED IN HIS ILLEGAL IMPOUNDMENTS AND HIS

-19-

RECENTLY RELEASED BUDGET, IS NOT THE VISION OF AMERICA THAT

I SEE.

↳ THE PRESIDENT CLAIMS HE KNOWS AMERICA -- AND AMERICANS. HE  
SEES THE SELF-MADE MAN, THE SELF-SUFFICIENT, THE FREE MARKET,  
AND THE VIRTUES OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE.

SURELY THAT IS PART OF AMERICA, BUT IT IS NOT ALL OF  
AMERICA.

↳ THERE IS <sup>another</sup> ~~A SECOND~~ AMERICA.

THERE IS AN AMERICA OF COMPASSION FOR ITS POOR, ITS HUNGRY,  
AND ITS SICK.

THERE IS AN AMERICA OF DEVOTION TO HELPING OTHERS HELP  
THEMSELVES.

THERE IS AN AMERICA OF GREAT WEALTH, CAPABLE OF GREAT  
DEEDS, IF ONLY CALLED TO DO SO.

-20-

THERE IS AN AMERICA THAT IS NO LONGER CONTENT TO BE  
PUBLICLY POOR AND PRIVATELY RICH.

THIS IS AN AMERICA NOT FOUND IN THE NIXON BUDGET NOR  
WELL SERVED BY A DEEPENING CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS  
PRECIPITATED BY IMPOUNDMENT.

WHAT AMERICA IS REALLY ALL ABOUT WAS WELL PHRASED  
IN FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT'S 1937 INAUGURAL ADDRESS.  
LOOKING OUT ON A NATION HE DESCRIBED AS ONE THIRD  
ILL-HOUSED, ILL-CLAD, ILL-NOURISHED, HE SAID:

"THE TEST OF OUR PROGRESS IS NOT WHETHER WE  
ADD TO THE ABUNDANCE OF THOSE WHO HAVE MUCH; IT  
IS WHETHER WE PROVIDE ENOUGH FOR THOSE WHO HAVE TOO  
LITTLE."

THIS IS AN AMERICA RICHARD NIXON DOES NOT KNOW OR

UNDERSTAND.

FOR RICHARD NIXON, AMERICA IS IN RETREAT. IT IS AN  
AMERICA PRACTISING DOMESTIC DISENGAGEMENT, RETRENCHING --  
NOT TO FIGHT AGAIN BUT TO ABANDON THE CAUSE OF CONQUERING  
OUR ILLS AND ENRICHING THE LIVES OF MANKIND.

IT IS NOT MY VISION OF AMERICA.

MY VISION OF AMERICA IS FOUND IN THE WORDS OF  
CARL SANDBERG:

"I SEE AMERICA, NOT IN THE SETTING SUN OF  
A BLACK NIGHT OF DESPAIR AHEAD OF US. I SEE  
AMERICA IN THE CRIMSON LIGHT OF A RISING SUN FRESH  
FROM THE BURNING, CREATIVE HAND OF GOD. I SEE GREAT  
DAYS AHEAD, GREAT DAYS POSSIBLE TO MEN AND WOMEN  
OF WILL AND VISION. . . "



# 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)