

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
PILLSBURY COMPANY CENTENNIAL  
"THE INDICTMENT OF THE SYSTEM AND SOCIETY"  
THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
OCTOBER 16, 1969

L LAST JANUARY, FOR THE FIRST TIME IN TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, I LEFT ACTIVE  
POLITICS AND RETURNED TO TEACH HERE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA AND AT  
MACALESTER COLLEGE. L IT DID NOT SURPRISE ME, AFTER THE 1968 PRESIDENTIAL  
CAMPAIGN, TO FIND THAT STUDENTS WERE ASKING PROVOCATIVE AND DIFFICULT  
QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NATURE OF OUR DEMOCRATIC ENTERPRISE. L IT WAS NOT SIMPLY  
A MATTER OF FINDING SOLUTIONS TO THE GREAT SOCIAL PROBLEMS FACING OUR  
COUNTRY. L IT WAS MORE A DISTURBING QUESTIONING OF THE VERY FOUNDATIONS OF  
OUR POLITICAL PROCESS ITSELF, AND THE PRINCIPLES AND BELIEFS WHICH UNDERGIRD  
THE ENTIRE SOCIAL ORDER.

L IN ADJUSTING TO THIS NEW ENVIRONMENT WITH A NEW GENERATION OF DEEPLY  
CONCERNED STUDENTS, I CAME TO LEARN THAT MY ANSWERS ABOUT THIS NATION'S  
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS WERE NOT SUFFICIENT -- FOR ME OR MY STUDENTS.

L AND THEIR QUESTIONING OF THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS AND THE NATURE OF OUR  
SOCIETY DID NOTHING FOR MY PEACE OF MIND. L IN ANY EVENT, I HAVE COME BETTER

TO APPRECIATE BOTH THE MAGNITUDE OF THE CHALLENGE THAT THE AMERICAN SYSTEM  
OF SELF-GOVERNMENT HAS TO FACE AND THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE IN WHICH IT  
 IS MOST CLEARLY SEEN.

FOR ME, THIS HAS BEEN A YEAR OF CONSIDERABLE INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION  
 AND EXAMINATION. AS IT IS WITH MOST TEACHERS, I HAVE LEARNED AS MUCH AS  
 I HAVE TAUGHT.

WE AMERICANS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN A RESTLESS NATION - RESTLESS IN SPACE,  
RESTLESS IN TIME. THROUGHOUT AMERICAN HISTORY, THIS RESTLESSNESS HAS PRO-  
 DUCED A CONSTANT SERIES OF CHALLENGES TO OUR IDEALS AND INSTITUTIONS. THE

"GENERATION GAP" IS NO NEW PHENOMENON; NOR OURS THE FIRST "CRITICAL ERA" *through*

*which* WE HAVE LIVED THROUGH. BUT I MUST SAY ~~TO YOU~~ THAT, IN MY OPINION, OUR

PRESENT CRISIS IS ONE OF THE BIG ONES, RIVALED PERHAPS ONLY TWICE IN OUR

HISTORY: BY THE CIVIL WAR, WHICH TESTED OUR ABILITY TO CONTINUE AS ONE

NATION DEDICATED TO DEMOCRATIC AND HUMANITARIAN PRINCIPLES, AND BY THE

GREAT DEPRESSION OF THE 1930's, WHICH EXPOSED THE FLAWS IN OUR ECONOMIC

SYSTEM AND CHALLENGED US TO FIND A NEW PLACE FOR THE FREE INDIVIDUAL IN A

SOCIAL ORDER OF INCREASING COMPLEXITY. BOTH OF THESE CRISES WERE TRAGIC

EVENTS IN OUR HISTORY. AND BOTH CONTAIN STRIKING PARALLELS TO THE  
AMERICAN CONDITION WE ENCOUNTER TODAY,

By some standards and compared to many other nations, we are a  
UNITED PEOPLE, SHARING A COMMON DESTINY. INDEED, IT IS VERY ODD THAT WE  
SHOULD BE HAVING A CRISIS AT ALL. WE HAVE SOLVED THE MOST DIFFICULT  
QUESTIONS OF PRODUCING GOODS AND MANAGING THE LARGEST AND MOST DIVERSE  
ECONOMY IN HISTORY. BY MOST CONVENTIONAL ECONOMIC INDICATORS, WE ARE A  
PROSPEROUS AND HEALTHY NATION. YET IT IS ALSO QUITE CLEAR TO ANYONE WITH  
EYES TO SEE THAT THESE CONVENTIONAL INDICATORS ARE NO LONGER AS USEFUL  
AS THEY ONCE WERE. THEY DO NOT DECEIVE, BUT THEY DO MISLEAD. SOMETIMES  
I GET THE IMPRESSION THAT WE AMERICANS ARE GETTING BETTER AND BETTER AT  
MEASURING THINGS WHICH ARE OF LESSER AND LESSER IMPORTANCE.

DESPITE THE GLOWING TESTIMONY OF NATIONAL INCOME FIGURES, OF THE  
GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT, EVEN OF THOSE FIGURES THAT REVEAL A SHARP DECREASE  
IN THE NUMBERS LIVING BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL - DESPITE ALL OF THIS, THERE  
 IS EVIDENCE BENEATH THE AMERICAN SURFACE - AND NOT ALWAYS BENEATH IT - OF  
A SOCIAL TURBULENCE WHICH IS AS POTENTIALLY DESTRUCTIVE TO OUR DEMOCRACY

AS THE FORCES UNLEASHED BY THE CIVIL WAR AND THE GREAT DEPRESSION. AND I AM  
 SPEAKING OF FORCES QUITE APART FROM THE GROWING AND INCREASINGLY OUTSPOKEN  
 OPPOSITION TO THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

↳ IN WAYS NO ONE COULD HAVE PREDICTED YESTERDAY - IN WAYS WHICH NO ONE  
DID PREDICT YESTERDAY - THE MOST BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF OUR SOCIETY ARE BEING  
 CHALLENGED. ↳ IT IS NOT UNUSUAL TO SEE YOUNG AMERICANS ATTACKING THE EXISTENCE  
 OF POVERTY OR THE UNEQUAL DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AND OPPORTUNITY. <sup>But</sup> IT IS  
UNUSUAL TO SEE THEM ATTACKING THE IDEA OF AFFLUENCE ITSELF.

↳ TO BE SURE, A HANDFUL OF PHILOSOPHERS AND SOCIAL CRITICS - THOREAU,  
 EMERSON, SANTAYANA - HAVE ALWAYS BEEN DISDAINFUL OF "MATERIALISM" OR  
AFFLUENCE. ↳ BUT NOW, IT IS AN AUTHENTICALLY POPULAR ATTITUDE AMONG THE  
 YOUNG. ↳ THINGS ARE NO LONGER IN THE SADDLE. THE HORSE IS FOR THE MOMENT  
RIDERLESS, SO THE QUESTION ARISES: CAN WE INVEST OUR DEMOCRATIC ENTERPRISES  
 WITH THE MORAL PURPOSE AND SENSE OF VALUES WHICH SEEM TO BE LACKING AND  
 WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL FOR SURVIVAL BEYOND OUR GENERATION? ↳ CAN WE LIVE WITH  
 AFFLUENCE WITHOUT CASTING ASIDE DEMOCRATIC IDEALS AND NATIONAL GOALS?



IN THE YEAR SINCE THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, I HAVE OBSERVED AMERICA FROM THE UNIQUE POSITION OF A PUBLIC MAN WHO IS NOW A PRIVATE CITIZEN.

I HAVE COME TO SEE NOW MORE CLEARLY THAN EVER BEFORE THAT IN CERTAIN CRITICAL RESPECTS, WE ARE -- DIVIDED OVER THE ROLE OF INSTITUTIONS IN SOCIETY, AND DIVIDED OVER THE BASIC ENDS FOR WHICH OUR SOCIETY EXISTS. WE ARE IT SEEMS, A NATION AT WAR WITH ITSELF.

WE HAVE ALL SEEN AND HEARD THE ACTIVE AND VOCAL PROTEST, REACHING FROM ~~THE~~ THE POOR LOCKED IN CITY GHETTOS TO MANY OF THE STUDENTS AND FACULTIES IN OUR UNIVERSITIES.

WE HAVE WITNESSED BLACK RAGE AND WHITE FEAR. WE HAVE SEEN THE REALITY OF NOT ONE AMERICA - BUT TWO - SEPARATE AND UNEQUAL.

WE HAVE ALSO FELT THE MORE SILENT PROTEST, BY THOSE AMERICANS WHO HAVE WORKED THEIR WAY UP FROM POVERTY AND DISADVANTAGE TO A BETTER LIFE, AND WHO NOW SEE THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS OR THEIR POSSIBILITIES FOR GROWTH THREATENED BY THE DEMAND FOR MORE CHANGE.

AND THE STEADY EROSION OF OUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT LOOMS LARGER ON ALL OF OUR HORIZONS AS A THREAT TO OUR VERY SURVIVAL.

"The hardest gap to bridge  
is not the generation gap,  
but the gap between what  
is and what could be"

THERE IS INCREASING DISAFFECTION WITH GOVERNMENT AND THE INSTITUTIONS  
 WE HAVE BUILT TO PRESERVE OUR DEMOCRACY. AND THERE IS A RISING TIDE OF LAW-  
 LESSNESS IN MANY FORMS, ITSELF PARTLY AN EXPRESSION OF A DEEPER FRUSTRATION  
 OF HUMAN ASPIRATION, PARTLY A WORLD-WIDE REJECTION OF AUTHORITY AND RULES OF  
CONDUCT, AND PARTLY A GESTURE OF SELF-HATRED, AN ASSAULT BY A MATERIALISTIC  
SOCIETY UPON ITSELF.

THESE ARE NOT ISOLATED PROBLEMS, TO BE APPROACHED SINGLY, NOR WILL  
 THEY GO AWAY SIMPLY BECAUSE WE WILL IT. ~~SOME~~ <sup>SOME</sup> SEE THEM AS A LIVING IN-  
DICTIONMENT OF THE PALTRY ACHIEVEMENTS OF OUR SYSTEM. I DO NOT AGREE. OUR  
 ACHIEVEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN PALTRY. I SEE THESE PROBLEMS AND OUR TURBULENCE  
 RATHER AS AN INDICTMENT OF THE UNREALIZED POTENTIAL OF OUR DEMOCRATIC  
 SYSTEM. In fact - the

THIS YEAR, AS A TEACHER AND NOT JUST AS A POLITICIAN, I HAVE HAD THIS  
 INDICTMENT PRESENTED TO ME BY SERIOUS-MINDED AND VOCAL MEMBERS OF THE RISING  
 GENERATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE AND BY CONCERNED TEACHERS. MANY OF THEM TELL ME  
 THAT THE ENTIRE ORDER OF AMERICAN POLITICS, INHERITED FROM THE PAST, CAN NO  
 LONGER WORK IN A WORLD OF RAPID AND PERVASIVE CHANGE. THERE IS NO LINK, THEY

SAY, BETWEEN THE LOUD TALK OF THE POLITICIAN AND THE SMALL, STILL VOICE OF  
 INDIVIDUAL CONSCIENCE; BETWEEN URGENT NEEDS AND THE CAPACITY OF OUR ESTABLISHED  
 INSTITUTIONS TO RESPOND TO THEM. AND THEY FURTHER SAY THAT ONLY THE  
 PERSONS WHO DENY THE EVIDENCE OF THEIR OWN SENSES CAN IGNORE THE  
 SHAMEFUL REALITY OF TWO AMERICAS IN OUR MIDST, THE ONE AFFLUENT AND  
 OFTEN INDIFFERENT, THE OTHER MISERABLE AND SEETHING WITH FRUSTRATION.

~~THIS YEAR~~ I HAVE LISTENED TO THESE AND OTHER AMERICANS WHO INDICT A  
 POLITICAL SYSTEM THEY BELIEVE TO BE GEARED ALMOST AUTOMATICALLY TO POURING  
 OUT LIMITLESS BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN SUPPORT OF ARMAMENT SYSTEMS BEYOND  
 THE BOUNDS OF RATIONAL AND JUSTIFIABLE NEEDS, - BUT, ~~A SYSTEM WHICH AS THEY~~  
~~SEE IT,~~ STRAINS AT A GNAT WHEN ASKED TO DEAL WITH THE DEMANDS OF OUR  
 EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM, THE CRISIS CONDITIONS IN OUR CITIES, IN OUR IMPOVERISHED  
 RURAL AREAS, THE INEQUALITIES OF OPPORTUNITY, AND THE APPALLING FACTS OF  
 HUNGER, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND ILLITERACY AMONG THE ~~POOR AND ONE-FOURTH~~ *deprived* OF OUR  
 POPULATION, WHITE AND BLACK ALIKE. ~~MANY AMERICANS FEEL THIS SYSTEM IS~~  
~~GEARED TO SPEND BILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO PUT TWO MEN ON THE MOON, BUT IS~~

~~Sullen and hard-hearted when asked to help put a dispirited man back on his feet here on earth.~~

In my travels, I have heard another part of this indictment, from *an older*  
 generation of Americans who have seen the certainities of the past eroded  
one by one in the face of change, who have shaped their lives by the stan-  
dards of the past, but find that they no longer provide a sure pathway to  
 the future. *by violence* They find that their past efforts are scorned -- ~~that~~ they are  
 often denied the security they have earned for the well-being of themselves  
 and their families, for their property, and sometimes even their lives. They  
 see a lifetime of work marred by the fear that the world they bequeath to  
 their children will be no better than their own, and perhaps much worse.

Some of these Americans, whatever their indictment, turn in their  
 frustration to oppose democracy, itself, while still others have a vague  
 sense of discontent that is inevitably transformed into disillusionment and  
 bitterness.

I have also encountered, *there is* ~~especially~~ among the young, *some of* a growing sense  
 of moral authoritarianism which seemingly blinds these *young* critics to the

TERRIBLY COMPLEX NATURE OF THESE PROBLEMS AND TO THE FALLIBILITY OF ALL

HUMAN ACTION. THIS DISTURBING TENDENCY TO DISMISS OUT OF HAND THE POSSIBILITY

OF HONEST DISAGREEMENT -- TO SEE THE PROCESS OF COOPERATION AND COMPROMISE

AS REFLECTING "PERSONAL IMMORALITY" RATHER THAN RECOGNIZING IT AS THE ESSENCE

OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT -- HAS ITSELF BECOME AS DESTRUCTIVE OF THE DEMOCRATIC

ENTERPRISE AS THE SOCIAL WRONGS THAT MUST BE REMEDIED.

THESE INDICTMENTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES POSE THE MOST BASIC QUESTIONS:

CAN WE MAINTAIN ALLEGIANCE TO A POLITICAL SYSTEM BASED UPON REASON AND

COMPASSION, SELF-DISCIPLINE, A DECENT RESPECT FOR THE OPINIONS OF OTHERS,

AND A SENSE OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY? CAN OUR DEMOCRATIC

SYSTEM SURVIVE THE NEW DEMANDS AND PRESSURES PLACED UPON IT? CAN IT PROVIDE

SOLUTIONS THAT ARE AT LEAST MINIMALLY WORKABLE?

THE ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS CAN NO LONGER AUTOMATICALLY BE ASSUMED

IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. THE VERY FACT THAT THESE QUESTIONS EXIST MAKES IT CLEAR

THAT THERE CAN BE NO EASY ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE INEVITABLE SUCCESS OF THE

DEMOCRATIC QUEST. BUT NEITHER CAN JOIN THOSE WHO WOULD SIMPLY ABANDON A

METHOD OF SELF-GOVERNMENT THAT HAS BROUGHT US THIS FAR AND THAT IS CONSIS-

TENT WITH MAN'S EARLIEST ASPIRATIONS OF HUMAN BROTHERHOOD. OUR TASK NOW IS

TO BEGIN THE SEARCH FOR A NEW STRATEGY OF DEMOCRACY, ONE THAT WILL REBUT THE  
INDICTMENT, CLAUSE BY CLAUSE, AND VINDICATE THE AMERICAN DREAM,

\* \* \* \*

TO UNDERSTAND THE TERMS OF THE INDICTMENT OF DEMOCRACY IS THE FIRST  
STEP IN DEFINING A STRATEGY OF REAFFIRMATION. THE NEXT STEP MUST BE TO UNDER-  
STAND MORE THOROUGHLY THE NEW AND LARGELY UNSEEN FORCES AT WORK IN OUR WORLD  
WHICH HAVE CAUSED THESE TROUBLED CIRCUMSTANCES, SHAPING REALITY ALMOST  
WITHOUT OUR KNOWING IT.

I RECOGNIZE, OF COURSE, THE DEVASTATING IMPACT WHICH THE TRAGIC WAR IN  
SOUTHEAST ASIA HAS HAD ON THIS COUNTRY, PARTICULARLY ON MANY OF OUR YOUNGER  
AMERICANS. IT HAS BROUGHT IN ITS WAKE NOT ONLY DEATH AND DESTRUCTION TO  
OUR OWN PEOPLE AND OTHERS, IT HAS ALSO ADDED A MEASURE OF BITTERNESS,  
ALIENATION, SUSPICION AND CYNICISM WHICH ERODES AND DESTROYS RESPECT FOR  
AND TRUST IN OUR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ORDER. THE HIGHEST PRIORITY IS TO  
END THIS WAR. MY PURPOSE ON THIS OCCASION, HOWEVER, IS TO EXAMINE THOSE

LESS VISIBLE FACTORS WHICH, IN MY VIEW, HAVE BROUGHT US TO THE PRESENT  
CRISIS OF DEMOCRACY -- FACTORS WHICH WOULD HAVE EXISTED REGARDLESS OF VIETNAM  
AND WHICH WILL BE AT WORK WHEN HOPEFULLY THIS TERRIBLE CONFLICT IS FINALLY  
OVER.

↳ WE NEED TO RECOGNIZE THAT MUCH OF WHAT WE HAVE TAKEN FOR GRANTED IN  
 OUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT IS CHANGING RADICALLY -- AND FOR THE WORSE UNLESS  
 WE ACT TO PREVENT IT. ↳ THE SHEER SIZE OF AMERICA AND THE SPEED OF ITS GROWTH,  
 BOTH IN POPULATION AND IN THE PRODUCTS OF OUR INDUSTRIAL ECONOMY, BRINGS  
 WITH IT REVOLUTIONARY IMPLICATIONS. NOT ONLY IS OUR LIVING SPACE DWINDLING,  
 BUT THE QUALITY OF THIS SPACE IS DECLINING.

↳ THERE IS THE GROWING CONCENTRATION OF OUR PEOPLE INTO A FEW CONTIGUOUS  
 URBAN COMMUNITIES. THIS POPULATION SHIFT WILL MAKE AVAILABLE TO MORE  
 PEOPLE THE ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL ADVANTAGES THAT ONLY URBAN LIFE CAN PROVIDE;  
 YET, IT IS ALSO LIKELY TO LIMIT EACH MAN'S SENSE OF THE LIVING SPACE NECESSARY  
 FOR HEALTHY PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT. ↳ EXPOSURE TO THE HOSTILE AND CONTINUOUS  
 PRESSURES OF URBAN STRESS, CROWDING, AND SOCIAL CONFLICT CAN ONLY UPSET



THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BALANCE WHICH MOST PEOPLE REQUIRE FOR HAPPY AND PRODUCTIVE LIVES.

IN A SIMILAR WAY, THE PACE OF OUR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OVER THE PAST FEW DECADES HAS ENHANCED THOSE HUMAN ACTIVITIES THAT SERVE THE LIMITED FUNCTIONS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH -- AND HAS DOWNGRADED OTHER FACTORS THAT RELATE TO THE PRESERVATION OF MAN'S HUMANITY. WE NOW MAINTAIN AN ECONOMY THAT IS RAPIDLY APPROACHING A GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT OF A TRILLION DOLLARS A YEAR. YET WE HAVE PAID FOR MUCH OF THIS GROWTH IN THE DESTRUCTION OF OUR WORLD. WE HAVE POLLUTED THE AIR OF OUR CITIES, POURED CHEMICAL WASTES INTO OUR RIVERS AND LAKES -- TO THE POINT OF DESTROYING SUCH PRICELESS NATURAL TREASURES AS LAKE ERIE AND THE HUDSON RIVER. WE TOLERATE THE INTRUSION INTO OUR PRIVATE LIVES OF URBAN NOISE, AND THE CONGESTION THAT RESULTS FROM SHEER, UNCONTROLLED MASS. THIS DESTRUCTION OF OUR NATURAL HERITAGE, THIS ASSAULT ON MAN'S PERSONALITY - EVEN THOUGH MUCH OF IT HAS BEEN UNINTENTIONAL - IS BASICALLY IMMORAL - A TRAGIC EXAMPLE OF MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN.

THE PROBLEM OF POLLUTION IS BASIC TO OUR FUTURE. FOR THE FIRST TIME, WE MAY BE ON THE THRESHOLD OF CONTROLLING THE MOST POWERFUL OF ALL THE

*Pollution*

NATURAL FORCES; THE WEATHER; BUT AT THE SAME TIME WE ARE FAILING TO CONTROL  
 THE NATURE OF THE AIR WE BREATHE, TO PROTECT OUR FOOD AND WATER FROM ACCUMU-  
 LATING POISONS, OR TO INSURE THE SURVIVAL OF A NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AT ALL.

↳ THERE IS NO REASON TO TOLERATE THESE DESTRUCTIVE BY-PRODUCTS OF IN-  
 DUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT. ↳ WE HAVE THE SKILLS TO ORDER OUR ECONOMIC DEVELOP-  
 MENT WITHOUT PAYING THE PRICE OF HUMAN DEGRADATION AND OF SUBMITTING MAN,  
 HIMSELF, TO THE IMPERSONAL WORKINGS OF INDUSTRY. ↳ THIS IS NOT ONLY SOMETHING  
 WE CAN DO; IT IS SOMETHING WE MUST DO. ~~IF WE ARE TO FIND THAT ALL OUR MATERIAL~~  
~~PROGRESS, ALL OUR AFFLUENCE, ONLY STIFLE AND FRUSTRATE US.~~

↳ THIS WILL REQUIRE US TO BE ATTENTIVE TO THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT OF  
 OUR SOCIETY AS NEVER BEFORE. ↳ WE MUST GO BEYOND THE MERE CONSERVATION OF  
 OUR NATURAL RESOURCES, OF OPEN SPACES, OF PURE WATER AND CLEAN AIR. IT  
 WILL REQUIRE US TO DEVELOP A CLEAR SET OF GOALS: TO DEVELOP AND RESTORE  
 OUR CITIES WITH CARE, AS EXPRESSIONS OF THE HIGHEST ACHIEVEMENT OF MAN'S

CULTURE WE MUST HARMONIZE WITH NATURE, INSTEAD OF DESTROYING IT, REVIVE  
THE DYING IDEA OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD; AND ENSURE THAT WHERE A MAN LIVES  
 AND WORKS CONTRIBUTES TO HIS SENSE OF WELL-BEING AND BELONGING -- MAKE  
 CERTAIN THAT IT HAS A HUMANIZING IMPACT ON HIM -- INSTEAD OF STUNTING HIS  
 MENTAL AND <sup>spiritual</sup> ~~MENTAL~~ GROWTH.

BUT LET US NOT MAKE THE COMMON MISTAKE OF ASSUMING THAT WE ARE  
 GOING TO ACHIEVE THESE GOALS PAINLESSLY OR COSTLESSLY. WE ARE GOING TO  
 HAVE TO PAY FOR MOST OF THEM - EITHER BY TAXATION OR A HIGHER COST OF LIVING.

TOO MANY WHO DECLAIM VOCIFEROUSLY AGAINST AIR POLLUTION CONTINUE TO RESIST  
 EFFORTS TO DISCOURAGE THEM FROM USING <sup>our</sup> ~~THEIR~~ AUTOMOBILES OR <sup>oppose</sup> ~~QUESTION~~ HIGHER  
~~PRICES TO BUILD~~ <sup>ing</sup> A RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM. INDIGNATION AGAINST SOCIAL EVILS

IS JUST AND NECESSARY. BUT THE ERADICATION OF THESE EVILS REQUIRES SELF-  
DISCIPLINE AND COMMITMENT. AND, AT THE MOMENT, WE ARE QUITE A WAYS FROM A  
WORKING EQUILIBRIUM, WITH SELF-DISCIPLINE AND COMMITMENT IN SHORTER SUPPLY  
THAN INDIGNATION.

OUR WORTH AS A NATION AND AS A PEOPLE -- VALUED IN TERMS THAT GO  
FAR BEYOND MATERIAL ACCOMPLISHMENT - DEPENDS UPON SECURING FOR EVERYONE

TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE, NOT AS BENEFITS BUT AS RIGHTS, THE BASIC  
PREREQUISITES OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND SECURITY  
AGAINST MISFORTUNE. BUT WE ALSO NEED SOMETHING LESS TANGIBLE: A SENSE  
 OF IDENTITY AND A SENSE OF COMMUNITY.

AS WE ADVANCE BEYOND TODAY'S INDUSTRIAL ERA, OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM WILL  
 ALSO GO THROUGH PROFOUND CHANGES. WE MUST LEARN TO COPE WITH THESE CHANGES  
 MORE EFFECTIVELY THAN WE HAVE IN THE PAST. THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN OUR

ECONOMY HAS LIMITED HIS PERSONAL SENSE OF WORTH; THE END PRODUCTS OF HIS  
LABORS ARE REMOVED FARTHER AND FARTHER FROM HIS OWN CONTRIBUTION. THE  
PRIDE OF PRODUCT AND PERFORMANCE BECOMES CORPORATE RATHER THAN INDIVIDUAL.

THE RESULT IS A CITIZEN WHO, THOUGH FULLY AND PRODUCTIVELY EMPLOYED, NEVER-  
 THELESS FEELS INCREASINGLY ISOLATED. HE HAS FEWER OPPORTUNITIES TO FIND A  
SENSE OF WORTH THAT IS NOT BASED ON THE ACCUMULATION OF MATERIAL GOODS ALONE.

WE CAN NO LONGER DODGE THE BASIC TASK OF RECONCILING AN AFFLUENT FREE  
 PEOPLE TO A SENSE OF PURPOSE. OUR OBJECTIVES MUST BE REARRANGED SO THAT  
 WE MEASURE THEM NOT IN TERMS OF ECONOMIC PRODUCTIVITY ALONE, BUT ALSO IN  
TERMS OF HUMAN AMENITY -- PERSONAL HAPPINESS, IF YOU WILL!

↳ DESPITE A GREAT DEAL OF INDIVIDUALISTIC RHETORIC, MOST OF IT QUITE SINCERELY MEANT, WE HAVE NEVER PUT THE WHOLE INDIVIDUAL, AS DISTINCT FROM THE ECONOMIC MAN, FIRST.

↳ OUR TASK IS WITHOUT PRECEDENT IN AMERICAN HISTORY, FOR IT WAS ALWAYS ASSUMED THAT THE INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVED HIS SENSE OF MORAL PURPOSE, OF COMMUNITY, THROUGH HIS FAMILY, HIS CHURCH, HIS VARIOUS VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS.

↳ BUT TODAY FOR VARIOUS REASONS, THIS IS NOT ENOUGH. ↳ THERE IS A VITAL ROLE FOR GOVERNMENT AS WELL. ↳ THIS IS A DANGEROUS MISSION, SINCE THERE IS ALWAYS THE SPECTRE OF AUTHORITARIANISM LURKING IN THE BACKGROUND. ↳ BUT IT IS AN INESCAPABLE MISSION AND NOT, I BELIEVE, AN IMPOSSIBLE ONE.

↳ IN THE FUTURE, THERE WILL ALSO BE THE FACT OF INCREASING LEISURE TIME - WHEN THE ROLE OF WORK IN MEETING THE NEEDS OF OUR ECONOMY WILL DECLINE.

↳ IN THE PAST, WORK HAS CONSUMED THE BULK OF MAN'S ENERGIES, AND HAS BEEN A MAJOR SOURCE OF THE SELF-DISCIPLINE THAT HELPS GIVE SHAPE TO HIS LIFE.

↳ WE HAVE BUILT OUR COUNTRY AND OUR ECONOMY ON TRADITIONS THAT HAVE MADE WORK THE CENTRAL ACTIVITY OF IMPORTANCE IN MAN'S TEMPORAL LIFE. ↳ BUT, AS TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES LEAD TO A SHORTER AND SHORTER WORK WEEK, WHERE WILL WE

*Tension*

FIND THE ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF THIS SELF-DISCIPLINE, THIS FOCUS FOR OUR  
PRODUCTIVE LIVES?

↳ IF WE ARE TO RESTORE TO EACH MAN THE SENSE OF PERSONAL WORTH AND  
COMMUNITY, AND IF WE ARE TO RESURRECT THE CONFIDENT SELF-DISCIPLINE HE  
ONCE GAINED FROM THE SATISFACTION OF PRODUCTIVE WORK, WE MUST BE PREPARED  
TO CHANGE OUR BASIC CULTURAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS WORK ITSELF. ↳ THIS CHANGE  
WILL BE DIFFICULT. ↳ EVEN NOW, OUR ATTITUDES TOWARDS WORK AND THE REWARDS  
OF SOCIETY STILL KEEP US, AS A NATION, FROM PROVIDING THE BASIC AMENITIES  
OF LIFE -- FOOD, SHELTER, MEDICAL ATTENTION -- TO THOSE AMERICANS WHO ARE  
TOO POOR TO AFFORD THEM AND TOO UNSKILLED TO PERFORM SUCCESSFULLY IN THE  
ECONOMY. ↳ WHEN OUR ECONOMY REQUIRES FROM EACH OF US EVEN LESS IN TERMS OF  
LABOR, WE WILL FACE THE NEED FOR A BASIC READJUSTMENT IN THE INCENTIVES THAT  
ARE NOW PROVIDED TO ENCOURAGE EACH MAN TO TAKE PART IN THE PRODUCTIVE LIFE  
OF AMERICA. ↳ WE WILL NEED DIFFERENT INCENTIVES BECAUSE WE WILL BE AIMING  
AT DIFFERENT GOALS.

↳ WE WILL NO LONGER BE ABLE TO DEFINE A MAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO HIS  
COMMUNITY IN ECONOMIC TERMS ALONE. ↳ ~~HOW WE JUDGE OTHERS~~ -- AND OURSELVES --

WILL HAVE TO BE DONE ACCORDING TO A NEW SET OF CRITERIA, A NEW IMAGE OF THE SUCCESSFUL MAN. ONE IS FAIRLY CERTAIN THAT THESE CRITERIA AND THIS IMAGE WILL BE CAST INCREASINGLY IN TERMS OF EACH MAN'S SEARCH FOR PERSONAL INTEGRITY AND FULFILLMENT, HIS OWN "PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS." THIS WILL REQUIRE A BROADENING OF THE DEFINITION OF WHAT WE CALL "WORK," PLACING NEW STRESS ON THE CONTRIBUTIONS THAT INDIVIDUALS MAKE TO THE LIFE OF THEIR COMMUNITY OR FAMILY, EVEN THOUGH THEY CANNOT BE ACCOUNTED FOR IN MATERIAL TERMS ALONE.

WE HAVE COME TO UNDERSTAND THAT THE ARTIST, THE ACTOR, THE POET -- AND OTHERS WHO CONTRIBUTE TO THE CULTURAL LIFE OF OUR NATION -- ARE MAKING AN ESSENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO OUR CIVILIZATION, TO OUR "WELFARE." IN THE FUTURE, WE MUST INCLUDE STILL OTHERS, ESPECIALLY THOSE WHO WILL FIND IN SERVICE TO THEIR COMMUNITIES A MAJOR SOURCE OF PERSONAL SATISFACTION AND REWARD. "PARTICIPATION" WILL CEASE TO BE A MERELY POLITICAL TERM AND WILL BECOME AN IDEAL ATTRIBUTE OF THE IDEAL CITIZEN. TO SOME EXTENT, IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN SUCH IN AMERICA. ~~BUT IT MUST BECOME MORE SO.~~

~~MORE THAN A DUTIFUL ASSOCIATION WITH AN ESTABLISHED ORGANIZATION.~~

↳ OF ALL THE NEW FORCES THAT WILL SHAPE MEN'S LIVES AND STRIKE AT THE VERY BASIS OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIETY, THE MOST IMPORTANT HAS ALSO BEEN ONE OF OUR GREATEST BLESSINGS: THE DRIVING FORCE OF TECHNOLOGY.

↳ IN THE PAST FEW DECADES, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY HAVE BROUGHT US AS CLOSE TO ACCOMPLISHING MIRACLES AS MAN CAN DARE. ↳ YET WE NOW TAKE THIS PROGRESS FOR GRANTED, AS PART OF THE REWARD FOR AN INDUSTRIAL NATION THAT HAS SOLVED SO MANY OF THE DIFFICULT AND INTRIGUING PROBLEMS THAT HAVE BAFFLED MAN THROUGHOUT THE AGES. ↳ THINK OF IT -- EVERY PERSON BORN AFTER JULY 21, 1969

WILL ACCEPT AS A FACT THAT MAN MAY TRAVEL TO THE MOON IF HE SO DESIRES.

↳ WHEN I WAS A CHILD IN SOUTH DAKOTA, A TRIP TO MINNEAPOLIS WAS A MARVEL.

↳ NOTHING WE DO NOW, SHORT OF DESTROYING THE WORLD ITSELF, CAN ERASE FROM MAN'S MEMORY THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCIENCES THAT IS NOW AT OUR COM-

MAND. ↳ BUT HEREIN LIES THE GREATEST CHALLENGE OF ALL, AS WE STRIVE TO CONTROL THE SEEMINGLY INEVITABLE DEVELOPMENT OF NEWER AND MORE TERRIFYING WEAPONS.



L WE -- AND OTHERS -- ARE NOW DEVELOPING NEW FORMS OF DESTRUCTION THAT ARE ERODING THE VERY PREMISES ON WHICH WE HAVE BASED OUR SECURITY IN THE

NUCLEAR AGE. L UNLESS WE ACT SOON -- AND HALT THIS DRIFT TO NUCLEAR HOLO- CAUST -- WE MAY FIND THAT WE HAVE LOST THE CHANCE TO ADAPT OUR LIVES AND

INSTITUTIONS TO NECESSARY CHANGES; THAT WE HAVE LOST THE RIGHT TO LIFE

ITSELF. L OPTIMISM ALONE WILL PROVIDE NO ANSWERS; ONLY HARD AND UNRELENTING EFFORT THAT BEGINS BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE, FOR THE SOLVING OF SOME PROBLEMS

TIME IS OURS TO CHOOSE. L BUT FOR OTHERS -- LIKE THE CONTROLLING OF THE ARMS

RACE -- TIME CAN ONLY BE OUR ENEMY.

L MORE GENERAL PROBLEMS OF TECHNOLOGY MAY NOT BE AS URGENT AS THAT OF CONTROLLING THE ARMS RACE OR PRESERVING OUR PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FROM A SLOWER FORM OF DESTRUCTION. BUT THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE, OR EVEN FOR THE SURVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY, ARE NO LESS IMPORTANT. L IN A WORLD OF

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, THE CHANCES FOR THE INDIVIDUAL TO TAKE PART IN THE ACTIVITIES OF HIS SOCIETY -- FROM DEBATE TO ACTION -- HAVE NEVER BEEN GREATER.

L WE ARE ALL ON TELEVISION NOW. WE HAVE NO SILENT AND UNSEEN PEOPLE. L BUT THE

THREATS TO HIS SENSE OF BEING AND INTEGRITY WITHIN THAT SOCIETY HAVE ALSO  
NEVER BEEN MORE ACUTE. / TO BE SURE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY HAVE MADE THE  
WORLD OUR NEIGHBORHOOD, BUT ARE WE NEIGHBORS OR STRANGERS, FRIENDS OR  
ENEMIES? IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD?

/ WE HAVE GRADUALLY BECOME AWARE OF THE IMPACT ON HUMAN BEINGS OF  
IMPERSONAL TECHNOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION! FROM THE ALL-ENCOMPASSING COM-  
PUTER THAT RECORDS INFORMATION ON ONE'S PRIVATE LIFE, TO THE MARKET  
ECONOMY WHERE CONSUMER CHOICE IS OFTEN SUBORDINATED TO THE NEEDS OF THE  
ENTIRE SYSTEM TO KEEP DEMAND GROWING AND PREDICTABLE; / WE HAVE COME TO  
ACCEPT THE INTRUSION OF COMMERCIAL ADVERTISING INTO LARGE AREAS OF OUR  
PRIVATE AND SEMI-PRIVATE LIVES. / WE HAVE UTILIZED THE TEACHINGS OF  
PSYCHOLOGY TO PERMIT THE MANIPULATION OF MAN, / OUR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS ARE  
COMING TO RESEMBLE THE MARKETING OF COMMODITIES. AND, SPEAKING BOTH AS  
A POLITICIAN AND AS A FIRM BELIEVER IN DEMOCRACY, I CAN SAY THAT NOWHERE  
HAS THE ATTEMPT TO MANIPULATE THE CHOICES AVAILABLE TO INDIVIDUAL AMERICANS  
BECOME MORE ABHORRENT AND UNACCEPTABLE. O

Communism

IN ONE PARTICULAR AREA, THE BENEFITS OF TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS NEED  
TO BE WEIGHED MOST CAREFULLY AGAINST ITS COSTS IN PERSONAL FREEDOMS AND  
THE DEMANDS OF DEMOCRACY. IT IS IN COMMUNICATIONS THAT THE REVOLUTION OF  
TECHNOLOGY HAS BEEN MOST APPARENT IN OUR DAILY LIVES. WE RELY ON COM-  
MUNICATIONS TO CARRY THE INFORMATION NEEDED FOR A FREE POLITICAL SYSTEM  
TO WORK, BUT, IF THAT INFORMATION IS MISLEADING OR IRRELEVANT, OUR LIVES  
AND OUR POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS WILL SUFFER.

IN THE PAST TWENTY YEARS, THE ADVENT OF TELEVISION, ALONE, HAS TRANS-  
FORMED OUR WORLD FROM ONE DEPENDENT ON THE TRANS-OCEANIC CABLE AND THE  
FILTERINGS OF THE SHORT-WAVE, TO ONE IN WHICH WE CAN SEND BY COMMUNICATION  
SATELLITE TELEVISION PICTURES INSTANTLY FROM ANY ONE CORNER OF THE EARTH  
TO ALMOST ANY OTHER, OR EVEN FROM DISTANT SPACE. WE HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO  
ABANDON ALL THOUGHT OF A PAROCHIAL EXISTENCE, AND TAKE IMMEDIATE ACCOUNT  
OF EVENTS ONCE FOREIGN TO US. WE NOW SEE IT ALL WITH OUR OWN EYES, IN-  
STANTLY AND WITH AN IMMEDIACY THAT CAN BE EITHER EXHILARATING OR SHOCKING.

BUT IN OUR WONDER AT THIS TECHNOLOGY, OR EVEN IN OUR BLAND ACCEPTANCE  
OF IT, WE HAVE SOMETIMES OVERLOOKED THE DEEPER DIFFICULTIES THAT IT HOLDS

FOR US. Too often we fail to realize that to see is not necessarily to understand. Television can bring us information; but it does not always bring us knowledge. It brings us the drama of crises and events; but in doing so, it may obscure more important issues and debates. Television can be a powerful force for education and through the medium of the satellite, will soon make possible a true university of the world. But it can also distort our image of the world, and give us a false sense of certainty that we comprehend it.

This growth of television has created a problem of ethics that we must resolve if this technology is to serve democracy instead of enslaving it. And we must ask not only whether our democratic institutions, but whether any society can weather almost total and relentless exposure. It is certain that no individual can - a man who tried to live and work in the eye of the camera would go out of his mind. No other free people has ever faced this question.

In recent years, television and radio have kept us from ignoring the most serious questions our nation has had to face: poverty, racial

INJUSTICE, AND OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM. BUT THEY HAVE OFTEN AMPLIFIED  
EVENTS TO UNREAL SIZE, MAKING LOCAL ISSUES NATIONWIDE, OR GIVING UNDUE  
PROMINENCE TO TINY MINORITIES, FROM THE ADVOCATES OF VIOLENCE ON THE LEFT,  
TO THE VIGILANTES ON THE RIGHT.

WE ARE CONTINUALLY EXPOSED TO THE CRISES OF THE WORLD, BUT TO FEW  
OF ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS. WE ARE SHOWN THE PROBLEMS OF DISTANT LANDS, BUT  
RARELY SEE THE WAY IN WHICH PEOPLE ARE TRYING TO ANSWER THEM. AND WE  
SELDOM GET A GLIMPSE INTO THE DEEP HISTORICAL DIMENSIONS OF ANY CRISES.

WATCHING RIOT SCENES ON TELEVISION MAY AROUSE OUR EMOTIONS BUT DOES IT  
GIVE US UNDERSTANDING OF WHY IT HAPPENS AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT. FORTUNATELY  
THUS FAR, TELEVISION HAS LARGELY SUCCEEDED IN DIVORCING THE PRESENTATION  
OF NEWS FROM THE COMMERCIAL INTERESTS THAT PROVIDE THE FINANCIAL BASIS FOR  
MODERN COMMUNICATIONS. BUT THE COMPETITIVE NATURE OF THE MEDIA -- OF  
TELEVISION, RADIO, NEWSPAPERS, AND MAGAZINES -- MUST MAKE US EVER VIGILANT  
AGAINST THE STIMULATION OF CONFLICT OR THE MAGNIFICATION OF CRISIS IN ORDER

TO PROMOTE WHAT IS ULTIMATELY A COMMERCIAL OR CORPORATE INTEREST. THE  
REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE  
SHOULD ALERT US AGAIN -- IF FURTHER WARNING IS NECESSARY -- TO THE GRAVE  
 SOCIAL PROBLEMS WE INCUR BY OUR FIXATION ON EPISODIC VIOLENCE, WHETHER IT  
 BE IN THE FORM OF NEWS OR ENTERTAINMENT.

THE MOST IMPORTANT CHALLENGE OF TELEVISION TO OUR SOCIETY -- ITS  
PROMISE AND PERIL -- LIES IN ITS RELATIONSHIP TO GOVERNMENT. I BELIEVE THAT  
THE MEDIA ARE, INDEED, THE FOURTH BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT, AND THAT WHAT  
GOVERNMENT DOES MUST BE HELD UP TO THE SCRUTINY OF ALL THE PEOPLE. IN A  
DEMOCRACY, THE MEDIA EXIST TO ILLUMINATE ISSUES AND TO INFORM THE PUBLIC,  
PRESENTING THE CONFLICTING POINTS OF VIEW THAT ALONE GIVE A FREE PEOPLE  
A BASIS ON WHICH TO CHOOSE.

BUT THIS SITUATION MUST NOT BLIND US TO THE WAYS IN WHICH EXCESSIVE  
ZEAL IN PERFORMING THIS FUNCTION CAN ACTUALLY INHIBIT THE WORKINGS OF  
DEMOCRACY. IF THE MEDIA ARE TO BE EFFECTIVE IN PROVIDING CHECKS AND  
BALANCES, WE MUST UNDERSTAND THAT EFFORTS OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER INSTI-  
 TUTIONS TO MEET OUR PRESSING PROBLEMS WILL SOMETIMES FAIL THROUGH A DIS-  
TORTED EXPOSURE OF EARLY TRIAL AND ERROR. THERE IS, HOWEVER, A GREATER

RISK THAT GOVERNMENT AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS WILL USE THE MEDIA TO  
 OBSCURE AND NOT TO ILLUMINATE, TO MISLEAD RATHER THAN TO INFORM. ALREADY,  
 THE USE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS BY GOVERNMENT AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS HAS  
 BUILT A CONTINUOUS "CREDIBILITY GAP" INTO OUR DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM. THIS  
 KIND OF PUBLIC CYNICISM WE CAN NO LONGER ACCEPT. BUT THE ALTERNATIVE  
 IS SOME ATTEMPT BY THE MEDIA ITSELF TO KEEP THE PART FROM STANDING FOR  
 THE WHOLE; TO KEEP THE ISOLATED MISTAKE FROM DESTROYING THE LARGER EFFORT

SO, TOO, THE MEDIA HAVE BEEN USED IN POLITICS TO TRANSMIT UNREAL  
 PROMISES, TO RAISE UNREAL HOPES, WHICH ONLY LEAD TO GREATER DISAPPOINTMENT  
 WHEN ACTION FALLS SHORT OF GOALS. AS WITH OUR EFFORTS TO BRING POVERTY TO  
 AN END, THE AMPLIFYING OF PROMISES BY GOVERNMENT AND THROUGH THE MEDIA  
 HAS MERELY LED TO GREATER FRUSTRATION WHEN SUCCESS HAS NOT COME IN TIME.

THIS USE OF THE MEDIA BY GOVERNMENT AND POLITICIANS HAS GIVEN A MANIC-  
 DEPRESSIVE QUALITY TO AMERICAN POLITICS, IN WHICH IT ALTERNATES BETWEEN  
 "UNREAL HOPE AND UNJUSTIFIED DESPAIR," WHILE WE PLAY DOWN THE DIFFICULT AND  
 NECESSARILY PROTRACTED BUSINESS OF WORKING THROUGH OUR PROBLEMS.



yep

I BELIEVE IN THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW; BUT I BELIEVE EVEN MORE IN

THEIR RIGHT TO KNOWLEDGE. THIS IS, ABOVE ALL, A PROBLEM OF EDUCATION.

KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING RARELY COME FROM DRAMATIC HEADLINES OR SPOT

NEWS FLASHES. THEY ARE THE REFINED PRODUCT OF SERIOUS AND CONTINUING

STUDY. WE CAN NO LONGER LET TECHNOLOGY OUTSTRIP OUR UNDERSTANDING OF

HISTORY, SOCIETY, AND CULTURE. SO, WE MUST BEGIN A MUCH MORE INTENSIVE

STUDY OF OTHER PEOPLES AND CULTURES, IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND AT LEAST

SOMETHING OF WHAT WE SEE AND HEAR OF THEM. UNLESS WE DO SO, WE STAND TO

BECOME TOURISTS OF THE REST OF THE WORLD, INTERPRETING EVERYTHING IN TERMS

OF OUR OWN VALUES, YET LEARNING AND UNDERSTANDING *little.*

THESE ARE SOME OF THE NEW FORCES WHICH ASSAULT MANY OF OUR MOST

CHERISHED TRADITIONS AND INSTITUTIONS. TOGETHER WITH THE ANCIENT CURSES OF

MANKIND -- POVERTY, BIGOTRY, IGNORANCE, FEAR, ~~disorder~~ -- THEY HAVE

GENERATED THE ANGER AND ALIENATION SO EVIDENT IN THE INDICTMENT OF THE

SYSTEM AND SOCIETY I HAVE RECOUNTED. THE GROWTH OF THESE FORCES *could*

JEOPARDIZE THE SURVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY ITSELF.

MORE CLEARLY SEEN, HOWEVER, IS THE CRISIS OF LIBERALISM WHICH HAS

ARISEN IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES. THE BASIC QUESTIONING OF THE METHODS WE

*Education*



HAVE USED TO HELP OUR INSTITUTIONS AND TRADITIONS CHANGE AND DEVELOP TO  
SERVE THE INTERESTS OF ALL. I HAVE LONG BEEN COMMITTED TO THE APPROACH

THAT IS EXPERIMENTAL, THE SOLUTION TENTATIVE, THE TEST PRAGMATIC, AND THE  
OBJECTIVE HUMANE. SOME WOULD CALL THIS THE METHOD OF LIBERALISM. IT IS

NOW UNDER ATTACK, AND JUSTLY SO, BECAUSE OF OUR FAILURE TO REMEMBER LIBERAL-  
ISM'S BASIC COMMITMENT; THAT THE LIBERAL PHILOSOPHY, LIKE DEMOCRACY ITSELF,  
MUST BE A WAY OF RECONCILING MAN WITH HIS ENVIRONMENT, <sup>and</sup> NOT MERELY A SET OF

PROGRAMS AND SLOGANS THAT MAY PROVIDE ANSWERS FOR THE MOMENT, BUT REVEAL

LITTLE OF THE WAY AHEAD. BY THE SAME TOKEN, CONSERVATIVES -- THOSE WHO  
HAVE SOUGHT TO PRESERVE AN ESTABLISHED SYSTEM OF VALUES -- HAVE BEEN

EQUALLY UNSUCCESSFUL IN COMPREHENDING THE NEW FORCES WHICH INCREASINGLY  
DOMINATE THE SYSTEM AND SOCIETY.

THE GREAT CONFLICT OF OUR TIMES, HOWEVER, IS NOT BETWEEN LIBERAL  
AND CONSERVATIVE. BOTH THESE PHILOSOPHIES ARE ROOTED IN A COMMON UNDER-  
STANDING OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT AND BOTH ARE EQUALLY COMMITTED TO THE

VALUES AND PRINCIPLES NECESSARY FOR THE SURVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY. LIBERALS

AND CONSERVATIVES ALIKE, MUST FACE THE PRESENT INDICTMENT OF THE SYSTEM

AND SOCIETY. AND WE MUST ANSWER IT TOGETHER OR TOGETHER WE SHALL SUCCUMB

TO THE ADVOCATES AND PRACTITIONERS OF FORCE AND VIOLENCE.

WE MUST UNDERSTAND THAT IF WE PUT OUR FAITH IN THE ABILITY OF MEN  
TO GOVERN THEIR OWN LIVES, WE MUST ALSO RETAIN A HEALTHY RESPECT FOR THEIR

ABILITY TO ERR. THIS MEANS REJECTING ANY STRATEGY BASED ON MORAL AUTHORITARIANISM -- WHETHER FROM THE RIGHT OR LEFT -- AND IT MEANS STRENGTHENING

THOSE INSTITUTIONS AND PROCESSES WHICH CAN OPPOSE SUCH AUTHORITARIANISM  
WHENEVER AND WHEREVER IT APPEARS.

IN FORMULATING THIS ANSWER WE MUST ALWAYS REMEMBER THAT ALIENATION  
IN OUR SOCIETY, AND THE QUESTIONING OF OUR DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM, IS THE PRO-  
DUCT, NOT OF A CALLOUS DISREGARD FOR HUMAN VALUES, BUT OF OUR NATION'S  
FAILURE TO LIVE UP TO MANY OF THESE MOST FUNDAMENTAL VALUES. ALIENATION  
IS AN ASSERTION OF WHAT WE BELIEVE; NOT A DENIAL OF IT. I AGREE WITH  
DE TOCQUEVILLE, THAT:

"THE SUFFERINGS THAT ARE ENDURED PATIENTLY  
 AS BEING INEVITABLE, BECOME INTOLERABLE THE  
 MOMENT THAT IT APPEARS THAT THERE MIGHT BE AN  
 ESCAPE. REFORM THEN ONLY SERVES TO REVEAL  
 MORE CLEARLY WHAT STILL REMAINS OPPRESSIVE AND  
NOW ALL THE MORE UNBEARABLE. . . ."

L I BELIEVE ALSO THAT WHAT WE ARE SEEING ESSENTIALLY IS NOT A CONFLICT  
 BETWEEN A SET OF RIGID PROPOSITIONS ENSHRINING THE STATUS QUO, ~~NO LONGER~~  
~~RELEVANT TO THE WORLD IN WHICH WE LIVE~~, AND WITH A TOTAL ABSENCE OF VALUES;

L BUT RATHER, A NEW EFFORT TO REACH OUT FOR UNDERSTANDING IN A WORLD OF CHANGE  
 WHILE TRYING TO IDENTIFY AND MAINTAIN WHAT IS VALUABLE IN OUR DEMOCRATIC  
 TRADITION. L THIS IS AS IT MUST BE, WHERE LAWS AND INSTITUTIONS CAN NO MORE  
RESIST THE NEED FOR CHANGE THAN A GROWN MAN CAN WEAR CLOTHES WHICH FIT HIM  
AS A BOY.

L IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES OUR TASK, IT SEEMS TO ME, IS CLEAR: WE MUST  
 BEND ALL OF OUR INTELLECTUAL AND MORAL POWERS TO ASSESS WHERE WE ARE, TO  
UNDERSTAND THE HUMAN CONDITION OF ALL MEN, AND TO DO WHAT WE CAN TO CREATE

THE CONDITIONS -- THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT -- IN WHICH MAN CAN MASTER HIMSELF  
AND THUS LIVE SENSIBLY -- AND HAPPILY -- IN HIS WORLD.

↳ IN THIS SERIES OF LECTURES, I DO NOT EXPECT TO SOLVE ALL OF THESE  
PROBLEMS, TO FIND A WAY TO SATISFY THE ALIENATED, TO PRESENT A NEW SET OF  
VALUES BY WHICH WE CAN LIVE, OR EVEN TO SHOW THE WAY TO ALL AMERICANS  
CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR COUNTRY AND OF THE WORLD IN GENERAL.

↳ MANY OF OUR PROBLEMS HAVE NO FINAL ANSWERS, WHETHER THEY BE ANSWERS OF THE  
POLITICIAN OR OF THE YOUNG STUDENT SEARCHING TO UNDERSTAND A CONFUSING  
WORLD. ↳ BUT TOGETHER, WE CAN -- AND WE MUST -- ~~TRY~~ **TRY**

↳ I RECALL THE WORDS OF ADLAI STEVENSON WHO IN HIS OWN SPIRIT PER-  
SONIFIED THE NOBILITY AND DECENCY OF DEMOCRACY. HE REMINDED US THAT  
"DEMOCRACY IS NOT SELF-EXECUTING. WE HAVE TO MAKE IT WORK, AND TO MAKE  
IT WORK WE HAVE TO UNDERSTAND IT, SOBER THOUGHT AND FEARLESS CRITICISM  
ARE IMPOSSIBLE WITHOUT CRITICAL THINKERS AND THINKING CRITICS. ↳ SUCH  
PERSONS MUST BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME TOGETHER, TO SEE NEW FACTS  
IN THE LIGHT OF OLD PRINCIPLES AND EVALUATE OLD PRINCIPLES IN LIGHT OF

NEW FACTS BY DELIBERATION, DEBATE, AND DIALOGUE, THIS, AS WE ALL KNOW  
WELL, THOUGH SOME OF US FORGET FROM TIME TO TIME, REQUIRES INTELLECTUAL

INDEPENDENCE, IMPENITENT SPECULATION AND FREEDOM FROM POLITICAL PRESSURE,

FOR DEMOCRACYS NEED FOR WISDOM WILL REMAIN AS PERENNIAL, AS ITS NEED FOR

LIBERTY. NOT ONLY EXTERNAL VIGILANCE, BUT UNENDING SELF-EXAMINATION

MUST BE THE PERENNIAL PRICE OF LIBERTY, BECAUSE THE WORK OF SELF-GOVERNMENT  
NEVER CEASES."

WE MAY HAVE TO BE CONTENT, FOR NOW, WITH IDENTIFYING THE MOST URGENT  
PROBLEMS. UNDERSTANDING THAT OFTEN WE WILL BE WRONG IN WHAT WE DO TO MEET

THEM. BUT LET US ALWAYS BEAR IN MIND THAT THE CONDITION OF OUR TIMES IS

THE INEVITABLE PRODUCT OF A CENTURY THAT HAS TESTED MANKIND AS NO CENTURY

BEFORE HAS DONE. WE HAVE SEEN STATES DESTROYED AND NEW STATES BORN. WE

HAVE SEEN A GRADUAL DECLINE OF RELIGION AS A SOURCE OF VALUES IN SOCIETY,

WE HAVE SEEN THE FAMILY AND THE STABILITY OF COMMUNITY ERODED BY THE STRESSES

OF CHANGE AND MOVEMENT. IN MY LIFETIME, WE HAVE SEEN TWO WARS THAT HAVE

CHANGED AND BRUISED THE WORLD, AND OTHER CONFLICTS WHERE *thousands died.*

h TODAY, THE THREAT OF MANKIND'S FINAL WAR IS ALWAYS WITH US, CO-EXISTING  
 WITH ALL WE DO TO BETTER OUR LIVES.

h IN THIS CENTURY OF CHANGE IN THE ENTIRE FABRIC OF THE WORLD AND  
 SOCIETY, I BELIEVE WE MUST SEE NOT ONLY MAN'S FAILURES, BUT ALSO HIS  
 ACHIEVEMENTS. WE MUST RECOGNIZE THE FACT THAT MAN HAS SURVIVED AND STILL  
 STRIVES FOR CIVILIZATION. THE MIRACLE OF MAN IS THAT HE CONTINUES TO  
 ADAPT TO DO WHAT HE CAN; AND TO SEARCH FOR A SENSE OF HIS OWN BEING IN A  
 WORLD OF UNCERTAINTY.

h IN THIS SPIRIT, THEN, AND FROM THIS PERSPECTIVE OF MAN'S TRIUMPH IN  
 THE MIDST OF TRAGEDY, I BELIEVE THAT ALL OF US WHO ARE CONCERNED, MUST BEGIN,  
 TOGETHER, A SEARCH FOR A NEW PHILOSOPHY -- ONE THAT WILL HELP US TO ADAPT  
 THOSE VALUES OF THE PAST THAT ARE STILL WORTHWHILE, TO DISCOVER THOSE NEW  
 PRINCIPLES THAT ARE NEEDED TODAY, AND TO APPLY THEM TO THE PLIGHT OF THE  
 INDIVIDUAL WHO IS FACING A SYSTEM AND A SOCIETY THAT ARE CHANGING FASTER  
 THAN HIS ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND AND DEFINE HIS OWN PLACE IN THEM.

L FOR ME, THIS NEW PHILOSOPHY MUST INCLUDE THE BEST OF THE HARD-HEADED  
 LIBERAL METHOD THAT HAS CONTRIBUTED SO MUCH TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR  
 DEMOCRATIC PROCESS. L IT MUST BE RESPONSIVE TO THE DEMANDS OF CHANGE AS  
 WELL AS THE DEMANDS OF ORDER. L WE MUST ONCE AGAIN RESORT TO THE DIFFICULT  
 WAYS OF CIVILIZED AND RATIONAL MEN - FEARLESSLY STRIKING DOWN THAT WHICH  
 HOBBOLES OUR NATIONAL GROWTH AND PURPOSE, BUT ALWAYS WITH A DECENT RESPECT  
 FOR THE OPINION OF OTHERS, ALWAYS WITH A FIRM GRASP OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES;  
 AND ALWAYS WITH AN UNCLOUDED VIEW OF OUR DIRECTION AND OBJECTIVE. L

TO DEVELOP AND EMBRACE SUCH A NEW PHILOSOPHY -- A NEW STRATEGY OF DEMOCRACY --  
 IS AN AMBITIOUS TASK.

L BUT IT MUST BEGIN NOW, IF WE ARE TO HAVE ANY HOPE OF SHAPING OUR FUTURE.  
 L TO DO LESS WOULD BE UNWORTHY OF OUR HERITAGE. L WITH A SENSE OF URGENCY AND  
 DESTINY AS IF CREATING A NEW NATION, WHICH IS WHAT WE ARE DOING, WE MUST  
 VENTILATE THE STALE AND CLOGGED CHANNELS OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND  
 SOCIAL OPPORTUNITY. L THE REFRESHING WINDS OF CHANGE WHICH ARE EVERYWHERE

ABOUT US, MUST BE DIRECTED TO CONSTRUCTIVE PURPOSES - NOT THROUGH VIOLENCE

- NOT THROUGH HATE - NOT THROUGH BITTERNESS - NOT THROUGH PASSION, BUT THROUGH

DEBATE AND DISSENT - THROUGH DIALOGUE AND DISCUSSION -- UNTIL DECISION AND

DIRECTION ARE ACHIEVED. THIS TO ME, IS THE MEANING OF GOVERNMENT BY THE CON-

SENT OF THE GOVERNED.



Excerpts from lecture

by

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

In the past twenty years, the advent of television, alone, has transformed our world from one dependent on the trans-oceanic cable and the filterings of the short-wave, to one in which we can send by communication satellite television pictures instantly from any one corner of the earth to almost any other, or even from distant space. We have been required to abandon all thought of a parochial existence, and take immediate account of events once foreign to us. We now see it all with our own eyes, instantly and with an immediacy that can be either exhilarating or shocking.

But in our wonder at this technology, or even in our bland acceptance of it, we have sometimes overlooked the deeper difficulties that it holds for us. Too often we fail to realize that to see is not necessarily to understand. Television can bring us information; but it does not always bring us knowledge. It brings us the drama of crises and events; but in doing so, it may obscure more important issues and debates. Television can be a powerful force for education and through the medium of the satellite, will soon make possible a true university of the world. But it can also distort our image of the world, and give us a false sense of certainty that we comprehend it.

This growth of television has created a problem of ethics that we must resolve if this technology is to serve democracy instead of enslaving it. And we must ask not only whether our democratic institutions, but whether any society can weather almost total and relentless exposure. It is certain that no individual can -- a man who tried to live and work in the eye of the camera would go out of his mind. No other free people has ever faced this question.

In recent years, television and radio have kept us from ignoring the most serious questions our nation has had to face: poverty, racial injustice, and our involvement in Vietnam. But they have often amplified events to unreal size, making local issues nationwide, or giving undue prominence to tiny minorities, from the advocates of violence on the left, to the vigilantes on the right.

We are continually exposed to the crises of the world, but to few of its accomplishments. We are shown the problems of distant lands, but rarely see the way in which people are trying to answer them. And we seldom get a glimpse into the deep historical dimensions of any crises. Watching riot scenes on television may arouse our emotions but does it give us understanding of why it happens and what to do about it. Fortunately thus far, television has largely succeeded in divorcing the presentation of news from the commercial interests that provide the financial basis for modern communications. But the competitive nature of the media -- of television, radio, newspapers, and magazines -- must make us ever vigilant against the stimulation of conflict or the magnification of crisis in order to promote what is ultimately a commercial or corporate interest. The report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence should alert us again -- if further warning is necessary -- to the grave social problems we incur by our fixation on episodic violence, whether it be in the form of news or entertainment.

The most important challenge of television to our society -- its promise and peril -- lies in its relationship to government. I believe that the media are, indeed, the fourth branch of government, and that what government does must be held up to the scrutiny of all the people. In a democracy, the media exist to illuminate issues and to inform the public, presenting the conflicting points of view that alone give a free people a basis on which to choose.

But this situation must not blind us to the ways in which excessive zeal in performing this function can actually inhibit the workings of democracy. If the media are to be effective in providing checks and balances, we must understand that efforts of government and other institutions to meet our pressing problems will sometimes fail through a distorted exposure of early trial and error. There is, however, a greater risk: that government and other institutions will use the media to obscure and not to illuminate, to mislead rather than to inform. Already, the use of public relations by government and other institutions has built a continuous "credibility gap" into our democratic system. This kind of public cynicism we can no longer accept. But the alternative is some attempt by the media itself to keep the part from standing for the whole; to keep the isolated mistake from destroying the larger effort.

So, too, the media have been used in politics to transmit unreal promises, to raise unreal hopes, which only lead to greater disappointment when action falls short of goals. As with our efforts to bring poverty to an end, the amplifying of promises by government and through the media has merely led to greater frustration when success has not come in time. This use of the media by government and politicians has given a manic-depressive quality to American politics, in which it alternates between unreal hope and unjustified despair, while we play down the difficult and necessarily protracted business of working through our problems.

I believe in the people's right to know; but I believe even more in their right to knowledge. This is, above all, a problem of education. Knowledge and understanding rarely come from dramatic headlines or spot news flashes. They are the refined product of serious and continuing study. We can no longer let technology outstrip our understanding of history, society, and culture. And we must begin a much more intensive study of other peoples and cultures, in order to understand at least something of what we see and hear of them. Unless we do so, we stand to become tourists of the rest of the world, interpreting everything in terms of our own values, yet learning and understanding nothing.

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey

Pillsbury Company Centennial

"The Indictment of the System and Society"

The University of Minnesota

October 16, 1969

Last January, for the first time in twenty-five years, I left active politics and returned to teach here at the University of Minnesota and at Macalester College. It did not surprise me, after the 1968 Presidential campaign, to find that students were asking provocative and difficult questions about the nature of our democratic enterprise. It was not simply a matter of finding solutions to the great social problems facing our country. It was more a disturbing questioning of the very foundations of our political process itself and the principles and beliefs which undergird the entire social order.

In adjusting to this new environment with a new generation of deeply concerned students, I came to learn that my answers about this nation's social and economic progress were not sufficient -- for me or my students. And their questioning of the democratic process and the nature of our society did nothing for my peace of mind. In any event, I have come better to appreciate both the magnitude of the challenge that the American system of self-government has to face and the historical perspective in which it is most clearly seen.

For me, this has been a year of considerable intellectual stimulation and examination. As it is with most teachers, I have learned as much as I have taught.

We Americans have always been a restless nation - restless in space, restless in time. Throughout American history, this restlessness has produced a constant series of challenges to our ideals and institutions. The "generation gap" is no new phenomenon; nor ours the first "critical era" we have lived through. But I must say to you that, in my opinion, our present crisis is one of the big ones, rivaled perhaps only twice in our history: by the Civil War, which tested our ability to continue as one nation dedicated to democratic and humanitarian principles, and by the Great Depression of the 1930's, which exposed the flaws in our economic system and challenged us to find a new place for the free individual in a social order of increasing complexity. Both of these crises were tragic events in our history. And both contain striking parallels to the American condition we encounter today.

By some standards and compared to many other nations, we are a united people, sharing a common destiny. Indeed, it is very odd that we should be having a crisis at all. We have solved the most difficult questions of producing goods and managing the largest and most diverse economy in history. By most conventional economic indicators, we are a prosperous and healthy nation. Yet it is also quite clear to anyone with eyes to see that these conventional indicators are no longer as useful as they once were. They do not deceive, but they do mislead. Sometimes I get the impression that we Americans are getting better and better at measuring things which are of lesser and lesser importance.

Despite the glowing testimony of national income figures, of the Gross National Product, even of those figures that reveal a sharp decrease in the numbers living below the poverty level - despite all of this, there is evidence beneath the American surface - and not always beneath it - of a

social turbulence which is as potentially destructive to our democracy as the forces unleashed by the Civil War and the Great Depression. And I am speaking of forces quite apart from the growing and increasingly outspoken opposition to the war in Vietnam.

In ways no one could have predicted yesterday - in ways which no one did predict yesterday - the most basic assumptions of our society are being challenged. It is not unusual to see young Americans attacking the existence of poverty or the unequal distribution of wealth and opportunity. It is unusual to see them attacking the idea of affluence itself.

To be sure, a handful of philosophers and social critics - Thoreau, Emerson, Santayana - have always been disdainful of "materialism" or affluence. But now, it is an authentically popular attitude among the young. Things are no longer in the saddle. The horse is for the moment riderless, so the question arises: Can we invest our democratic enterprise with the moral purpose and sense of values which seem to be lacking and which are essential for survival beyond our generation? Can we live with affluence without casting aside democratic ideals and national goals?

In the year since the Presidential election, I have observed America from the unique position of a public man who is now a private citizen. I have come to see now more clearly than ever before that in certain critical respects, we are -- divided over the role of institutions in society and divided over the basic ends for which our society exists. We are it seems, a nation at war with itself.

We have all seen and heard the active and vocal protest, reaching from within the poor locked in city ghettos to many of the students and faculties in our universities.



We have witnessed Black rage and White fear. We have seen the reality of not one America - but two - separate and unequal.

We have also felt the more silent protest, by those Americans who have worked their way up from poverty and disadvantage to a better life, and who now see their achievements or their possibilities for growth threatened by the demand for more change.

And the steady erosion of our physical environment looms larger on all of our horizons as a threat to our very survival.

There is increasing disaffection with government and the institutions we have built to preserve our democracy. And there is a rising tide of lawlessness in many forms, itself partly an expression of a deeper frustration of human aspiration, partly a world-wide rejection of authority and rules of conduct, and partly a gesture of self-hatred, an assault by a materialistic society upon itself.

These are not isolated problems, to be approached singly, nor will they go away simply because we will it. One can see them as a living indictment of the paltry achievements of our system. I do not agree. Our achievements have not been paltry. I see these problems and our turbulence rather as an indictment of the unrealized potential of our democratic system.

This year, as a teacher and not just as a politician, I have had this indictment presented to me by serious-minded and vocal members of the rising generation of young people and by concerned teachers. Many of them tell me that the entire order of American politics, inherited from the past, can no longer work in a world of rapid and pervasive change. There is no link, they say, between the loud talk of the politician and the small, still voice of individual conscience, between urgent needs and the capacity of our established

institutions to respond to them. And they further say that only the persons who deny the evidence of their own senses can ignore the shameful reality of two Americas in our midst, the one affluent and often indifferent, the other miserable and seething with frustration.

This year I have listened to these and other Americans who indict a political system they believe to be geared almost automatically to pouring out limitless billions of dollars in support of armament systems beyond the bounds of rational and justifiable needs - but, a system which, as they see it, strains at a gnat when asked to deal with the demands of our educational system, the crisis conditions in our cities, in our impoverished rural areas, the inequalities of opportunity, and the appalling facts of hunger, unemployment, and illiteracy among the excluded one-fourth of our population, white and black alike. Many Americans feel this system is geared to spend billions of dollars to put two men on the moon, but is sullen and hard-hearted when asked to help put a dispirited man back on his feet here on earth.

In my travels, I have heard another part of this indictment, from a generation of Americans who have seen the certainties of the past eroded one by one in the face of change, who have shaped their lives by the standards of the past, but find that they no longer provide a sure pathway to the future. They find that their past efforts are scorned -- that they are often denied the security they have earned for the well-being of themselves and their families, for their property, and sometimes even their lives. They see a lifetime of work marred by the fear that the world they bequeath to their children will be no better than their own, and perhaps much worse.

Some of these Americans, whatever their indictment, turn in their frustration to oppose democracy, itself, while still others have a vague



sense of discontent that is inevitably transformed into disillusionment and bitterness.

I have also encountered, especially among the young, a growing sense of moral authoritarianism which seemingly blinds these critics to the terribly complex nature of these problems and to the fallibility of all human action. This disturbing tendency to dismiss out of hand the possibility of honest disagreement -- to see the process of cooperation and compromise as reflecting personal immorality rather than recognizing it as the essence of democratic government -- has itself become as destructive of the democratic enterprise as the social wrongs that must be remedied.

These indictments and these circumstances pose the most basic questions: Can we maintain allegiance to a political system based upon reason and compassion, self-discipline, a decent respect for the opinions of others, and a sense of private and public responsibility? Can our democratic system survive the new demands and pressures placed upon it? Can it provide solutions that are at least minimally workable?

The answers to these questions can no longer automatically be assumed in the affirmative. The very fact that these questions exist makes it clear that there can be no easy assumptions about the inevitable success of the democratic quest. But neither can I join those who would simply abandon a method of self-government that has brought us this far and that is consistent with man's earliest aspirations of human brotherhood. Our task now is to begin the search for a new strategy of democracy, one that will rebut the indictment, clause by clause, and vindicate the American dream.

\* \* \* \*

To understand the terms of the indictment of democracy is the first step in defining a strategy of reaffirmation. The next step must be to understand more thoroughly the new and largely unseen forces at work in our world

which have caused these troubled circumstances, shaping reality almost without our knowing it.

I recognize, of course, the devastating impact which the tragic war in Southeast Asia has had on this country, particularly on many of our younger Americans. It has brought in its wake not only death and destruction to our own people and others, it has also added a measure of bitterness, alienation, suspicion and cynicism which erodes and destroys respect for and trust in our political and social order. The highest priority is to end this war. My purpose on this occasion, however, is to examine those less visible factors which, in my view, have brought us to the present crisis of democracy -- factors which would have existed regardless of Vietnam and which will be at work when hopefully this terrible conflict is finally over.

We need to recognize that much of what we have taken for granted in our physical environment is changing radically -- and for the worse unless we act to prevent it. The sheer size of America and the speed of its growth, both in population and in the products of our industrial economy, brings with it revolutionary implications. Not only is our living space dwindling, but the quality of this space is declining.

There is the growing concentration of our people into a few contiguous urban communities. This population shift will make available to more people the economic and cultural advantages that only urban life can provide. Yet it is also likely to limit each man's sense of the living space necessary for healthy personal development. Exposure to the hostile and continuous pressures of urban stress, crowding, and social conflict can only upset the psychological balance which most people require for happy and productive lives.

In a similar way, the pace of our economic development over the past few decades has enhanced those human activities that serve the limited functions of economic growth -- and has downgraded other factors that relate to the preservation of man's humanity. We now maintain an economy that is rapidly approaching a gross national product of a trillion dollars a year. Yet we have paid for much of this growth in the destruction of our world. We have polluted the air of our cities; poured chemical wastes into our rivers and lakes -- to the point of destroying such priceless natural treasures as Lake Erie and the Hudson River. We tolerate the intrusion into our private lives of urban noise, and the congestion that results from sheer, uncontrolled mass. This destruction of our natural heritage, this assault on man's personality - even though much of it has been unintentional - is basically immoral -- a tragic example of man's inhumanity to man.

The problem of pollution is basic to our future. For the first time, we may be on the threshold of controlling the most powerful of all the natural forces: the weather; but at the same time we are failing to control the nature of the air we breath, to protect our food and water from accumulating poisons, or to insure the survival of a natural environment at all.

There is no reason to tolerate these destructive by-products of industrial development. We have the skills to order our economic development without paying the price of human degradation and of submitting man, himself, to the impersonal workings of industry. This is not only something we can do; it is something we must do, if we are to find that all our material progress, all our affluence, only stifle and frustrate us.

This will require us to be attentive to the physical environment of our society as never before. We must go beyond the mere conservation of

our natural resources, of open spaces, of pure water and clean air. It will require us to develop a clear set of goals: to develop and restore our cities with care, as expressions of the highest achievement of man's culture, we must harmonize with nature, instead of destroying it; revive the dying idea of the neighborhood; and ensure that where a man lives and works contributes to his sense of well-being and belonging -- make certain that it has a humanizing impact on him -- instead of stunting his mental and moral growth.

But let us not make the common mistake of assuming that we are going to achieve these goals painlessly or costlessly. We are going to have to pay for most of them - either by taxation or a higher cost of living. Too many who declaim vociferously against air pollution continue to resist efforts to discourage them from using their automobiles or question higher taxes to build a rapid transit system. Indignation against social evils is just and necessary. But the eradication of these evils requires self-discipline and commitment. And, at the moment, we are quite a ways from a working equilibrium, with self-discipline and commitment in shorter supply than indignation.

Our worth as a nation and as a people -- valued in terms that go far beyond material accomplishment - depends upon securing for everyone to the greatest extent possible, not as benefits but as rights, the basic prerequisites of personal development: health, education, and security against misfortune. But we also need something less tangible: a sense of identity and a sense of community.

As we advance beyond today's industrial era, our economic system will also go through profound changes. We must learn to cope with these changes more effectively than we have in the past. The role of the individual in our

economy has limited his personal sense of worth; the end products of his labors are removed farther and farther from his own contribution. The pride of product and performance becomes corporate rather than individual. The result is a citizen who, though fully and productively employed, nevertheless feels increasingly isolated. He has fewer opportunities to find a sense of worth that is not based on the accumulation of material goods alone.

We can no longer dodge the basic task of reconciling an affluent free people to a sense of purpose. Our objectives must be rearranged so that we measure them not in terms of economic productivity alone, but also in terms of human amenity -- personal happiness, if you will.

Despite a great deal of individualistic rhetoric, most of it quite sincerely meant, we have never put the whole individual, as distinct from the economic man, first.

Our task is without precedent in American history, for it was always assumed that the individual achieved his sense of moral purpose, of community, through his family, his church, his various voluntary associations. But today for various reasons, this is not enough. There is a vital role for government as well. This is a dangerous mission, since there is always the spectre of authoritarianism lurking in the background. But it is an inescapable mission and not, I believe, an impossible one.

In the future, there will also be the fact of increasing leisure time - when the role of work in meeting the needs of our economy will decline. In the past, work has consumed the bulk of man's energies, and has been a major source of the self-discipline that helps give shape to his life. We have built our country and our economy on traditions that have made work the central activity of importance in man's temporal life. But as technological advances lead to a shorter and shorter work week, where will we find the alternative sources of this self-discipline, this focus for our

productive lives?

If we are to restore to each man the sense of personal worth and community, and if we are to resurrect the confident self-discipline he once gained from the satisfaction of productive work, we must be prepared to change our basic cultural attitudes towards work itself. This change will be difficult. Even now, our attitudes towards work and the rewards of society still keep us, as a nation, from providing the basic amenities of life -- food, shelter, medical attention -- to those Americans who are too poor to afford them and too unskilled to perform successfully in the economy. When our economy requires from each of us even less in terms of labor, we will face the need for a basic readjustment in the incentives that are now provided to encourage each man to take part in the productive life of America. We will need different incentives because we will be aiming at different goals.

We will no longer be able to define a man's contribution to his community in economic terms alone. How we judge others -- and ourselves -- will have to be done according to a new set of criteria, a new image of the successful man. One is fairly certain that these criteria and this image will be cast increasingly in terms of each man's search for personal integrity and fulfillment, his own "pursuit of happiness." This will require a broadening of the definition of what we call "work," placing new stress on the contributions that individuals make to the life of their community or family, even though they cannot be accounted for in material terms alone.

We have come to understand that the artist, the actor, the poet -- and others who contribute to the cultural life of our nation -- are making an essential contribution to our civilization, to our "welfare." In the future, we must include still others, especially those who will find in



service to their communities a major source of personal satisfaction and reward. "Participation" will cease to be a merely political term and will become an ideal attribute of the ideal citizen. To some extent, it has always been such in America. But it must become more so, more than a dutiful association with an established organization.

Of all the new forces that will shape men's lives and strike at the very basis of their relationship to society, the most important has also been one of our greatest blessings: the driving force of technology. In the past few decades, science and technology have brought us as close to accomplishing miracles as man can dare. Yet we now take this progress for granted, as part of the reward for an industrial nation that has solved so many of the difficult and intriguing problems that have baffled man throughout the ages. Think of it -- every person born after July 21, 1969 will accept as a fact that man may travel to the moon if he so desires. When I was a child in South Dakota, a trip to Minneapolis was a marvel.

Nothing we do now, short of destroying the world itself, can erase from man's memory the knowledge of the sciences that is now at our command. But herein lies the greatest challenge of all, as we strive to control the seemingly inevitable development of newer and more terrifying weapons.

We -- and others -- are now developing new forms of destruction that are eroding the very premises on which we have based our security in the nuclear age. Unless we act soon -- and halt this drift to nuclear holocaust -- we may find that we have lost the chance to adapt our lives and institutions to necessary changes; that we have lost the right to life itself. Optimism alone will provide no answers; only hard and unrelenting effort that begins before it is too late. For the solving of some problems

time is ours to choose. But for others -- like the controlling of the arms race -- time can only be our enemy.

More general problems of technology may not be as urgent as that of controlling the arms race or preserving our physical environment from a slower form of destruction. But their implications for the future, or even for the survival of democracy, are no less important. In a world of science and technology, the chances for the individual to take part in the activities of his society -- from debate to action -- have never been greater. We are all on television now. We have no silent and unseen people. But the threats to his sense of being and integrity within that society have also never been more acute. To be sure science and technology have made the world our neighborhood, but are we neighbors or strangers, friends or enemies in this neighborhood?

We have gradually become aware of the impact on human beings of impersonal technology and organization: from the all-encompassing computer that records information on one's private life, to the market economy where consumer choice is often subordinated to the needs of the entire system to keep demand growing and predictable. We have come to accept the intrusion of commercial advertising into large areas of our private and semi-private lives. We have utilized the teachings of psychology to permit the manipulation of man. Our political campaigns are coming to resemble the marketing of commodities. And, speaking both as a politician and as a firm believer in democracy, I can say that nowhere has the attempt to manipulate the choices available to individual Americans become more abhorrent and unacceptable.

In one particular area, the benefits of technological progress need to be weighed most carefully against its costs in personal freedoms and



the demands of democracy. It is in communications that the revolution of technology has been most apparent in our daily lives. We rely on communications to carry the information needed for any free political system to work; but, if that information is misleading or irrelevant, our lives and our political institutions will suffer.

In the past twenty years, the advent of television, alone, has transformed our world from one dependent on the trans-oceanic cable and the filterings of the short-wave, to one in which we can send by communication satellite television pictures instantly from any one corner of the earth to almost any other, or even from distant space. We have been required to abandon all thought of a parochial existence, and take immediate account of events once foreign to us. We now see it all with our own eyes, instantly and with an immediacy that can be either exhilarating or shocking.

But in our wonder at this technology, or even in our bland acceptance of it, we have sometimes overlooked the deeper difficulties that it holds for us. Too often we fail to realize that to see is not necessarily to understand. Television can bring us information; but it does not always bring us knowledge. It brings us the drama of crises and events; but in doing so, it may obscure more important issues and debates. Television can be a powerful force for education and through the medium of the satellite, will soon make possible a true university of the world. But it can also distort our image of the world, and give us a false sense of certainty that we comprehend it.

This growth of television has created a problem of ethics that we must resolve if this technology is to **serve democracy** instead of enslaving it. And we must ask not only whether our democratic institutions, but whether any society can weather almost total and relentless exposure. It

is certain that no individual can - a man who tried to live and work in the eye of the camera would go out of his mind. No other free people has ever faced this question.

In recent years, television and radio have kept us from ignoring the most serious questions our nation has had to face: poverty, racial injustice, and our involvement in Vietnam. But they have often amplified events to unreal size, making local issues nationwide, or giving undue prominence to tiny minorities, from the advocates of violence on the left, to the vigilantes on the right.

We are continually exposed to the crises of the world, but to few of its accomplishments. We are shown the problems of distant lands, but rarely see the way in which people are trying to answer them. And we seldom get a glimpse into the deep historical dimensions of any crises. Watching riot scenes on television may arouse our emotions but does it give us understanding of why it happens and what to do about it. Fortunately thus far, television has largely succeeded in divorcing the presentation of news from the commercial interests that provide the financial basis for modern communications. But the competitive nature of the media -- of television, radio, newspapers, and magazines -- must make us ever vigilant against the stimulation of conflict or the magnification of crisis in order to promote what is ultimately a commercial or corporate interest. The report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence should alert us again -- if further warning is necessary -- to the grave social problems we incur by our fixation on episodic violence, whether it be in the form of news or entertainment.

The most important challenge of television to our society -- its promise and peril -- lies in its relationship to government. I believe that

the media are, indeed, the fourth branch of government, and that what government does must be held up to the scrutiny of all the people. In a democracy, the media exist to illuminate issues and to inform the public, presenting the conflicting points of view that alone give a free people a basis on which to choose.

But this situation must not blind us to the ways in which excessive zeal in performing this function can actually inhibit the workings of democracy. If the media are to be effective in providing checks and balances, we must understand that efforts of government and other institutions to meet our pressing problems will sometimes fail through a distorted exposure of early trial and error. There is, however, a greater risk: that government and other institutions will use the media to obscure and not to illuminate, to mislead rather than to inform. Already, the use of public relations by government and other institutions has built a continuous "credibility gap" into our democratic system. This kind of public cynicism we can no longer accept. But the alternative is some attempt by the media itself to keep the part from standing for the whole; to keep the isolated mistake from destroying the larger effort.

So, too, the media have been used in politics to transmit unreal promises, to raise unreal hopes, which only lead to greater disappointment when action falls short of goals. As with our efforts to bring poverty to an end, the amplifying of promises by government and through the media has merely led to greater frustration when success has not come in time. This use of the media by government and politicians has given a manic-depressive quality to American politics, in which it alternates between unreal hope and unjustified despair, while we play down the difficult and necessarily protracted business of working through our problems.

I believe in the people's right to know; but I believe even more in their right to knowledge. This is, above all, a problem of education. Knowledge and understanding rarely come from dramatic headlines or spot news flashes. They are the refined product of serious and continuing study. We can no longer let technology outstrip our understanding of history, society, and culture. And we must begin a much more intensive study of other peoples and cultures, in order to understand at least something of what we see and hear of them. Unless we do so, we stand to become tourists of the rest of the world, interpreting everything in terms of our own values, yet learning and understanding nothing.

These are some of the new forces which assault many of our most cherished traditions and institutions. Together with the ancient curses of mankind -- poverty, bigotry, ignorance, fear, sickness -- they have generated the anger and alienation so evident in the indictment of the system and society I have recounted. The growth of these forces would jeopardize the survival of democracy itself.

More clearly seen, however, is the crisis of liberalism which has arisen in these circumstances, the basic questioning of the methods we have used to help our institutions and traditions change and develop to serve the interests of all. I have long been committed to the approach that is experimental, the solution tentative, the test pragmatic, and the objective humane. Some would call this the method of liberalism. It is now under attack, and justly so, because of our failure to remember liberalism's basic commitment: that the liberal philosophy, like democracy itself, must be a way of reconciling man with his environment, not merely a set of programs and slogans that may provide answers for the moment, but reveal little of the way ahead. By the same token, conservatives -- those who

have sought to preserve an established system of values -- have been equally unsuccessful in comprehending the new forces which increasingly dominate the system and society.

The great conflict of our times, however, is not between liberal and conservative. Both these philosophies are rooted in a common understanding of democratic development and both are equally committed to the values and principles necessary for the survival of democracy. Liberals and conservatives alike must face the present indictment of the system and society. And we must answer it together or together we shall succumb to the advocates and practitioners of force and violence.

We must understand that if we put our faith in the ability of men to govern their own lives, we must also retain a healthy respect for their ability to err. This means rejecting any strategy based on moral authoritarianism -- whether from the right or left -- and it means strengthening those institutions and processes which can oppose such authoritarianism whenever and wherever it appears.

In formulating this answer we must always remember that alienation in our society, and the questioning of our democratic system, is the product, not of a callous disregard for human values, but of our nation's failure to live up to many of these most fundamental values. Alienation is an assertion of what we believe; not a denial of it. I agree with de Tocqueville, that:

"The sufferings that are endured patiently, as being inevitable, become intolerable the moment that it appears that there might be an escape. Reform then only serves to reveal more clearly what still remains oppressive and now all the more unbearable. . . ."

I believe also that what we are seeing essentially is not a conflict between a set of rigid propositions enshrining the status quo, no longer relevant to the world in which we live, and with a total absence of values, but rather a new effort to reach out for understanding in a world of change, while trying to identify and maintain what is valuable in our democratic tradition. This is as it must be, where laws and institutions can no more resist the need for change than a grown man can wear clothes which fit him as a boy.

In these circumstances our task, it seems to me, is clear: we must bend all of our intellectual and moral powers to assess where we are, to understand the human condition of all men, and to do what we can to create the conditions -- the human environment -- in which man can master himself and thus live sensibly -- and happily -- in his world.

In this series of lectures, I do not expect to solve all of these problems, to find a way to satisfy the alienated, to present a new set of values by which we can live, or even to show the way to all Americans concerned about the future of our country and of the world in general. Many of our problems have no final answers, whether they be answers of the politician or of the young student searching to understand a confusing world. But together, we can -- and we must -- try.

I recall the words of Adlai Stevenson who in his own spirit personified the nobility and decency of democracy. He reminded us that "Democracy is not self-executing. We have to make it work, and to make it work we have to understand it. Sober thought and fearless criticism are impossible without critical thinkers and thinking critics. Such persons must be given the opportunity to come together, to see new facts in the light of old principles and evaluate old principles in light of



new facts by deliberation, debate, and dialogue. This, as we all know well, though some of us forget from time to time, requires intellectual independence, impenitent speculation and freedom from political pressure. For democracys need for wisdom will remain as perennial as its need for liberty. Not only external vigilance, but unending self-examination must be the perennial price of liberty, because the work of self-government never ceases."

We may have to be content, for now, with identifying the most urgent problems, understanding that often we will be wrong in what we do to meet them. But let us always bear in mind that the condition of our times is the inevitable product of a century that has tested mankind as no century before has done. We have seen states destroyed and new states born. We have seen a gradual decline of religion as a source of values in society. We have seen the family and the stability of community eroded by the stresses of change and movement. In my lifetime, we have seen two wars that have changed and bruised the world, and other conflicts where millions died. Today, the threat of mankind's final war is always with us, co-existing with all we do to better our lives.

In this century of change in the entire fabric of the world and society, I believe we must see not only man's failures, but also his achievements. We must recognize the fact that man has survived and still strives for civilization. The miracle of man is that he continues to adapt to do what he can; and to search for a sense of his own being in a world of uncertainty.

In this spirit, then, and from this perspective of man's triumph in the midst of tragedy, I believe that all of us who are concerned must begin, together, a search for a new philosophy -- one that will help us to adapt those values of the past that are still worthwhile, to discover those new

principles that are needed today, and to apply them to the plight of the individual who is facing a system and a society that are changing faster than his ability to understand and define his own place in them.

For me, this new philosophy must include the best of the hard-headed liberal method that has contributed so much to the development of our democratic process. It must be responsive to the demands of change as well as the demands of order. We must once again resort to the difficult ways of civilized and rational men - fearlessly striking down that which hobbles our national growth and purpose, but always with a decent respect for the opinion of others; always with a firm grasp of democratic principles; and always with an unclouded view of our direction and objective. To develop and embrace such a new philosophy -- a new strategy of democracy -- is an ambitious task.

But it must begin now if we are to have any hope of shaping our future. To do less would be unworthy of our heritage. With a sense of urgency and destiny as if creating a new nation, which is what we are doing, we must ventilate the stale and clogged channels of political participation and social opportunity. The refreshing winds of change which are everywhere about us, must be directed to constructive purposes - not through violence - not through hate - not through bitterness - not **through passion**, but through debate and dissent - through dialogue and discussion -- until decision and direction are achieved. This to me, is the meaning of government by the consent of the governed.



~~DRAT~~  
10/9/69

Final Copy

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey

Pillsbury Company Centennial

"Indictment of the System and Society"

The University of Minnesota

October 16, 1969

Last January, for the first time in twenty-five years, I left active politics and returned to teach here at the University of Minnesota and at Macalester College. It did not surprise me, after the 1968 Presidential *asking provocative and difficult questions about nature of our* campaign, to find that students were ~~questioning many assumptions which~~ *demonstrate enterprise.* ~~were operative in our society.~~ It was not simply a matter of finding solu-

tions to the great social problems facing our country. It was ~~also~~ <sup>more</sup> a dis- *and the principles and beliefs which undergird the entire social* <sup>order.</sup> turbing questioning of the very foundations of our political process itself.

*deeply concerned* In adjusting to this new environment with a new generation of ~~inquisitive~~ <sup>this nation's</sup> students, I came to learn that my answers about ~~the significant~~ *were not sufficient -- for me or my* social and economic progress ~~we've made did not fully satisfy many of~~ *and the nature of our society* ~~the students.~~ <sup>them</sup> And their questioning of the democratic process ~~certainly~~ did nothing for my ~~place~~ of mind. In any event, I have come better to appreciate both the magnitude of the challenge that the American system of self-government has to face and the historical perspective in which it is most clearly seen.

For me, this has been a year of considerable intellectual stimulation and examination. *As it is with most Teachers, I have* *learned as much as I have taught.*

We Americans have always been a restless nation - restless in space, restless in time. Throughout American history, this restlessness has produced a constant series of challenges to our ideals and institutions. The "generation gap" is no new phenomenon; nor ours the first "critical era" we have lived through. But I must say to you that, in my opinion, our present crisis is one of the big ones, rivaled perhaps only twice in our history: by the Civil War, which tested our ability to continue as one nation dedicated to democratic and humanitarian principles, and by the Great Depression of the 1930's, which exposed the flaws in our economic system and challenged us to find a new place for the free individual in a social order of increasing complexity. Both of these crises were tragic events in our history. And both ~~unlike~~ contain striking parallels to the American condition we encounter today.

By some standards and compared to many other nations, we are a united people, sharing a common destiny. Indeed, it is very odd that we should be having a crisis at all. We have solved the most difficult questions of producing goods and managing the largest and most diverse economy in history. By most conventional economic indicators, we are a prosperous and healthy nation. Yet it is also quite clear to anyone with eyes to see that these conventional indicators are no longer as useful as they once were. ~~They~~ They do not deceive, but they do mislead. Sometimes I get the ~~im-~~pression that we Americans are getting better and better at measuring things which are of lesser and lesser importance.

Despite the glowing testimony of national income figures, of the Gross National Product, even of those figures that reveal a sharp decrease in the numbers living below the poverty level - despite all of this, there is evidence beneath the American surface - and not always beneath it - *of a* social turbulence which is as potentially destructive to our democracy as the forces unleashed by the Civil War and the Great Depression. And I am speaking of forces quite apart from the growing and increasingly *outspoken* ~~social~~ opposition to the war in Vietnam.

In ways no one could have predicted yesterday - in ways which no one did predict yesterday - the most basic assumptions of our society are being challenged. It is not unusual to see young Americans attacking the existence of poverty or the unequal distribution of wealth and opportunity. It is unusual to see them attacking the idea of affluence itself. (To be sure, a handful of philosophers and social critics - Thoreau, Emerson, Santayana - have always been disdainful of "materialism" or affluence. But now, it is an authentically popular attitude among the young. Things are no longer in the saddle. The horse is for the moment *ridersless*, ~~addition~~, so the question arises: Can we invest our democratic enterprise with the moral purpose and sense of values which seem to be lacking and which are essential for survival beyond our generation? *Can we live with affluence and without casting aside democratic ideals and national goals?*

In the year since the Presidential election, I have observed America from the unique position of a public man who is now a private citizen, *+*

*in certain critical respects, we are*  
↓ have come to see now more clearly than ever before that, ~~we could become~~  
*-- divided over the role of institutions in society and divided*  
*a nation at war with itself*  
*over the basic ends for which our society exists. We are*

*it seems a*  
*nation at*  
*war with*  
*itself.*  
We have all seen and heard the active and vocal protest, reaching  
from within the poor locked in city ghettos to many of the students and  
faculties in our universities.

*If we have witnessed Black rage and white fear*  
*We have seen the reality of not one America -*  
*but two - Separate and unequal.*  
We have also felt the more silent protest, by those Americans who

have worked their way up from poverty and disadvantage to a better life,  
and who now see their achievements or their possibilities for growth

threatened by the demand for more change.

*We have witnessed*  
*black rage and white fear.*  
And the steady erosion of our physical environment looms larger on

all of our horizons as a threat to our very survival.

There is increasing disaffection with government and the institutions  
we have built to preserve our democracy. And there is a rising tide of law-  
lessness in many forms, itself partly an expression of a deeper frustration  
of human aspiration, partly a world-wide rejection of authority and rules of  
conduct, and partly a gesture of self-hatred, an assault by a materialistic  
society upon itself.

These are not isolated problems, to be approached singly, nor will  
they go away simply because we will it. One can see them as a living in-  
dictment of the paltry achievements of our system. I do not agree. Our  
achievements have not been paltry. I see these problems and our turbulence  
rather as an indictment of the unrealized potential of our democratic system.

This year, as a teacher and not just as a politician, I have had this indictment presented to me by serious-minded and vocal members of the rising generation of young people and by concerned teachers. Many of them tell me that the entire order of American politics, inherited from the past, can no longer work in a world of rapid and pervasive change. There is no link, they say, between the loud talk of the politician and the small, still voice of individual conscience, between urgent needs and the capacity of our established institutions to respond to them. And they further say that only the persons who deny the evidence of their own senses can ignore the shameful reality of two Americas in our midst, the one affluent and often indifferent, the other miserable and seething with frustration.

This year I have listened to these and other Americans who indict a political system ~~that~~ they believe to be geared almost automatically to pouring out limitless billions of dollars in support of armament systems beyond the bounds of rational and justifiable needs <sup>but,</sup> - a system which, as they see it, strains at a gnat when asked to deal with the demands of our educational system, the crisis conditions in our cities, in our impoverished rural areas, the inequalities of opportunity, and the appalling facts of hunger, unemployment, and illiteracy among the excluded one-fourth of our population, white and black alike. Many Americans feel this system is geared to spend billions of dollars to put two men on the moon, but is sullen and hard-hearted when asked to help put a dispirited man back on his feet here on earth.

In my travels, I have heard another part of this indictment, from a generation of Americans who have seen the certainties of the past eroded one by one in the face of change, who have shaped their lives by the standards of the past, but find that they no longer provide a sure pathway to the future. They find that their past efforts are scorned -- that they are often denied the security they have earned for the well-being of themselves and their families, for their property, and sometimes even their lives. They see a lifetime of work marred by the fear that the world they bequeath to their children will be no better than their own, and perhaps much worse.

Some of these Americans, whatever their indictment, turn in their frustration to oppose democracy, itself, while still others have a vague sense of discontent that is inevitably transformed into disillusionment and bitterness.

I have also encountered, especially among the young, a growing sense of moral authoritarianism which seemingly blinds these critics to the terribly complex nature of these problems and to the fallibility of all human action. This disturbing tendency to dismiss out of hand the possibility of honest disagreement -- to see the process of cooperation and compromise as reflecting personal immorality rather than recognizing it as the essence of democratic government -- has itself become as destructive of the democratic enterprise as the social wrongs that must be remedied.

These indictments and these circumstances pose the most basic questions: Can we maintain allegiance to a political system based upon

reason and compassion, self-discipline, a decent respect for the opinions of others, and a sense of private and public responsibility? Can our democratic system survive the new demands and pressures placed upon it? Can it provide solutions that are at least minimally workable?

The answers to these questions can no longer automatically be assumed in the affirmative. The very fact that these questions exist makes it clear that there can be no easy assumptions about the inevitable success of the democratic quest. But neither can I join those who would simply abandon a method of self-government that has brought us this far and that is consistent with man's earliest aspirations of human brotherhood. Our task now is to begin the search for a new strategy of democracy, one that will rebut the indictment, clause by clause, and vindicate the American dream.

\* \* \* \*

To understand the terms of the indictment of democracy is the first step in defining a strategy of reaffirmation. The next step must be to understand more thoroughly the new and largely unseen forces at work in our world which have caused these troubled circumstances, shaping reality almost without our knowing it.

I recognize, of course, the devastating impact which the tragic war in Southeast Asia has had on this country, particularly on many of our younger Americans. My purpose on this occasion, however, is to examine those less visible factors which, in my view, have brought us to the present crisis

*It has ~~produced the suffering~~ brought in its wake, not only death and destruction to our own people and others, it has also added a measure of bitterness, alienation, suspicion and cynicism which erodes and destroys respect and trust in our political and social order. The ~~first~~ highest priority is to end this war.*



of democracy -- factors which would have existed regardless of Vietnam and which will be at work when hopefully this terrible conflict is finally over.

We need to recognize that much of what we have taken for granted in our physical environment is changing radically -- and for the worse unless we act to prevent it. The sheer size of America and the speed of its growth, both in population and in the products of our industrial economy, brings with it revolutionary implications. Not only is our living space dwindling, but the quality of this space is declining.

There is the growing concentration of our people into a few contiguous urban communities. This population shift will make available to more people the economic and cultural advantages that only urban life can provide. Yet it is also likely to limit each man's sense of the living space necessary for healthy personal development. Exposure to the hostile and continuous pressures of urban stress, crowding, and social conflict can only upset the psychological balance which most people require for happy and productive lives.

In a similar way, the pace of our economic development over the past few decades has enhanced those human activities that serve the limited functions of economic growth -- and has downgraded other factors that relate to the preservation of man's humanity. We now maintain an economy that is rapidly approaching a gross national product of a trillion



dollars a year. Yet we have paid for much of this growth in the destruction of our world. We have polluted the air of our cities; poured chemical wastes into our rivers and lakes -- to the point of destroying such priceless natural treasures as Lake Erie and the Hudson River. We tolerate the intrusion into our private lives of urban noise, and the congestion that results from sheer, uncontrolled mass. This destruction of our natural heritage, this assault on man's personality - even though much of it has been unintentional - is basically immoral -- a tragic example of man's inhumanity to man.

The problem of pollution is basic to our future. For the first time, we may be on the threshold of controlling the most powerful of all the natural forces: the weather; but at the same time we are failing to control the nature of the air we breath, to protect our food and water from accumulating poisons, or to insure the survival of a natural environment at all.

There is no reason to tolerate these destructive by-products of industrial development. We have the skills to order our economic development without paying the price of human degradation and of submitting man, himself, to the impersonal workings of industry. This is not only something we can do; it is something we must do, if we are to find that all our material progress, all our affluence, only stifle and frustrate us.

This will require us to be attentive to the physical environment of our society as never before. We must go beyond the mere conservation

of our natural resources, of open spaces, of pure water and clean air. It will require us to develop a clear set of goals: to develop and restore our cities with care, as expressions of the highest achievement of man's culture, we must harmonize with nature, instead of destroying it; revive the dying idea of the neighborhood; and ensure that where a man lives and works contributes to his sense of well-being and belonging -- make certain that it has a humanizing impact on him -- instead of stunting his mental and moral growth.

But let us not make the common mistake of assuming that we are going to achieve these goals painlessly or costlessly. We are going to have to pay for most of them - either by taxation or a higher cost of living. Too many who declaim vociferously against air pollution ~~would~~ <sup>continue to</sup> resist efforts to discourage them from using their automobiles or question higher taxes to build a rapid transit system. Indignation against social evils is just and <sup>and commitment.</sup> necessary. But the eradication of these evils requires self-discipline. And, at the moment, we are quite a ways from a working equilibrium, with <sup>and commitment</sup> self-discipline <sup>in shorter supply</sup> ~~than~~ <sup>than</sup> indignation.

Our worth as a nation and as a people -- valued in terms that go far beyond material accomplishment -- depends upon securing for everyone to the greatest extent possible, not as benefits but as rights, the basic prerequisites of personal development: health, education, and security against misfortune. But we also need something less tangible: a sense of identity and a sense of community.

As we advance beyond today's industrial era, our economic system will also go through profound changes. We must learn to cope with these changes *more effectively* ~~better~~ than we have in the past. The role of the individual in our economy has limited his personal sense of worth; the end products of his labors are removed farther and farther from his own contribution. The result is a citizen who, though fully and productively employed, nevertheless feels increasingly isolated ~~and who~~ *and he* has fewer opportunities to find a sense of worth that is not based on the accumulation of material goods alone. *The pride of Product and performance becomes corporate rather than individual.* We can no longer dodge the basic task of reconciling an affluent free people to a sense of purpose. Our objective<sup>s</sup> must be rearranged so that we measure them not in terms of ~~maximizing~~ economic productivity alone, *also -- personal happiness, if you will.* but in terms of ~~maximizing~~ human amenity. *Despite a great deal of individualistic rhetoric, most of it quite sincerely meant, we have never put the whole individual, as distinct from the economic man, first. Our task is without precedent in American history, for it was always assumed that the individual achieved his sense of moral purpose, of community, through his family, his church, his various voluntary associations, but today* *for* various reasons, this is not enough. There is a vital role for government as well. This is a dangerous mission, since there is always the spectre of authoritarianism lurking in the background. But it is an inescapable mission and not, I believe, an impossible one.

In the future, there will also be the fact of increasing leisure <sup>time</sup> when the role of work in meeting the needs of our economy will decline, In the past, work has consumed the bulk of man's energies, and has been a major source of the self-discipline that helps give shape to his life, We have built our country and our economy on traditions that have made work the central activity of importance in man's temporal life. But as technological advances lead to a shorter and shorter work week, where will we find the alternative sources of this self-discipline, this focus for our productive lives?

If we are to restore to each man the sense of personal worth and community, and if we are to resurrect the confident self-discipline he once gained from the satisfaction of productive work, we must be prepared to change our basic cultural attitudes towards work itself. This change will be difficult. Even now, our attitudes towards work and the rewards of society still keep us, as a nation, from providing the basic amenities of life -- food, shelter, medical attention -- to those Americans who are too poor to afford them and too unskilled to perform successfully in the economy. When our economy requires from each of us even less in terms of labor, we will face the need for a basic readjustment in the incentives that are now provided ~~in our economy~~ to encourage each man to take part in the productive life of America. We will need different incentives because we will be aiming at different goals.

We will no longer be able to define a man's contribution to ~~his~~ community in economic terms alone. How we judge others -- and ourselves -- will have to be done according to a new set of criteria, a new image of the ~~successful man~~. One is fairly certain that these criteria and this image will ~~be~~ *be* increasingly ~~in~~ in terms of each man's search for personal integrity and fulfillment, his own "pursuit of happiness." This will require a broadening of the definition of what we call "work," placing new stress on the contributions that individuals make to the life of their community or family, even though they cannot be accounted for in material terms alone,

We have come to understand that the artist, the actor, the poet -- and others who contribute to the cultural life of our nation -- are making an essential contribution to our civilization, to our "welfare." In the future, we must include still others, especially those who will find in service to their communities a major source of personal satisfaction and reward. "Participation" will cease to be a merely political term and will become an ideal attribute of the ideal citizen. To some extent, it has always been such in America. But it must become more so, more than a dutiful association with an established organization.

Of all the new forces that will shape men's lives and strike at the very basis of their relationship to society, the most important has also been one of our greatest blessings: the driving force of technology. In the past few decades, science and technology have brought us as close

to accomplishing miracles as man can dare. Yet we now take this progress for granted, as part of the reward for an industrial nation that has solved so many of the difficult and intriguing problems that have baffled man throughout the ages. Think of it -- every person born after July 21, 1969 will accept as a fact that man may travel to the moon if he so desires. When I was a child in South Dakota, a trip to Minneapolis was a marvel.

Nothing we do now, short of destroying the world itself, can erase from man's memory the knowledge of the sciences that is now at our command. But herein lies the greatest challenge of all, as we strive to control the seemingly inevitable development of newer and more terrifying weapons.

We -- and others -- are now developing new forms of destruction that are eroding the very premises on which we have based our security in the nuclear age. Unless we act soon -- and halt this drift to nuclear holocaust -- we may find that we have lost the chance to adapt our lives and institutions to necessary changes; that we have lost the right to life itself. Optimism ~~itself~~ <sup>alone</sup> will provide no answers; only hard and unrelenting effort that begins before it is too late. For the solving of some problems, time is ours to choose. But for others -- like the controlling of the arms race -- time can only be our enemy.

More general problems of technology may not be as urgent as that of controlling the arms race or preserving our physical environment from a

slower form of destruction. But their implications for the future, or even for the survival of democracy, are no less important. In a world of science and technology, the chances for the individual to take part in the activities of his society -- from debate to action -- have never been greater. We are all on television now. We have no silent and unseen people. But the threats to his sense of being and integrity within that society have also never been more acute.

*To be sure, science and technology have made the world our neighborhood, but are we neighbors or strangers, friends or enemies in this neighborhood?*

~~In the past few years,~~ We have gradually become aware of the impact on human beings of impersonal technology and organization: from the all-encompassing computer that records information on one's private life, to the market economy where consumer choice is often subordinated to the needs of the entire system to keep demand growing and predictable. We have come to accept the intrusion of commercial advertising into large areas of our private and semi-private lives. We have utilized the teachings of psychology to permit the manipulation of man. Our political campaigns are coming to resemble the marketing of commodities. And, speaking both as a politician and as a firm believer in democracy, I can say that nowhere has the attempt to manipulate the choices available to individual Americans become more abhorrent and unacceptable.

In one particular area, the benefits of technological progress need to be weighed most carefully against its costs in personal freedoms and the demands of democracy. It is in communications that the revolution of



technology has been most apparent in our daily lives. We rely on communications to carry the information needed for any free political system to work; but, if that information is misleading or irrelevant, our lives and our political institutions will suffer.

In the past twenty years, the advent of television, alone, has transformed our world from one dependent on the trans-oceanic cable and the filterings of the short-wave, to one in which we can send <sup>by communication satellite</sup> television pictures instantly from any one corner of the earth to almost any other, or even from distant space. We have been required to abandon all thought of a parochial existence, and take immediate account of events once foreign to us. We now see it all with our own eyes, instantly and with an immediacy that can be either exhilarating or shocking.

But in our wonder at this technology, or even in our bland acceptance of it, we have sometimes overlooked the deeper difficulties that it holds for us. Too often we fail to realize that to see is not necessarily to understand. Television can bring us information; but it does not always bring us knowledge. It brings us the drama of crises and events; but in doing so, it may obscure more important issues and debates. Television can be a powerful force for education and through the medium of the satellite, will soon make possible a true university of the world. But it can also distort our image of the world, and give us a false sense of certainty that we comprehend it.

This growth of television has created a problem of ethics that we must resolve if this technology is to serve democracy instead of enslaving it. And we must ask not only whether our democratic institutions, but whether any society can weather almost total and relentless exposure. It is certain that no individual can - a man who tried to live and work in the eye of the camera would go out of his mind. No other free people has ever faced this question.

In recent years, television and radio have kept us from ignoring the most serious questions our nation has had to face: poverty, racial injustice, and our involvement in Vietnam. But they have often amplified events to unreal size, making local issues nationwide, or giving <sup>undue</sup> prominence to tiny minorities, from the advocates of violence on the left, to the vigilantes on the right. / We are continually exposed to the crises of the

world, but to few of its accomplishments; ~~We~~ are shown the problems of distant lands, but rarely see the way in which people are trying to answer them. And we <sup>seldom</sup> ~~rarely~~ get a glimpse into the deep historical dimensions of

any crises. Watching riot scenes on television will not help us with that

~~understanding.~~

*may arouse our emotions but does it give us understanding of why it happens and what to do about it?*

*Intimately shared* So far, television has largely succeeded in divorcing the presentation of news from the commercial interests that provide the financial basis for modern communications. But the competitive nature of the media -- of television, radio, newspapers, and magazines -- must make us <sup>even</sup> vigilant

against the stimulation of conflict or the magnification of crisis in order to promote what is ultimately a commercial or corporate interest. The report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence should alert us again -- if further warning is necessary -- to the grave social problems we incur by our fixation on episodic violence, whether it be in the form of news or entertainment.

The most important challenge of television to our society -- its promise and peril -- lies in its relationship to government. I believe that the media are, indeed, the fourth branch of government, and that what government does must be held up to the scrutiny of all the people. In a democracy, the media exist to illuminate issues and to inform the public, presenting the conflicting points of view that alone can give a free people a basis on which to choose.

But this situation must not blind us to the ways in which excessive zeal in performing this function can actually inhibit the workings of democracy. If the media are to be effective in providing checks and balances, we must understand that efforts of government and other institutions to meet our pressing problems will sometimes fail through a distorted exposure of early ~~failure~~ <sup>trial and error</sup>. There is, however, a greater risk: that government and other institutions will use the media to obscure and not to illuminate, to mislead rather than to inform. Already, the use of public relations by government and other institutions has built a continuous "credibility gap"

into our democratic system. This kind of public cynicism we can no longer accept. But the alternative is some attempt by the media <sup>itself</sup> to keep the part from standing for the whole; to keep the isolated mistake from destroying the larger effort.

So, too, the media have been used in politics to transmit unreal promises, to raise unreal hopes, which only lead to greater disappointment when action falls short of goals. As with our efforts to bring poverty to an end, the amplifying of promises by government and through the media has merely led to greater frustration when success has not come in time. This use of the media by government and politicians has given a manic-depressive quality to American politics, in which it alternates between unreal hope and unjustified despair, while we play down the difficult and necessarily protracted business of working through our problems.

I believe in the people's right to ~~know~~ <sup>to know;</sup> but I believe even more in their right to knowledge. This is, above all, a problem of education. We can no longer let technology outstrip our understanding of history, society, and culture. And we must begin a much more intensive study of other peoples and cultures, in order to understand at least something of what we see and hear of them. Unless we do so, we stand to become <sup>tourists</sup> ~~voyeurs~~ of the rest of the world, interpreting everything in terms of our own values, yet learning and understanding nothing.

*Knowledge and understanding rarely come from headlines or ~~that~~ spot news flashes, they are the refined product of serious and continuing study.*

These are some of the new forces which assault many of our most cherished traditions and institutions. Together with the ancient curses of mankind -- poverty, bigotry, ignorance, fear, sickness -- they have generated the anger and alienation so evident in the indictment of the system and society I have recounted. ~~The~~ growth of these forces would jeopardize the survival of democracy itself.

More clearly seen, however, is the crisis of liberalism which has arisen in these circumstances, the basic questioning of the methods we have used to help our institutions and traditions change and develop to serve the interests of all. I have long been committed to the approach that is experimental, the solution tentative, the test pragmatic, and the objective humane. Some would call this the method of liberalism. It is now under attack, and justly so, because of our failure to remember liberalism's basic commitment: that the liberal philosophy, like democracy itself, must be a way of reconciling man with his environment, not merely a set of programs and slogans that may provide answers for the moment, but reveal little of the way ahead. By the same token, conservatives -- those who have sought to preserve an established system of values -- have been equally unsuccessful in comprehending the new forces which increasingly dominate the system and society.

The great conflict of our times, however, is not between liberal and conservative. Both these philosophies are rooted in a common understanding of democratic development and both are equally committed to the

values and principles necessary for the survival of democracy. Liberals and conservatives alike must face the present indictment of the system and society. And we must answer it together or together we shall succumb to the advocates ~~and~~<sup>st</sup> practitioners of force + violence.

We must understand that if we put our faith in the ability of men to govern their own lives, we must also retain a healthy respect for their ability to err. This means rejecting any strategy based on moral authoritarianism -- whether from the right or left -- and it means strengthening those institutions and processes which can oppose such authoritarianism whenever and wherever it appears.

In formulating this answer we must always remember that alienation in our society, and the questioning of our democratic system, is the product, not of a callous disregard for human values, but of our nation's failure to live up to many of these most fundamental values. Alienation is an assertion of what we believe; not a denial of it. I agree with de Tocqueville, that:

"The sufferings that are endured patiently, as being inevitable, become intolerable the moment that it appears that there might be an escape. Reform then only serves to reveal more clearly what still remains oppressive and now all the more unbearable...."

I believe also that what we are seeing essentially is not a conflict between a set of rigid propositions enshrining the status quo, no longer relevant to the world in which we live, and with a total absence of values, but rather a new effort to reach out for understanding in a world of change, while trying to identify and maintain what is valuable in our democratic tradition. This is as it must be, where laws and institutions can no more resist the need for change than a grown man can wear clothes which fit him as a boy.

In these circumstances our task, it seems to me, is clear: we must bend all of our intellectual and moral powers to assess where we are, to understand the human condition of all men, and to do what we can to create the conditions -- the human environment -- in which man can master himself and thus live sensibly -- and happily -- in his world.

In this series of lectures, I do not expect to solve <sup>all of</sup> these problems, to find a way to satisfy the alienated, to present a new set of values by which we can live, or even to show the way to all Americans concerned about the future of our country and of the world in general. Many of our problems have no final answers, whether they be answers of the politician or of the young student searching to understand a confusing world. But together, we can -- and we must -- try. (Eleven years) over on back 7 page.

We may have to be content, for now, with identifying the most urgent problems, understanding that often we will be wrong in what we do



I recall the words of Adlai Stevenson who in his own  
~~own~~ spirit personified the nobility and decency  
of democracy. He reminded us that "democracy is  
not self-executing. We have to make it work,  
and to make it work we have to understand it.  
Sole thought and fearless criticism are impossible  
without critical thinkers and thinking critics.  
Such persons must be given the opportunity to  
come together, to see new facts in the light of  
old principles and evaluate old principles  
in light of new facts by deliberation, debate,  
and dialogue. This, as we all know well,  
though some of us forget from time to time,  
requires intellectual independence, independent  
speculation and freedom from political  
pressure. For democracy need for  
wisdom will remain as perennial  
as its need for liberty. Not only external  
vigilance, but unending self-examination  
must be the perennial price of liberty,  
because the work of self government  
never ceases."

to meet them. But let us always bear in mind that the condition of our times is the inevitable product of a century that has tested mankind as no century before has done. We have seen states destroyed and new states born. We have seen a gradual decline of religion as a source of values in society. We have seen the family and the stability of community eroded by the stresses of change and movement. In my lifetime, we have seen two wars that have changed and bruised the world, and other conflicts where millions died. Today, the threat of mankind's final war is always with us, co-existing with all we do to better our lives.

In this century of change in the entire fabric of the world and society, I believe we must see not only man's failures, <sup>but also his achievements.</sup> ~~however great.~~ We must ~~also~~ recognize the fact that man has survived and still strives for civilization. The miracle of man is that he continues to adapt to do what he can; and to search for a sense of his own being in a world of uncertainty.

In this spirit, then, and from this perspective of man's triumph in the midst of tragedy, I believe that all of us who are concerned must begin, together, a search for a new philosophy -- one that will help us to adapt those values of the past that are still worthwhile, to discover those new principles that are needed today, and to apply them to the plight of the individual who is facing a system and a society that are changing faster than his ability to understand and define his own place in them.

For me, this new philosophy must include the best of the hard-headed liberal method that has contributed so much to the development of our

democratic process. It must be responsive to the demands of change as well as the demands of order. <sup>(F)</sup> To develop and embrace such a new philosophy -- a new strategy of democracy -- is an ambitious task.

But it must begin now if we are to have any hope of shaping our future. To do less would be unworthy of our heritage. (see end of ~~unpublished~~ Sp) ~~etc~~

~~Yes, now as in the history of this nation's birth~~  
we must once again resort to the different ways of civilized and rational men - fearlessly striking down that which ~~has~~ hobbles our national growth and purpose, but always with a decent respect for the opinion of others; always with a firm grasp on democratic principles; and always with an unclouded view of ~~what we are~~ ultimately our direction and objectives.

With a sense of urgency and destiny as if creating a new nation, which is what we are doing, we must ventilate the stale and clogged channels of Political Participation and Social Opportunity. The refreshing winds of change which are everywhere about us must be directed to constructive purposes - not through violence - not through hate - not through bitterness - not through passion, but through debate and dissent - through dialogue and discussion - until decision and direction are achieved. (over)

This, to me, is the meaning of government  
by the consent of the governed.



# 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)