Transcript of Remarks
The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey
Electrical Industry Scholarship Breakfast
Flushing New York
April 19, 1969

ARMAND D. ANGELO: Our guest today is more than a great man. He is a giant of our time and of history. In the annals of mankind it can be said of relatively few men that the world was better because they lived. It can be said of very few leaders that rather than being the mere product of history, they helped to mold and make history. It can be said of very few minds and hearts that the spirit of compassion and the meaning of brother-hood motivated and influenced their thought and their feelings. Our guest spoke for; he strived for and fought for the doctrine of human rights long before it was fashionable to do so. His passionate interest...

(APPLAUSE)

for the deprived marked his entire life and all of his works.

He led the struggle for decent housing, equal opportunity,

labor-management rights, long before it was the chic or the

political thing to do. He was the voice of the little man,

the conscience of America. As a mayor, as a Senator and as

a Vice-President of the United States, he gave articulate and

meaningful expression to compassion, understanding and caring -
caring for the sick, the poor and the hopeless. He has given

leadership and inspiration to those people and those programs

that represent the ideals, the faith in the future of our nation.

My good friends, it is a great honor for all of us and a great personal privilege for me to present our good friend, the former Vice-President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey.

(APPLAUSE)

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman and Reverend Clergy, Mr. Cleary and Mr. Van Arsdale, and all of the officers that are here today of the Educational and Cultural Trust Fund of the Electrical Industry and my friends of the labor movement and of industry, and above all, may I personally congratulate once again the recipients of these fine scholarships and those who today have been singularly honored by the special scholarship — the Dean Harry Carman Fellowship and the scholarship in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., both very wonderful testimonials to great men.

Now it was said that I had a little difficulty getting here. It is true. I was at the University of Massachusetts last night and infact all day yesterday — in class with students, speaking to a very large assembly last evening of several thousand. And for the two days prior to that at the campus of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I thought that you would like to know that we've had a wonderful three days of hard work, intensive work — from early in the morning 'til late at night with question and answer periods lasting from two to three hours, with students who are bright and unafraid and willing to ask every question, even embarrassing ones if they so desire — putting them to you day after day and hour after hour, and I would like to just make this one comment, you may recall that on both of these campuses, within the last two weeks, troubles have taken place.

In one instance the former professor, a very distinguished scholar of M.I.T., was unable to finish his address due to

interruptions. In another at the University of Massachusetts the United States Senator with whom I do not agree and whose political philosophy is very different from mine; nevertheless he is entitled to free speech because when you deny freedom of speech to one, even though you may disagree totally with what he has to say, you ultimately deny freedom of speech to everyone.

(APPLAUSE)

Now I mention this my good friends, and I'm going to not take too much of your time this morning — I mention this because even as I was in Minnesota, far away from here I saw a front page headline story about the fact that some students at M.I.T. would not let Dr. Rostow speak. I said some — very few, and I read where some students would not let Senator Strom Thurmond speak. I'm sure I wouldn't have enjoyed what he had to say in many ways but nevertheless he was denied the right to speak. It was news on your television, one your radio, in your press.

I would like to have you know that last night over eight thousand students not only permitted me to speak but they — well, they honored me as a man could hardly ever be honored with their applause, with their good will, with their questions — with an hour of penetrating questions with an enthusiastic, courteous reception. Oh yes, we had a few demonstrators — they marched down the hall — they were dressed up in a certain way that they wanted to dress with protesting certain things, but they did it well, and it was just a part of the scene, but

not stopping of the speech.

Now to you ladies and gentlemen I want to say from this platform that until there is equal coverage between the students who honor their guests and those who dishonor them, the American student is not being dealt with fairly in the public media.

(APPLAUSE)

And I've been to a hundred and thirty-five college campuses in four and a half years. I've been to a lot of them, and I find our young people, yes, asking questions that go to the heart of the conscience of America, and I find the overwhelming majority -- 98, 99 per cent of them, not necessarily agreeing with you, infact I'm sure many not agreeing with us, very dis -- concerned, disturbed and properly so, but they're willing to racognize the importance of academic freedom, and from this platform I want to say that whenever a university gets to a position where those who seek to be heard -- whatever their views -are denied the right to be heard, then America is in serious trouble -serious trouble. It's one thing to have violence in a back alley, in a barroom, in a salcon -- you can expect conduct sometimes like that in such surroundings, but a university should be a place where reason and dialogue and dissent and debate sharp and -sharp and critical can take place, but it is not a brawl and it never should be one -- it shouldn't be a house of brawling.

(APPLAUSE)

I had to say this because I'm convinced that a number of young

people today are getting very discouraged for many reasons —

I'm going to talk a little bit about that, but I want them to
have some encouragement — I'm not asking that they agree — to
the contrary I think the present always ought to disagree with
the past just to improve it. I think there's a constant conflict
between the generations. I think that's true; I think that
the present should always challenge the yesterday. I think that
the present should always look to the tomorrows, but I think that
we have to understand, have to ask ourselves how? That's really
the central question of today. How I — I went back to teaching,
gone back to teaching — I didn't do it voluntarily...

(LAUGHTER)

...but here I am. As a matter of fact I wanted to be President of these United States because I thought that the best... (APPLAUSE)

have been the White House. I thought it was from there that
we might be able to aspire and to lead and to educate and be
educated because let me tell you there's no greater danger
in public life than isolating yourself from the public, and there
is a tendency to have that happen, under the very precautions
that are taken for one's so-called safety. The flow of information
is a two-way street, and it must so be, but now I've gone back to
my first love, which is the school room, the classroom, and I
happen to agree so much with what Mr. Schwartz had to say here
this morning, that much of what you learn is not in that regular

classroom but in the classroom of our community, in the great classroom and the laboratory of our city, our state, our nation, our world. While I'm not going to discuss with you this morning what I believe are the essential requirements for the redirection of our higher education, some of the reforms which I believe can be made, and which I believe will be made, let me just say this that a young man or a young woman today will have to learn not only from the books, from the proscribed course of study which will be changed and changed plenty in the next decade and indeed in the next year, but that young man and young woman will get a good deal of his or her education in the environment in which a university or a college is to be found, and I want to see a college, not a meadow of meditation, but I want to see an acre of action. I want to see a university become a laboratory of community life, and I want to see the university student and professor involve himself in community life.

But I also want to have it clearly understood that a university is no place for the lowest common denominator; it is good for everybody to do his own thing, providing that he has an idea of what kind of standards he ought to have for his own thing.

(APPLAUSE)

In other words the purpose of a university is to elevate.

Once you leave a university you have been given a certificate,
so to speak, even if it isn't written out, and it may very well
be that the time will come where we don't get these diplomas, but

the fact that you've been there tells people something. It say that you're supposed to be better, and I'm going to make it my business to see that university and college education is not downgraded. I'm going to try to see that it's upgraded.

(APPLAUSE)

But a university should also represent an openmind, an open spirit, an open door; it should be the very institution that understands change, and it must be able to permit, and not only permit, it must invite and go out of its way to invite and adjust itself accordingly in its program and its curriculum and its administration -- it must invite the deprived, the powerless, so that they can become a part of the power structure and the privileged. It's exactly what we're talking about these days -how many young people are being given the chance from our ghettos, from the hills and the valleys and the poor areas of America to share in the blessings of higher education. When I hear people say, "Well, they're not prepared," then I say "Prepare them." It's not their fault they're not prepared. It isn't good enough this day and age to have merely equal opportunity for some; some people who've been denied equal opportunity for two to three hundred years need more than equal opportunity, so that they can be in a bargaining position to have equal opportunity for the rest of their lives.

(APPLAUSE)

Well, I thought I'd get that off my chest early. See
I teach at the University of Minnesota. I am the all -- the all

University Professor there, which means that I can go around from class to class in different disciplines in the field of the humanities and the social arts and the social sciences. I occupy the chair in International Relations at the Macalester College — you know, it only shows how the full circle comes. I used to teach at the University of Minnesota; I'm a graduate of the university, and I used to teach at Macalester College, twenty-five years ago, twenty-six years ago, so here I am back. Well, I want to say to some of you I got a mighty good start back there — never can tell, it may start all over again.

(LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE)

I'm a member of the Board of Regents of the Brandeis
University, one of the fine liberal -- liberal arts universities,
a new one.

A young med student said to me the other day, he said "What reason do you have to be on it," you know, they ask really good questions. So what reason do you have to be on Brandeis University Board — what do you know about education? Well, I said I've come to a time in my life where I have found out that experience is a liability rather than an asset I guess, but...

(LAUGHTER)

very much, but maybe I have a right to go to school too. I'm trying to learn, and I really am. I'm trying to learn what's going on. I'd like to give a layman's input, too, as to what's going on. We need many different kinds of people involved in

education today because education is not the perogative of a faculty. It doesn't belong to the President of a University alone. It doesn't even belong to the students alone. It belongs to the community, and we need different kinds of people, and plus the fact, as I said, it takes money to run a university, believe it or not, and I go out and reise a lot of it for a lot of colleges and universities.

(APPLAUSE)

I happen to also be — privileged to be the chairman of the Board of Regents of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, established by act of Congress, which will be a center of advanced study in the nation's capital. And we're going to construct there, and we're going to create one of the finest institutions of advanced studies in the field of public affairs and the world. What a privilege it is to help design that — that great institution, and I don't intend to let it be a cheap outfit. I don't intend, if I can permit it, to let it — to let it rest on less than top-grade standards, because we've got to push up, push up — we've got to look to the stars; we've got to have broader horizons, and I don't think that you necessarily get it by always trying to be popular.

You know, I told you sometime ago, some of you, that I considered the worst virus that infects mankind is the desire to always be popular, because frequently popularity requires that you sacrifice principle, standards, integrity, character, and there are times when you have to take your stand — popular or not popular,

only to find that history later on, long after you're gone, may say, you know, he was right. Abraham Lincoln was not popular; he was even a minority President: he didn't even come close to ever getting the majority. He was called every name in the book. Harry Truman was not popular, but I'll tell you both Lincoln and Truman were right, and thank God they had the courage and the conviction to do what they thought had to be done in their time, even though they suffered the contempt and the hatred and the —and the derogation of their contemporaries. They lived to have history recognize them and those that came after their time—they came — they — history came to recognize them as great people.

Now Mr. Schwartz has said something here that touched me as he spoke. He said much of college is what you make of it.

And yet he gave us a very succinct analysis, I think, of asme of the limitations of present higher education. Might I add that much of life is what you make of it, and then much of what this nation is is what you make of it. It's trite to say that we're living in times of ferment and change—of course we are, and by the way we always have, and I want to say a word to the parents here this morning. I don't think we help our young people by letting them believe that schehow or another that this is the only time the world has been in trouble. There is a permissiveness on our part which really does not serve anyone well. Each generation has its problems; each generation

has its trouble, and each generation challenges the other, so don't lean over backwards too much, as I told my students at the University of Minnesota, I'm not going to roll over and play dead for you, you may be right, but you're going to have to prove it.

A handball court with foam rubber for the backboard doesn't give you much bounce, and I refuse to be a feamrubber teacher, or a foamrubber dad. In other words as I say we're going to mix it up; you may be very, very right, young man, as I've said to my younger son, who has many ideas of his own, but I said your dad is going to make you examine your thoughts until you know in your own heart that you're right, because the greatest disservice I can do for you is to let you get off on some binge where you know you're wrong, and you start to believe that what you know is wrong is right because I didn't have enough courage to challenge you, so we'll make it competitive. The refiners' fire of ideas -- that's what's needed, and sometimes today those of us in positions of responsibility, at a university, at home, in government and so forth, we just don't put up any resist -- we just don't put up any resistance, any backboard on which -- upon which you can bounce off the ideas, rather than having the ball come in and sink as if it's lost in mud.

Is it any wonder that this country of ours and this world of ours is in change, and by the way, if you're worried about student dissent and troubles, it's not in America only, it's the whole world. Now we get to thinking it's all here, and I

might add you hear a whole lot more about it here than we do out where I live. When I read the papers here and read them out home, I wonder which country I'm in. Now that doesn't — you know, this is a great country — it's not to be critical of either — it's just that there are many variables in our country, many differences, many, and some of them are so different that you kind of feel that you're in different cultures, and we are. And that's one of the wonderful things — we ought to understand that there are different ethnic groups and different cultures and different mores. We don't all have to be alike.

And the same is true of the world in which we live, and this is where we're really coming to grips now with reality. We used to talk glibly about Asia, and now we're beginning to find out there really isn't any such thing as Asia -- there are a number of cultures and peoples and mores and religions that make up a continent that is called Asia, but everyone is different. A citizen of Malaysia is as different from a citizen of Vietnam as a Norwegian is from an Italian. Their Ettitudes; their looks, their responses -- there isn't any Such thing as Africa except as geography. There are eight hundred separate tribes in Africa -- all different. I was sitting with one of the great African scholars, Dr. Baumery (?) last night at the University of Massachusetts; he spent some time in Africa doing studies back in the bush. He said, you know I was amazed -- he said that one tribe is as different as if it were another mation. It's as different as a Fin from a Spaniard,

or it's as different as an American Negro from a Swede. People are different — good! We just need to understand it, and when we begin to understand these differences and their cultural patterns and their political mores and their social mores, we'll begin to have a more — I think a more peaceful existence in this world — a more — at least a more responsible pattern of human conduct, because what we've done for so many years is to substitute power and money for knowledge and understanding, and now we've gotten to a point where money doesn't do it anymore, and where power doesn't do it anymore — it doesn't protect you; it doesn't save you; it doesn't even get you to move, and we're going to have to go the other way new, where we use that which Divine Providence gave to us, namely the mind, spirit and reason — where reason and restraint are the pattern of the day, rather than where power and money represent the mode of conduct.

Young people, all of us, particularly with our time now, young or parents or members of the family of the younger generation — what are we, we're the products of World War II, which shook this world to its very foundation. Here's the United Nations in your great city — twenty some years ago the United Nations had less than fifty members — today it has a hundred and thirty or so.

Here is the time of the space age -- ten years ago the space age just started -- Sputnik, just about 1958, and here we are this summer going to put a man on the moon. We're beginning to learn about our neighborhood, and I'm not talking

about Queens or Flushing or something like that. Do you know what our neighborhood is — for the young men that are sitting ahead of me here, their neighborhood is the solar system. That's their neighborhood. My neighborhood as a boy — thirty-five years ago was Spink County, South Dakota. I had never been to a city larger than Watertown, South Dakota until I graduated from high school. That shows what kind of a mobility has happened since then.

These young men and women that have here been honored today are going to live at a time when we explore the entire solar system. I saw in a laboratory yesterday make — how we're making robots that can be used on the planets to make analysis of the climate, of temperature, of soil, of atmosphere, as if they were human beings, and how they will receive massages, talk to you, and how they'll send back messages, and how they will show that they have to reject some messages because they can't perform them, and how then they will — then make the corrections which are necessary, and it'll all be done through what we call electronics.

This is — this is what they're going to be living with.

We read today about the kidney transplant and the heart transplant, and it's a headline. They're going to see the day that it's someon place medicine. We're learning about life itself — the human cell for the first time — oh, we're learning so much in bio-medicine, science and technology. Listen, if nothing else had happened in this world in the last twenty-five years except the computer, it'd been enough to drive you half nuts.

(LAUGHTER)

The computer is revolutionizing industry and decision making and production, and it's at its infancy. It's about where Oroville Wright's airplane was, the Kittyhauk. It's just beginning. I've seen — I saw yesterday computer mus — I heard computer music — beautiful, simple from the computer — computer art, magnificent, magnificent design in color from a computer — beautiful, where you'd be able to have if you could do it in your home, a computer and have your own art gallery in your own home, because the computer can produce it, and where you can change it anytime you want to and where you can change — use the same computer to produce the finest opera, the finest symphony, the finest music in the world. It's gonna happen. You say, well, they say whatever you can produce in a laboratory, fifteen years later it will be in the marketplace.

Now I'm interested in these young folks that got these certificates today and these scholarships because afterall they're going to have to be responsible for my Medicare, and I want to know what kind of people they are.

(LAUGHTER)

(APPLAUSE)

But I'll tell you they're wrestling with a lot of problems just as the rest of us did in our way; the difference is that they have more tools to — to use and more challenge to the tools than we had, but each generation in its own way had to come to grips with its own problems.

Look at the impact of television. There really is no place to hide anymore. The tape recorder — I go to a class — when I teach at the university, kids sit there with tape recorders, you know, they don't take notes anymore — they've got little pocket tape recorders. You gotta be mighty careful what you say.

(LAUGHTER)

You can't say, well, you didn't get my full sentence. They're right on you — close circuit television, the communications satellite — let me tell these young men and women that received their scholarships that by the time they are where Mr. Schwartz is, today in terms of seeking their PhD or having their PhD — advanced doctoral study, that they will be getting lectures through nationwide and worldwide closed circuit television from the great universities of the world right on in to any college that wants to tap in. That's — that's just — that's just a matter now of just getting at it, and even though here I talk to electrical industry people, you know the ground stations in due time will not even be necessary. We'll generate the power in the satellite itself for transmittal.

Instantaneous translation of languages just as 1f you're talking like this, the retrieval of information is now a matter of only time. I work for the particular company where we can put a whole library of 50,000 books in a machine just exactly like you have it for cigarettes or sandwiches, one of these little ones that you put a quarter in and get out what you want.

We call it the micro — not microfilming, microfacie (?), and where you have readers that enlarge what's on that film. Infact that — the company is now selling a twenty thousand volume library for fifteen thousand dollars, and it can be stored in something not bigger than the chair in which you sit in, and you'll be able to get any book that you want, including an encyclopedia by going over and putting a quarter in the machine and drawing out a film, and that's your book. It's a fact. Boy, are we living.

(LAUGHTER)

Now all of this is shocking, you know, what does it do to industry, what does it do -- everybody gets excited, you see, this, what I'm trying to show you is that we are in this tramendous period of ferment and change. War has been brought into our livingroom. I am here to say that if the television cameras could have circulated as freely in World War II as they have in the war in Vietnam, I -- I imagine this country would have exploded, because war is one consecutive series of mistakes, and I know, for example, in World War II that many a time an American bember bombed American troops by mistake. We bombed open cities by mistake. You know, we have most of the pictures of World War II with Jimmy Stewart and John Wayne as the heroes, but the television, the live television brings the ugliness of a war in your pleasant home and livingroom. I submit that if every country on the face of the earth could have open television like we have in America there wouldn't be anymore war, but my fellow Americans

they don't all have it. It doesn't mean they couldn't have it, but certain societies do not permit it. We know much more about South Vietnam than we know about North Vietnam because what you get out of North Vietnam is what they let you get. What you get out of South Vietnam is what we get — NBC, ABC, CBS, and to be sure it's mean and masty — same mud, same blood.

What a change in the world in which we live. Mobility of population -- I'm in a class -- I'm at a university that when I was there it had thirteen thousand students. Today we have forty-seven thousand -- Minnesota.

I was at the University of Massachusetts, got an honorary degree there five years ago -- it had seven thousand, two students; it has eighteen thousand now. Listen even if you were the best manager in the world that kind of an influx is more than you can take.

The population — this is what's one of the problems in your great metropolitan area called New York. Ladies and gentlemen I — there's a figure that's so startling that it just almost throws you out of the room. You could put the whole population of the United States of America right here in the — in the boroughs of New York City if all the rest of the boroughs had the same density of population as Harlem. Just think of that — all two hundred million, and I say to you in the presence of the clergy, if they were saints and angels, and you put them in that kind of density in the rest of the boroughs in this city, there'd be tension and trouble,

and there'd be violence. You can't live that close together, my dear friends, and be a man and a woman, and be a human being and not have that unless you are more than even angels.

So you see we've got real serious problems of the day that cause this tension. Now what does it all add up to? Well, the young people say to me the system won't work. I go out on the campus I've just come away from about a three day real working over, and there's a group that says down there and says the system won't work; we've got to destroy it. They're a very -- very limited number, but there's a lot of them that say we wonder if this system can work. And they get up and ask me, and they say Mr. Humphrey, there's hunger, there's poverty. there's war, there's disease, there's hate, there's all of this, isn't it a fact this system doesn't work? Isn't it a fact that it's a failure? I sometimes turn the question and say, well, what kind of a system are you recommending; that's when the game stops. Because it's very easy to point out what's -- what's wrong; it's a little more difficult to quickly design what would be right, particularly when you're dealing with that in -- that unpredictable entity called man and his makeup and his emotions, because you're not dealing with machines, you're dealing with that unpredictable bit of flesh, blood and spirit and soul called man, and they react very differently to the same kind -- to the same kind of irritants or even to the same kind of pleasures. Can the system work? That's the question.

Now I want to say just this -- I think it can, and I'll tell you why, because the system that they're talking about is the system that has as its central point, adaptability to change. I'm a student of government, both pragmatic, from a practical point of view, and theoretical. I've spent my years at the university -- just seven, that's all -- all tolled. And I have spent twenty-five years in public life, and when I hear people say that its system can't work, I say to them the trouble with you is you've been in theory and in not in practice.

The -- the labor movement knows that at one time this system denied you the chance of voluntary association. You know that at one time this system declared you to be a conspiracy; you know that at one time this system did not permit collective bargaining, and you know that this system was brought to change. Oh, not easily, and I want to say right now that if you expect it's all going to come with sweetness and light, no, you fought it out many times, but the system had the resiliency to accept that pain and struggle and make the change. It doesn't bother me, particularly, that there's a little difficulty here and there. The important thing is do we have a social structure that can adapt itself to human need, the only purpose of a system or an institution is to serve mankind, whether it's a church or a government or a union or a business. Does it make your life a little more -- does it make it richer, better, and the founding fathers put it very well: "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." I remember when I said that in a

campaign, and when I said the "pursuit of happiness" there were certain people who thought they were great intellects that started to pooh-pooh that. Well, what is the purpose of life? God Almighty intended us to try to be happy, and when the Lord could say to me, "Greater things than I have done, ye can do also."

I take it — I take Him at his word. And I think it wouldn't be a bad idea if we'd start to think that way. This system of ours can adjust, and this system of ours has made room now for — for people that never before ever had a chance. No other system in the world has done it so well.

It doesn't mean that you just sit around patiently waiting for it to change, you make it change. Time is neutral, and you use time for a positive purpose. And we can make this system change, so that the powerless today have power, so that those who are deprived today have their opportunity; so that those today who are the victims of poverty can become the beneficiaries of an affluent society, but the most important change that's needed in this system is the right of people to have something to say about their own lives without destroying comebody elso's life, and this is where I draw the line on some of my friends. Freedom is not license, the right to do my own thing, as they put it in the modern parlance, does not mean the right to do it at the expense of the other fellow, and as a teacher the right to do -- the right of a student to do his own thing doesn't mean that he can disrupt my class, because if everybody's going to do their own thing without any regard to the other fellow, there'll be mass suicide, mass anihilation.

OK

I happen to like to drive on the left hand side of the road for some peculiar reason. I even like to drive on wrong — on one way streets the wrong way, and the right to do my own thing would be not only disastrous to me, but it would kill somebody else. I do not have the right to destroy either my life or somebody else's, and when I speak of ideals I must think of the first ideal what do I do with my temple — namely with this body, and when I hear many young people and older people speak about that they want a purer society, a more idealistic society, and I see the unbelievable use of drugs that destroy body and soul, I say how can you save a society if you can't even take care of your own temple.

(APPLAUSE)

Your own temple. Well, Winston Churchill said that democracy is the worst form of government ever tried except all others.

(LAUGHTER)

And I must say that what he was saying to us is it's a constant challenge to make it work. My plea to you is not only to have patience but to persevere in making change a constructive force. You know what's wrong. Gunnar Myrdal, the great sociologist from Sweden once was asked how do you find out what's wrong in America? He said just ask somebody. They'll tell you. We — and that's a sign of our health, not our weakness; this is the age of discovery — we finally have discovered — you'd think it was not — you shouldn't — well, you

just wonder how we didn't do it before. We finally have discovered that there was another America, not one America but two — we've finally discovered it was separate and unequal; we've discovered that there were poor in our midst that were poorer than anybody ever believed, not only poor of purse but poor of spirit and poor of hope, poor in every way, but now we've discovered something else. We've discovered we know a little bit what to do about it.

And what I'm going to spend the rest of my days trying to do is to get this nation to make the commitment to reorder its priorities and to reorder its priorities so that the resources of this land, men and materials will be directed towards improving the human condition and the human environment, and we can do it.

As somebody said so well that any nation that can put a man on the moon ought to be able to help put a man on his feet right here on earth. I think it can be done.

(APPLAUSE)

I want to wish my young friends back here the best. We give them a big challenge, but they've got what it takes. Let's help them; let's not stand in their way, but to help them does not mean that you refuse to engage in the dialogue which tests an idea. If an airplane needs a test flight, so does an idea, and my dear friends these are young pilots. They're well prepared; they have those qualities and quan — they have those qualities that indicate that they are superior, but I would not want my generation to deny them the backboard that they need, on which to try their ideas, and I'll bet you that if we give them

some competition of the intellect and the spirit, that they'll come up with ideas that will make this America of ours what it's supposed to be, and you good union friends and my good union friends, since I'm also a card carrying member, remember that we've got something going for us in the Constitution, right off the bat in the first lines it says to help form a more perfect union. And that's what we're trying to do.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

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.

