

FROM: UNITED DEMOCRATS FOR HUMPHREY  
1100 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. (202) 393-6420

For further information:  
Ev Munsey, ext. 208  
U-142

Release for  
Wednesday AMs, June 5, 1968

*didn't  
speak  
there*

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY URGES  
AN "OPEN PRESIDENCY"

Colorado Springs, Col., June 5 -- Vice President Humphrey, speaking at Air Force Academy Commencement exercises, called today for an "open Presidency (which) means, in short, not decisions made at the top of a vast pyramid, but the exposure of ideas -- all ideas which have to do with the fundamental workings of our society -- to a maximum number of people in that society."

The Vice President said that societies in America and elsewhere face the question: "Must we sacrifice individualism on the altar of institutionalism?" "Can we, in America, preserve government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Or must we have -- indeed do we have -- government of the system, by the system, for the system?"

"The open Presidency would not solve all the problems of a people beset by a crisis of individualism. But it would, I believe, have a catalytic effect."

"What does the open Presidency infer? Nothing more or less than examining every aspect of relations between federal government, state and local government, and every private institution in our country, and asking this single question: Does this relationship help the individual American to live a freer more meaningful and less institutionalized life?"

"If it does not, then that relationship must be changed."

"The open Presidency means, too, the encouragement of a broad public dialogue in this nation -- a dialogue in which public officials, the press, and every man with an idea to express may enter freely and without reservation into the market place of public discussion."

"The open Presidency means not oppression of responsible disagreement, but its encouragement."

"The open Presidency means not secrecy, but the widest possible discussion and ventilation of this nation's problems . . . ."

"Within the open Presidency, too, there is the determination that the watchers, wiretappers, and the listeners, armed with new technologies, be kept within the bounds of national security alone -- national security in its strictest definition -- so that the right of privacy, so basic to the right of individual expression, may not only be preserved but nourished."

The Vice President said his concept of the open Presidency "has the strains of populism within it" -- a populism which believes "that there is a basic wisdom within the people and that neither the people nor the decision will be wise, unless the people freely and openly express themselves."

"There must be worked out -- and this will be the hardest of all -- methods for the effective expression and communication of the views of those individuals who feel strongly . . . but who do not resort to the extremes of protest which now receive extraordinary notice."

"Those of us who believe most deeply in social justice must concern ourselves greatly with the processes by which peoples' grievances are heard."

(more)

"For democracy's essential difference lies in those processes.

"Those of us who are most truly concerned about preserving public order must do the most to see that there is adequate means for any grievant to be fully heard -- not just in court -- but in democracy's councils."

FOR RELEASE: WEDNESDAY PM'S  
JUNE 5, 1968

REMARKS  
VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO  
JUNE 5, 1968

I have come here today to express to you, the members of this Class of 1968, your Nation's thanks.

Please take this gratitude with you for there will be only a small few, if any, to express gratitude at the moment when you do the most for your country.

You accepted this when you came to the Academy. You know that the real measure of a man...and his fullest satisfaction...is in what he does for its own sake...within the compact he makes with himself.

But know, too, that a grateful people look up at a speck in the sky and a trailing vapor stream...and realize there is a man there -- a man willing to put everything and the best that is in him at the service of his fellow men.

Your contribution reminds us of the compact which all of us as individuals make with each other...through our membership, as citizens, in our society -- the direct instrument which is our government.

I want to say a little more here today about the basic terms of this compact between the individual and his government.

For it is increasingly important that these terms be kept clear -- and clearly consistent with the central idea and ideal of democracy.

This is an ancient and long-debated issue.

But it has to be raised again by each generation. And the answers which each generation finds largely determine the operational meaning of the principles upon which our society is built.

PAGE TWO

There can never be final answers in the search for that delicate balance between the rights of individuals, and the responsibilities of Government;

between man's right of privacy and man's need for social contact;

between loyalty to one's self and loyalty to the community.

Indeed, the business of democratic government -- as always -- is characterized by a struggle between the forces of individual expression and action and the requirement of social organization and order. The resolution of this struggle is what we call justice.

Our definitions of justice become particularly critical to the survival of individualism in this age of bigness -- big corporation -- big union -- big university -- and big government.

We dream nostalgically of days when every statehouse was regarded as a prairie Athens, and every neighborhood a public forum...days when Abraham Lincoln -- the man whom Tolstoy called a "universal individualist" -- scratched out his orders with a quill and the help of two secretaries.

Mammoth institutions have provided for most citizens a material life better than anything known before.

But these same institutions -- both public and private -- can and often do dilute and deaden the challenges of life... the opportunities for free expression...the risks of personal involvement and commitment.

Things appear all too safe. They appear all too decided. They seem all too settled before they begin.

There are clear signs today of protest against this trend -- against the rise of institutions at the expense of individuals.

There are little lapel buttons which proclaim "I am a human being. Do not fold, spindle or mutilate."

The fever of protest in the streets of Europe -- including Eastern Europe -- and on the campuses and in the slums of America, is a symptom of this current crisis of individualism.

The question in America -- as it is elsewhere -- is simply this:

Must we sacrifice individualism on the altar of institutionalism?

The question here, of course, is not the same in nature as it is, for instance, in Eastern Europe.

For here we begin with a common dedication to the precept of individualism within the framework of a free society. And we seek to redress the imbalances which have grown within that framework. In the East, the urgent push by ordinary people is against both precept and framework.

Slowly, yet surely, the drive of individual expression is pushing outward in the East against the stifling environment of state control. And I, personally, have no doubt that these exertions will in the final analysis succeed.

But this in no way lessens the challenge before our own society. Nor does it make any less difficult the effort we must undertake to make our institutions serve us -- not in the collective, but each American citizen.

Can we, in America, preserve government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Or must we have -- indeed do we have -- government of the system, by the system, for the system?

The American experiment has been largely the building of social institutions designed to preserve the opportunity...and sanctity...of individual action.

The Founding Fathers -- that extraordinary group of basically ordinary men -- were fervent individualists.

They pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to the proposition that, in Emerson's words, "The private

life of one man shall be a more illustrious monarchy than any kingdom."

America's heroes have been individualists -- fiery public individualists like Tom Paine and John Brown...secluded individualists like Thoreau...humorous individualists like Mark Twain...tinkering individualists like Tom Edison...courageous individualists like Billy Mitchell, who phrased the eternal truth of democracy this way:

"The bodies and organizations which the people created for the purpose of protecting them are merely agencies to put their world into execution."

Our democratic legacy dictates that the world-wide crisis of individualism is particularly an American crisis.

And in our peculiarly American way, we are now groping for answers.

We know we have more opportunity for individual expression than any other major society in history -- including the ancient Greeks, to whom democracy meant rule by the few, the elite.

We remember, even as we yearn for a return for simple America, when legislators held court over cracker barrels, that in those days, women and Negroes could not vote.

The cry that rises today from the people of our city slums seems shrill because it is so new.

Long years of resigned silence have given way to a new confidence in individual expression, a new feeling that something can be accomplished -- and is being accomplished -- by individual action.

There is such a thing as a revolution of rising expectations.

For, it is when people begin to have hope and know that relief is in reach that they begin to rebel and speak out. Throughout history, the totally oppressed have remained silent generation after generation.

There is outcry, too, from students who demand a greater voice in their own lives.

Some of those outcries, and some of those student actions, have been irresponsible and not within the framework of our democracy.

Some of them in fact have had far more in common with Hitler youth tactics of the 1930's than they have with any democratic outlet. I am assured that you, as I, have nothing but contempt for those who take the easy and irresponsible way of violence and lawlessness rather than having the courage to buckle down to the hard work of responsible change. The students who seize a university office are no less lawless than the looters who steal a television set from a burning department store.

Yet, for every student extremist who acts irresponsibly, there are one hundred other students at work in peaceful, purposeful social groups working for change and progress within democratic means. You know that. America needs to know that.

I believe, too, that the vast majority of Americans who seek greater personal expression today are seeking to do so through established, democratic processes. But many are not quite sure how to do it.

They want not only to protest but to propose...not only to dissent but to offer effective support.

It is an imperative demand on our nation today to provide fuller means for the individual to speak out effectively...and yet consistently with the free society's essential safeguard.

There must be, too, a deliberate effort to involve the largest possible participation of private organizations in meeting urgent social needs in our country.

We have begun to do this through such means as the Urban Coalition -- dedicated to wiping out slumism and reclaiming

our urban environment -- and the National Alliance of Businessmen -- dedicated to training the hard-core unemployed. We have begun through youth opportunity and job training programs in thousands of communities throughout the country in which government, business, labor, civic organizations and ordinary people are all playing a role.

We have begun through the Community Action programs associated with our War on Poverty -- programs where the poor organize to meet their own problems at a neighborhood level. There are, in this country, outlets for the individual volunteer -- ranging from the Peace Corps and VISTA to the League of Women Voters and Jaycees.

But still, there is a need for all of us in our society to find new ways in which each citizen can more directly become involved in this business of self-government -- or he will, eventually, become submerged even in those voluntary institutions I have cited.

As a student, political scientist and political office holder, I have spent most of my life examining our American system of government -- its evolution, its changing needs and priorities -- including the Presidency.

Today I believe that office of the Presidency offers opportunity to meet this challenge of the individual, and the institutions which gradually but surely encroach upon him.

I say this in no partisan or personal way: I believe a vast consensus of men of good will could agree that the years ahead thus particularly demand the concept of the open Presidency.

And, certainly, each of our post-war presidents has increasingly come to recognize and to work toward this goal -- seeking to extend the protection of our civil rights and liberties.

What does the open Presidency infer?

Nothing more or less than examining every aspect of relations between federal government, state and local government, and

every private institution in our country, and asking this single question: Does this relationship help the individual American to live a freer more meaningful and less institutionalized life?

If it does not, then that relationship must be changed.

The open Presidency means, too, the encouragement of a broad public dialogue in this nation -- a dialogue in which public officials, the press, and every man with an idea to express may enter freely and without reservation into the market place of public discussion.

The open Presidency means not oppression of responsible disagreement, but its encouragement.

The open Presidency means not secrecy, but the widest possible discussion and ventilation of this nation's problems and the alternate problems to their solutions.

The open Presidency means, in short, not decisions made at the top of a vast pyramid, but the exposure of ideas -- all ideas which have to do with the fundamental workings of our society -- to a maximum number of people in that society.

Within the open Presidency, too, there is the determination that the watchers, wiretappers, and the listeners, armed with new technologies, be kept within the bounds of national security alone -- national security in its strictest definition -- so that the right of privacy, so basic to the right of individual expression, may not only be preserved but nourished.

This is an area where each succeeding president has had to exercise increasing vigilance.

The objective in all of this is to give people a stake in their everyday lives...a feeling that can directly influence their own destinies.

Is this South Dakota prairie populism?

No. But it has the strains of populism within it. The kind of populism which dedicates that there is a basic wisdom within the people and that neither the people nor the decision

will be wise, unless the people freely and openly express themselves.

The open Presidency would not solve all the problems of a people beset by a crisis of individualism.

But it would, I believe, have a catalytic effect.

It would mean some mistakes.

It would mean experiments that sometimes fail.

But I believe the mistakes and failed experiments would be small beside the prospects of a free people fully exercising their basic right of public participation.

There must be worked out -- and this will be the hardest of all -- methods for the effect expression and communication of the views of those individuals who feel strongly...but who do not resort to the extremes of protests which now receive extraordinary notice.

Those of us who believe most deeply in social justice must concern ourselves greatly with the processes by which peoples' grievances are heard.

For democracy's essential difference lies in those processes.

Those of us who are most truly concerned about preserving public order must do the most to see that there is adequate means for any grievant to be fully heard -- not just in court -- but in democracy's councils.

I say finally to you in this class:

Your commitment to the service of our country is complete, unqualified, unquestioning.

Democracy depends -- and always has -- on your kind of faith in it.

Democracy depends, too -- as it always has -- on the individual being protected by their Government...and, at the same time, against it.

Our commitment to you -- who undertake the defense of democracy -- is to see to it that democracy works, so that what

PAGE NINE

you are pledged to protect is worthy of your sacrifice.

We pledge ourselves to that purpose.

# # # # #

MESSAGE

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

(Read to the Academy commencement by Secretary Brown (of the Air Force))

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

JUNE 5, 1968

I am sure that the class of 1968 will understand the circumstances which prevent me from joining them on this day.

I leave with you some thoughts upon the events of last evening.

Our sorrow is for the man and for his family which has already known too much tragedy. Our grief is that this dreadful act should follow on other dreadful acts of violence which have taken place in the recent history of this country.

How can we explain these acts within the framework of our free and democratic society? What is the flaw which reoccurs among us and brings us such shame?

We cannot explain. We can only determine as a free people that such madness shall not reoccur.

Today our needs as a nation are clear: To be strong ... to face the full reality of what this dreadful act means ... and to pray.

No nation conceived upon the proposition that free men are able to peacefully govern themselves can do otherwise than to go on with its work -- the work of building a society where tensions and hate may finally be replaced by unity and love.

May God, in His infinite mercy, be with those who are the victims of this shameful act and may God forgive and help us all.

# # #

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Not delivered because of shooting  
of Senator Robert Kennedy -- and  
the Vice President decided to  
cancel his address and return to  
Washington. The speech had been  
released to the press.

## REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

JUNE 5, 1968

I have come here today to express to you, the members of this class of 1968, your nation's thanks.

Please take this gratitude with you for there will be only a small few, if any, to express gratitude at the moments when you do the most for your country.

You accepted this when you came to the academy.

You know that the real measure of a man -- and his fullest satisfaction -- is in what he does for its own sake ... within the compact he makes with himself.

But know, too, that a grateful people look up at a speck in the sky and a trailing vapor stream ... and realize there is a man there -- a man willing to put everything and the best that is in him at the service of his fellow man.

Your contribution reminds us of the compact which all of us as individuals make with each other ... through our membership as citizens in our society -- the direct instrument of which is our government.

I want to say a little more here today about the basic terms of this compact between the individual and his government.

For it is increasingly important that these terms be kept clear -- and clearly consistent with the central idea and ideal of democracy.

This is an ancient and long-debated issue.

But it has to be raised again by each generation.

And the answers which each generation finds largely determine the operational meaning of the principles upon which our society is built.

There can never be final answers in the search for that delicate balance:

Between the rights of individuals, and responsibilities of government;

Between man's right of privacy, and man's need for social contact;

Between loyalty to oneself, and loyalty to the community;

Indeed, the business of democratic government -- as always -- is characterized by a struggle between the forces of individual expression and action and the requirement of social organization and order.

The resolution of this struggle is what we call justice.

Our definitions of justice become particularly critical to the survival of individualism in this age of bigness -- big corporation ... big union ... big university ... and big government.

We dream nostalgically of days when every state house was regarded as a prairie Athens, and every neighborhood a public forum ... days when Abraham Lincoln -- the man whom Tolstoy called a "universal individualist" -- scratched out his orders with a quill and the help of two secretaries.

Mammoth institutions have provided for most citizens a material life better than anything known before.

But these same institutions -- both public and private -- can and often do dilute and deaden the challenges of life ... the opportunities for free expression ... the risks of personal involvement and commitment.

Things appear all too safe. They appear all too decided. They seem all too settled before they begin.

There are clear signs today of protest against this trend -- against the rise of institutions at the expense of individuals.

There are the little lapel buttons which proclaim "I am a human being ... do not fold, spindle, or mutilate."

The fever of protest in the streets of Europe -- including Eastern Europe -- and on the campuses and in the slums of America is a symptom of this current crisis of individualism.

The question in America -- as it is elsewhere -- is simply this: Must we sacrifice individualism on the altar of institutionalism?

The question here, of course, is not the same in nature as it is, for instance, in Eastern Europe.

For here we begin with a common dedication to the precept of individualism within the framework of a free society. And we seek to redress the imbalances which have grown within that framework. In the East, the urgent push by ordinary people is against both precept and framework.

Slowly, yet surely, the drive of individual expression  
in the East  
is pushing outward/against the stifling environment of  
state control. And I, personally, have no doubt that  
these exertions will in the final analysis succeed.

But this in no way lessens the challenge before our  
own society. Nor does it make any less difficult the effort  
we must undertake to make our institutions serve us -- not in  
the collective, but each American citizen.

Can we, in America, preserve government of the  
people, by the people, and for the people?

Or must we have -- indeed do we have -- government  
of the system, by the system, for the system?

The American experiment has been largely the building of social institutions designed to preserve the opportunity ... and sanctity ... of individual action. ✓

The Founding Fathers -- that extraordinary group of basically ordinary men -- were fervent individualists. ✓

They pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to the proposition that, in Emerson's words, "the private life of one man shall be a more illustrious monarchy than any kingdom." ✓

America's heroes have been individualists -- fiery public individualists like Tom Paine and John Brown ... secluded individualists like Thoreau... humorous individualists like Mark Twain ... tinkering individualists like Tom Edison ... courageous individuals like Billy Mitchell who phrased the eternal truth of democracy this way: "The bodies and organizations which the people ✓

created for the purpose of protecting them are merely agencies to put their world into execution."

Our democratic legacy dictates that the world-wide crisis of individualism is particularly an American crisis.

And in our particularly American way, we are now groping for answers.

We know we have more opportunity for individual expression than any other major society in history -- including the ancient Greeks to whom democracy meant rule by the few, the elite.

We remember, even as we yearn for a return for simple America when legislators held court over crack-barrels that, in those days, women and Negroes could not vote.

The cry that rises today from the people of our city slums seems shrill because it is so new.

Long years of resigned silence have given way to a new confidence in individual expression, a new feeling that something can be accomplished -- and is being accomplished by individual actions.

There is such a thing as a revolution of rising expectations.

For, it is when people begin to have hope and know that relief is in reach that they begin to rebel and speak out. Throughout history, the totally oppressed have remained silent generation after generation.

There is outcry, too, from students who demand a greater voice in their own lives. Some of those outcries, and some of those students' actions, have been irresponsible and not within the framework of our democracy.

Some of them in fact have had far more in common with Hitler youth tactics of the 1930's than they have with any democratic outlet. I am sure that you, as I, have nothing but contempt for those who take the easy and irresponsible way of violence and lawlessness rather than having the courage to buckle down to the hard work of responsible change. The students who seize a university office are no less lawless than the looters who steal a television set from a burning department store.

Yet, for every student extremist who acts irresponsibly there are 100 other students at work in peaceful, purposeful, social action groups working for change and progress within democratic means. You know that. America needs to know that.

I believe, too, that the vast majority of Americans who seek greater personal expression today are seeking to do so through established, democratic processes. But many are not quite sure how to do it.

They want not only to protest but to propose ... not only to dissent but to offer effective support.

It is an imperative demand on our nation today to provide fuller means for the individual to speak out effectively ... and yet consistently with the free society's essential safeguards.

There must be, too, a deliberate effort to involve the largest possible participation of private organizations in meeting urgent social needs in our country.

We have begun to do this through such means as the Urban Coalition -- dedicated to wiping out slumism and reclaiming our urban environment -- and the National Alliance of Businessmen -- dedicated to training the hard-core unemployed. We have begun through youth opportunity and job training programs in thousands of communities throughout the country in which government, business, labor, civic organizations and ordinary people are all playing a role.

We have begun through the Community Action programs associated with our War on Poverty -- programs where the poor organize to meet their own problems at a neighborhood level. There are, in this country, outlets for the individual volunteer -- ranging from the Peace Corps and VISTA to the League of Women Voters and Jaycees.

But still, there is a need for all of us in our society to find new ways in which each citizen can more directly become involved in this business of self-government -- or he will, eventually, become submerged even in those voluntary institutions I have cited.

As a student, political scientist and public office-holder, I have spent most of my life examining our American system of government -- its evolution, its changing needs and priorities -- including the Presidency.

Today I believe the office of the Presidency offers opportunity to meet this challenge of the individual, and the institutions which gradually but surely encroach upon him.

I say this in no partisan or personal way: I believe a vast consensus of men of good will could agree that the years ahead thus particularly demand the concept of the open Presidency.

And, certainly, each of our postwar Presidents has increasingly come to recognize and work toward this goal -- seeking to extend protection of our civil rights and liberties.

What does the open Presidency infer?

Nothing more or less than examining every aspect of relations between federal government, state and local government, and every private institution in our country, and asking this single question: Does this relationship help the individual American to live a freer more meaningful and less institutionalized life?

If it does not, then that relationship must be changed.

The open Presidency means, too, the encouragement of a broad public dialogue in this nation -- a dialogue in which public officials, the press, and every man with an idea to express may enter freely and without reservation into the marketplace of public discussion.

The open Presidency means not oppression of responsible disagreement, but its encouragement.

The open Presidency means not secrecy, but the widest possible discussion and ventilation of this nation's problems and the alternate courses to their solution.

The open Presidency means, in short, not decisions made at the top of a vast pyramid, but the exposure of ideas -- all ideas which have to do with the fundamental workings of our society -- to a maximum number of people in that society.

Within the open Presidency, too, there is the determination that the watchers, wiretappers, and listeners, armed with new technologies, be kept within the bounds of national security alone -- national security in its strictest definition -- so that the right of privacy, so basic to the right of individual expression, may not only be preserved but nourished.

This is an area where each succeeding President has had to exercise increasing vigilance.

The objective in all of this is to give people a stake in their everyday lives ... a feeling that they can directly influence their own destinies.

Is this South Dakota prairie populism?

No. But it has the strains of populism within it. The kind of populism which ~~dedicates~~<sup>dictates</sup> that there is a basic wisdom within the people and that neither the people nor the decisions will be wise, unless the people freely and openly express themselves.

The open Presidency would not solve all the problems of a people beset by a crisis of individualism.

But it would, I believe, have a catalytic effect.

It would mean some mistakes.

It would mean experiments that sometimes failed.

But I believe the mistakes and the failed experiments would be small beside the prospect of a free people fully exercising their basic right of public participation.

There must be worked out -- and this will be hardest of all -- methods for the effective expression and communication of the views of those individuals who feel strongly ... but who do not resort to the extremes of protests which now receive extraordinary notice.

Those of us who believe most deeply in social justice must concern ourselves greatly with the processes by which people's grievances are heard.

For democracy's essential difference lies in those processes. ✓

Those of us who are most truly concerned about preserving public order must do the most to see that there is adequate means for any grievant to be fully heard -- not just in court -- but in democracy's counsels. ✓

I say finally to you in this class:

Your commitment to the service of our country is complete, unqualified, unquestioning.

Democracy depends -- and always has -- on your kind of faith in it.

Democracy depends, too -- as it always has -- on the individuals being protected by their government ... and, at the same time, against it.

Our commitment to you -- who undertake the sense of democracy -- is to see to it that democracy works, so that what you are pledged to protect is worthy of your sacrifice.

We pledge ourselves to that purpose.

# # #

*Do Not Remove*

*Master  
Copy*

MESSAGE

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

JUNE 5, 1968

I AM SURE THAT THE CLASS OF 1968 WILL UNDERSTAND  
THE CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH PREVENT ME FROM JOINING THEM ON THIS  
DAY.

I LEAVE WITH YOU SOME THOUGHTS UPON THE EVENTS OF  
LAST EVENING.

OUR SORROW IS FOR THE MAN AND FOR HIS FAMILY WHICH  
HAS ALREADY KNOWN TOO MUCH TRAGEDY. OUR GRIEF IS THAT THIS  
DREADFUL ACT SHOULD FOLLOW ON OTHER DREADFUL ACTS OF VIOLENCE  
WHICH HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THE RECENT HISTORY OF THIS COUNTRY.

HOW CAN WE EXPLAIN THESE ACTS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF  
OUR FREE AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY? WHAT IS THE FLAW WHICH  
REOCCURS AMONG US AND BRINGS US SUCH SHAME?

WE CANNOT EXPLAIN. WE CAN ONLY DETERMINE AS A FREE  
PEOPLE THAT SUCH MADNESS SHALL NOT REOCCUR."

TODAY OUR NEEDS AS A NATION ARE CLEAR: TO BE STRONG ...  
TO FACE THE FULL REALITY OF WHAT THIS DREADFUL ACT MEANS ...  
AND TO PRAY.

NO NATION CONCEIVED UPON THE PROPOSITION THAT FREE MEN  
ARE ABLE TO PEACEFULLY GOVERN THEMSELVES CAN DO OTHERWISE  
THAN TO GO ON WITH ITS WORK -- THE WORK OF BUILDING A SOCIETY  
WHERE TENSIONS AND HATE MAY FINALLY BE REPLACED BY UNITY AND  
LOVE.

MAY GOD, IN HIS INFINITE MERCY, BE WITH THOSE WHO ARE  
THE VICTIMS OF THIS SHAMEFUL ACT AND MAY GOD FORGIVE AND  
HELP US ALL.

file

DRAFT OF COLORADO SPEECH:

I have come here today to express to you, the <sup>members</sup> ~~numbers~~ of this class of 1968, <sup>your</sup> ~~a~~ nation's thanks.

Please take ~~these simple words~~ <sup>this</sup> of gratitude with you. / For there will be ~~no one~~, or only <sup>a</sup> the smallest few, to ~~repeat them at those the~~ <sup>express gratitude</sup> ~~moments of those finest achievements~~ <sup>if any,</sup> when you do the most for your country.

└ You accepted this when you came to the academy. / You ~~have it~~ <sup>inside you</sup> to know that the real measure of a man. — and his fullest satisfaction <sup>in</sup> is what he does ~~when he is alone~~ <sup>for its own sake ... within the compact ~~man~~ makes with himself.</sup>

└ But know, too, that a grateful people look up at a speck in the sky and a trailing vapor stream . . . and realize there is a man there -- a man willing to put everything and the best that is in him at the service of his fellow man.

└ ~~The contribution of each man~~ <sup>Your contribution</sup> Your extraordinary contributions reminds us of the ~~compact~~ <sup>compact</sup> which all of us as individuals make with each other . . . through our membership and as citizens in our ~~government~~ <sup>society</sup> — the instrument of which is ~~our~~ <sup>direct</sup> government.

└ I want to say a little more here today about the basic terms of this compact between the individual and <sup>his</sup> ~~the~~ government. / For it is increasingly important that these terms be kept clear -- and clearly consistent with the central idea and ideal of democracy.

└ This is an ancient and long-debated issue. / But it has to be raised <sup>again</sup> ~~anew~~ by each generation, and the answers which each generation finds,

largely determine <sup>our society</sup> the operational meaning of the principles upon ~~which~~ <sup>democracy</sup> is built.

There can never be final answers in the search for that delicate balance ~~between~~ between the rights of individuals and responsibilities of government, <sup>privacy,</sup> between man's right of ~~poverty~~ and man's need for social contacts, <sup>to</sup> between loyalty to oneself and loyalty to the community, between the public servant's obligation to we the people, and his equal obligation to represent their desires faithfully.

Indeed, the business of ~~democratic~~ democratic government -- as always -- is characterized by a struggle between the forces of individual expression and action and the requirement of social organization and order. The resolution of this ~~struggle~~ struggle is what we call justice.

Our definitions of justice becomes particularly critical to the survival of individualism in this age of ~~bigness~~ <sup>of</sup> bigness -- big corporations . . . big unions . . . big universities . . . and big government.

We dream of ~~distant~~ <sup>not far away</sup> days -- days when every state house <sup>regarded as</sup> a prairie Athens, and every neighborhood a public forum . . . days when

Abraham Lincoln -- the man whom Tolstoy called a "universal individualist" -- ~~scratch~~ <sup>ed</sup> out his orders with a quill and the help of

two secretaries. Although ~~mammoth~~ <sup>have</sup> mammoth institutions ~~can~~ <sup>material life better than</sup> ~~provide~~ <sup>But</sup> for most citizens a level of superior existence for ~~surpassing~~ anything known before -- these same institutions -- both public and private -- ~~often~~ <sup>can and often do</sup> dilute and deaden the challenges of life . . .

the opportunities for free expression . . . the risks of personal involvement and commitment.

too divided.

Things are all too safe. They are all too settled before they begin.

There are clear signs today of protest against this trend -- against the rise of institutions at the expense of individuals.

There are the protest ballads of Bob ~~XXXX~~ Dylan, the protest poems of Allan Ginsburg . . . the protest philosophy of Professor Herbert Marcuse Marcuse. . . and the little lapel button which proclaims "I am a human being . . . do not fold, spindle, or mutilate."

The fever of protest in the streets of Europe -- including eastern Europe -- and on the campuses and in the slums of America, are symptoms of <sup>the</sup> ~~our~~ current crisis of individualism.

The question in America -- as it is in ~~France, Italy and Germany~~ <sup>elsewhere</sup> . . . Must we is simply this: ~~XXXXXX~~ sacrifice ~~our~~ individualism on the altar of institutionalism? (X) (A)

Can we, in America, preserve government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Or must we have -- indeed do we have -- government of the system by the system, for the system?

The American experiment has been largely the building of social institutions designed to preserve the opportunity . . . and sanctity . . . of individual action.

The Founding Fathers ~~---~~ that extraordinary <sup>group</sup> of basically ordinary men ~~---~~ were fervent individualists. They pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to the proposition that, in Emerson's words, "The private life of one man shall be a more illustrious monarchy than any kingdom."

America's heroes <sup>have been</sup> ~~are~~ individualists ~~---~~ fiery public individualists like Tom Paine and John Brown . . . secluded individualists like Thoreau.,

human<sup>STENO</sup>~~orists~~ individualists like Mark Twain, tinkering individualists like Tom Edison, courageous individuals like Billy Mitchell who phrased the eternal truth of democracy this way: "The bodies and organizations which the people created for the purpose of protecting them are merely agencies to put their world into execution."

Our democracy<sup>tic</sup> legacy dictates that the world-wide crisis of individualism is particularly an American crisis.

And in our particularly American way, we ~~have been~~<sup>are now</sup> groping for answers.

We know we have more opportunity for individual expression than any other major society in history -- including the ancient Greeks to whom democracy meant ruled by the few, the elite.

We remember, even as we yearn for a return for simple America when legislators held court over crack-barrels, that in those days, women and Negroes could not ~~vote~~<sup>→</sup> vote. The cry that rises <sup>today</sup> from the ~~depressed~~<sup>people</sup> residents of ~~the~~<sup>our</sup> city slums seems shrill because it is ~~so~~<sup>→</sup> so new.

Long years of resigned silence have given way to a new confidence in individual expression, a new feeling that something can be accomplished -- and is being accomplished by individual actions.

For every student extremist who resorts to violence of thought or violence of deed, there are 100 other students at work in peaceful, purposeful, political action groups working <sup>for</sup> change and progress ~~within~~<sup>→ within within</sup> our existing democratic system.

SO I ASK YOU PATRIOTS TO KNOW THIS:

Yes, democracy's groping for answers has not been without results.

Page 5

The very turmoil which dominates the morning headlines testifies to the continuing vitality of action and inter-action which is going on within our society.

This turmoil also tells us that democracy's essential ~~diag-~~ dialogue -- the dialogue between individuals and the established institutions of the society -- is not working satisfactorily.

Not just the university student -- nor poor people alone -- but a great many others in the country are asking today how they can make their voices heard and their ideas known . . . and accepted.

They want not only to protest but to propose . . . not only to dissent but to offer effective support. ~~They want to take a larger part in their government affairs . . . for that means, in a democracy, in their own affairs.~~

###

It is an imperative demand on our nation today to provide fuller means ~~for~~ the individual to speak out effectively . . . and yet consistently society's essential with the free ~~societies~~ safeguards.

*I propose to do this*  
~~This must be done in this~~ election campaign -- by providing forums throughout the country, so that the ~~sex~~ citizens in each community can ~~take common counsel~~ *meet together* and express their views more fully than their votes alone -- on a single election day -- permit.

*too,*  
*participation*  
There must be a deliberate effort to involve the largest possible ~~representation~~ of private ~~org.~~ organizations ~~in the Administration's~~ *and in meeting urgent social needs in our country.* *(C)*  
~~government programs~~

We must devise ways to use, much more fully than we have been, the desire and ability of individuals to perform volunteer service in public programs.

~~There is no reason to put responsibility in those state and local governments willing to assume responsibility for the human concern.~~

There must be worked out ~~and~~ and this will be hardest of all ~~methods~~ methods for the effective expression and communication of the views of those individuals who feel strongly . . . but who do not resort to the extremes of protests which now receive extraordinary notice.

Those of us who believe most deeply in social justice ~~must~~ must concern ourselves greatly with the ~~processes~~ *by* by which people's grievances are heard.

For democracy's essential difference lies in ~~in~~ those processes.

Those of us who are most truly concerned about preserving public order must do the most to see that there is adequate for any grievant

to be fully heard -- not in court -- but in democracy's counsels.

I say finally to you in this class:

Your commitment to the service of our country is complete,  
unqualified, unquestioning.

Democracy depends -- and always has -- on your kind of faith  
in it.

Democracy depends too -- as it always has -- on the individuals  
being protected by the <sup>ir</sup> government . . . and, at the same time, against  
it.

Our commitment to you -- who undertake the sense of democracy --  
is to see to it that democracy works, *so that what you are pledged*  
*to protect is worthy of your sacrifice.*  
We pledge ourselves to that purpose.

# # #

DRAFT

Air Force Academy

Today I want to speak with you about individualism.

This deeply personal subject is so big and basic -- and so much on my mind -- that I am giving a series of speeches on it.

Today I want to speak particularly about the relationships and the tensions between the individual and his government.

This is an ancient and long-debated issue, but I believe that it has particular relevance for our day.

And the subject is loaded with inherent conflicts.

Between the rights of individuals and the responsibilities of Government;

Between man's desire for privacy and man's need for social contact;

Between loyalty to one's self and loyalty to the group;

Between the public servant's obligation to lead the people, and his obligation to be led by the people.

I believe that these conflicts add up to a very central concern because this is an age of bigness -- big population, big cities, big corporations, big technology, big government.

And bigness tends to subvert the individual.

We see clear signs of protest against this subversion ... against the rise of institutions at the expense of individuals.

There are the protest ballads of Bob Dylan ... the protest poems of Allen Ginsburg ... the protest philosophy of Professor Herbert Marcuse ... and the popular little lapel button, which proclaims "I am a human being. Do not fold, spindle or mutilate ..."

The fever of protest in the streets of Europe -- including Eastern Europe -- and on the campuses of America, are symptoms of concern about the status of the individual.

The need to protect the rights and liberties of individuals is of particular concern to us, as Americans.

The Founding Fathers -- that extraordinary group of basically ordinary men -- were individualists. They laid down the American Propositions, a particularly individualistic proposition. It held that, in Emerson's words, "The private life of one man shall be <sup>a</sup> more illustrious monarchy than any kingdom."

America's heroes are individualists ... Fiery public individualists like

Tom Paine and John Brown ... secluded individualists like Thoreau ...

humorous individualists like Mark Twain ... tinkering individualists like

Tom Edison ... courageous individualists like Harry Truman -- and Billy Mitchell.

Billy Mitchell, speaking of the armed forces, phrased the eternal truth of democracy this way:

"The bodies and organizations which the people created for the purpose of protecting them are merely agencies to put their will into execution."

Today, as Government grows bigger and more complex, the agencies of Government appear to grow more distant from the people.

If we mean to preserve the integrity of democracy, surely we have the duty to preserve the integrity of the individual. What will America's course be?

Must we sacrifice our individualism as institutionalism rises? Can we preserve Government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Or must we have -- indeed do we have -- Government of the system, by the system, for the system?

We dream of distant days... Days when every state house was a prairie Athens... Days when every neighborhood was a public forum... Days when Abraham Lincoln--the man whom Tolstoy called a "universal individualist"--scratched out his orders with a quill and the help of two secretaries.

*In this place,*  
Those days will never return again. ~~Instead~~, we have big corporations, big ~~labor~~ unions, big university<sup>ies</sup>--and big Government.

Since Lincoln's day, the nation's population has increased six-fold, but the number of federal ~~agencies~~ <sup>civilian employees</sup> has multiplied almost <sup>one-hundred</sup> 100-fold, from 37,000 <sup>thousand</sup> to close to 3,000,000 <sup>three million</sup>. And the number of federal and local Government agencies has grown to 40,000 <sup>thousand</sup>.

Why this geometric increase? I believe that Government is growing not for the sake of growth <sup>itself</sup> but because it is responding to the legitimate wants and needs and expectations of the people. ~~So the~~ rise of government institutions is really a response to the wishes of the people.

*and necessary*  
So the growth of institutions is a good thing. But how can we concurrently preserve that other very good thing--American individualism?

How can the ~~average~~ individual American ever expect to win an argument with ~~xi~~ such distant experts as the tax investigator and the welfare invest

investigator?

~~I am disturbed because~~ Democracy's dialogue--the dialogue between the people and their public officials--has become lopsided. The mass media magnify the voice of the Government official, and television puts his image into practically every living room in the land. But where is the the feedback? Where ~~and how~~--and how--can the individual citizen talk back, except as a rare cipher in the public opinion poll, and except as one voice among millions on election day?

I think that these are very legitimate questions, and we must try to find answers.

Perhaps the time will come when we can use our inventive technology to amplify the voice of the people. Perhaps every voter can ~~will~~ have a pocket voting machine...an electronic gadget with a "Yes" button and a "No" button...allowing us to conduct instant referendums on public issues.

Whether or not the time has come for that, the time has indeed come for us to do at least three other things to magnify the voice of the individual:

First

The time has come for us to establish community forums, where people can speak on on the issues with a direct, active voice. That is

reason why my supporters will conduct public forums on public issues in dozens of communities across the nation in the next few months. I shall attend every one of these public forums. Then and there, I shall do my best to respond to the questions, the complaints and the ideas of the people. And I intend to continue these regular forums of the people if I am elected the President of the People.

Second, the time also has come for us to hire mediators to hear individual ideas and complaints -- the kind of mediators whom the Swedes call Ombudsmen.

Third, the time has come for us to revitalize and reform state constitutions and city charters to build new and equitable tax structures and to create regional or metropolitan political institutions that will give an even greater voice to the people. Much of this revitalization is already going on, but the drive for it could be speeded by an extra push from that potentially great force for reform, the university. The time has come, as I have said many times for the university to become more of a force for community action. The university must involve itself -- faculty and students -- in political action programs and social welfare

7. programs in the community beyond its gates.

I believe that Government can do much to liberate the human spirit--that indeed it already has done much.

For one thing, Government economic policy has helped to ~~make~~ make us economically liberated. Because most of us no longer have to worry about finding enough money to nourish our bodies, we now can invest more thought in the greater purpose of nourishing our spirits. And to the critics who <sup>in</sup> charge that the spirit of American entrepreneurship is being undermined by Government ~~guarantee~~ and insurance programs, let me point out that American individuals last year started 206 thousand new business enterprises--more than ever before.

Government legal policy has become so liberalized in questions of censorship and private morality that, for better or worse, individual men and women can exercise their eccentricities and occasional flaunt their aberrations.

Government <sup>also</sup> education policy has expanded learning to the point where 51 per cent of America's college age men and women are <sup>en</sup>rolled in colleges. Learning liberates. <sup>with</sup> learning enhances individualism. <sup>and</sup> learning makes for a louder and more articulate expression of the public's will.

Certainly we have more opportunity for individual expression than any other major society in history...Including the ancient Greeks, to whom democracy meant rule by the few, the elite, ~~the Renes~~

If we yearn for a return to a simpler America, when legislators held court over cracker barrels, let us also remember that in those days, women and Negroes could not vote...~~and some barons of industry boasted that they could buy whole legislatures--and they did.~~

Today the walls and ceilings are tumbling down, and that is good. The cry that rises from the deprived residents of the c/ty slums seems so shrill because it is so new. The long years of resigned silence have given way to a new confidence in individual expression, a new feeling that something can be accomplished--and is being accomplished --by individual action.

I believe that there is hope for even greater individual expression and greater individual action.

For every person who complains that he is just another "mass man," lost in "the lonely crowd," there are one hundred other <sup>persons</sup> ~~men~~ who realize ~~x~~ that ~~more than ever~~ we have the freedom of choice--and the burden of choic<sup>ty</sup>.

Far more than our forefather, we have to make decisions--decisions that once were made for us by circumstance or tradition or necessity. Man is forced to choose--to choose his career, his wife, his friends, his political allegiance, and even the number of children that he will have.

For every executive who grouses about bumper-to-bumper conformity in the corporate world, there are one hundred other executives--and their wives, and their children--at work in private crusades in their home communities...on school boards,...on town councils...in social action groups. <sup>T</sup>hey give credence to the idea--an idea that I fervently support and hope to expand--that individual action, that ~~community~~ <sup>community</sup> action can work.

For every student extremist who resorts to violence of thought or violence of deed, there are <sup>one hundred</sup> ~~100~~ other students ~~at~~ at work in peaceful, purposeful political action groups....Working for change and progress within our existing democratic system.

"Be not conformed to the world," echoed Saint Paul. But non-conformity alone is no measure of individualism. No man is more rigidly conformist than the ritualistic non-conformist....Including

10.

the man who automatically assails his Government, not because he is  
"doing his own thing," <sup>but</sup> but because "It is the thing to do."

The law of liberty holds that the individual ~~must always~~ <sup>always must be</sup> the  
master and the institution the servant.

That seems self-evident to us...But let us never take it for  
granted. For freedom must be won anew every day, and America must  
re-declare her purposes every day.

America has entered an historic period...A new period ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup>  
when we are redefining the <sup>S</sup>social compact. We are ~~redefining the~~  
~~and~~ restructurturing the relationships between blacks and whites...

Between ~~the~~ older and ~~the~~ young...between old and young...between

the individual and the institutions....  
*We are trying to make Government more human,  
more aware, more responsive,  
effort and this*

I urge each of you to put yourself into this debate...to become  
a disputant in democracy's <sup>dialogue</sup> dialogue, the continuing and peaceful  
dialogue.

My message to you is ~~simply~~ this:

You have much more to contribute to society...and to your own  
individual free spirits...by speaking up...by working for change and  
progress within our existing institutions...than by rejecting them  
or defying them or dropping out of them.

11.

If we are really individuals, let us distinguish between dissent and disorder....between non-conformity and nihilism... between compromise and copping out.

I call upon each of you to show a special genius--the genius of being an individual. For only so long as America continues to be a land of individuals--the land of individuals--can the people reign...And ~~for~~ freedom ring.

The bastion of individualism is conscience. And a person commence<sup>s</sup>/to be an individual when he declares his conscience. You have proved <sup>your</sup> ~~this~~ declaration of conscience by declaring yourselves to your country's service at this important hour.



# 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)