

From the Office of:
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
1313 New Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.
Capitol 5-2424

FOR RELEASE: FRIDAY P.M.'s
JULY 10, 1964

HUMPHREY URGES WORKING PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN BUSINESS

AND GOVERNMENT TO REACH GOALS OF THE 'GREAT SOCIETY'

The following is the text of an address by Senate Majority Whip

Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) prepared for delivery in New York City
Friday before an American Management Association seminar on Planning to
Meet Shifts in Defense Production.

Historians have remarked of England's Queen Elizabeth I that "her
bold decisions were few, but each of them began an epoch."

In a meeting such as this, in closer relations between the business
community and the White House, in the increasing desire for businessmen
to participate in the achievement of national goals, we can see the
beginning of a new epoch. I refer to an emerging era in which trust has
replaced suspicions between business and government, cooperation has
replaced conflict, and respect has replaced hostility. I refer to the
emergence of a society in which, in Whitehead's phrase, "men of business
think greatly of their functions."

It is my conviction that we are witnessing a new development of major
proportions which will have an exhilarating effect on the nation's welfare.
And in the next few minutes I would like to tell you why I hold that
conviction.

The subject of this conference, the problem of economic conversion
caused by a gradual shift in our defense programs, would have been unlikely
two years ago - and unthinkable five years ago. Yet today no subject is
more timely.

What was unmentioned only yesterday is timely today because the
international atmosphere has changed. The stark clash of interests between
the United States and the Soviet Union has gradually evolved toward a
limited cooperation based on mutual fear of
nuclear weapons. The turning point was, of course, the nuclear test ban
treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union signed a year ago

(MORE)

(MORE)

next month. This milestone in what President Kennedy called the "long journey" toward a peaceful world represented the fruit of long negotiation and reflected the judgment of the two major nuclear powers that their own national security as well as the interests of humanity at large could best be served by calling a halt to the unrestricted search for technological breakthrough in nuclear weaponry.

The limited agreements which have been conducted and are now under consideration helped to create a changed climate in international relations which a short time ago would have seemed incredible.

It is too early to say whether the Cold War has been transformed, much less ended. Indeed, it would be a foolish man who believes that we must not maintain our defenses and our position of military strength. But it is clear that a change of atmosphere has occurred and we must be alert to take advantage of opportunities for cooperation that do not diminish our national security.

There are many reasons of course, for these changes in the international atmosphere. The growing dispute between the Soviet Union and China; the steady economic burdens of maintaining the arms race, the growing realization of the major nuclear powers that further increases of military hardware do not increase international security, but insecurity through proliferation; the concern in both the United States and the Soviet Union that our most precious resources, the talents and skill of our people, are being put to non-productive use rather than the urgent unfinished business of our two societies. All of these considerations favor the achievement of a political climate in which arms reduction becomes possible and makes possible individual measures toward disarmament and arms control which in turn help to sustain that climate.

The general easing of tensions between East and West therefore does not flow exclusively from treaties and formal diplomatic agreements. It proceeds in a gradual unobtrusive way - for reasons not always easy to detect. And it reveals itself intermittently in improved cooperation in the United Nations, in joint projects to patrol outer space and to desalinate water from the sea, in efforts to improve communication through establishment of a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow.

On taking office, President Johnson made it clear that regardless of formal pacts he intends to continue the policy of peaceful conciliation, stating in his State of the Union address of January, 1964 that "even in the absence of agreement we must not stockpile arms beyond our needs or seek an excess of military power that could be provocative as well as wasteful."

In the wake of this change in the international atmosphere, we have already seen a 4 per cent cutback in defense expenditures and fully expect a continued downward trend in the next five years. The question is no longer: Are we going to have defense cutback - but rather - How do we respond to this cutback in our defense program?

It is essential in a free society like ours that this defense cutback occur in a climate of confidence and understanding. In an autocratic society like the Soviet Union, where decisions are made from above by a self-chosen few, There is no need for building broad cooperation, consensus and harmony. In a free society the need for consensus between business and government, between government and the community is critical.

When confronted by a basic social or economic change calling for remedial action, there is a natural tendency to look to government for a solution. While government action is essential, it can only be truly effective if it is accompanied by comparable action in the private sector. And cooperation between government and the private sector in this instance means cooperation between business and government. If the problems of economic conversion have to be met, there can be no room for distrust between government and business. By word and deed, government must make it clear that it is not anti-business, that it prizes the indispensable contribution which a vital business community makes to a free society. It has long been my belief that we must encourage an environment within which all types of business rivalry can flourish.

The chief internal economic role of Government must be the smoothing of the way for new men and new ideas. Where lack of credit stifles growth, Government should see that is provided. When patent rights are being used to foster monopoly, rather than reward inventive skill, Government should insist that other companies be allowed to use patents on reasonable terms. When the power of large corporations is misused to restrain competition, the anti-trust division must act swiftly and decisively.

But Government should not merely oppose monopoly, it must concentrate on encouraging competition. We do not want to limit the growth of large firms that can offer better and cheaper products to consumers.

The partnership of business and government of which I speak is not textbook theory but a fact of our experience. In world War II business and government gladly pooled resources and energies for the common good, despite the fact that such measures as tight controls, rationing and priorities were alien to businessmen accustomed to the free play of the market. Our experience in World War II - and in the period since - should have shattered the myth of hostility toward business by the Democratic Party. I suggest we drop this destructive mythology - and get on with a fruitful Government-business partnership.

Our experience in World War II is instructive in another sense.

At that time decisions were taken for what we called the "duration" which meant as long as hostilities lasted. Today, the duration is for as long as we want our freedom to last - the freedom of the individual, the freedom of business to compete, the freedom of America to prosper and to fulfill her responsibilities in a difficult world.

Turning from World War II to the present, I am convinced that though the reconversion problems confronting us today are different, they can be solved if government and industry confront them with cooperation, energy and ingenuity. The problems of economic conversion have concerned me deeply since 1960. One of the prerogatives and one of the responsibilities of men in public life is to look ahead, to look beyond the immediate problems of the day to the emerging problems of the decade. In 1961 I initiated a study by the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the economic impact of disarmament. In 1962 I addressed a symposium sponsored by the Bendix Corporation based on the findings of the Subcommittee. In 1963 I brought the material up-to-date in an address on the Senate floor. This year I introduced in the Senate a bill to establish a Hoover-type Commission on Automation, Technology and Employment.

One of the duties of the Commission would be to plan for possible changes in defense spending. If properly staffed and supported, it could serve as a sort of "early warning conversion committee," devoting itself to alerting business in advance to pending government cutbacks. This Commission should be staffed by management, government and labor to work closely with the interagency committee established by President Johnson last December to cope with the impact of arms reduction and shifts in defense spending.

You will note that this Commission will not confine its activities to the problem of economic conversion, but will also address itself to the related problems created by automation and technological change. Automation

must be considered together with defense conversion, for as President Johnson told the Congress "If we have the brains to invent these machines, we have the brainpower to make certain that they are a boon and not a bane to humanity." A government commission to deal with the problems of economic conversion is only one step in dealing with the total problem of economic conversion. It remains for industry itself to deal with many of the most crucial problems. I mention but a few. How do we shift research funds from the defense economy to the civilian economy? How do we channel a sufficiently high percentage of research funds into civilian production so as to be able to compete in the world market with our European and Japanese friends who are already concentrating a higher percentage of their research dollar in civilian goods? How can effective planning release high-order scientific skills from defense work and shift it to the research and development problems underlying the growth of new industries, new plants and products, and new employment? These are but a few of the problems whose solution depends on a working partnership between government and the private sector.

In meeting these problems of economic conversion, there are three ruling principles which should guide the conduct of business and government. The first of these principles is that of mutual recognition and respect between government and business. Business must recognize the role which government must play in raising and enforcing a standard to guide the action of all groups in the community. Government must recognize that business can make its greatest contribution if permitted a wide scope for creative initiative. This entails, in the practical realm, a recognition by government of the legitimacy of reasonable business profits. I trust that we have reached a maturity today that enables us to agree that profits must be adequate to the requirements of reinvestment and the expansion of America's productive capacity.

My second principle is the understanding of the value of free democratic planning. There was a time when the very word "planning" carried dark connotations of force, imposition without consent, as indeed it is practiced in police states. But planning in America, as you have demonstrated here, is the use by business and government of advanced forecasting and decision-making techniques to pierce the probabilities of the future. Such planning involve acceptance and consent, for its essence is revision. No business executive would consider operating on a five-year projection without revising it constantly in the light of contemporary developments. Planning, therefore, is the measure we take of the future.

Growing out of this principle of democratic planning, is a third related theme, the principle of approximate objectives. There are vivid historical examples of the harmful consequences of the hard, and fast objective that leaves no room for appraisal. Indeed, the success of our own American Revolution was due in part, to the inflexibility of certain British interests at the time. And I'm certain that you, in business, run into the same situation. Indeed, Peter Drucker has suggested that the successful corporation is the one that sets overriding objectives and then broad latitudes of flexibility and freedom within the established periphery. In building a Great Society in America we will have to avoid the stubborn goal, and instead, employ the mathematician's idea of successive approximations. We will have to try and try again and this must apply to business as well as government. If we apply these three principles - of mutual recognition and respect, of democratic planning, and the principle of approximate objectives, I believe we can successfully meet the challenge posed by substantial shifts in our defense programs.

The easing of the Cold War and the consequent reduction in defense spending should not lead to relaxation of effort - but rather to a freeing of energies to meet unmet needs at home and abroad. Though our defense requirements may level off our international responsibilities as leader of the free world remain. If tension between East and West continue to abate, we can turn our energies more to meeting the problems of the underdeveloped countries. I refer to the glaring and growing gap between the affluent modern technological societies of Europe and North America and the poverty-ridden underdeveloped societies of Latin America, Africa and Asia which are struggling to create modern technological societies. If

these struggling societies are to succeed they will require not only external government aid but also the creative action that a progressive private sector can generate. Foreign private investment - and I refer specifically to the American free enterprise system - has a definite role to play. In Latin America, an area of primary concern to me, I note that it is increasingly recognized that foreign private investment - as many previously skeptical Latin Americans have now learned after experimenting with swollen inefficient state business corporations - is absolutely essential both to increase the productivity of a country and to develop an efficient industrial and agricultural sector. With the strong encouragement of the U. S. Government - for example through investment guarantees and tax credits - American business can continue to provide leadership in building a strong private sector - not only in Latin American countries - but in Asia and Africa as well.

Our international responsibilities continue but our commitment to meet these can no longer be a pretext for neglected unmet social needs at home. One of the unfortunate - but necessary - effects of the Cold War has been a massive diversion of wealth and talent from civilian life to the increasingly complex and costly defense sector to preserve American security. The needs of the community have been neglected in favor of the security of the free world.

The consequences of this concentration of resources in meeting security needs are everywhere evident - in the blight of ugliness and slums that has spread across our cities from coast to coast. We lack adequate schools for millions of children. We are short of medical facilities and personnel to protect the health of our people. We have only limited cultural and recreational opportunities available to millions of Americans. Finally these consequences are evident in the fact that, despite the progress of the past three decades, there remains in our otherwise affluent society one-fifth of the population ill-clothed, ill-educated and ill-housed.

It is these unmet needs of our own society that pose as great a challenge to the partnership of government and business as the problems of economic conversion. In the United States we have succeeded before in converting to peacetime economy - unlike the Soviet Union which has never experienced the change to a peacetime economy. Whether we can meet our unmet social problems at home with equal success is still an unanswered question. I am convinced that if we put a premium on innovation at home, if we harness all the energy and ingenuity of the many groups in our pluralistic society, we can succeed in building the Great Society which President Johnson has proposed. Our success will in great part depend on you.

The American businessman has exhibited astounding ability to organize economic efforts, to devise new methods of distribution, to put people to work, and altogether, to continually design new and better ways of doing things. Without this creativity, whatever efforts we make toward the Great Society, will be slowed immeasurably.

The promise of a Great Society, the promise which America has always held out to its own at home and to the watchful millions abroad, is well stated in a passage from Thomas Wolfe: "To every man his chance; to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity; to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever his manhood and his vision can combine to make him -- this, seeker, is the promise of America."

To make the promise of America a reality will take planning and innovation, will take cooperation and respect between business and government, and above all intelligence and courage.

###

Mr ~~ABLE~~

Sen Mc Govern

Civil Rts 1948
a Tompkins Report

CONFIDENCE AND COOPERATION:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

IN A PEACETIME SOCIETY

An Address by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

before the

AMERICAN MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

Seminar on Planning to Meet

Shifts in Defense Production

July 10, 1964

New York, New York

Historians have remarked of England's Queen

Elizabeth I that "her bold decisions were few,

but each of them began an epoch."

In a meeting such as this, in closer relations

between the business community and the White House,

in the increasing desire for businessmen to

participate in the achievement of national goals,

we can see the beginning of a new epoch. I refer

to an emerging era in which trust has replaced

suspicion between business and government,

cooperation has replaced conflict, and respect

has replaced hostility. I refer to the emergence

of a society in which, in Whiteheads phrase,

"men of business think greatly of their functions."

It is my conviction that we are witnessing a new development of major proportions which will have an exhilarating effect on the nation's welfare. And in the next few minutes I would like to tell you why I hold that conviction.

The subject of this conference, the problem of economic conversion caused by a gradual shift in our defense programs, would have been unlikely two years ago - and unthinkable five years ago.

Yet today no subject is more timely.

What was ~~st~~ unmentioned only yesterday, is timely today because the international atmosphere has changed.

The stark clash of interests between the U. S. and the Soviet Union has gradually looked toward limited cooperation based on mutual fear of nuclear weapons. The turning point was ~~of~~ the nuclear test ban treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union signed a year ago next month.

This milestone in what President Kennedy called the "long journey" toward a peaceful world, represented the fruit of long negotiation and reflected the judgment of the two major nuclear powers that their own national security as well as the interests of humanity ~~are~~ ~~could~~ best be served by calling a halt to the unrestricted ~~search~~ ^{testing} ~~a~~ for technological breakthrough in nuclear weaponry.

The limited agreements which have been ^{negotiated} ~~concluded~~ and
are now under consideration helped to create a changed
climate in international relations which a short time ago
would have seemed incredible.

It is too early to say whether the Cold War has been
transformed, much less ended. Indeed, it would be a
foolish man who believes that we must not maintain our
defenses and our position of military strength. But it
is clear that a change of atmosphere has occurred and we
must be alert to take advantage of opportunities for
cooperation that do not diminish our national security.

This we must do.

There are many reasons ~~of course~~, for these changes) in the international atmosphere. The growing dispute between the Soviet Union and China; the steady economic burden upon the U.S.S.R of maintaining the arms race; the growing realization of the ~~major nuclear powers~~ that further increases of military hardware do not increase international security, but *in fact may increase* ~~within themselves~~ insecurity through proliferation; the concern in both the United States and the Soviet Union that our most precious resources, the talents and skill of our people, are being put to non-productive use rather than the urgent unfinished business of our two societies. All of these considerations favor the achievement of a political climate in which arms reduction becomes possible ~~and makes possible~~ individual measures of disarmament and arms control which in turn help to sustain that climate.

The general easing of tensions between East and West therefore does not flow exclusively from treaties and formal diplomatic agreements. It proceeds in an gradual unobtrusive way - for reasons not always easy to detect. And it reveals itself intermittently in improved cooperation in the United Nations, in joint projects to patrol outer space and to desalinate water from the sea, in efforts to improve communication through establishment of a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow, and the establishment of Consular Offices, ~~which~~

L On taking office, ~~President Johnson~~ ^{has} made it clear that regardless of formal pacts he intends to continue the policy of peaceful conciliation, stating in his State of the Union address of January, 1964 that "even in the absence of agreement we must not stockpile arms beyond our needs or seek an excess of military power that could be provocative as well as wasteful."

L In the wake of this change in the international atmosphere, we have already seen a 4 percent cutback in defense expenditures and fully expect a continued downward trend in the next five years. The question is no longer: Are we going to have defense cutback - but rather - how do we respond to this cutback ^{already underway} in our defense

program ^{already underway} - as Sen Mc Govern & Arthur Barker indicated on yesterday

It is essential ^{in an open society} in a free society like ours

that this defense cutback occur in a climate of

confidence and understanding. ~~In an autocratic society~~

ⁱⁿ like the Soviet Union, where decisions are made from

above by a self-chosen few, there is ^{less} need for

building broad cooperation, consensus and harmony.

In a free society the need for consensus between

business and government, between government and the

community is critical.

When confronted by a basic social or economic change calling for remedial action, there is a natural tendency to look to government for a solution. While government action is essential, it can only be truly effective if it is accompanied by comparable action in the private sector. And cooperation between government and the private sector in this instance means cooperation between business and government. If the problems of economic conversion have to be met, *(and they do)* there can be no room for distrust between government and business. By word and deed, government must make it clear that it is not anti-business, that it prizes the indispensable contribution which a vital business community makes to a free society. It has long been my belief that ^{*Government policy must*} ~~we must~~ encourage an environment within

which all types of business ^{competition} ~~industry~~ can flourish.

L The chief internal economic role of government must be the smoothing of the way for new men and new ideas. Where lack of credit stifles growth, government should see that is provided. When patent rights are being used to foster monopoly, rather than reward inventive skill, government should insist that other companies be allowed to use patents on reasonable terms.

L When the power of large corporations is misused to restrain competition, the anti-trust division must act swiftly and decisively.

L But government should not merely oppose monopoly, it must concentrate on encouraging competition. ~~We do not want~~ ^{It should encourage investment and expansion}

^{we should not} limit the growth of large firms that can offer better and cheaper products to consumers.

L The partnership of business and government of which

I speak is not a textbook theory but a proven fact of
our experience. In World War II business and govern-
ment gladly pooled resources and energies for the
common good, despite the fact that such measures as tight
controls, rationing and priorities were alien to
businessmen accustomed to the free play of the market.

Our experience in World War II - and in the two decades
since - should have shattered the myth of hostility
toward business by the Democratic Party. I suggest we
drop this destructive mythology -- and get on with a
fruitful government-business partnership.

Our experience in World War II is instructive
in another sense.

At that time decisions were taken for what we
called the "duration" which meant as long as

hostilities lasted. Today, the duration is for
as long as we want our freedom to last -- the freedom
of the individual, the freedom of business to compete,
the freedom of America to prosper and to fulfill her
responsibilities in a difficult world.

Turning from World War II to the present, I am convinced that ^{while} ~~through~~ the reconversion problems confronting us today are different, they can be solved if government and industry confront them with cooperation, energy and ingenuity. The problems of economic conversion have concerned me deeply since 1960. One of the prerogatives -- and one of the responsibilities of men in public life is to look ahead, to look beyond the immediate problems of the day to the emerging problems of the decade. In 1961 I initiated a study by the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the economic impact of disarmament. In 1962 I addressed a symposium on this subject sponsored by the Bendix Corporation based on the findings of the study. In 1963 I brought the material

} This Study completed.

up-to-date in an address ^{in the U.S.} ~~on the~~ Senate ~~floor~~. This

year I introduced in the Senate a bill to establish

a Hoover-type Commission on Automation, Technology

and Employment.

designed to deal with the problems of economic conversion from defense production to civilian production.

yes One of the duties of the Commission would be to

plan for possible changes in defense spending. If

properly staffed and supported, it could serve as a

sort of "early warning Conversion Committee", devoting

itself to alerting business in advance to pending government

cutbacks. This Commission should be staffed by management,

government and labor to work closely with the inter-agency

committee established by President Johnson last December

to cope with the impact of arms reduction and shifts in

defense spending.

↳ You will note that this Commission will not confine its activities ^{solely to} ~~to~~ the problem of economic conversion,

but will also address itself to the related problems

created by automation and technological change.

Automation must be considered together with defense

conversion for as President Johnson told the Congress

"If we have the brains to invent these machines, we

have the brainpower to make certain that they are a

boon and not a bane to humanity." A Government Commission

to deal with the problems of economic conversion is only

one step in dealing with the total problem of economic

conversion. It remains for industry itself to deal with

many of the most crucial problems. ^{now,} I mention but a few.

How do we shift research funds from the defense economy

to the civilian economy? How do we channel a sufficiently

high percentage of research funds into civilian

production so as to be able to compete in the world

market with our European and Japanese friends who are

already concentrating a higher percentage of their
research dollar in civilian goods? How can effective
planning release high-order scientific skills from defense
work and shift it to the research and development problems
underlying the growth of new industries, new plants
and products, and new employment? These are but a few
of the problems ~~whose~~ ^{the} solution ^{of which} depends on a working
partnership between government and the private sector.

In meeting these problems of economic conversion,
there are three ruling principles which should guide the
conduct of business and government. The first of these
principles is that of mutual recognition and respect
between government and business. Business must
recognize the role which government must play in
raising and enforcing a standard to guide the action
of all groups in the community. Government must

recognize that business can make its greatest contri-
bution if permitted a wide scope for creative initiative.

This entails, in the practical realm, a recognition by
government of the legitimacy of reasonable business
profits. I trust that we have reached a maturity today
that enables us to agree that profits must be adequate
to the requirements of reinvestment and expansion of
America's productive capacity.

My second principle is the understanding of
the value of free democratic planning. There was a
time when the very word "planning" carried dark
connotations of force, imposition without consent, *regimentation*,
as indeed it is practiced in the police states. But
planning in America, as you have demonstrated here, is
the use of advanced forecasting and decision-making
techniques to pierce

effective planning implies

the probabilities of the future. ~~They imply~~ acceptance

The Essence of Democratic Planning

and consent. ~~For their essence~~ is revision. No business

executive would consider operating on a five-year projection

without revising it constantly in the light of contemporary

developments. Planning, therefore, is the measure we take

of the future.

~~Forecasting, based on~~

Growing out of the principle of democratic planning,

is a third related theme, the principle of approximate

objectives. There are vivid historical examples of

the harmful consequences of the hard, and fast

objective that leaves no room for appraisal. Indeed,

~~the success of our own American Revolution was due in~~

~~part, to the inflexibility of certain British interests~~

~~at the time. And I'm certain that you, in business,~~

~~run into the same situation. Indeed, Peter Drucker~~

has suggested that the successful corporation

is the one that sets overriding objectives and then

broad latitudes of flexibility and freedom within the

established periphery. In building a Great Society in

America, we will have to avoid the stubborn goal, and

instead, employ the mathematician's idea of successive approximations. We will have to try and try again and

this must apply to business as well as government. If

we apply these three principles -- of mutual recognition

and respect, of democratic planning, and the principle

of proximate objectives, I believe we can successfully

meet the challenge posed by substantial shifts in our

defense programs.

h The easing of the Cold War and ~~the consequent~~ any subsequent
reduction in defense spending should not lead to

relaxation of ^{our} effort - but rather to a freeing of

energies to meet other unmet needs at home and

abroad. Though our defense requirements may level off

our international responsibilities as leader of the
free world remain. If tension between East and West
continues to abate, we can turn our energies to meeting
the problems of the underdeveloped countries. I refer
to the glaring and growing gap between the affluent
modern technological societies of Europe and North
America and the poverty-ridden underdeveloped societies
of Latin America, Africa and Asia which

are struggling to create modern ~~technological~~ societies.

h If these struggling societies are to succeed they will require not only external government aid but also the creative action that a progressive private sector can generate.

h Foreign private investment -- and I refer specifically to the American free enterprise system -- has a definite role to play. In Latin America, an area of primary concern to me, I note ~~that it is increasingly recognized~~ ^{a growing recognition} that foreign private investment -- (as many previously skeptical Latin Americans have now learned after experimenting with swollen inefficient state business corporations) -- is absolutely essential both to increase ^{ing} the productivity of a country and to develop an efficient industrial and agricultural sector. With the strong encouragement of the U.S. Government -- (for example through investment guarantees and tax credits) -- American business can continue to provide leadership in building a strong private sector --

not only in Latin American countries -- but in Asia and
Africa as well.

Our international responsibilities continue but our
commitment to meet these can no longer be a pretext for
neglecting unmet social needs at home. One of the
unfortunate -- but necessary -- effects of the Cold War has
been a massive diversion of wealth and talent from civilian
life to the increasingly complex and costly defense sector *in order*
to preserve American security. The needs of the community
have been neglected in favor of the security of the free
world. ~~The public happiness has far too long now been~~
~~considered as a luxury to be postponed to some distant~~
~~future date when world dangers are no more.~~

The consequences of this concentration of resources
in meeting security needs are everywhere evident -- in the
blight of ugliness and slums that have spread across our cities

We will need to rebuild
23 - up areas of our cities -
Clean the air we breathe -

Protect our
Water supplies
Conserve our
natural
resources

from coast to coast. We lack adequate schools for
millions of children. We have a shortage of medical
facilities and personnel to protect the health of our
people. We have limited cultural and recreational
opportunities available to millions of Americans.

Our urban transportation
system is totally
inadequate.

~~Finally they are evident in the fact that~~ *and finally*
~~dispite~~
economic
the progress of the past three decades there remains
in our otherwise affluent society one fifth of the
population ill-clothed, ill-educated and ill-housed.

Poverty Prog

~~It is~~ these unmet needs of our own society
pose as great a challenge to the partnership of
government and business as ~~the~~ *do the* problems of economic
conversion. *and* In the United States we have succeeded
before in converting to peacetime economy -- unlike the
Soviet Union which has never experienced the change to a
peacetime economy.

But, the resources
released by
reductions in
Defense spending,
if properly used,
can meet these
needs.

In Public Sector - Oceanography -
Water Resources

Technical
Schools
for college
Graduate (Doubt)
Centers
Colleges



~~Whether we can meet our unmet social problems at home with
equal success is still an unanswered question.~~ I am

convinced that if we put a premium on innovation at

home, if we harness all the energy and ingenuity of the

many groups in our pluralistic society, we can succeed in

building the Great Society which President Johnson has

proposed. ^{But} Our success will in great part depend on you,

The American businessman has exhibited astounding

ability to organize economic efforts, to devise new

methods of distribution, to put people to work, and

altogether, to continually design new and better ways of

doing things. Without this creativity, whatever efforts

we make toward the Great Society will be slowed immeasurably.

The promise of a Great Society, the promise which America has always held out to its own at home and to the watchful millions abroad, is well stated in a passage from Thomas Wolfe: "To every man his chance; to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity; to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever his manhood and his vision can combine to make him -- this, seeker, is the promise of America."

To make the promise of America a reality will take planning and innovation, will take cooperation and respect ~~between~~ ~~business~~ between business and government, and above all intelligence and courage.



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