SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

at

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, FRIDAY EVENING

October 16, 1964

FOR RELEASE:
Saturday AMs
October 17, 1964

Today I want to discuss with you one of the gravest domestic questions facing this nation. That question is this: How can we build a society of many races with liberty and justice for all?

We usually think of the motto of our nation, e pluribus unum, as referring to the many states joined in one nation. Yet it also refers more profoundly and symbolically to the many races, colors, and creeds joined in one people.

Ours is the first nation in the history of man to assert that its citizens have rights common to all mankind. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," the Declaration of Independence says, "that all men are created equal."

Let us repeat, "all men" -- not only Americans or Anglo-Americans -- not Christians or Jews -- not White men of Colored. No, our Declaration of Independence says all men, and that is what it means.

Our society has been built on this principle. But the task has been great, and it has been great from the very beginning. We have passed through many trials, and at one point in our history those trials even burst forth into a tragic struggle of brother against brother.

In judging the present, we must consider the past as well. Only when we compare the present with the past can we form reasonable plans

and hopes for the future.

When the Constitution was drafted and ratified, many compromises had to be made -- even with the evils of slavery. For the alternative to compromise was not a society of perfect equality and perfect freedom. The alternative was plainly and simply no independence at all, no nation, and no Constitution.

The choice was clear. Human freedom and equality were to be realized at the outset either imperfectly or not at all. Without compromise, the noblest experiment in human freedom would have perished before it was born.

Thus the Founding Fathers, after enshrining the principle of equality in the Declaration of Independence, set out through the Constitution to bring its more perfect fulfillment.

The proposition "that all men are created equal" is fundamental to our American Society.

The equality that is God's gift, however, is not the same as saying that all men's accomplishments must be equal, that their skills must be equal, that their ambitions are equal, or that their energies are equal. No, on those levels, there is no equality. There is only opportunity.

Certainly, no level of government can or should attempt by its actions to enforce equality in those essentially personal areas of great human differences. It is such differences that give life its diversity and man his wondrous variety.

Where government presumes to control equality, forgetting that in its essential areas it lies within God's province and the laws of nature, there can be only conformity. Government must consider and treat all men as equal in the areas of law and civic order. Only in those areas can it make men equal.

Government can protect the diversity that men can achieve from the base of their God-given equality or government can repress the diversity.

The child born in America and the child born in Cuba are created equal - but because the Cuban child is born to tyranny, he cannot enjoy the freedoms in which that basic equality will be respected and in which he will have the opportunity to strive for self-fulfillment.

No one expects man to be as perfect as God. But the goodness of God is a reason for man to strive for such perfection as comes within his reach. A man who cannot become a saint need not remain a sinner.

The true choice is, therefore, between moving in the right direction -- guided by sound principles -- or sliding backward into irresponsibility and immorality .

The trouble comes from heeding false counsel. There are those who seem to denounce society as hopelessly evil because it is not perfect. On the other hand, there are those who tell us to be satisfied with what we already have.

If such false counsel is heeded, minorities suffering unfair discrimination will surely suffer frustration as well. One kind of frustration can be brought about if no progress at all seems to be made toward greater equality of opportunity. Another can be brought about if everything short of total success is viewed as nothing at all, worthless, and deserving only of contempt.

This all-or-nothing attitude is bound to end in disaster, and has already caused much harm to many innocent persons.

It is wrong to compel children to attend schools restricted to members of their own race, however that may be defined. It is also wrong to forbid children to attend schools restricted to members of another race. I condemn that sort of segregation because it is compulsory.

There is another way that people may separate and distinguish themselves from each other. Farm from being compulsory, it is the necessary result of freedom -- the freedom of association.

Throughout this land of ours, we find people forming churches, clubs, and neighborhoods with other families of similar beliefs, similar tastes, and similar ethnic backgrounds. No one would think of insisting that neighborhoods be "integrated" with fixed proportions of Anglo-Americans, German-Americans, Swedish-Americans -- or of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

To me, it is wrong to take some children out of the schools they would normally attend and bus them to others -- just to get a mixture of ethnic and racial groups that somebody thinks is desirable. This forced integration is just as wrong as forced segregation.

It has been well said that the Constitution is color blind. And so it is just as wrong to compel children to attend certain schools for the sake of so-called integration as for the sake of segregation.

Our aim, as I understand it, is neither to establish a segregated society nor to establish an integrated society as such. It is to preserve a free society.

I am not here passing judgment on particular measures adopted by particular states or ~~xxxx~~ localities in dealing with their particular problems. If this campaign ~~xxxxxxxx~~ accomplishes nothing else,

it is going to remind the people of this country that they must look after their own problems if they are to be solved. They must look first to themselves, and next to the governmental level closest to them, for responsible action on problems of social relations.

But even though the national leadership should not legislate for local problems, it should expound the principles upon which sound action should proceed.

And so I endorse the position of the Republican Platform of 1964 on the bussing of school children. I say with the Platform that it is wrong to take school children out of their normal neighborhood schools for the sake of achieving "racial balance" or some other hypothetical goal of perfectequality imagined by the theorists of the so-called "Great Society". It is wrong -- morally wrong -- because it re-introduces through the back door the very principle of allocation by race that makes compulsory segregation morally wrong and offensive to freedom.

The bussing of school children is only one example of doctrinaire and misguided equalitarianism. If we extend the principle to its logical end, we are compelled to use racial quotas as a substitute for the principle of equal opportunity in every aspect of social life. Why not move families from one neighborhood to another so that quotas set by some bureaucrat somewhere will be everywhere met? Or workers from one job to another? Or business men, or government officials, or any group of any description? Is this what we have in mind when we speak of freedom and equal opportunity?

It is often said that only the freedom of a member of a minority is violated when some barrier keeps him from associating with others in his society. But this is wrong. Freedom of association is a double freedom or it is nothing at all. It applies to both parties who want to associate

with each other. And so the barriers infringe the freedom of everybody in the society, not just the minorities.

Now, the removal of such barriers enhances freedom. That is clear. But it is equally clear that freedom is diminished when barriers are raised against the freedom not to associate. We must never forget that the freedom to associate means the same thing as the freedom not to associate. It is wrong to erect legal barriers against either side of this freedom.

We are forced to only one conclusion. As far as the government is concerned, it must ensure freedom of association, but it cannot and should not ensure association itself. That is a matter that must be mutually and freely decided by the individuals involved. It is a matter of the heart and conscience.

We only cloud the issue by labelling this as a problem of "civil rights." A man's civil rights are those he has in relation to his government, not in relation to his fellow man. Of course, government should not discriminate among citizens on irrelevant grounds such as color, creed, or religion. And no national political leader believes it should.

There are still pockets of resistance to equality in civil rights, but the problem here is to see to it that the rights guaranteed by the Constitution are realized. And, as I have said so many times and repeat once again, the President must execute his office and exercise his moral leadership to make sure that this is the case.

Congress must also take action to remedy defects in the laws dealing with genuine civil rights, and that is why I voted for and supported the acts of 1957 and 1960. These laws gave needed protection and security to every citizen's right to vote in federal elections, regardless of race or creed. Nothing less would be faithful to our Constitution.

But the fundamental issue of our day -- the new area into which the act of 1964 dangerously treads -- is a different one. It is the issue of unfair discrimination in the private affairs of men. Here government can provide no lasting solution. No law can make one person like another if he doesn't want to. Government can do little more than offer moral leadership and persuasion. The ultimate solution lies in the hearts of men.

Nevertheless, unfair discrimination in the private affairs of men must be of grave concern to all those who serve in national office. The reason is simple: it limits the opportunities for pursuit of happiness open to members of minority groups.

But what can those in national office do about this problem? Some laws will help, but they cannot be relied upon to provide the full solution -- indeed, even a major part of it. This is a moral problem, and local leadership is needed to make headway in solving it. The best thing the President can do is to use his office to persuade and encourage localities to take up the task of leadership.

This means more than calling upon the governors of our states and the mayors of our towns and cities. It means calling upon leaders in the fields of religion, education, business, and labor, and so on.

And more than that, it means returning to communities the responsibility for local government along with resources to carry it out.

Of course, states, localities, religious groups, and associations of private citizens need to provide better educational opportunities for those who are able and motivated to make use of them. But how can these organizations do so when our citizenry is so heavily bur-

dened by federal taxes?

Let us never forget that our people came here as immigrants from all over the world. Each minority group faced some degree of discrimination as it arrived and took root in our society. And each overcame the obstacles of discrimination because -- when all is said -- America is the land of opportunity.

Let me say that I know what it means to be discrimiated against, and I sympathize in the depth of my heart with those who suffer discrimination. At the same time, my family and I also know that we would not be alive today if we had been in Poland -- where my grandfather once lived -- in the days of Hitler, Stalin, and Khrushchev. We know we would have suffered for not reason other than circumstances of birth.

In a society, government is by consent -- hence by the opinion -- of the governed. Law as an expression of opinion cannot be more enlightened than the opinion it expresses. Political leadership must always work first for the enlightenment of hearts and minds -- for the opinions which enable men to understand each other and respect their differences.

One thing that will surely poison and embitter our relations with each other is the idea that some pre-determined bureaucratic schedule of equality -- and, worst of all, a schedule based upon the concept of race -- must be imposed as the goal of the so-called "Great Society." That way lies destruction.

The forces working for true equality and true justice lie in the heart of this great American people. Let us place a more patient confidence in their ultimate triumph.

We have come, literally and figuratively, from the very ends of the earth to make this great nation. From many races, nations and creeds we have made, as we shall ever more perfectly make, under God, one people.