

ADDRESS

BY

HONORABLE HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Prepared for Delivery  
before the  
Commencement Exercises  
of the  
University of Nebraska

Lincoln, Nebraska  
Monday, June 8, 1953

During the quarter of a century during which my father was a member of the faculty here at the University of Nebraska, and there was always at least one other member of our immediate family attending the University, my brothers and sisters accumulated quite a collection of college degrees of various ranks and in many different fields of academic achievement. But they worked for those degrees in the classroom or in the laboratory, sometimes for years at a stretch. So I feel somewhat like the black sheep in the fold to receive a degree today just for spending four months in Washington. Or maybe it was for the 20 years work in trying to get there! But seriously it is an honor of great moment to me to receive this recognition from my beloved Alma Mater, headed by our distinguished Chancellor; an honor for which I am grateful from the bottom of my heart.

I must warn the graduating class that this occasion brings on an acute attack of nostalgia. You would be the chief sufferers if I did give way - in a few thousand well chosen words - to reminiscences of my own college days and nearly half a lifetime spent in Lincoln, which the graduation ceremonies bring to my mind. But I'll restrain myself on the score of memories except to briefly mention the almost staggering differences between the world into which you are about to step - by the grace of the Board of Regents - and the one into which I entered with the permission of their predecessors nearly 30 years ago.

Page 2-

Then, the graduates gave no thought to the impact which the Federal government might have on their lives. Worldwide peace seemed assured then, six years after the Armistice Day of November 1918. No totalitarian government threatened our American way of life by direct atomic attack on our mainland, or by ruthlessly planned and organized subversive activities within our midst. No hydrogen bomb had been dreamed of, even, so far as I know, over in the Physics Building. No military draft law was in existence. No one thought of going to work for the Federal Government as a career. Income taxes were low enough so they didn't enter into calculations about having enough wherewithal to get married. National debt was no drag on the immediate fruits of one's labor.

Today, however, the Federal Government and its far flung activities are perhaps the greatest factor in your calculations of "Where do I go from here." For most of the men in the graduating class, there's the draft law, with a necessary period of military service as your initial part in building for yourself and other Americans a safe world in which to live. Then, many of you are undoubtedly giving careful thought to whether you're going to work for the Government or in defense facilities maintained by Government contracts. A very large proportion of our people do now work directly for Government. Then, too, the burden of two world wars and a depression and of the current threats of Communist aggression has lifted the load of national debt and

Page 3-

taxes to a point where every graduate, even with a modest beginning income, must pay part of it directly to Government, and thereby postpone accumulating his own savings. And a large agency of Government, headed by a former Governor of this State, is making plans for civilian defense of our country, not only the seacoast but also the inland states, in the event of atomic bomb attacks.

Because Government must, in our half-peace, half-war economy, immediately affect you and all your calculations in such a substantial degree, I feel justified in commenting today upon some major governmental developments affecting all our lives.

So far as we can see ahead, until the imperialistic dictators in the Kremlin change their plans for world-wide aggression, and decide to stop their "hate" campaign against the United States, we must live in a world in which peace will be more nearly an armistice.

Such a society, on any long-term basis, is new to our country. It poses problems of social, economic and legal significance which will call for the same ingenuity and dedication to freedom and individual liberty shown by our Founding Fathers when they developed a constitutional Republic which gave to a central Federal Government sufficient power to deal on the world scene - to wage war if necessary - yet retained in the people in their local communities the freedoms set forth in the Bill of Rights as well as the right to accumulate private property under a system of

Page 4-

free enterprise.

Can our Governmental system be adapted to the atomic era without destroying our heritage. My position in Washington gives me a unique opportunity to see the forces in action which seek to change radically our traditional national life, upon the excuse that world tensions will continue indefinitely and will require such changes. Just let me cite by way of illustration, some of the matters that come across the desk of the Attorney General.

First, a proposed Constitutional Amendment to limit the power of the Federal Government to make treaties and limit the power of the President to make Executive Agreements with other countries. The thought behind this proposal seems to be that if our country deals less with foreign nations, we'll get into less trouble. But the men who wrote our Constitution thought otherwise. They had just experienced the devastation to trade, to currency, and to national safety itself which comes from a weak and ineffectual central Government. So, time after time, in word and action, they gave to our Federal Government the broadest powers to deal in foreign affairs. It seems particularly inappropriate in the present state of affairs in the world to limit the power of the President to work out solutions of our international affairs with our allies, subject to Congressional approval as required by the Constitution.

For many years, our Nation meandered over uncharted lanes in its efforts in the field of foreign relations.

That era came to an end in recent months.

Our great President after going to Korea and shortly after taking office said that "We are ready . . . to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears of the world." Here was a leader who is taking us out of a defensive position and giving us an affirmative program.

You and I, as Americans, don't like to sit around to see just when and where an opponent is going to hit.

When we want something, we try to find a way to accomplish it affirmatively and then work at the plan. Our President has set forth a definite plan for peace which cannot be misunderstood:

Talk is not enough and with this in mind, the United States is ready to act to do its fair share. Russia will be judged only by what she does for the cause of peace now that we have stated in definite terms the responsibilities we will assume in that direction.

We believe that the people of Russia, like us, desire peace, fellowship and justice. We believe also that security is dependent on effective cooperation among fellow nations.

We believe that every nation has the inalienable right to choose its own form of government and economic system and that no nation has the right to dictate its form of government to another.

Finally, we believe that an armament race will not produce peace, but that the foundation must be just relations and honest understanding with all other nations.

Page 6-

At the moment, and largely, I believe, because of our Nation's new firm foreign policy, we are hoping that before another day passes, an armistice shall have been signed in Korea, and the killing of American boys on Asiatic soil shall have ceased. During today's anxious hours our thoughts and prayers will be with the President, whose first major goal has been to end the Korean war.

Another proposal that comes across the Attorney General's desk is one to reorganize our Department of Defense to establish a long-sought goal of more efficient management and modern procurement and personnel practices which have proven so successful in American industry. The goal - when one cuts through the legal language and technical terms - is to carry out the administration's promise of better national defense for less dollars.

The President has said that there must be -- far from any slackening of effort -- a speeding, a sharpening, a concentration that will extract the last cent of value from every dollar spent. He also has said that the Nation will not rest until its defense establishment has reached the level of performance we want.

Now, in recent days, there has been much discussion of proposed cuts in the defense budget. There have been many conflicting reports due to a misunderstanding of what your Government intends to do about its defenses.

Page 7-

Many of you here today will be going into the Armed Forces. Naturally, like any other in time of world trouble, you want to make certain that while in uniform your Government will provide you with the best equipment and its inherent protection, which it can.

You will have it.

The defense spending cuts do not mean that you will be defenseless. As a matter of fact, the program calls for the best equipment possible.

The revised defense program is designed to give greater security at less cost. It recognizes that this is an age of danger. It recognizes that we must sustain our defense rather than build hurriedly and wastefully for intermittent crises. It insures enough strength to deter aggression and to strike back with a devastating force against any nation which hazards an attack.

Page 2-

It is a realistic approach and follows out the promise of your President that a strong fighting service ready for any contingency will be maintained but that in achieving adequate military strength it will be within the limits of endurable strain on our economy. As he put it, "To amass military power without regard to our economic policies would be to defend ourselves against one kind of disaster by inviting another."

What is the truth about the proposed cuts in the Air Force program? It is this:

No fixed sum of money was originally set to which defense plans had to be tailored. It was first determined what is truly vital to security and then ways were found to eliminate every useless expenditure and duplication. It was then that the decision on the amount of money needed to meet the program was made. Due to our method of appropriations, money is often made available but not used during the year for which it was voted by Congress. These funds, therefore, accumulate.

Since war broke out in Korea, plus the amount asked for the next fiscal year, the Air Force will have received

Page 9-

approximately seventy billion, four-hundred million dollars. It has spent thirty billion dollars, so on July 1, it would have left for spending more than forty billion dollars. Of this, funds available for purchase of aircraft, parts and other essentials would total more than twenty-three billion dollars, or nearly four times the annual expenditures during the fiscal year now ending.

Actually the delivery schedule under the reduced budget calls for more combat planes for the Air Force than was called for under the planning of the prior administration.

There are many reasons why our appropriations for the Air Force can be reduced and its strength increased.

In the initial stages of build-up, when the aircraft industry was preparing for volume production, it was necessary to provide for extraordinary long intervals between placing an order and getting delivery. This was financed. Now that the industry is in quantity production, a much shorter interval is required and money does not have to be obligated so far ahead.

Production fell below schedule over the last thirty months so much money was not expended because many planes were not delivered. This built up the substantial carry-over of funds.

Now let's turn to the question of attrition. Plane losses in Korea and in accidents have been appreciably lower than estimates upon which previous budgets were drawn. The result has been more carry-over of funds.

The life of jet engines has proven to be much longer than expected so not nearly as many replacements were needed as had been planned for. Thus, substantial funds were carried over to apply for future procurement. So, you can see that there will be no diminution in the protection possible through our air arm. In the opinion of our best qualified experts, there will be sufficient cover for our troops in the field, sufficient aircraft to protect our industry at home, and also sufficient aircraft for strategic attack in event of all-out war.

The over-all defense budget proposal provides for major emphasis on air power including accelerated rate of build-up and modernization of equipment with undiminished reliance on the Strategic Air Command as a deterrent to aggression through the threat of forceful retaliation. At the same time it provides for maintenance of all basic combat force now in being in the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps. It also provides that their combat efficiency shall be increased by modernization of equipment. There is also recognition of the necessity for continuation of worldwide contributions by the United States to the defense of freedom including our NATO defenses in Europe.

All of this is designed to achieve greater military strength and efficiency with utmost economy under a program which recognizes that we must not try to prepare for one danger while setting the stage for another, - economic disaster.

Still another problem that crosses the Attorney General's desk is the protection of our country's internal security.

Page 11-

Much of the responsibility in this area is in the F. B. I. arm of the Department of Justice. We are working under four programs in the field of internal security.

First, prosecuting leaders of the Communist Party located in this country and of all others who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

Second, enforcing the law that agents of foreign powers located in this country must register, disclose their finances and label their propaganda so that its source may be known to all.

Third, denaturalizing and deporting subversives who have violated our laws.

And Fourth, removing from the Government payrolls that small minority of employees who are risks to our national security.

In a myriad of other ways, the day-to-day activities of the Department of Justice reflect the fact that your lives are tied in closely with the Federal Government in a world half-at-war. In a single day we may have to question a pair of spies brought back from Europe where they sought to sell military secrets to the enemy.

To decide whether to prosecute for perjury or contempt of Congress some witness called upon to testify as to his present or past membership in the Communist party;

To seek an injunction against a striking labor union in a manufacturing plant whose product is vital to the atomic

Page 12-

energy program;

To institute land condemnation proceedings against property needed for a new airfield;

To decide whether an anti-trust suit should be brought affecting business activities abroad which infringe sharply on matters of national security or foreign relations;

To recommend action in a petition to the President for clemency in a case of someone convicted of smuggling secret atomic data to agents of a foreign power.

I'm sure that the Department of Justice wasn't faced with problems like that 30 years ago. But it is today. And these problems, in varying degrees, will be matters of moment to every member of the graduating class in the months ahead.

So I come back to the topic of these remarks today -- a new approach to Justice. Of course we have to take a new approach to meet the complex new problems of our day -- to re-examine whether our form of Government and our legal system are flexible enough to give to our government power to protect us in an atomic era, but still preserve the safeguards to individual liberty which we have always considered an inherent glory of these United States.

I believe these individual liberties can be preserved in today's world. It will be the firm policy of the Department of Justice to protect those liberties (1) against those who seek to impose censorship on legitimate news, in the name of national

Page 13-

security when no valid security matter is involved, (2) against those who seek to misuse our Immigration laws to suppress freedom of speech heretofore sanctioned in this country, (3) against those, including some members of the legal profession, who seek to make a mockery of our Court system by use of excessive delaying tactics and sham appeals and frivolous pleadings, (4) against those in Government who try to misuse administrative power to deny hearings before impartial examiners to persons with just grievances, (5) against those, in Government or out, who attempt to narrow the protection of the Bill of Rights to gain temporary political advantage.

This battle to preserve individual liberty, in a world where military might is needed and central Governmental authority is required to make it effective, calls for eternal vigilance -- certainly on the part of those in Government -- but more importantly for the future on the part of everyone in today's graduating class. In Nebraska we have breathed the air of freedom. As you go out from Nebraska today to all parts of the globe, I am confident that you will carry that heritage with you, and lead another generation of American youth in paths of freedom and individual liberty under law.