

Kansas State U

001198

PEOPLE ON PODIUM

→ (Purple + white) the  
Victims

1. Gov. <sup>James</sup> Landon
2. PRESIDENT McGAIN - Presidents House
3. Gov. DOCKING (Robert + Meredith)
4. MR. ROBERT WILSON - HE IS CHAIRMAN  
OF THE PATRONS OF THE LECTURES AND A  
LOCAL BUSINESS MAN.

5. Prof Joseph Higdon - John McCormick  
Wm. mother

The 1960's - Characteristics

Politically  
unreliable

Decade of Discontent and Disillusion  
of war and worry

Characterized  
our confidence

Our confidence in  
our wealth + Power  
in our Science + Technology

Period of Self-disillusion  
our Progress  
our Prosperity  
our Hunger  
our Cities  
our Education  
our Environment  
our role in the world

Learning  
through

Gov Landon  
"Every Man a Wildcat"

000000  
agiville  
cultural center  
7KSU  
001199

REMARKS

ALFRED M. LANDON LECTURE

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

MANHATTAN, KANSAS

JANUARY 9, 1970

Testing whether this nation many nation so concerned  
& so dedicated Can long endure.

constitution  
It is good, sometimes, to go back to the beginning in our con-  
templation of the nature of our Federal system. To remind ourselves,  
for example, that the Preamble to the Constitution is written in the  
present tense--We the people do ordain and establish . . . " not "We  
the people did ordain . . . "

Such language builds in the flexibility that keeps our Constitut-  
ion contemporary while so many of the world's nations are forced to  
seek new forms of government in order to meet changing needs and  
changing times.

This is what we mean when we speak of the living Constitution,  
and it is why our government has unlimited capacity to adapt to the  
changing conditions, needs, and desires of its citizens.

-2-

In the early days of our country, because systems of communication were rudimentary, local government could respond most quickly to the needs of the people and, therefore, most governing was done by the smaller units.

The national government had few functions, and these were primarily in the areas of national defense, foreign policy, trade and national development.

But as communications and commerce united our people, as our transportation systems became more sophisticated, and our people more migratory, the inadequacy of local government was increasingly apparent.

Thus the role of the states, and of the federal government, began to grow.

Constitutional interpreters have substantiated the legitimacy of this growth, and Constitutional flexibility has allowed each Chief Executive freedom in interpreting these divisions of responsibility.

Five years ago in a speech at the University of Michigan,

-3-

President Lyndon Johnson talked about his plans for the "Great Society"--and the phrase became an eloquent and familiar expression of the goals of his administration.

Less well remembered--but equally important--is a companion phrase from the same speech--Creative Federalism.

When President Johnson expressed his hopes and desires for the future of our country, he knew well that legislation alone does not a program make, that good administration--and cooperative administrative relationships--are essential components if there is to be true progress.

Creative Federalism was the phrase the President used to describe the whole array of cooperative relationships between the Federal Government and State Governments, between city, county, and other local government units, between universities and hospitals, voluntary agencies, professional and trade associations and the whole of the private sector.



# Pres. Lint Nixon - new federalism

-4-

↳ The new Federalism was not so much a delineation of powers between the National and State governments, as a pattern, or description, of a cooperative partnership of all levels of government in concert with private resources. ↳ This partnership of Creative Federalism was designed to maximize and mobilize the nations resources--public and private--for the achievement of national goals and the solution of increasingly complex problems.

↳ The need for these working relationships was increasingly obvious. In the 1960's the Congress had finally shaken off the tired states rights rhetoric of the past and--in a series of creative enactments--dramatically enlarged the role of the Federal government.

The whole concept of federal responsibility took on new meaning under the activist leadership of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson.

Before 1960, federal grants-in-aid were seen primarily as an assist to localities that lacked the wherewithal to solve their own problems. The money--and sometimes the technical assistance--came from Washington, but policymaking and power remained in the community.

~~and~~ But the new legislation of the 60's carried broad statements of national purpose.

~~The~~ New federal programs were ~~being~~ designed to meet national needs and the state and local governments were ~~being~~ asked to serve as a cooperative partner in the ~~execution~~ administration of these programs.

↳ In a whole basketful of categories the Federal government made clear its determination to improve the conditions and opportunities of life for all citizens in our society.

↳ The citizen is not only a citizen resident of a locality, but a citizen of the United States and therefore entitled to the protections and opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution. ↳ The emphasis in the new Federal policy is on United States citizenship.

~~In a series of dramatic substantive programs, the Federal Government Administration and the Congress declared war not only on poverty, but on unemployment, illiteracy, hunger, the deterioration of our cities, the pollution of our environment and the infringement of civil rights and liberties for many of our citizens.~~

-6-

Four major legislative achievements are destined to greatly change the American political and social order, broadening the political base and expanding and deepening the social structure.

1. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 —
2. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 —
3. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 —
4. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 —

Truly a  
Revolutionary  
Impact

And in each of these landmark measures, the legislative language referred to the national concern.

... In 1961, the Area Redevelopment Act declared that maintaining the economy at a high level was "vital to the best interests of the United States," and that unemployment detracted from the "national welfare".

... In 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act said "It is in the national interest" to train those without skills "in order that the Nation may meet" its manpower needs.

... In the revolutionary Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the 89th Congress noted that "The United States can achieve its full economic

-7-

and social potential as a nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society", and concluded: "It is therefore the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation."

... In the Model Cities legislation of 1966, the Congress declared that "improving the quality of urban life is the most critical domestic problem facing the United States".

DL Throughout this series of historic enactments--education bills without precedent, civil rights legislation that many of us had struggled

for decades to enact, housing and manpower and area redevelopment--~~Consumer~~

~~of Pollution Control - Consumer Protection~~ one emphasis remained constant: the Federal government had a goal

and a purpose, and federal funds would be expended to achieve these national goals and purposes.

No longer would federal grants be conceived merely as financial aid to states and communities.

↳ Congress once and for all asserted the primacy of the national interest in a broad range of activities--many until then considered the exclusive province of state or local government.

*Reason* ↳ There are some obvious reasons for this dramatic change. Chief among them is the increase in the migratory habits of our population subsequent to World War II.

↳ We became a mobile nation and state loyalties grew thin.

↳ We are a nation on the move and our ties are to country, to family and to job.

↳ Provincial local loyalties have diminished.

↳ No longer do families remain in the towns of their forebears, no longer do children live in the cities where they were raised.

↳ In-migration to our cities and to the sunny states of California and Florida--aided by decreasing transportation costs--is in large part the result of improved communication.

↳ Rural families, once isolated from the general culture, were able to see Chicago and New Orleans close up on the television screen.

-9-

It looked good to many. And many<sup>maybe</sup> --too many for the available services--decided they wanted to join the urban scene.

The poorly schooled boy from South Carolina began showing up as a welfare statistic in New York City.

The malnourished child from Appalachia was in the hospital in Detroit.

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

The recognition that a single city had no leverage in the fight for clean air and drinkable water made clear the need for national intervention on behalf of the beleaguered municipalities.

The inability of minority groups to achieve first-class citizenship after a century of struggle made abundantly clear the need for a legal statement of national conscience and federal enforcement of national standards.



-10-

For the better part of this decade, we have been involved in the very complicated task of defining our national objectives in these and other areas.

We have been writing and passing the legislative programs that could tackle them effectively. And we have been struggling to coordinate the proliferating inter and intra-governmental efforts.

We have been more successful with the first two of these objectives than with the latter.

There was - and there still is - considerable overlap and duplication both among and between layers of government and among and between the agencies on a given level of government.

These duplications will exist unless - or until - we establish a National Planning Board with the administrative authority to properly allocate resources and mobilize our talent and skills.

But administrative problems pale before the splendid achievements of the 60's.

When I left the Office of the Vice President in 1968, there were <sup>95</sup> areas for which <sup>federal</sup> grants-in-aid were available.

Only ten of these had existed before 1930.

Seventeen were added during the years of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and 29 were added between the New Deal and 1961. In just five years--between 1961 and 1966--39 new categories of Federal programs were added to the national catalog--and every one of these addressed a national need, ~~and maintained policymaking and control on the Federal level.~~

~~In a just published report on the Federal system from the Brookings Institution, author James Sundquist notes that the "dramatic expansion of the range of concern of the federal government in the 1960's can be seen as the culmination of a historic trend--the final burial, perhaps, of traditional doctrines of American federalism that, for a long time, had been dying hard."~~

~~Sundquist was referring to the Federalism that restricted or restrained the power and outreach of the Federal government. The~~

*of Restructuring powers of Fed. Govt.*

*Then*

New Federalism was not a negative concept, but rather a positive expression of national concern, national goals, and a national program to be achieved in a new partnership of all levels of government and with the added resources of the private sector.

Sundquist goes on to discuss the traditional view of federalism--the dual system--where the federal and the state governments were considered separate sovereignties with specific demarcations in their spheres of activity.

But America's leading student of federalism, Morton Grodzins, in his well-known analogy likening our federal system to a marble cake, rather than the more commonly conceived layer cake, concludes that there never really had been exclusive jurisdiction.

Even under the loosely written Articles of Confederation--when citizens were decrying the lack of central authority--the Federal government was providing limited grants-in-aid for education.

Today the Federal government provides billions for education--

though education is still generally considered the province of local government.

The federal government and the states have always cooperated in a wide variety of areas--banking, railroad construction, internal improvements, and so forth.

Relationships--among governments as well as people--are seldom established by design. They evolve.

As Mr. Sundquist notes in his excellent report, the intermingling of local, state and federal interests in no sudden departure. It is the culmination of our gradual drift toward a single unified system of government in which all the partners contribute to the efficient functioning of each other.

With the exception of President Eisenhower--and until President Nixon--the national leaders of the 20th century have steadfastly supported the expansion of the federal responsibility.

Eisenhower, who ran on the Republican States Rights platform of 1952, searched in vain for a federal activity to return to the states during his years in the White House.

-14-

He appointed a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and asked it to recommend limitations on the federal role.

Instead, the Commission, in a sophisticated and enlightened report, supported the trend toward cooperative government, concluding, "There are few activities of government indeed in which there is not some degree of national interest and in which the national government is without constitutional authority to participate in some manner".

"The National government and the states should be regarded not as competitors for authority but as two levels of government cooperating with or complementing each other in meeting the growing demands on both", so the Commission reported back to the Chief Executive.

A subsequent commission of governors, charged by the President with the same task, had a tough time finding anything to recommend.

In the end, they suggested eliminating federal grants for vocational education and sewage treatment plants. Both proposals were rejected by the Congress.

-15-

It is clear that the Federal Government is in the service business to stay.

We know that ~~I do not want to give you the idea that the~~ American federal system is perfect. It isn't. Its imperfections are many and the need for refinement is great. It is only the best system of government that man has yet devised. •

Churchill

Actually, it is inaccurate to speak of a single system. We are a system of systems. Within each level and throughout each layer are complicated interacting networks of public authorities and private interests.

In addition to the Federal government and the 50 state governments, we share some 19,000 municipal governments, almost as many townships, more than 3000 county governments and so many special purpose districts that we are yet to get an accurate count--though we know there are enough to bring the total of tax-levying authorities near --and maybe over--the one hundred thousand mark.

100,000



Any given tax-payer may be under obligations to as many as a dozen of these authorities.

In addition to his municipal, state and federal obligations, he will certainly pay for the support of an elementary and a secondary school district, probably a junior college district, usually a state university system.

He probably supports county government and he will certainly have taxes levied by several special service districts.

There are special lighting districts and port authorities, there are special recreation districts, sewer districts, fire protection districts, mosquito abatement districts, transit authorities, port authorities, bridge districts, water districts and pollution control districts--you name the need, somewhere in the United States there is a special service district answering it.

As if that isn't enough to contend with, there are the whole host of local, state and national associations of professionals interacting with each of the levels of government.

Our educational institutions, for example, have to deal with teacher training and credentialing organizations, with local, county and state curriculum code groups, with organizations of education professionals (local, state and national associations of teachers, of administrators, of curriculum specialists, of superintendents of schools, etc.) and, of course, the parents who make their voices felt through PTA's and Parents Clubs.

There is a local school board deciding policy--and there is a county and a state school board, also with policy making authority.

Back in Washington, there are committees in the House and the Senate with education as a primary concern. And there is the U. S. Office of Education.

All of these formal and informal public and private groups are concerned with a single enterprise; education. The day to day functioning of a given school is a typical example of the melange of interests and governments that interact to affect and influence one single area.

In this case--education--it is relatively easy to determine who is in charge.

Too often the citizen cannot identify the final authority in the bewildering battery of entities.

Who should he call if he lives in an unincorporated area and his neighbor's septic tank overflows on his property? If he lives in the city and his sewer backs up?

The county supervisors? The Mayor? The Sanitary District? The Water District? The Pollution Control Board?

Which jurisdiction do you call when the water main breaks or the house next door is abandoned or the trash is uncollected?

What does a citizen do if his complaint is badly handled?

Often he cannot identify the names on his local ballot.

He cannot make an intelligent choice of members for the Hospital Board or for City Court Judge.

He does not know who is responsible for clogged highways or polluted air; he cannot decide who to blame for the absence of a stop sign at a busy corner.

-19-

↳ These things--large and small--are the stuff of government,  
and they are the kinds of problems our single, unified federal system  
must be able to handle with facility if we are to lay claim to providing  
good government.

↳ Contrary to general mythology, the federal government often  
is more responsive to citizen complaints than local government.

↳ Citizens have built-in lobbyists in their Congressmen, who  
regularly call Federal agencies on behalf of their constituents.

↳ It is a fallacy that local government is closest to the people.  
Local and state governments are less predictable in their response  
to citizen complaints and there is less likelihood of finding quali-  
fied professionals staffing the smaller units.

Many states have yet to institute personnel merit systems and  
a substantial majority of cities still operate on the archaic spoils system.

The Federal programs depend crucially upon the competence and  
the willingness of state and community personnel for their effective  
functioning.

-20-

↳ The central premise of all the new "people" programs is that they are, in effect, local programs--but local programs in the national interest.

↳ It is in the county court house, the city and village halls and the thousands of town meetings across the nation that their success or failure will be determined.

↳ Congress, in most cases, can do no more than enact enabling legislation.

↳ You cannot legislate good administration; you cannot legislate creative local government.

↳ It is the community that must act, must initiate applications for the grant money, must administer the ~~resultant~~ program with local people in the community.

↳ The Federal government can offer an <sup>*injection*</sup> infusion of money and ideas, but local leadership and cooperation is essential to final success.

~~Because the national government has such a large stake--financial and ideological--in the effective functioning of state and local governments, a substantial amount of legislation in this decade has included~~

-21-

provision to upgrade the quality of the state service or agency.

Because the federal government has superior fiscal resources, the threat to suspend or withhold a grant is a very powerful weapon-- but one to be handled with care. We do not, after all, want to withhold services from our citizens.

I do not mean to suggest that the relationship between the levels of government is hostile or contentious--on the contrary.

The relationships between the federal government and the communities are better than they have been for many years.

The federal government has no desire to supercede or supplant local government.

The new legislation was designed to strengthen state legislatures and administrators and other local bodies because the Federal government needs strong partners.

The federal government has fostered --and I have supported-- inter-state compacts and regional compacts, metropolitan councils of government and multi-county authorities.



# Coordination - Duplication

001220

In 1968,

included ~~that~~ <sup>Policy</sup>

Last year I proposed a Domestic Development Council, to be structured much like the National Security Council. The Domestic Council would be headed by the Vice President, just as the National Security Council is headed by the President.

To coordinate federal programs at the regional level, I suggested the appointment of a Presidential representative, a domestic Ambassador, if you will, who would have responsibilities at the regional level much like those an Ambassador abroad has in his assigned country.

This kind of coordination--at the federal level through the Domestic Council, and at the regional level through the Presidential representative--could untangle some of these complex and overlapping government entities.

There is increasing recognition of the need to work together and to coordinate the multiplicity of government efforts.

Keep

But coordination does not necessarily result in simplification. The new coordinating bodies of this decade have given us a more complicated federal system--one with five, six and sometimes seven levels of government, where

~~1970's~~

before there had been three or four.

Many of these regional groupings have been effective in their efforts. The Appalachia Regional Commission, for example, defined the problems of an economically depressed area and focussed on the need for highways and other transport in order to get the goods to market--and thus attract industry that previously shunned the area.

Some have been less successful.

One of the stumbling blocks in our federal effort to deal equally with the states is their inherent lack of equality. The largest of our states has 70 times the population of our smallest.

The divergence in financial resources is similiarly unequal.

Some of our states are primarily agricultural, some are primarily industrial. Some have an abundance of water, some are near-desert.

Some are plagued by smog, others need to build highways. Some are very cold and some are very hot.

↳ The same disparities are found among our cities and urban areas.

↳ It is obvious that no national program can deal fairly and equitably with the disparate and diverse needs and desires of all cities or all states.

Thus the legislation of the 60's was deliberately flexible, taking into account the diverse needs of our widely varying communities. This necessary flexibility is responsible for some of the resultant chaos and confusion.

Some feel that a little chaos in government is a good thing. But how much is a little?

When confusion and duplication seriously interfere with the successful achievement of our primary objective--the best government for the least expenditure --it is time to end the old rivalries between--and among--levels of government and proceed with the development of close harmonious working relationships.

Government is a tool for us to use, not an enemy to be abused. We cannot afford the isolation of any government--local, state or federal--if we are to succeed in our great national undertakings, and if we are to develop a society where the dignity of our people equals the marvelous products of our affluence.

In our growing and demanding United States, we need the wisdom to create, control--and to support-- a government strong enough to protect our liberties and concerned enough to meet the needs of all of our citizens.

*We must set priorities + jobs  
We must change*

Now, as in the time of this nation's birth, we must resort to the difficult ways of civilized and rational men--fearlessly striking down that which hobbles national growth and purpose, but always with a decent respect for the opinions of others, always with a firm grip on democratic principles and liberties, and an unclouded view of where we are headed.

*Change*

This is the continuing American revolution. ~~This is the road to the Great Society.~~

*The struggle today is not so much between Liberal + Conservatives as between those who seek to preserve*

1960's

~~overconfidence in our Power~~  
~~in our Technology~~

~~overindulgence~~

~~our confidence in Science~~

~~But many Break~~

*change the system & those who would  
destroy it*

-26-

001226

*Stok  
Carmichael  
Parton*

✓ I recall Adlai Stevenson's reminder that "Democracy is not  
self executing. We have to make it work, we have to understand it . . .  
not only external vigilance but unending self-examination must be  
the perennial price of liberty, because the work of self government  
never ceases."

✓ With a sense then of urgency, we must ventilate the clogged  
channels of political participation, and of 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 reason and discussion--until decision  
and direction are clear.

This, my friends, is the meaning of government by the  
consent of the governed--a social contract among equals.

✓ That is the meaning of Creative Federalism, ~~and it is a path~~  
~~to The Great Society.~~



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

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

We have a Voting Rights Act -- and it ~~has provided~~ three quarters of a million ~~black citizens~~ <sup>black citizens</sup> become voters ~~million blacks have been offered the franchise~~ under this tough, effective legislation.

We have an Economic Opportunity Act -- and Vista Volunteers, Job Corps graduates and Head Start youngsters are among the <sup>productive</sup> ~~tangible~~ results of this creative legislation

We have the Elementary and <sup>S</sup> Econdary Education Act -- and it offers tangible concern for evidence of our national ~~commitment~~ <sup>concern</sup> to excellent education .

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

###

TEXT  
LONDON LECTURE  
BY  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

I want to talk today about our social order, our government, this country, its role in the world. I've said that the topic would be "How We Can Make Our Government Work" -- or perhaps I should say work better. I want to talk to you about the federal structure of our government. I realize this isn't the most soul-gripping topic. It isn't politically sexy, but it is terribly important.

Let us take a look at the 60's. I don't want to spend too much time on them -- but let's take a quick look and then we will look ahead to the 1970's. The 1960's could well be described as the decade of dissent and discovery. . . the decade of war and worry. It was a period in which we -- in a sense -- discovered ourselves.

Everybody is trying to do that these days. And when you try to discover yourself -- your individual identity or your national identity -- you have to be prepared to discover some things you may not like.

The 1960's saw us, 15 years after World War II, with vast changes that had taken place worldwide -- and yet with many habits in the American political and social structure that had not changed.

The 1960's found us with unprecedented economic prosperity -- and yet with a poverty of spiritual resources -- with no real satisfaction out of our affluence, even though that's what most of the people of my

generation thought was most important.

We were the sons and daughters of the depression, and to us economic security was vital. We learned the hard way. There were no jobs; the nation was prostrate. The leaders ~~what~~ were in power -- in business, in government, in labor, in every institution in our country at the beginning of the 1960's with few exceptions -- were men and women who had suffered the anguish and the pain and the disaster of war -- world war --, of depression -- worldwide depression.

Therefore ~~our~~ major objectives were to see, number one, that never again would a depression level this nation and this world. And we spent our time trying to create the economic mechanism that would assure the production of goods and services to guarantee economic health for the nation.

Perhaps we forgot that man does not live by bread alone.

But we did learn -- also learned the hard way -- that isolated as a nation, there was no security. We learned it from Hitler and Tojo; we learned it from the tragedy of World War II. We learned that isolation was dangerous and that aggression likewise was dangerous, and therefore we bound together in many pacts and alliances called collective security.

I think maybe we failed to recognize that you can overdo that as well.

So the 1960's could be described as a time when we had too much confidence in our wealth, too much confidence in our power -- thinking that wealth was goods and services and that power was military might and alliances. There was far too little emphasis, I suppose on real power, namely, reason and understanding, knowledge directed ~~in~~ action, a knowledge with commitment.



Let me say as I speak to you that knowledge without commitment may be wasteful, but commitment without knowledge is dangerous. So we were treading on wasteful and dangerous ground.

We had a little too much confidence in our science and technology. We were overwhelmed -- awed -- by computers, by electronics, by the Space Age -- thinking that these things would somehow or other bring us the millennium. We failed to recognize that science must be a tool for man; that it must be his servant, not his master.

The 1960's taught us that we should make science and technology our servants and this requires that we have political conviction, political decision, and social decision.

What I am saying is that we have created the material means to do the great things that need to be done. The question is whether we, as individuals, have the willingness to do what the founders of this republic said we would have to do if we wanted life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: namely, to pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the achievement of these goals.

In the 1960's, a great deal of self-analysis took place. For the first time, we began to appreciate the ugliness, the sin, the immorality, and the indecency of racism -- and may I say to this campus that this is still a central problem in our society. But at least we have come to grips with it, at least we have faced it.

The first sign of health is recognizing your sickness. A strong nation and a great people do not run away from their problems, they confront them head on -- and recognize that they can be solved.

We came face to face with the fact of hunger in our midst at a time of unbelievable production of foodstuffs. We came face to face with the fact of poverty in the richest nation on the face of the earth. I am not talking about people just being poor. To be poor is one thing; to be the victim of poverty is an entirely different thing.

People who are poor can have their troubles remedied by money; but the victims of poverty have suffered defeat and failure. They are hopeless and helpless. They have lost motivation and self-respect, and they are sick in a very serious and fundamental way -- and it takes more than just income or income maintenance to bring them out of that sickness.

We are coming to grips for the first time with the hidden poor and with the victims of poverty.

And we found in the 1960's that we were a nation of cities. Demographers tell us that by the year 2,000, ninety percent of our people will live in cities of over 200,000 people each. As a matter of fact, seventy-five percent of our people already live in such cities. And all at once, the problems of noise, of congestion, of slums, of overlapping governmental jurisdiction, of the inadequacy of social services and resources was right on our doorstep.

And we began also to realize that our environment, our physical environment, was being destroyed. In fact, that environment was becoming more dangerous to our well-being than the weapons of our military arsenals. The young men and women of today understand that -- at least they are beginning to understand it. Pollution -- the polluters and pollution -- came into focus.

And I believe, too, that out of the agony of a tragic and costly, painful, festering war we have begun to understand our role in the world -- that we cannot be the world's policeman. We must act as a partner and as a scholar, as a doctor and a healer and a technician. The role, I hope, we will play is that of the good neighbor. We cannot decree that America must have its way and that other people must do our bidding.

I think one of the greatest statements made in the sixties was made by the late President Kennedy when he said that our purpose is to help make the world safe for diversity -- for the right to be different -- and he coupled that with the right to be different in peace, without violence.

There is no guarantee, you know, that democracy, this fragile strategy of human relations, can endure. Many democratic systems are short-lived because we believe that all we need to do is to legislate, write, ordain, and it happens.

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

And at the time that our Constitution was written, it was written for all generations yet to come -- and the key to the federal system in this country is that our Constitution is written in the present tense.

The preamble of the Constitution of the United States says "we the people of these United States do ordain and establish" -- at this hour,



today, here in Manhattan, Kansas -- it did not say "did ordain and establish" in Philadelphia.

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

The government of the United States draws its powers from that Constitution and the Constitution draws its powers from the people -- so that government must change and the social structure must also change.

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

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

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

And when I hear people today talking about governments in other lands -- whether it be a government in New Delhi or whether it be a government in

Peking, or whether it be a government in Saigon or wherever else it may be -- I think it is important that we remember that in developing countries or in agricultural countries, government that really affects people's lives is close, local.

But communication changed that in our country. And communication has brought us together as one people from many, a pluralistic society, a multi-racial society, seeking common purposes. It is not too difficult to govern a homogeneous people, but remember that this is one of the few free countries in the world -- one of the few countries with representative government -- with free elections. This is one of the few countries -- and the only major one -- that has a multi-racial base.

Our people are drawn from every area of the world. And the task of bringing about responsible, responsive, representative, broadly participating government in such a society is no small task -- and there are no instant ways to achieve it. But we've had presidents who have been talking to us about these things. President Kennedy and President Johnson talked about what they called Creative Federalism. One of them talked about a new frontier, one of them about a great society. President Nixon has talked about the new federalism. What they are all saying is that things have changed, and that federalism today is no longer <sup>u</sup> <sub>Δ</sub> limitation on the powers of the federal government, but a positive assertion of the cooperative relationships between federal government, state governments, city, county, and other local government units; between universities and governments; universities and hospitals, and voluntary agencies, professional ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> trade associations, labor associations, and the whole spectrum of the private sector.



Now why do I give you that broad description? Because today there isn't a single problem that confronts this country that can be handled successfully by any one of these governmental structures or any one of these groups. No problem. Racism cannot be handled by the trade unions or business or the churches or the universities. It requires both legal sanctions and a change of heart and attitude and prospective.

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

So what we are talking about is a great new partnership. Possibly the greatest contribution of the space program, into which we poured great resources, is not that man set his foot on the moon and took that great stride for mankind, but that <sup>The</sup> space program demonstrated that modern society requires a partnership of private and public sectors, a partnership of the university with the private economic community and the government and all other segments of society.

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

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

Any nation that can do what we did in less than a decade of space science and technology can surely, help put a man on his feet right here on earth.

And that's exactly where the action needs to take place. We can't escape this planet -- this is our space -- this is our space satellite. We're on it together, and we are either going to keep it together and preserve it together, or we will destroy it together.

The 1960's has showed us these possibilities. That's why I call it a time of decision and dissent -- there was dissent against the inadequacies of the moment, dissent against old practices which no longer work; but there was also great discovery, discovery of what we could do, the possibilities that are ours.

This new federalism, therefore, wasn't so much a delineation of power between national and state government as it was a pattern or description or formula of cooperative partnership of all levels of government in concert with private resources, the partnership of creative federalism.

Your government -- and that's what we're talking about -- was designed to maximize and mobilize the nation's resources for the achievement of national goals and the solution of increasingly complex problems. This is the only modern industrial nation in the world that lacks a system to establish our priorities.

We do not have unlimited resources. We need to have goals, we need to set priorities. If I were to go through this audience and ask you to list our priorities according to what you believe their significance should be, there would be as many ideas about priorities and goals as there are people.

This is not the way you direct the energies of a nation. I had some awareness of and some participation in the new legislation of the fifties

and sixties, legislation that for the first time carried broad statements of national purpose.

In a whole basketful of categories, the federal government made clear its determination to improve the conditions and opportunities of life for all the citizens in our society. This new federalism emphasizes one vital point: the citizen is not only a citizen of the state or locality, he is above all a citizen of the United States of America, and therefore is entitled to every protection and every guarantee of the Constitution.

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

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

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

Rural families, once isolated from the general culture, were able to see New York and Chicago and New Orleans and Los Angeles close up on their television screen. These places looked good to many Americans, and many



migrated before there were services to meet their needs. The poorly schooled boy from South Carolina began showing up as a welfare statistic in New York City. The malnourished child from Appalachia showed up in a hospital in Detroit.

This mobility among our people made health and welfare, the physical environment, education and economic development matters of national, rather than just local, concern. There was recognition that no city can protect itself from pollution by itself.

There was recognition of the inability of minority groups to achieve first-class citizenship after a century of struggle. There was clear need for a legal statement of national conscience, and federal enforcement of national standards.

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

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

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

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 said that the government of the United States is going to wage war on man's most ancient enemy -- poverty.

And with the Economic Opportunity Act came the often criticized Community Action Program.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Community Action Program, the community council concept, is built around the premise that those who are to be affected by programs should have something to say about them. Maximum feasible participation by the poor -- we haven't done it yet -- there is always a gap between man's pronouncements and his performance. But I can tell you that it has set a pattern, and the avenues of participation have been opened.

The last Act I want to mention is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which, for the first time, permitted the federal government to pump billions of dollars into the educational system of this country -- not nearly as much as we need, but a beginning.

Now we are looking not only at the need for financial resources for education, but at the need for change in the methods and the technology of education.

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

Now the central premise of all these new <sup>11</sup>people programs <sup>11</sup>is that they are designed to meet local needs, but local needs that are in the national interest.

No longer does the government just pump in money. It also establishes programs and standards to achieve what is established by statute as a national policy.

But it is in the county courthouse, the city hall, the state capital, the thousands of town meetings across the country, that the success or failure of these programs will be determined.

You can't legislate good administration; and you can't legislate creative government. But you can provide the resources and the direction that make it possible. This is a complex subject, and our time is limited today

I can only tell you that we must find ways to coordinate <sup>things and</sup> and to eliminate duplication in this ~~huge and~~ complicated government structure, so that we maximize the purposes of government as never before. With thousands of governmental units, with hundreds of federal grant programs, coordination is essential.

This is why in 1968 when I sought the highest office in this land I recommended that the next President of the United States have a <sup>Domestic</sup> ~~Democratic~~ Policy Council to coordinate every domestic program just as the President has a National Security Council to coordinate issues of national security.

I also suggested that there be at a regional level a presidential ambassador who would be the President's personal representative to the multitude of federal agencies within that region -- just exactly as an ambassador to a foreign country represents your nation in all of its aspects abroad. This kind of coordination in policy structure could help us to achieve some of our goals, for government is a tool to be used, not an enemy to be abused.

We can't afford to isolate any level of government if we are to succeed in our great national undertakings. In our growing and demanding



United States, we need the wisdom to create, to control, and to support a government that is sufficiently strong to achieve its objectives and to protect our liberties, and a government that is sufficiently sensitive and concerned to meet the needs of all of our citizens.

I look to the decade of the seventies with optimism. For, just as war has its own built-in escalation, so does the process of peace have its built-in escalation, and the first priority of this nation must be the search, and not only the search, but the attainment, of peace.

It is my view and my conviction that until we are able to obtain peace and disengagement -- obtain it not in a sporadic outburst of emotion, but with full consideration of our responsibilities -- until then, many of our domestic priorities will be set aside.

Therefore, peace must be the first priority; and there is good reason to hope that this will be achieved in the early days of the seventies. But America must have a broader vision than that. If we were out of Viet Nam this afternoon, <sup>would</sup> we still face great problems.

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

We can't have two Americas. We need a positive program to set priorities for the development of human resources.

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

And we must conserve the physical resources we are abusing and ruining at an unprecedented rate, not only in our nation, but throughout the world. When six percent of the people of the world, which we represent, consume forty percent of the produce of the world, which we do -- six percent of the people consume forty percent of all that the world produces -- then I think the rest of the world might consider us over indulgent.

And surely if there is one focus for the seventies, it must be survival and the protection of our physical environment.

I'm not here to talk on ecological matters, per se, but, ladies and gentlemen, don't underestimate the danger that is before us. Our danger is not merely nuclear weapons and it's not merely the poor man's atom bomb -- *the* bacteriological, biological, and chemical weapons -- all of which should be abolished. The danger that faces us today comes right out of the exhaust pipe of our automobiles and our busses, and out of the water that flows from an industrial plant into the river, and out of the smoke stacks that spew their poisonous gases into the air and out of a jet engine.

And if young America will become as excited about this kind of contamination as it has been excited about violence abroad and about nuclear proliferation, maybe we can save ourselves.

These are the central problems. We must promote the conditions that are conducive to peace -- and that includes curbing the arms race. We must halt the arms race before it halts the human race -- and we can.

It isn't a matter of whether we can trust the Russians, because we have developed alternatives for trust -- sophisticated detection systems. So it is a question of whether we have the confidence and the will, to understand that



we are all together on this planet -- and we're going to live or die here.

I recall Adlai Stevenson's words as I leave you today. Adlai Stevenson was defeated for the presidency twice. But he was, in a greater sense, a winner. There's a lot of difference between failure and defeat, you know.

Failure is when you are defeated and neither learn anything nor contribute anything.

Alfred Landon was defeated for the presidency, but he was not a failure. He has given a great deal to this country, even out of office. Adlai Stevenson was one of the noble men of our times, and, like this good former governor of yours, Adlai Stevenson gave much to his nation without ever having the trappings of office. <sup>this</sup> ~~the~~ noble man of the fifties -- that great spirit -- reminded us again and again that "Democracy is not self-executing. We have to make it work. We have to understand it. Not only external vigilance but unending self-examination must be the perennial price of liberty because the work of self-government never ceases." Adlai Stevenson didn't want to destroy the system, he didn't want to tear it down.

He said "unending self-examination is the perennial price of liberty." He said "the work of self-government never ceases."

And he said we have to make this democracy of ours work -- and that's where you come in. In order to make it work, we have to understand it. That's what I've been trying to say today -- that we must understand our government, and <sup>we must</sup> not ~~to~~ lose faith in it.

So, therefore, with a sense of urgency, I suggest that we ventilate the clogged channels of political participation and of social opportunity. These refreshing winds of change, which are everywhere about us, must be

directed to constructive purposes -- but not through violence, not through hate, not through bitterness, not through ugly passion, but through responsible debate and dissent, through reason and discussion, until decision and direction are clear.

This, my friends, is the meaning of government by the consent of the governed. This is what we mean when we say a wholesome and decent respect for the opinions of others. This is what we mean by a social contract among equals.

And this is what creative federalism means -- a government that never stands still, a society that sees change as a challenge not as an enemy, a social structure that constantly expands and opens its doors because we, the people, know that there are new people to be heard from, new ideas to be discovered, and new ways of life to be found.



KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY *Manhattan, Kansas 66502*  
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES, ~~HOLTZ HALL~~ Kedzie Hall 220

November 3, 1969

Mrs. Ursula Culver  
Appointment Secretary for  
The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey  
1510 H Street N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 2

Dear Mrs. Culver:

I am very pleased to know that Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey is likely to present his Alfred M. Landon Lecture on Public Issues at Kansas State University on Friday, January 9, 1970. We would like to schedule the lecture from 10:30 to 11:15 a.m. in our university field house, with a brief question-and-answer period following the lecture. We anticipate that the lecture will be televised and broadcast live and that it will be taped for rebroadcast later on. Landon lectures are usually well attended, on the average by 5,000 students; Kansas press is always well represented and appreciates a copy of the speech in advance. Governor Landon, Governor Robert Docking and members of the Board of Regents are on the stage with the speaker. The Landon lecturer meets prominent Kansans at a luncheon following the morning program.

Governor Landon would like to invite Mr. Humphrey to have dinner with him Thursday evening, January 8 and spend the night in his home, 1001 Fillmore St., Topeka, Kansas. They would come to Manhattan by car in the morning of January 9.

We shall be delighted to greet Mrs. Humphrey here. She would be seated on the stage.

I look forward to receiving the confirmation of the date of January 9. I shall also be pleased to receive background data and a photo to be used for our news release. If possible, we would like to announce the topic of Mr. Humphrey's lecture.

Under separate cover I am mailing the Landon lectures published so far. We would like to publish Mr. Humphrey's lecture during the 1969-70 academic year.

With my best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Hajda  
Coordinator  
Landon Lecture Series

Enclosure - under separate cover

November 18, 1969

MEMORANDUM

FOR: Caryl Conner

FROM: HHH

For the Landon Lecture, please note the original copy of my Canadian American Conference speech. I have made some adjustments and added some language.

I think the speech should be opened by a paragraph or two noting the unique nature of American government with some historic perspective, the idea of the living Constitution; in other words, a constitutional system that expands and adapts with the times. For example, the Preamble to the Constitution is written in the present tense -- "We the people do ordain and establish...." -- not "We the people did ordain...." There's a whole theory of government based on the concept of the living Constitution -- a government that changes with the times, a government that adapts itself to the conditions and to the needs of people. In the early days of our country, that government which could respond most readily to the needs of the people was local government and, therefore, the emphasis for governmental authority and responsibility was on local government; with the national government having rather limited functions directed mainly toward national defense, foreign policy, trade and national development. As our country became more united by communication and commerce, as our people became more mobile, the principle



Page 2

of Federalism made room for greater responsibility at the central government level, etc.

Finally, this Landon speech should end up with the final paragraphs of the Williamsburg address as I have noted -- pages 16 to 17.

Be sure that the original Canadian American speech gets back to Marsha and into our files here at 1510 H.

PERMANENT RECORD

SOUTHWORTH CO. 1957

10/6/60 TOWN OF BIRMINGHAM

# MACALESTER COLLEGE

SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA 55101

■ DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

November 21, 1969

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Caryl Conner

FROM: HHH

For the speech on Federation, I have two thoughts. One - the importance of national planning - the imperative necessity of a National Planning Board, Agency, or Department. It is only in this way that we can properly allocate our resources and mobilize our talent and skills. / 9

Secondly, there needs to be much more done to coordinate Federal programs -- otherwise, there is duplication of funds and the failure to have priorities. I proposed during the campaign a Domestic Development Council similar to the National Security Council.

*Grasping?* [ This Domestic Council would be headed by the Vice President just as the National Security Council is headed by the President. We have a speech on that in our 1968 campaign files. Stewart knows where it is. Finally, we need to outline national goals. Please note attached speech of Governor Guy. Oh, yes -- at the regional level we ought to coordinate federal programs with all regional offices. We need some one like a Presidential Ambassador, in other words, a Presidential appointee who can pull together all Federal programs at a regional level...just as a U. S. Ambassador abroad is responsible for all U. S. activities in a country and supposedly coordinates all of these activities so a Presidential representative -- in cities like Kansas City, or Denver, or Chicago would pull together all the programs in that area. I believe that this was outlined in my speech on the Domestic Council that I spoke of. This coordination at the Washington level through the Domestic Council and on the regional level by a special Presidential representative would strengthen Federalism. page 22

Weave this material into the speech.

REMARKS

GTA Annual Convention  
St. Paul, Minnesota  
November 20, 1969

by Governor William L. Guy

We are living in a fascinating and turbulent world. Each year the percentage of people in our population who are young increases.

We are forced to listen to what young people are talking about as never before in our history; unless, of course, it was that period when many men in their 20's and 30's revolutionized life in America by writing the Declaration of Independence and starting a new nation nearly 200 years ago.

But today young people everywhere seem to have common aspirations. I am afraid we would have to say that they are very similar in all disrespects.

Our university campuses have changed from the traditional, sedate, ivy-towered setting to one of seething ferment. Maybe that is where the saying originated that our colleges are fountains of learning and many students come there to drink.

A funny incident happened in my office this year which I thought was a sign of the times. General Mock, the Commander of the 5th Army stationed in Chicago, took a swing around the 14 states in his command area to become acquainted with those states' Governors.

General Mock was freshly back from a tour of duty in Vietnam and he is the rigid, spit and polish, no foolishness, type of military officer.

He strode briskly into my office, followed by a Colonel who was his aide. Accompanying them was North Dakota's Adjutant General of our National Guard and a Colonel who was his aide.

I marvel at Generals. They wouldn't venture out without a Colonel along to open doors and hang up their hats for them.

General Mock said, "Governor, I know these are trying times. I know that we have had civil disturbances across this nation in recent months and I am sure we will have them in the months ahead.

"I want you to know that the 5th Army, with its headquarters in Chicago and with me in command, is highly trained to handle civil disturbances. We are poised to respond at a moment's notice if any Governor requests our presence."

"Well, General Mock, "I said, "I doubt that we will have the type of civil disturbance that would require the 5th Army to respond. As a matter of fact, "I continued, "I have a dim view of calling in the military to settle these problems.

"The last time we called on the military to settle a civil disturbance, the outcome was highly unsatisfactory. As a matter of fact, we have never even received a report from the man in charge of the operation."

The General's eyebrows flew up and he said, "Who was in command of that operation?" And I answered him, "General George Custer!"

There are many things about this young generation that grate on the nerves of their elders. The long hair is something that disturbs many parents. But so many people are following the young generation in letting their hair grow long, that I felt I had to do likewise in order to remain a comfortable conformist.

Last week, while visiting the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, I found myself in conversation with an old Indian friend of mine by the name of Nathan Little Soldier.

Nathan's eyes twinkled when he glanced at my hair and he said, "I see you have let your hair grow out."

I said, "Nathan, I don't mind Republicans and other types noticing that my hair has grown out, but it makes me nervous to have my Indian friends notice."

"Oh," laughed Nathan, "you don't have to worry. With all that gray hair, your scalp would make a very poor trophy."

I want to speak briefly to you tonight about the future. I know that my remarks to you will be judged by their brevity. I cannot hope to compete with my good friend Hubert Humphrey in a full blown speech. Somehow I must be different.



As a political leader, I have made it a point to learn what people are thinking. In the last 60 days, I have talked with student groups at several colleges and universities. I've met with high school aged youth on two hunger marches to collect money for the disadvantaged. My business as a politician requires that I try to keep my ear to the ground, my nose to the grindstone and my shoulder to the wheel. If you think this is easy, give it a try.

There are many things about the youthful viewpoint that we should be aware of. Dick Gregory has said that there is not a generation gap, but there is a morality gap. Perhaps there is more truth to his observation than we wish to admit.

Our young people are wondering what is happening to us as a nation. Are we mastering our own destiny? Are we adequately preparing to absorb another 100 million people in the next 30 years to bring our population in the United States up to nearly one-third of a billion people?

As I listen to these youth and try to project some major domestic issues in the 70's and 80's, I see three major issues emerging.

One issue is conservation. This includes that new word "ecology" or the relation of all living things, both plant and animal, to each other. It includes conservation of natural beauty, as well as the minerals in the ground, the soil on the surface of the planet and the wild waterfowl that grace our wetlands.

The second major issue that is coming to the forefront is the management of our environment. How can we provide pure water and pure air to a growing population when we are failing miserably at the present time? Is noise and ugliness of our surrounding really necessary?

The third major issue that will evolve is population distribution, or the balance that must take place between the numbers of people living in underpopulated states and those in overpopulated states, if we are to absorb 100 million more people in the

next 30 years without a drastic down-turn in our quality of living. In our upper midwest we call it the rural urban imbalance.

These are three major domestic issues. They are interrelated and they can be subdivided many times.

Youth seem no longer to be as interested in the mad dash of our generation to turn everything we can feel, hear, smell or see into cash, as though we were the last generation on earth. They are not the product of a great depression. They are the product of a generation that achieved fantastic gain in material goods without really being satisfied with that achievement.

Our youth are seeking a direction in which to move. They believe that this great nation, if it is to be a leader and if it is to capture the minds of mankind everywhere, must establish certain national goals.

These goals must be so simple and fundamental, yet so lofty and idealistic, that they can be recognized and supported by the vast majority of citizens in this country and around the world.

These goals should wave proudly from the signal halyard of our ship of state so that all can know what course we are following.

These signal banners of national goals that could fly from the halyard of our ship of state certainly would include the following:

(1) Our nation should lead in the struggle to eliminate war as a means of settling differences between nations. We have reached a point where total nuclear destruction of all life on earth is possible. The need for further overkill and maginot lines is a questionable allocation of our resources.

(2) Our nation, as the wealthiest on earth, should eliminate poverty in our country and seek to diminish it around the world. Our economic system is best. Let us so completely serve all our people that it will be sought as an economic system everywhere.

(3) Our country, which has the medical capability of transplanting hearts, should set as a goal that disease and suffering is reduced in this country and abroad. It is

a disgrace that 30 million Americans today have no access to medical service.

(4) Our nation, which draws its strength from many nationalities and races, should strive to dignify mankind everywhere regardless of race, or color, or political creed.

(5) The United States, which prides itself on its democratic process of government, should fly proudly the national goal of supporting self-determination and democratic process in this country, from Gary, Indiana, to all other countries around the world.

(6) One of the most popular goals our nation could establish is to push back the veils of ignorance through constantly improved education in America and in other countries. And I'm talking about all facets of education: man power training, higher education, adult education, primary and secondary education and special education for the handicapped.

(7) Our nation, which leads the world in consuming, must also lead in conservation. A country that can junk 5 million automobiles should have as a national goal the strict conservation of its minerals including reclaimed metals as well as all other natural resources.

(8) Another goal of this country should be the constant improvement of our environment. It would not make sense to criticize another country for fouling the atmosphere with fallout from nuclear testing if we do nothing about our own auto exhaust smog and raw sewage polluted water. These abuses to our environment are the unnecessary results of the affluence of the American society.

And the last national goal that I would mention is a goal to provide an opportunity for a good life for all who seek it in this country through distribution of our population so that there can be more equality in elbow room and job opportunities. The social and real costs of overcrowding as well as stripping the rural areas of people are staggering.

Certainly these are major goals that would provide a direction in which our country should move. These are goals that to our young generation would bring relevancy back to

our national lives.

Of course there are other major goals, and time has a way of changing the priority of those goals, but we desperately need to articulate and to show by example to the world what course we are following and what goals we have set for ourselves as a nation.

In this way, we would provide far more leadership and tranquility on this planet than we can ever achieve by rattling our nuclear sabers or following an unplanned, business as usual, program.

All of these goals that should fly as banners from the signal halyard of our ship of state are interdependent. The pursuit of one complements another.

If we master these goals in the years ahead, we will master our own destiny. Goals in the future will be pursued by the establishment of official policies, programs, and attitudes. National goals are pursued by all levels of government and by the vast private enterprise and private professional sector as well. The political party that comprehends the need for these goals in the decade ahead will lead the nation. The nation that sets these goals will lead the world.

The last goal that I mention intrigues me, particularly. Where will 100 million people live in the next 30 years?

Will they continue to migrate to overpopulated suburbia or will they find their lives in small towns, small cities, on the farm in underpopulated states?

We are talking of a future of population distribution which is not caught up helplessly by natural phenomenon like the rising and setting of the sun, but rather by man-made problems, programs, and policies.

Is population distribution new? No - the Homestead Act, the Reclamation Act, land grant colleges, and grants to railroads have been government programs for distributing population for decades. But these programs were not the result of comprehensive federal planning.

What is happening now because of inadvertent federal programs and total lack of comprehensive planning. Let's look at college research grants, defense contracts and farm programs.

If we adopted population distribution as a national goal, what could we do?

(a) low cost loans (b) tax incentive (c) manpower training (d) revamping of freight structure (e) water resource development.

We need national planning.

We need a federal department of National Planning and we need the direction of coordination of federal planning if state and local government, as well as the private sector, are to mesh their planning behind national goals.

We need to set an example to the world.

We need to establish the goals of the American people and raise them as banners on the signal halyard of our ship of state.

I ask the GTA to join in the chorus. We need to swelt that public cry which is so tiny as to be imperceptible now.

Let us demand that our federal government start comprehensive and integrated planning for the future. Let us establish for the first time a cabinet level department of planning which would make sure that all federal agencies were planning and that the plants move us toward national goals.

Let us bear down and demand that our nation set goals and follow them. Goals that sweep aside the hypocrisies that are troubling the new generation.

Let us challenge ourselves above and beyond the headlong pursuit for personal pleasure.

Let us listen carefully to our youth. Perhaps there is more truth than fiction in the statement that there is no generation gap. Youth simply wants to close that national gap between what we say we believe in and what we do.

GTA is deeply involved in the three great issues of tomorrow--conservation, environmental management and population distribution. Therefore, it has been a rare privilege for me to discuss them with you.



# 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)