

NEW POLICY AND NEW ADMINISTRATOR IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

—A YULGOK Lecture*—

by
Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey

Professor of Government
University of Minnesota

First I want to pay my respects to President Choe of Seoul National University and, of course, to Doctor Lee, the Dean of the Graduate School of Public Administration.

I couldn't help but jot down a note or two after that introduction by Dean Lee. I always thought that distinguished scholars like Dr. Lee were interested in the pursuit of truth, but after I heard that introduction I realize this has no bearing on his life at all. He's a writer of fiction. And not only that, I would call him the Bob Hope. How would you like to be introduced as the man who took ten years to get through college, and then in the next breath be told that he is a scholar? How would you like to be introduced as one who is eminent in politics, only to have somebody say that when he ran for office the first time he failed, and then when the grand prize was up, he failed? How would you like to be up here and be told, what a self-reliant individual you are, and then have somebody say that his wife put him through college? It's only because of my deep affection, may I say, for Korea and this great national University that I am willing to take all of this.

But there was a ray of hope here and there. I did finally get through school. I had to go

* Publisher's Note: This is an *unedited* reproduction of Professor Humphrey's extemporaneous lecture which was featured as a part of the YULGOK Seminar-Lecture Series of the Graduate School of Public Administration, on October 29, 1969. The School wishes to thank Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., for its arrangement of Mr. Humphrey's visit.

home and get married first though. As I said today at Korea University, I got my own scholarship. I did not go waiting for the government or anything. I went out and married her and proceeded to get her a job so that she could put me through school.

Well, next I will talk about one or two matters that I thought were rather significant today as I listened to the words about the great statesman and patriot, Yi Yulgok, I believe that is about as good a pronunciation as a Minnesotan can make. Indeed, he was a most remarkable man. To be even considered in the same category for purposes of discussion is a rare honor. I mean that quite sincerely. I understand that his service came just a little bit before the Japanese Invasion of Hideyoshi, but I want you to know that my name is Admiral Yi. I am the fellow who won at the end, you see. I mention that because I was told here that in 1943 things went bad but in 1945 they went well, 1969 things went bad. I never knew that I would be nominated for a second try in Seoul, Korea.

Well, I want to take just a few moments to talk to you today because I would be doing this very same thing at this very hour at the University of Minnesota. Wednesday is my Seminar. I would be keeping them a little long. It is supposed to be from three p.m. to five p.m., but sometimes I hold the class over when we get a little excited and have something very interesting. So I want you, Doctor Lee to fill out an affidavit for me that I can present to the head of the Political Science Department of the University of Minnesota saying that on this day, Wednesday, October 29, one man by the name of Hubert H. Humphrey appeared before the graduate seminar in Public Administration in Seoul National University and proceeded to give a lecture. You don't need to say whether it was good or bad. And because of the close relationships between our two great universities and because of what has been said here of the interest of the University of Minnesota, its school of public administration, in particular, in this school of public administration I think that affidavit is in order. Now if you can do anything about tomorrow I will appreciate it because tomorrow I am supposed to be at Macalester College. Well, may be I can get a testimonial from Korea University for that one.

× × ×

I want to take a few minutes to tell you a little bit about what I think is happening in the fields of politics and administration in the United States. Now I don't have the time here to go into this in any depth but I do think that you ought to know a little bit more about my country, a country which means a great deal to you and to the world, because what we do or

what we don't do in the United States not only affects ourselves, but it also has an impact on others. I need not tell you that we are going through a period of sweeping change. To be very frank about it, there is a social revolution underway in America. In a sense it is a political revolution; fortunately, rather peaceful, occasionally, a little violent, but in the main, it is all within the spirit of the first amendment to our Constitution, namely, free speech, freedom to assemble, the right of petition, all of the freedoms that we claim in the Bill of Rights. In fact, the recent Moratorium Day in my country, widely reported, turned out to be a rather orderly day of protest, discussion and dissent within the democratic spirit and within the framework of our Constitution. It was a day of really law-abiding performance, living within the bounds of law.

There have been four major pieces of legislation in the last five years that have changed the American political scene. The change is not yet fully understood nor has the impact of these changes been fully revealed. Now, those four pieces of legislation are the following: the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Federal Aid to Education Act of 1964, and the War on Poverty of 1964. Those are the four basic pieces of legislation which have changed the American political scene, I think, for the good. All four of them broadened the base of participation in politics. All four of them imposed new responsibilities upon administrative officers. All four of them require closer cooperation between the national government, the state government, and the local government. All four of them are directed towards bringing into the mainstream of American life the disadvantaged, and all too often that turns out to be the Blacks, the Negroes,

Remember, my good friends, my country is one of the few societies in the world that is multi-racial. We are not a homogeneous people, and we are trying to develop a society in which you have the right to be different: to look different, to act different: to talk and think differently, to be different and yet find some common objectives.

We are what you would call a pluralistic society. We are a mosaic, not a monolith. We are a symphony of different forces, of different voices, different instruments, but we try to find a harmony and a melody, and we try to find a way of making good music, point and counter-point, for the musician that is there.

This is the most difficult assignment ever given to the science of government. It is difficult to govern a country under any circumstances in a period of rapid change. It is exceedingly difficult to govern a country that has a multi-racial or multi-ethnic structure. It is very difficult

to govern a country that has a vast expanse of territory over which there were different periods of development and therefore the development is not the same in each area. And then at the same time to have different social groups, different religious groups, different ethnic groups, different political groups and try to bring one from many without destroying the many. Now that is the assignment that my country has. It is a very difficult one, but we are struggling with it and we are making progress.

For example, we have banished by law all forms of discrimination. Now that does not mean that all prejudice has been removed, because prejudice is in the mind and the heart. But discrimination, as such, is illegal, subject to prosecution, subject to indictment in the courts of the land. So the law now is on the side of human rights for all people. And not only all people of color and race but of economic groups.

Now the second thing that we have tried to do is to start a war on poverty, not just to help people that are poor economically, but people who are the victims of an indigenous, long-term poverty. The poverty of not being wanted and of being pushed aside, forgotten, neglected, ignored, humiliated; the poverty which comes with the broken heart, the broken spirit, of bitterness, hatred. That is the hardest poverty in the world to touch and to cure. That is the difficult assignment. The poverty of the purse can be corrected by welfare, by a job, by income, but the poverty of the spirit may take generations to overcome, because it is how a man thinks, his psychic makeup that counts more than anything else. But we are determined to experiment, to try to do something about it. And we are going to make a lot of mistakes. I want you to know that. Remember this: freedom is never perfect in its administration or execution. Winston Churchill once said that democracy is the worst possible form of government, except all others that ever been tried, which is a way of saying that it is the most difficult assignment in the world to have a government that is representative and still make it effective and sufficiently useful to serve the common good.

Now we also have gone into an expanded program of Aid to Education because we believe in our country, as you believe here, thank goodness, that education is the energy, so to speak, of the great national machine. Education is a wise investment. Every child should have all the learning that he can possibly absorb. We are on the road towards that. We still have a long way to go but we have gone a long way. We have increased our university enrollment in the last eighteen years from two and a half million to seven and a half million. Just think of that! If nothing else had ever happened in the universities of America, there would be trouble

just because of the population explosion. Now we are going down to pre-school age, age four and even to age three.

Those are the great programs: the Voting Rights Act where we have assured every person, regardless of race, color, or creed the right to vote, and not only the right but we protect that right with the law. And we see to it that persons, regardless of their color, or their economic status or where they live, that in so far as the president, the vice-president, the senators and the congressmen are concerned, all national officers, those potential voters, can become active voters under the protection of law. You can't use any tricks any more to keep them out.

Now all of this imposes a new responsibility, which you men will have to wrestle with wherever you are, in any country. If you came to my country, if you would come into our government service today, you would see that a new type of administrator is needed. He needs to be not only a mechanic but the sensitive spirit of a poet and an artist to be able to do his job in representative democratic government. President Johnson called it Creative Federalism. President Nixon calls it New Federalism. I just call it Good Government. I don't know what all those new names mean. I know this, that we have a federal system which is a division of powers between national and state and local. I also know that federal system also has a great residual power with the people. All power emanates from the people. That is the central principle of American government, the Tenth Amendment. If you know nothing more about American government than the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution you know a lot. It says: "all powers herein not granted to the national government are reserved to the states or the people."

Not the New Federalism or the Creative Federalism or Good Government today requires a closer relationship between the national government, the state and local government than ever before. Our problem in the United States is when we legislate, like Model Cities, which is our new urban program, how to get the money coming from the Washington treasury--and we appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars--down to the people at the bottom without a lot of it being lost along the way. Now I am not talking about corruption. That happens too. What I am talking about is its being diluted by the long delay by the time it comes down. This is the biggest problem we have today. With the national government doing more and more things with tremendous amounts of resources--28 billion dollars is going into what we call the aid to the needy, 15 billion dollars going into our cities from the federal government down to

the local government--the problem is: how do you get that money there fast enough to do the job? And how do you get it there in large enough doses to correct the disease? It is exactly like a sick patient. people do not live at the national government you know. There is just a few people up there. They are on the payroll. The people are down in the villages, in the cities, in the counties, in the rural districts. They are that way in Korea and they are that way in the United States. People are not in the government, as such. The representatives of the government are there. Our job is to see to it that the resources that come from the power of the central government to tax get down to where they are needed. It is like hiring the doctor. What good does it do to hire the doctor if you have got pneumonia and he is coming in with the penicillin, if he stops off at the local bar and has a drink or two on the way and then visits his sister or his girl friend and decides to stop off at the library. In the meantime, the penicillin gets out of date and gets old and by the time you get it, it does not correct your pneumonia. If you do not die, you suffer.

Now, that, frequently, is what happens in terms of federal, state and local government relations. New public administration, therefore, requires that we find ways to clear the arteries. This is what we call eliminating red tape. But in eliminating red tape you have got to be sure that you keep enough records so that somebody does not stick all the money in his pockets by the time it gets down to where it is supposed to go. You see, much of the red tape in government is due to the fear that people have that something will go wrong.

I have visited the Soviet Union several times. It is not just that I don't agree with Communism. That is not all that is wrong. It is just their bureaucracy. I can tell you that if the czar was back or if they had a king or an elected prime minister, that if they did not get rid of that bureaucracy it would still be the same, because they have built into that government structure the kind of a bureaucracy that won't permit anything to happen in a hurry. And most of the time nothing will happen at all, simply because no one will take and make a decision.

Our bottleneck today in American government is essentially at the state government level. Fifty separate states, each with their own legislature, those fifty are trying to pattern, supposedly, their legislative and administrative structure in such a way that it will cooperate with the national government, because the national government has big resources. I will tell you what it's like. The national government is like a great big automobile and the state government is sort of like the highway on which it's to run. The trouble is that you have got fifty highway

engineers and each one of them wants to put a separate kind of turn. Some of them want nice wide angles. Some of them want sharp turns. Some of them have a protective fence on one side and the other one says, go over the cliff.

So our problem is how do you organize a program so that, when the program leaves the federal level, it comes into the state level and thereby is expedited, not slowed down, but improved, added on to, made more relevant to the needs of that country or that state, and then gets down to the local government where the people live.

I have been a mayor, as was said here, and I worked with the mayors as vice-president. I was the liason officer from the federal government to all the mayors and country officials. and city managers in the United States of America. Dean Lee has a letter that I sent to him about the Pacific Conference on Urban Growth held in Honolulu in 1967 which I had hoped to attend but was unable to. I have worked closely with those local officials and it's there that the problems are. It is right there. That is where the people live. When you are mayor, the people are right on your back all the time. When you are in Washington, you can at least get away for a while. You can hide out for a week or two. But when you are the mayor of a city, they are at your doorstep, particularly in my country.

And what does a mayor need? He needs the resources to do the job. One mayor came down to testify in Washington before a committee of Congress and the Senator said, "What is it that you need?" And the mayor said, "Three things: money revenue, and finances!" Well my friends, he needs more than that obviously, because that is not enough. There is also the whole structure of local government. Our cities today are no longer related to the old jurisdictional lines. When you go to Philadelphia, one of our big cities, right outside of Philadelphia is Camden, New Jersey. It is not only another city that borders right on. You can not tell when you are in Philadelphia except to go across the river. You are not only in separate cities, but you are in separate states. So if you are going to have a federal program for air-pollution, it does not do any good to have the air clean in Philadelphia, if it is not clean in Camden. In fact, it doesn't do any good to try to clear the air any place on the eastern seaboard unless you clean it every place in my country. Because there is one solid city from Boston almost down to Atlanta now, surely from Boston down to Virginia. One solid city, a hundred million people are on that seaboard. And the same thing is beginning to happen on the western coast of the United States. So the problems of administration become ever more intricate, but we've got to learn how to master them.

Now I've got one final thing that I want to say. We are also working in the international sphere. I don't have time to go into this with you except to say this. Our country is not only undertaking reassessment of priorities at home. What should we use our resources for? We are taking a reassessment of our commitments and our national interests abroad. What is the role of the United States today in the world of tomorrow? What is the role of the United States in Asia? How much of our efforts should be channeled through the United Nations? How much through regional organizations? How much through multi-national and multi-lateral institutions like the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the African Development Bank, the World Bank? Again, another problem of administration, isn't it?

You are in the right field, I can't think of any field that is more interesting for a young man or woman to go into in the days ahead, than in the field of Public Administration, because you are not only going to have to wrestle with problems of national importance, local importance, but international importance. I must say to you that it is your duty to prepare yourself with an international point of view, as well as with a national point of view, to prepare yourself to understand the forces that are at work in the world.

I repeat we don't need mechanics. What we need are people of vision. Somebody once said that experts should be on tap, never on top. But I want to add to that that even if the experts are not on top and are on tap, I want them to be experts not only on how to keep an accounting system or how to do a particular technical job. I want them to have some knowledge about the purpose of democratic society. I want them to have some knowledge about the world in which they live. I remind you, the worst totalitarian regimes have had some very good experts. Mr. Hitler had some of the best experts the world has ever known. Experts do not make for good government. Remember that. Experts can help make good government if they get the right kind of orientation and direction. That is the difference. I have often thought, Hitler became Chancellor of the Third Reich on March 4, 1933. Franklin D. Roosevelt became President of the United States on March 4, 1933. Both countries were in total economic collapse. Germany had suffered its inflation. We had suffered a major depression. Our people were prostrate. Our economic system was at a standstill. It had broken up, failed. Why was it that America didn't turn to dictatorship? Why was it that Germany with brilliant students, great experts, fine institutions of higher education, outstanding scholars, turned to the path of dictatorship?

I think it was in their tradition. We had Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, Madison, Cleveland,

Washington. They had Bismark, Prussian militarism, Hegel, Nietsche. They had nihilism and we had some of John Stuart Mill's egalitarianism. We had a little of the spirit of representative government and they did not. And I think that is the differentec.