

"THE AMERICAN SYSTEM AND THE GREAT SOCIETY"

It is fashionable today in American politics to look back with a touch of nostalgia to the good old days when the simple life still prevailed in this land. We hear a great deal about the need to recapture the simple and direct approach of our ancestors in solving our contemporary crises and challenges. Many people tingle with anticipation at the thought of reliving these golden days. And this call of the lost horizon possesses a certain appeal to persons weary of their charter membership in the crisis-of-the-week club.

In this stampede to the past it is generally forgotten that every generation has had its share of complex problems and crises. Read any period of our history and the lesson is always the same: Democracy in America is a difficult business. In fact, man's eternal struggle to govern himself is the most demanding of all human

endeavors. This is just as true today as it was in the golden days of some unidentified past.

But every generation has heard its false prophets pleading for a return to the glories of yesterday, only thereby to sacrifice their right to participate in the building of today and tomorrow. One hundred years in the future -- in the year 2064 -- I am confident there will be the same fervent pleas to recapture the verities which guided Americans in the early decades of the nuclear and space age. Then we will suddenly become the hardy pioneers whose understanding of virtue and principle will provide the instant solutions to the problems of the inter-planetary world of the 21st century. But depend upon it: This message will be just as false then as it is now.

Despite the problems and crises which have always been before us, democracy in America has prevailed. It has prevailed because each generation of Americans has joined in this struggle with the faith and courage displayed by our late President John F. Kennedy when he proclaimed in his Inaugural Address: ". . . I do not shrink from this responsibility -- I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation." And democracy has prevailed because of the faith and courage displayed by our President Lyndon B. Johnson when he addressed a grief-stricken Congress and nation on November 27, 1963: "This is our challenge -- not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us. . . ."

This affirmation has been proclaimed anew by every generation of Americans. It does not promise prefabricated solutions to the complex problems of democratic government. It recognizes that the essence of politics is the asking and re-asking of the most difficult of all questions: What is justice? What is right? We can never seek those answers and never govern ourselves successfully on the basis of generalities, half-truths, and myths -- no matter how superficially appealing they may be.

As one who has served in local government -- the Mayor of a city of over one-half million people, Minneapolis, Minnesota -- I believe I have some appreciation of the importance of local government in our federal system. Those of us who have served at the local level come face to face with the tough daily problems of the relationship of government to the people.

And make no mistake about it, when the people think of government, they are primarily thinking of that government which touches their lives -- the police and fire departments, the health and transportation services, the education and cultural facilities, and, yes, even the property taxes and the sales tax.

American government is more than Washington and the State Capitol. American government is Washington, the State Capitol, the county court houses, the city and village halls, the town meetings and the thousands of independent separate governmental authorities that range from port authorities to sewage systems, from metropolitan airports commissions to the local school boards.

No nation in the world has had as much experience in self-government as ours. If there is one area of

human activity in which we can claim superior knowledge and greater experience it is in the field of representative self-government. I salute those public officials -- elected and appointed -- who serve on the front line of public service and who all too often go unappreciated and unrewarded.

We are, however, exposed to some of the most remarkable notions about the role of the Federal Government in relation to the States, counties, and localities.

We have heard the shopworn phrases about "Washington's ever eager fingers of bureaucracy" grabbing responsibilities which supposedly have been defaulted by local governments. We are exposed to the same tired misconceptions of a pitiless Federal establishment solely "obsessed by the enlargement of its role and its personnel," and trampling over the rights of a helpless populace. We are told of

certain unnamed people who "seek solutions only by concentrating more and more power in fewer and fewer hands."

These tired complaints demonstrate a most profound misunderstanding of the dynamics of the American federal system. As professionals in the increasingly difficult task of governing our counties, you know that State, county and local government is not about to collapse from any merciless onslaught from Washington.

Indeed the facts demonstrate that in recent years expansion of American government has occurred primarily at the State and local levels as these governments have struggled with the gigantic task of governing America. Financial and employment figures tell much of the story. Since 1946, for example, State, county, and local governments and their budgets have grown more rapidly than the Federal government despite our national commitments to national defense, space exploration, nuclear development,

veterans' benefits, postal service, and welfare programs.

While Federal spending has increased 46% over this period, State, county, and local expenditures have soared by over 400%. Federal taxes per capita have increased almost 75%, but State, county and local taxes have jumped 213%. The Federal debt has risen by slightly more than 10% in the past 18 years; State, county and local debt has climbed by more than 400%.

This is not criticism, it is a factual analysis that tells the story of a growing and demanding America. The willingness of our State, county and local governments to assume a greater share of our common burden deserves explicit recognition and commendation. So, let's stop suggesting that the localities have either sold out or caved in to the Federal government. This is one Senator who considers them very much alive!

To those who say that the Federal Government is taking over our local governments, I can only point out that the number of

Federal employees has declined about 10% since 1946--while employees of the State, county and local governments have risen by over 100%. Not long ago the ratio of Federal employees was 19 per thousand of the total U.S. population; today that number has fallen to 13 per thousand. Of those 13, 5 are located in the Defense Department, 3 in the Post Office Department, and 1 in the Veterans Administration. The remainder--about 600,000 employees--comprise about 100,000 persons less than it takes to operate the Bell Telephone System.

Government has indeed grown since World War II--right from the grass roots of America. And why has this remarkable growth taken place? I am sure you know the reason far better than I. Government has grown because America has grown. You see and feel America develop and grow every month--every year.

I came to the U.S. Senate in 1949. Since then, the United States has added people equal to the entire present population of Great Britain and we continue to grow at the rate of

3 million new persons each year. These people have needed roads, housing, jobs, police and fire protection, water and sewer systems, transportation facilities and the whole range of essential services which comprise good government in the 20th century.

The country is now gripped by an industrial and technological revolution which, when coupled with our population growth, requires us to create 300,000 additional jobs each month just to stay even in terms of unemployment percentages. Life expectancy has increased from 49 years in 1900 to 70 years today; one thousand people per day reach the age of 65. In 1950 there were 2.3 million students in institutions of higher learning; by 1970 there will be 7 million--more than a 300% increase. We are still lacking 60,000 classrooms in elementary and secondary schools if we want to eliminate overcrowding. Each year 100,000 qualified high school graduates fail to attend college because they lack the necessary funds. Can responsible

government simply ignore these social and economic realities?

Of course not.

Those persons who denounce the response of our Federal, State, and local governments to these forces remind me of the Kansas farmers who tried in the 1860's to lynch a weatherman because he correctly predicted a tornado.

I suggest that it is time to talk sense to the American people. It is time to ask this fundamental question: What should be the appropriate roles of the Federal, State, county and local governments in terms of the social and economic realities of 1964? Can we devise methods and procedures whereby the unique capabilities of each level are used to the fullest? Will each segment of our federal system be prepared to allocate the human and economic resources necessary to get the job done? These are questions worthy of a free people determined to make democracy work.

In seeking these answers, one fact stands out above all others: the respective levels of government in the American system are partners in a common enterprise. The basis for this truth has been recognized since the dawn of our Republic. Writing in the Federalist Papers (No. 46), James Madison noted that "the Federal and State governments are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people..." In our democracy the people are masters at all levels. If this is true, and I believe it is, it makes little sense to drive a wedge between the people and the government at any level.

Government and people are collaborators in the common cause of securing the national interest, not mutual antagonists contending against one another for power and glory.

Without bothering to wrap up all of this in fancy political theory, we have attained a sound and workable modus operandi for our federal system. No one advocates running everything from Washington. Indeed, the major Federal agencies have devolved an immense amount of decision-making to their State and regional offices which are generally run by local individuals. Most Federal programs are administered on terms highly favorable to the States and localities: the Federal government provides a substantial portion of the money, demands certain minimal standards, and the rest is left to wisdom and abilities of local officials.

The development of these methods and procedures has proceeded for many decades, during the ascendancy of both major parties, and is about as bi-partisan an operation as the observance of the

Fourth of July. Beginning with the Kestenbaum Commission in 1954, the Joint Federal-State Action Committee in 1957, and continuing with the permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations established by act of Congress in 1959, the question of Federal relationships has received --and is receiving -- detailed and searching reexamination. The Senate and House have subcommittees specifically charged with similar responsibilities. Topics ranging from government in metropolitan areas to periodic reassessments of Federal grant-in-aid programs have recently occupied the Senate subcommittee of which I am proud to be a member. All of these bodies are constantly exploring for ways to improve what is already a remarkably effective system of intergovernmental relations.

As President Johnson proclaimed so eloquently in his address at the University of Michigan on the "Great Society:" "The solution to these problems does not rest on massive programs in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the national Capitol and the leaders of local communities."

Let's look at some specific situations. You -- as county officials -- and I -- as a former mayor of Minneapolis -- have direct knowledge of the severe limitations on the revenue resources of our local governments. As many of you know, for many years I have been concerned with the revenue losses accruing to county and municipal governments due to tax-free Federal properties.

I have attempted to devise an equitable formula of Federal payments in lieu of taxes. This effort to devise such a formula should be resumed in the 89th Congress.

Consistent with the requirements of national defense, the Federal government should advocate fiscal and monetary policies and sponsor action programs to increase local tax revenues. The Kennedy-Johnson Administration has been doing just this through the tax cut, the investment tax credit, and accelerated depreciation schedules.

These policies have produced the longest period of sustained economic growth in 110 years, a factor which certainly enhances the revenue resources of governments at all levels in our Federal system.

There is, of course, one problem of special urgency and importance now confronting our country.

The issue of civil rights and racial justice challenges the wisdom, abilities, and resources of our Federal, State, and local governments to an extent not equalled by any other issue of this century. And its resolution will only be possible through the unique relationship of partnership and cooperation which characterizes the American system.

In passing the civil rights bill we sought to create a framework of law wherein men of good will and reason could attempt to resolve peacefully the difficult and emotional issues of human rights. Passage of the bill certainly did not solve these problems, but it did establish certain channels and procedures to make their solution more probable.

As county officials, you know that most of this burden rests upon the shoulders of our local governmental officials. Only when communities and States are unable to meet their responsibilities set forth in this act is direct Federal action authorized. This is surely within the best traditions of our American system.

Every responsible public official has the obligation to see that civil peace is maintained across this land. No solutions to these terribly difficult problems are possible in the midst of chaos, violence and disorder. As I have stated on numerous occasions: Civil wrongs do not make civil rights.

But neither can we afford to believe that by driving angry mobs from the street we are touching

the festering sores of unemployment, dilapidated and overcrowded housing, drug addiction, and hopelessness which afflict the ghetto areas of our large urban centers.

We speak of restoring civil peace to our cities, and so we must. But let it be a peace with justice. Let us understand that we can no longer postpone the massive problem of restoring our decaying cities in both a material and spiritual sense. We can no longer afford the luxury of pretending that the problem is unreal, or that it will somehow go away, or that the people trapped in these ghettos rather enjoy their misery.

No responsible public official suggests that the States, counties and cities are prepared to command the financial and human resources needed

in this historic job of urban restoration. Without the active cooperation of the Federal Government, we can never achieve the massive programs of academic and vocational education, job training, youth work, mass transportation, slum eradication, recreational and community development which are essential in saving our cities. This is a job we postpone only at our gravest peril.

There is one area of responsibility which is the special task of the Federal Government: namely, to preserve our national security during these trying years of the Cold War.

I am shocked that any candidate for the Presidency could stand on this platform and assert that "we are disarming ourselves and demoralizing our allies." I find it difficult to believe that

any candidate for high public office could be so tragically misinformed about our defense posture to suggest that "our guard is dropping in every sense."

In an attempt to close the information gap which must have contributed to such misleading statements, let me summarize the facts about the Administration's record in bolstering our national defense.

The Administration has invested a total of \$30 billion more for fiscal years 1962-65 than would have been spent if we continued at the level of fiscal year 1961, the last year of the Eisenhower Administration.

What have these additional \$30 billion procured for America's defense establishment:

- A 150% increase in the number of nuclear warheads and a 200% increase in total megatonnage in our Strategic Alert Forces.
- A 60% increase in the Tactical Nuclear Force in Western Europe.
- A 45% increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions.
- A 44% increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons.
- A 75% increase in airlift capability.
- A 100% increase in funds for general ship construction and conversion to modernize our fleet.
- A 800% increase in the Department of Defense Special Forces trained for counterinsurgency.

Today we have more than 1100 strategic bombers, 800 fully armed and dependable ICBM's deployed on launchers (30 times the number we had in January 1961), 256 Polaris missiles deployed in 16 nuclear submarines (compared with 32 missiles available in 2 submarines in January 1961), 16 combat-ready Army divisions (compared to 11), 79 tactical fighter squadrons (compared to 55), and a planned Navy fleet of 883 ships (compared to 817 proposed in the budget for fiscal year 1961).

Funds expended for military research and development have increased by 50% over the level prevailing during the last four years of the Republican administration.

On June 3, 1964, President Johnson summed up the situation quite succinctly with this statement: "In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all nations in the history of the world."

It was precisely this ^{massive} array of balanced military forces which permitted President Johnson to select the appropriate response to the outrageous attack on our destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. President Kennedy had demonstrated similar firmness and skill during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. But prior to 1961 this nation lacked a credible limited war capability and thereby ran the grave risk of being unable to muster the type of military response which punished an ^{ag}gressor but avoided the risks of all out nuclear war.

Today this nation is prepared to meet any type of military threat to our national security. Our allies understand this fact--and so do our enemies.

There is one final area--the war on poverty--which cries out for the full involvement and participation of all segments of the American system. The war on poverty is crucial because it involves the meaning of one cherished word--"America."

We hear much these days about the need to encourage individualism and self-reliance--and these qualities are important components of the American character. But let us never forget that America has--from its very beginnings--possessed another national trait which sets us apart from all other peoples: a profound sense of obligation to assist the less fortunate in this country and around the world. This is the essence of the word--"America"--and the heart of the democratic faith.

The Statue of Liberty standing in New York harbor

symbolized this feeling to the millions of immigrants who came to make a new life on these shores. We now have the opportunity to provide a similar beacon of hope to those 35 million Americans who find themselves alien in our prosperous and affluent society.

The Congress won the first battle of the war on poverty by passing President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This legislation is founded squarely on the American principles of federalism; all levels of government will have an opportunity to participate in implementing the broad range of programs included in the act. In particular, the Community Action programs authorized in Title II will rely heavily upon the expertise, experience, and skill of our local units of government.

But this legislation is only the beginning. The war

on poverty is related intimately to our crusade to build the Great Society which President Johnson described with these words: "The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice...The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents...It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community...But most of all, the Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

This is a vision which merits the total commitment of every American. This is a vision worthy of our faith that man does possess the courage, wisdom, charity, and love to govern himself. And--never forget--the Great Society will be a

product of all levels of our federal system, laboring together
in pursuit of this common goal. Not Federal against State
or county against municipality, but one free people joined
in common cause to give new and richer meaning to that glorious
word--America!

and careful study of our foreign policy in Asia. I am greatly concerned that if we seek to settle the existing crisis in Asia with American military force and threat of escalation of the war into North Vietnam, Laos and Red China, we may find ourselves in a full scale war in Asia that can bog us down for a quarter of a century or longer, with terrific financial costs; a terrible loss of American lives and mass slaughter of the victims of our bombs. As long as there is any hope for substituting the rule of law encompassed in the United Nations Charter and the SEATO Treaty as a means for settling the threat to

peace in Asia, instead of the use of unilateral American military action, I shall continue to plead for that course of action in the Senate of the United States.

Let there be no doubt as to what the position of your Senator will be in case, God forbid, war is declared. Then we must unite for a successful prosecution of that war, and after military victory—if one is attained—try again to substitute plough shares of reason for the swords of military might; the settlement of disputes which threaten the peace of the world.

The American System

THE GREAT SOCIETY

By HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senator from Minnesota

Delivered before the National Association of Counties, Washington, D. C., August 12, 1964

IT IS FASHIONABLE today in American politics to look back with a touch of nostalgia to the good old days when the simple life still prevailed in this land. We hear a great deal about the need to recapture the simple and direct approach of our ancestors in solving our contemporary crises and challenges. Many people tingle with anticipation at the thought of reliving those golden days. And this call of the lost horizon possesses a certain appeal to persons weary of their charter membership in the crisis-of-the-week club.

In this stampede to the past it is generally forgotten that every generation has had its share of complex problems and crises. Read any period of our history and the lesson is always the same: Democracy in America is a difficult business. In fact, man's eternal struggle to govern himself is the most demanding of all human endeavors. This is just as true today as it was in the golden days of some unidentified past.

But every generation has heard its false prophets pleading for a return to the glories of yesterday, only thereby to sacrifice their right to participate in the building of today and tomorrow. One hundred years in the future—in the year 2064—I am confident there will be the same fervent pleas to recapture the verities which guided Americans in the early decades of the nuclear and space age. Then we will suddenly become the hardy pioneers whose understanding of virtue and principle will provide the instant solutions to the problems of the inter-planetary world of the 21st century. But depend upon it: This message will be just as false then as it is now.

Despite the problems and crises which have always been before us, democracy in America has prevailed. It has prevailed because each generation of Americans has joined in this struggle with the faith and courage displayed by our late President John F. Kennedy when he proclaimed in his Inaugural Address: . . . "I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation." And democracy has prevailed because of the faith and courage displayed by our President Lyndon B. Johnson when he addressed a grief-stricken Congress and nation on November 27, 1963: "This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us . . ."

This affirmation has been proclaimed anew by every generation of Americans. It does not promise prefabricated solu-

tions to the complex problems of democratic government. It recognizes that the essence of politics is the asking, reasking of the most difficult of all questions: What is justice? What is right? We can never seek these answers and never govern ourselves successfully on the basis of generalities, half-truths, and myths—no matter how superficially appealing they may be.

As one who has served in local government—the Mayor of a city of over one-half million people, Minneapolis, Minnesota—I believe I have some appreciation of the importance of local government in our federal system. Those of us who have served at the local level come face to face with the tough daily problems of the relationship of government to the people.

And make no mistake about it, when the people think of government, they are primarily thinking of that government which touches their lives—the police and fire departments, the health and transportation services, the educational and cultural facilities, and, yes, even the property taxes and the sales tax.

American government is more than Washington. American government is Washington, the State Capitol, the county court houses, the city and village halls, the town meetings, and the thousands of independent separate governmental authorities that range from port authorities to sewage systems, from metropolitan airport commissions to the local school boards.

No nation in the world has had as much experience in self-government as ours. If there is one area of human activity in which we can claim superior knowledge and greater experience it is in the field of representative self-government. I salute those public officials—elected and appointed—who serve on the front line of public service and who all too often go unappreciated and unrewarded.

We are, however, exposed to some of the most remarkable notions about the role of the Federal government in relation to the states, counties, and localities.

We have heard the shopworn phrases about "Washington's ever eager fingers of bureaucracy" grabbing responsibilities which supposedly have been defaulted by local governments. We are exposed to the same tired misconceptions of a pitiless Federal establishment solely "obsessed with enlargement of its role and its personnel" and trespassing over the rights of a helpless populace. We are told of unnamed people who "seek solutions only by concentrating more and more power in fewer and fewer hands."

These tired complaints demonstrate a most profound misunderstanding of the dynamics of the American federal system. As professionals in the increasingly difficult task of governing our counties, you know that State, county and local government is not about to collapse from any merciless onslaught from Washington.

Indeed, the facts demonstrate that in recent years expansion of American government has occurred primarily at the State and local levels as these governments have struggled with the gigantic task of governing America. Financial and employment figures tell much of the story. Since 1946, for example, State, county, and local governments and their budgets have grown more rapidly than the Federal government despite our national commitments to national defense, space exploration, nuclear development, veterans' benefits, postal service, and welfare programs. While Federal spending has increased 46 per cent over this period, State, county, and local expenditures have soared by over 400 per cent. Federal taxes per capita have increased almost 75 per cent, but State, county and local taxes have jumped 213 per cent. The Federal debt has risen by slightly more than 10 per cent in the past 18 years; State, county and local debt has climbed by more than 400 per cent.

This is not criticism; it is a factual analysis that tells the story of a growing and demanding America. The willingness of our State, county and local governments to assume a greater share of our common burden deserves explicit recognition and commendation. So, let's stop suggesting that the localities have either sold out or caved in to the Federal government. This is one Senator who considers them very much alive!

To those who say that the Federal government is taking over our local governments, I can only point out that the number of Federal employees has declined about 10 per cent since 1946—while employees of the State, county and local governments have risen by over 100 per cent. Not long ago the ratio of Federal employees was 19 per thousand of the total U. S. population; today that number has fallen to 13 per thousand. Of those 13, 5 are located in the Defense Department, 3 in the Post Office Department, and 1 in the Veterans Administration. The remainder—about 600,000 employees—comprise about 100,000 persons less than it takes to operate the Bell Telephone System.

Government has indeed grown since World War II—right from the grass roots of America. And why has this remarkable growth taken place? I am sure you know the reason far better than I. Government has grown because America has grown. You see and feel America develop and grow every month—every year.

I came to the U. S. Senate in 1949. Since then, the United States has added people equal to the entire present population of Great Britain and we continue to grow at the rate of 3 million new persons each year. These people have needed roads, housing, jobs, police and fire protection, water and sewer systems, transportation facilities and the whole range of essential services which comprise good government in the 20th century.

The country is now gripped by an industrial and technological revolution which, when coupled with our population growth, requires us to create 300,000 additional jobs each month just to stay even in terms of unemployment percentages. Life expectancy has increased from 49 years in 1900 to 75 years today; one thousand people per day reach the age of 65. In 1950 there were 2.3 million students in institutions of higher learning; by 1970 there will be 7 million—more than a 300 per cent increase. We are still lacking 1,000 classrooms in elementary and secondary schools if we want to eliminate overcrowding. Each year 100,000 qualified high school graduates fail to attend college because they

lack the necessary funds. Can responsible government simply ignore these social and economic realities? Of course not.

Those persons who denounce the response of our Federal, State, and local governments to these forces remind me of the Kansas farmers who tried in the 1860's to lynch a weatherman because he correctly predicted a tornado.

I suggest that it is time to talk sense to the American people. It is time to ask this fundamental question: What should be the appropriate roles of the Federal, State, county and local governments in terms of the social and economic realities of 1964? Can we devise methods and procedures whereby the unique capabilities of each level are used to the fullest? Will each segment of our federal system be prepared to allocate the human and economic resources necessary to get the job done? These are questions worthy of a free people determined to make democracy work.

In seeking these answers, one fact stands out above all others: the respective levels of government in the American system are partners in a common enterprise. The basis for this truth has been recognized since the dawn of our Republic. Writing in the *Federalist Papers* (No. 46), James Madison noted that "the federal and State governments are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people . . ." In our democracy the people are masters at all levels. If this is true, and I believe it is, it makes little sense to drive a wedge between the people and the government at any level.

Government and people are collaborators in the common cause of securing the national interest, not mutual antagonists contending against one another for power and glory.

Without bothering to wrap all of this up in fancy political theory, we have attained a sound and workable *modus operandi* for our federal system. No one advocates running everything from Washington. Indeed, the major Federal agencies have developed an immense amount of decision-making to their State and regional offices which are generally run by local individuals. Most Federal programs are administered on terms highly favorable to the States and localities: the Federal government provides a substantial portion of the money, demands certain minimal standards, and the rest is left to the wisdom and abilities of local officials.

The development of these methods and procedures has proceeded for many decades, during the ascendancy of both major parties, and is about as bi-partisan an operation as the observance of the Fourth of July. Beginning with the Kestenbaum Commission in 1954, the Joint Federal-State Action Committee in 1957, and continuing with the permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established by act of Congress in 1959, the question of federal relationships has received—and is receiving—detailed and searching reexamination. The Senate and House have subcommittees specifically charged with similar responsibilities. Topics ranging from government in metropolitan areas to periodic reassessments of Federal grant-in-aid programs have recently occupied the Senate subcommittee of which I am proud to be a member. All of these bodies are constantly exploring for ways to improve what is already a remarkably effective system of intergovernmental relations.

As President Johnson proclaimed so eloquently in his address at the University of Michigan on the "Great Society": "The solution to these problems does not rest on massive programs in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the national Capital and the leaders of local communities."

Let's look at some specific situations. You—as county officials—and I—as a former mayor of Minneapolis—have direct knowledge of the severe limitations on the revenue resources of our local governments.

As many of you know, for many years I have been concerned with the revenue losses accruing to county and municipal governments due to tax-free Federal properties. I have attempted to devise an equitable formula of Federal payments in lieu of taxes. This effort to devise such a formula should be resumed in the 89th Congress.

Consistent with the requirements of national defense, the Federal government should advocate fiscal and monetary policies and sponsor action programs to increase local tax revenues. The Kennedy-Johnson Administration has been doing just this through the tax cut, the investment tax credit, and accelerated depreciation schedules.

These policies have produced the longest sustained period of economic growth in 110 years, a factor which certainly enhances the revenue resources of governments at all levels in our federal system.

There is, of course, one problem of special urgency and importance now confronting our country. The issue of civil rights and racial justice challenges the wisdom, abilities, and resources of our Federal, State, and local governments to an extent not equaled by any other issue of this century. And its resolution will only be possible through the unique relationship of partnership and cooperation which characterizes the American system.

In passing the civil rights bill we sought to create a framework of law wherein men of good will and reason could attempt to resolve peacefully the difficult and emotional issues of human rights. Passage of the bill certainly did not solve these problems, but it did establish certain channels and procedures to make their solution more probable.

As county officials, you know that most of this burden rests upon the shoulders of our local governmental officials. Only when communities and States are unable to meet their responsibilities set forth in this act is direct Federal action authorized. This is surely within the best traditions of our American system.

Every responsible public official has the obligation to see that civil peace is maintained across this land. No solutions to these terribly difficult problems are possible in the midst of chaos, violence and disorder. As I have stated on numerous occasions: Civil wrongs do not make civil rights.

But neither can we afford to believe that by driving angry mobs from the street we are touching the festering sores of unemployment, dilapidated and overcrowded housing, drug addiction, and hopelessness which afflict the ghetto areas of our large urban centers.

We speak of restoring civil peace to our cities and so we must. But let it be a peace with justice. Let us understand that we can no longer postpone the massive problem of restoring our decaying cities in both a material and spiritual sense. We can no longer afford the luxury of pretending that the problem is unreal, or that it will somehow go away, or that the people trapped in these ghettos rather enjoy their misery.

No responsible public official suggests that the States, counties and cities are prepared to command the financial and human resources needed in this historic job of urban restoration. Without the active cooperation of the Federal government, we can never achieve the massive programs of academic and vocational education, job training, youth work, mass transportation, slum eradication, recreational and community development which are essential in saving our cities. This is a job we postpone only at our gravest peril.

There is one area of responsibility which is the special task of the Federal government: namely, to preserve our national security during these trying years of the Cold War.

I am shocked that any candidate for the Presidency could stand on this platform and assert that "we are disarming our-

selves and demoralizing our allies." I find it difficult to believe that any candidate for high public office could be so tragically misinformed about our defense posture to suggest that "our guard is dropping in every sense."

In an attempt to close the information-gap which must have contributed to such misleading statements, let me summarize the facts about the Administration's record in bolstering our national defense.

The Administration has invested a total of \$30 billion more for fiscal years 1962-65 than would have been spent if we continued at the level of fiscal year 1961, the last year of the Eisenhower Administration.

What have these additional \$30 billion procured for America's defense establishment:

—A 150 per cent increase in the number of nuclear warheads and a 200 per cent increase in total megatonnage in our Strategic Alert Forces.

—A 60 per cent increase in the Tactical Nuclear Forces in Western Europe.

—A 45 per cent increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions.

—A 44 per cent increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons.

—A 75 per cent increase in airlift capability.

—A 100 per cent increase in funds for general ship construction and conversion to modernize our fleet.

—An 800 per cent increase in the Department of Defense Special Forces trained for counterinsurgency.

Today we have more than 1100 strategic bombers, 800 fully armed and dependable ICBM's deployed on launchers (30 times the number we had in January 1961), 256 Polaris missiles deployed in 16 nuclear submarines (compared with 32 missiles available in 2 submarines in January 1961), 12 combat-ready Army divisions (compared to 11), 79 tactical fighter squadrons (compared to 55), and a planned Navy fleet of 883 ships (compared to 817 proposed in the budget in fiscal year 1961).

Funds expended for military research and development have increased by 50 per cent over the level prevailing during the last four years of the Republican administration.

On June 3, 1964, President Johnson summed up the situation quite succinctly with this statement: "In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all nations in the history of the world."

It was precisely this massive array of balanced military forces which permitted President Johnson to select the appropriate response to the outrageous attack on our destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. President Kennedy had demonstrated similar firmness and skill during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. But prior to 1961 this nation lacked a credible limited war capability and thereby ran the grave risk of being unable to muster the type of military response which punished an aggressor but avoided the risks of all-out nuclear war.

Today this nation is prepared to meet any type of military threat to our national security. Our allies understand the fact—and so do our enemies.

There is one final area—the war on poverty—which calls out for the full involvement and participation of all elements of the American system. The war on poverty is crucial because it involves the meaning of one cherished word—"America." We hear much these days about the need to encourage individualism and self-reliance—and these qualities are important components of the American character. But let us never forget that America has—from its very beginnings—possessed another national trait which sets us apart.

from all other peoples: a profound sense of obligation to assist the less fortunate in this country and around the world. This is the essence of the word—"America"—and the heart of the democratic faith.

The Statue of Liberty standing in New York harbor symbolized this feeling to the millions of immigrants who came to make a new life on these shores. We now have the opportunity to provide a similar beacon of hope to those 35 million Americans who find themselves aliens in our prosperous and affluent society.

The Congress won the first battle of the war on poverty by passing President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This legislation is founded squarely on the American principles of federalism; all levels of government will have an opportunity to participate in implementing the broad range of programs included in the act. In particular, the Community Action programs authorized in Title II will rely heavily upon the expertise, experience, and skill of our local units of government.

But this legislation is only the beginning. The war on poverty is related intimately to our crusade to build the "Great

Society" which President Johnson described with these words:

"The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice . . . The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents . . . It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community . . . But most of all, the Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

This is a vision which merits the total commitment of every American. This is a vision worthy of our faith that man does possess the courage, wisdom, charity, and love to govern himself. And—never forget—the Great Society will be a product of all levels of our federal system, laboring together in pursuit of this common goal. Not Federal against State or county against municipality, but one free people joined in common cause to give new and richer meaning to that glorious word—America!

The Security of The United States

PROGRESS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY

By GEORGE MEANY, *President AFL-CIO*

Delivered before the platform committee of the Democratic Party, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., August 18, 1964

ON BEHALF OF the AFL-CIO and its 13½ million members, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your platform committee. Let me say at the outset—as I said to the platform committee of the Republican party about six weeks ago—that we believe party platforms are important. We believe the platform represents—or ought to represent—the policies a party will follow if its candidates are elected.

That is still our position.

Therefore we hope your committee drafts a platform that is clear and specific. We do not see any merit in the argument that the traditional party platforms are too long. They may be over-loaded with self-praise, on the one hand, or partisan criticism, on the other. In these areas, perhaps platforms should be shorter. But there should be no cuts when you come to the issues.

The American people want to know—and have a right to know—what each party proposes to do about each of the many issues that face our country today. The voters want answers, not platitudes.

They have a right to expect the platform will tell them what the Presidential candidate will propose, if elected.

We in the AFL-CIO have proposals on a great many issues—too many to be covered in an oral presentation. Therefore we have prepared a printed document covering all of them, one by one. You will see that it is indexed, so that our recommendations on any point can be found very easily.

We submitted this same document to the Republicans last month. I regret to say that we can find very little evidence of our efforts in the Republican platform as written. I further regret that we can find few specifics with respect to that platform's policies anywhere in that platform.

We hope your committee will be more responsive; for the major interests of the AFL-CIO are those which concern, not just unions and union members, but all Americans.

Therefore we urge your committee, and its subcommittees to give serious consideration to the views set forth in this document as the various platform planks are drafted. We think all of them are important. Let me offer a few examples:

* The wage-hour law should be revised to protect all the low-paid workers who are presently exempt, and the minimum wage should be raised to \$2 an hour.

* As an essential to full employment, steps should be undertaken at once to reduce the standard work-week to 35 hours, with penalty pay of double time for overtime.

* Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. This is the provision which surrenders to the states jurisdiction as to the union shop—giving rise, in some 20 states, to so-called "right-to-work" laws. Aside from the iniquity of these statutes in themselves, federal abdication in one phase of labor-management relations, while asserting jurisdiction over the rest, is inconsistent with established practice. In addition, the Taft-Hartley Act as a whole badly needs overhauling to eliminate other obvious injustices.

* A hospital insurance program for the aged, as part of the social security system, has long been needed desperately by a substantial segment of the American people, both young and old.

* Federal aid to education at all levels is essential to prepare the nation's youth for the world of today and tomorrow. There are no valid grounds for further delay.

* Much has been achieved through federal housing and urban renewal programs. Much more remains to be done—and should be done.

I have mentioned these few items to emphasize the variety of measures which we in the AFL-CIO believe are essential to meet the demands of the modern world.

But in this presentation I will concentrate, primarily, on two fundamental issues; the two which overshadow all the rest, and in a sense embrace them all.



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