

*Speak
few minutes*

Building Phase II Project

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

*Students from
mine*

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

APRIL 2, 1973

- Art McNease

Pres John Stevens

Chancellor Don Morris

(Beecham Bump)

Tommy Piazza Case

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

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

THE POLITICAL STRATEGY OF THE WHITE HOUSE IS CLEAR:

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

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

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

-2-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

-3-

I CAN CONSTRUCT THEM."

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

CAN AND DOES ALTER, CHANGE, OR EVEN TERMINATE PROGRAMS

∠ IT CAN AND DOES SIGNIFICANTLY ALTER, CHANGE, OR REVISE, a Terminate
DECLARED PUBLIC POLICY.

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

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

∠ BUT THERE ARE DIFFERENT KINDS OF IMPOUNDMENTS,
FIRST, FUNDS MAY BE WITHHELD FROM A PROGRAM TO "EFFECT
SAVINGS OR PREVENT DEFICIENCIES." THIS IS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.!

Classic Example - always used to justify Impoundment?

-4-

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

L JEFFERSON SAID THAT THE MONEY WAS NOT NEEDED.

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

ABATED. JEFFERSON WAS SAVING MONEY.

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

AND IN 1905 AND 1906, THE CONGRESS ENACTED THE ANTI-
DEFICIENCY ACTS TO PREVENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES FROM HASTILY

SPENDING THEIR COMPLETE APPROPRIATIONS AND THEN SEEKING ADDITIONAL

APPROPRIATIONS.

L THESE ACTS ESTABLISHED A BUDGET TECHNIQUE OF MONTHLY

ALLOTMENTS TO PREVENT UNDUE EXPENDITURES.

-5-

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

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

L NOR WERE THEY MEANT TO ^{erase} ~~OBVIATE~~ THE SEPARATION OF POWERS
DOCTRINE IN THE GUISE OF EFFICIENCY. L CHIEF JUSTICE

WARREN, IN 1965, DECLARED THAT SEPARATION OF POWERS WAS

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

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

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

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

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

L IN FACT, PRESIDENTS HAVE USED IMPOUNDMENT EXTENSIVELY

IN MILITARY MATTERS. PRESIDENT TRUMAN, IN 1949, REQUESTED

FUNDS FOR ONLY 48 AIR FORCE GROUPS. THE CONGRESS PROVIDED

58, TRUMAN IMPOUNDED THE FUNDS FOR THE EXTRA TEN GROUPS. BUT HE DID SO UPON AN EXPRESSION OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORT READ: "IF THE

MONEY IS APPROPRIATED, IT MAY NOT BE USED." PRESIDENT

EISENHOWER REFUSED TO SPEND MONEY FOR ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILES

UNTIL HE WAS SATISFIED THAT THE DEVELOPMENTAL TESTS WOULD

PROVE FRUITFUL.

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

THERE IS A FOURTH TYPE OF IMPOUNDMENT -- AN IMPOUNDMENT

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

POLICY IMPOUNDMENT IS PRACTISED BY PRESIDENT NIXON. IT IS

THE KIND OF IMPOUNDMENT THAT TERMINATES PROGRAMS ENACTED

BY CONGRESS, SUCH AS THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT; OR

-9-

SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERS A PROGRAM BY SEVERE CUTS IN THE FUNDING,

SUCH AS THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT OF 1972, WHERE

PRESIDENT NIXON'S WITHHOLDING HAS HAD A MAJOR IMPACT ON

POLICY AND PROGRAM OBJECTIVES,

L" POLICY IMPOUNDMENT HAS RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIAL

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

AND MEDICAL FACILITIES AND HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION -- THEREBY CHANGING

LEGISLATIVE INTENT

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

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

CHIEF, BUT BECAUSE THE PRESIDENT HAS UNILATERALLY DECIDED TO

IMPOUND MONEY FOR PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT HIS PRIORITIES.

L IT IS A METHOD OF SUBSTITUTING EXECUTIVE WILL FOR

-10-

CONGRESSIONAL PURPOSE.

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

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

L POLICY IMPOUNDMENT IS EXECUTIVE ARROGANCE.

L IT ENCROACHES UPON THE CONSTITUTIONAL PREROGATIVES OF CONGRESS.

L IT VIOLATES THE SEPARATION OF POWERS.

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

L BUT, PRESIDENT NIXON CLAIMS THAT HE POSSESSES INHERENT

-11-

CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO IMPOUND, FIRST, TO FIGHT INFLATION,

AND SECOND, TO RESOLVE THE MEANING OF CONTRADICTIONARY LAWS.

∠ THE PRESIDENT'S DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL --

JOSEPH SNEED -- IN TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS

of the Senate,
SUBCOMMITTEE, SAID THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS INHERENT "LATITUDE"

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

∠ SUCH AN ASSERTION IS TO MY MIND A BLIND READING OF THE
CONSTITUTION. ∠ A 1969 JUSTICE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM PREPARED

BY THEN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, NOW SUPREME COURT JUSTICE,

WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, SAID:

"WITH RESPECT TO THE SUGGESTION THAT THE PRESIDENT

HAS A CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO DECLINE TO SPEND APPROPRIATED

-12-

FUNDS, WE MUST CONCLUDE THAT EXISTENCE OF SUCH A BROAD

POWER IS SUPPORTED NEITHER BY REASON NOR PRECEDENT."

THOSE ARE UNEQUIVOCAL WORDS

Justice

REHNQUIST IS CORRECT. THERE IS NO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

TO IMPOUND FUNDS; TO TERMINATE PROGRAMS; ^{to} OR SUBSTITUTE

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

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

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

-13-

IN THE ENTIRE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT -- NOT EXCLUSIVELY IN THE

EXECUTIVE BRANCH. IN ADDITION, THERE ARE OTHER POWERFUL MEANS

FOR FIGHTING INFLATION, ANTI-TRUST ACTIONS TO INCREASE COMPETITION,

ECONOMIC CONTROLS, CUTTING IMPORT RESTRICTION, INCREASING

TRADE, AND GOVERNMENT FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICY,

↳ IMPOUNDMENT OUGHT NOT TO BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THESE WEAPONS

IN OUR FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION.

↳ BUT, THE PRESIDENT IS CORRECT WHEN HE NOTES THAT CONGRESS HAS

IN SOME INSTANCES PASSED CONTRADICTORY LAWS. *↳ But, the*

WAY TO RESOLVE CONFLICTS OVER CONTRADICTORY LAWS IS NOT

TO TAKE UNILATERAL PRESIDENTIAL ACTION, BUT TO RETURN TO

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

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

-14-

POLICY.

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

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

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

THEIR PRIORITIES.

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

-15-

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

L WHAT ARE THE REMEDIES TO PRESIDENTIAL IMPOUNDMENT?

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

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

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

-16-

OR "ORDERED" TO SPEND APPROPRIATED FUNDS. CONGRESS HAS

DONE SO BEFORE, SUCH AS IN THE 1970 CONTINUING RESOLUTION

FOR EDUCATION FUNDS.

L CONGRESS, UNDERSTANDABLY, HAS BEEN RELUCTANT TO USE

SUCH LANGUAGE BECAUSE IT RECOGNIZES THAT CONDITIONS DO

CHANGE --THAT CHANGES MIGHT BE NECESSARY IN THE SPENDING

OF FUNDS. L BUT, UNTIL THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION CAME INTO

OFFICE, CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT HAVE ALWAYS HAD A

RELATIONSHIP THAT WAS INFORMAL BUT CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD

ON THE USE OF FUNDS. (LBJ)

L THAT COMITY NO LONGER EXISTS. L PERHAPS MANDATORY LANGUAGE

WILL HAVE TO BECOME STANDARD IN ALL APPROPRIATION BILLS

SO THAT THE PRESIDENT WILL CLEARLY FOLLOW AND EXECUTE

THE LAW.

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

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

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

-18-

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

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

HOW WILL THIS CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS BE RESOLVED?

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

I DO KNOW THAT THE CRISIS IS SERIOUS.

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

-19-

RECENTLY RELEASED BUDGET, IS NOT THE VISION OF AMERICA THAT

I SEE.

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

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

THERE IS ~~A SECOND~~ ^{another} AMERICA.

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

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

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

-20-

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

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

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

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

THIS IS AN AMERICA RICHARD NIXON DOES NOT KNOW OR

UNDERSTAND.

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

IT IS NOT MY VISION OF AMERICA.

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

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



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org