

Text

## THE SOURCES OF AMERICAN STRENGTH

IT'S GREAT TO COME HOME TO MACALESTER. EVEN BEFORE FAST FOOD WAS INVENTED, IT WAS THE "BIG MAC" IN MY LIFE. COMING BACK HERE, THIS EVENING, REMINDS ME OF A SCENE ACTED OUT NOT SO LONG AGO. MOTHER SAYS TO HER SON: "IT'S TIME TO GET UP AND GO TO SCHOOL." "I DON'T WANT TO," HE SAYS. "BUT YOU HAVE TO GO TO SCHOOL," HIS MOTHER REPLIES. "I DON'T WANNA. THE STUDENTS DON'T LIKE ME, THE TEACHERS DON'T LIKE ME -- NOBODY LIKES ME. GIVE ME ONE GOOD REASON I SHOULD GO."

"SON," HIS MOTHER SAYS, "I'LL GIVE YOU TWO: FIRST, YOU'RE 42 YEARS OLD; SECOND, YOU'RE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY."

BUT I KNOW THAT ISN'T TRUE HERE AT MAC, WITH A GREAT PRESIDENT IN JOHN DAVIS.

THIS SCHOOL MEANS SO MUCH TO ME. I MET MY WIFE JOAN HERE. I FIRST MET HUBERT HUMPHREY WHILE I WAS A STUDENT AT MAC; I WENT TO MY FIRST POLITICAL MEETING; AND HAD MY FIRST EXPOSURE TO IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY -- IN DISCUSSIONS OF WHAT WE THEN CALLED THE CITIZENSHIP SEQUENCE. I ALSO MET TED MATAU HERE, ONE OF MAC'S GREAT TEACHERS AND AN INSPIRATION

TO GENERATIONS OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY ALIKE. IT WAS HE WHO TOLD ME THAT IF I WORKED HARD, AND PERSEVERED, AND APPLIED MYSELF -- THEN I WOULDN'T HAVE TO TAKE SECOND PLACE TO ANYBODY.

THERE WAS ONLY ONE THING WRONG WITH MY TIME HERE AT MACALESTER: I WISHED I HADN'T DROPPED THAT COURSE ON HOW TO BE AN ACTOR.

TONIGHT, I WOULD LIKE TO CONTINUE IN THE SPIRIT OF MY EDUCATION HERE, AND SHARE WITH YOU SOME THOUGHTS ON THE SOURCES OF AMERICAN STRENGTH IN THE WORLD. PEOPLE HAVE CONFLICTING VIEWS ABOUT WHAT AMERICAN STRENGTH IS, AND DIFFERENT IDEAS ON WHAT WE NEED TO DO TO ENHANCE IT. AT A TIME WHEN OUR GOVERNMENT PROPOSES TO MAKE A MASSIVE REALLOCATION OF RESOURCES WITH ONE GOAL BEING THAT OF INCREASING OUR STRENGTH, I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO STAND BACK AND SEE WHETHER THERE IS A DEFINITION OF AMERICAN STRENGTH ON WHICH WE CAN ALL AGREE.

FOR THE LAST FOUR YEARS, I WAS HONORED BY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO SERVE IN THE SECOND HIGHEST OFFICE IN THE LAND. INHERENTLY, THE OFFICE CARRIES WITH IT MAJOR NATIONAL SECURITY RESPONSIBILITIES. THE VICE PRESIDENT IS A STATUTORY MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL; HE STANDS IN THE LINE OF

SUCCESSION, AND MUST KNOW IN AN EMERGENCY HOW TO EXECUTE THE AWESOME STRATEGIC POWER OF THIS COUNTRY. HIS OATH OF OFFICE CHARGES HIM NOT ONLY "TO PRESERVE, PROTECT AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION" ... BUT THE UNITED STATES AS WELL.

PRESIDENT CARTER ADDED A FURTHER DIMENSION TO THESE RESPONSIBILITIES. ONLY NINETY-SIX HOURS AFTER OUR INAUGURATION, HE SENT ME TO MEET WITH ALLIED LEADERS IN EUROPE AND ASIA TO REAFFIRM AMERICA'S COMMITMENT TO OUR COLLECTIVE SECURITY.

I LATER WENT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA TO REASSURE OUR FRIENDS AND ALLIES SHAKEN BY VIETNAMESE AGGRESSION. I TRAVELED TO ISRAEL AND EGYPT TO PUSH FORWARD THE PROCESS OF PEACE THAT LED TO CAMP DAVID. I VISITED WEST AFRICA TO DRAMATIZE OUR CONCERN AND SUPPORT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND PROGRESS IN THAT CONTINENT AND CONVEYED THE SAME MESSAGE TO THE LEADERS OF SOUTH AFRICA WHEN WE MET IN VIENNA. I WENT TO CHINA TO CONCLUDE THE PROCESS OF NORMALIZING OUR RELATIONS WITH ONE-QUARTER OF HUMANITY -- SYMBOLIZED BY MY BEING ABLE TO SPEAK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BEIJUNG, IN A SPEECH BROADCAST THROUGHOUT THAT COUNTRY.

IN ALL THESE FOREIGN ENCOUNTERS AND IN DAY-TO-DAY WORK ON THE CONDUCT OF OUR NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY, I HAD AN ALMOST UNMATCHED OPPORTUNITY TO SEE AMERICA'S STRENGTH, ITS INTERESTS, AND ITS RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE WORLD.

THAT IS WHAT I WANT TO TALK ABOUT THIS EVENING --  
AMERICA'S STRENGTH AND AMERICA'S PURPOSE. DURING THE RECENT  
PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN, WE VIGOROUSLY DEBATED OUR NATIONAL  
STRENGTH. BUT THE DEBATE DID NOT BEGIN THEN; AND IT DID NOT  
END ON ELECTION DAY. IT WAS PART OF AN ENDURING PROCESS IN  
OUR HISTORY AS A NATION, AND ESPECIALLY IN THE EVENTS OF THIS  
CENTURY WHICH CALLED FORTH THE UNITED STATES TO PLAY A CRITICAL  
ROLE AMONG THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH. WITH EACH SUCCEEDING  
GENERATION, WE HAVE HAD TO REDISCOVER THE SOURCES OF OUR  
STRENGTH; WE HAVE HAD TO REDEFINE OUR PURPOSES AS THE WORLD  
CHANGED, AND WITH IT, THE ROLE THAT AMERICAN POWER WAS  
REQUIRED TO PLAY.

IN OUR OWN GENERATION, THE VIETNAM WAR WAS A DECISIVE  
EVENT IN THAT CONTINUING HISTORICAL PROCESS, FOR IT DESTROYED  
A QUARTER CENTURY OF CONSENSUS ABOUT AMERICAN POWER AND  
FOREIGN POLICY.

AS A CONSEQUENCE, IN THE YEARS SINCE THEN THE NATIONAL  
SECURITY DEBATE IN AMERICA TENDED TO BECOME POLARIZED AT  
TWO EXTREMES:

-- THERE WERE THOSE WHO REACTED TO THE HORROR OF THAT  
EXPERIENCE BY URGING COURSES OF ACTION THAT WOULD HAVE RESULTED  
IN AN AMERICAN RETREAT FROM THE WORLD. A FEW EVEN OPPOSED  
MAINTAINING STRONG AND EFFECTIVE MILITARY FORCES AS THOUGH

THEY FEARED THESE FORCES WOULD BE USED FOR UNJUST ENDS OR WOULD, BY THEIR VERY EXISTENCE, IRRESISTIBLY INVOLVE THE NATION IN FURTHER TRAGEDIES. THE RESULT WAS THAT THE PRESIDENT BECAME INCREASINGLY LIMITED IN THE EXERCISE OF POWERS ASSIGNED TO HIM BY THE CONSTITUTION FOR THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND THE DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY.

-- AT THE SAME TIME, THERE WERE THOSE WHO, PERHAPS REACTING TO THE HUMILIATION OF VIETNAM, SEEMED TO BE OBSESSED WITH WHAT THEY SAW AS GROWING AMERICAN WEAKNESS. THE POWERFUL FORCES OF CHANGE SWEEPING THE GLOBE WERE SEEN AS INEVITABLY HOSTILE TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE RESULT OF AMERICAN POWERLESSNESS OR LACK OF WILL. ARMS CONTROL WAS DISMISSED AS WEAKNESS IN FACE OF OUR PRINCIPAL ADVERSARY. AND ABOVE ALL, THERE WAS A CONSTANT AND SELF-DEFEATING REFRAIN THAT AMERICA WAS A PITIFUL, HELPLESS GIANT.

THIS POLARIZATION CREATED A CHARGED ATMOSPHERE WHICH UNDERMINED RATIONAL DISCUSSION AND MADE EVEN MORE DIFFICULT THE CONDUCT OF A PRUDENT, SOBER, AND REALISTIC POLICY. IT MADE ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE A BIPARTISAN NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY.

IT IS LONG PAST TIME THAT THIS BREACH BE HEALED. WE NEED A NEW AND MATURE CONSENSUS ABOUT WHAT MAKES AMERICA STRONG AND HOW OUR STRENGTH MUST BE USED -- NOT JUST FOR OURSELVES, BUT

FOR OTHERS WHO LOOK TO US FOR PARTNERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP, WITHOUT SUCH A CONSENSUS, WE WILL BE DRIVEN BY OUR FEARS, LURCHING FROM CRISIS TO CRISIS WITH THE PENDULUM SWINGING FROM INTERVENTION TO RETREAT FROM YEAR TO YEAR.

LET ME SUGGEST FOUR CARDINAL PRINCIPLES THAT I BELIEVE ARE BASIC TO ESTABLISHING A NEW NATIONAL CONSENSUS ON THE SOURCES AND PURPOSES OF AMERICAN STRENGTH.

FIRST, WE MUST HAVE A RATIONAL AND EFFECTIVE DEFENSE PROGRAM, WHOSE BURDENS ARE SHARED FAIRLY IN OUR SOCIETY.

THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT GREATER DEFENSE EFFORTS ARE NEEDED -- NOT JUST FOR TODAY, BUT SUSTAINED OVER MANY YEARS. FOR NEARLY TWO DECADES, THE SOVIET UNION HAS BEEN INCREASING ITS MILITARY EFFORTS. IT NOW HAS MORE THAN FOUR MILLION MEN UNDER ARMS -- TWICE THE SIZE OF OUR MILITARY. IT IS PRODUCING MAJOR WEAPONS -- GUNS, TANKS, PLANES, AND MISSILES -- AT A RATE THREE TIMES GREATER THAN OURS. AND IT IS NOW CLOSING THE GAP IN TECHNOLOGY THAT FOR SO LONG GAVE US A COMPENSATORY ADVANTAGE.

SIX YEARS AGO, IN A SPEECH IN MOSCOW, I TOLD THE SOVIETS THAT THEIR MILITARY BUILDUP WAS EXCEEDING ANY LEGITIMATE DEFENSIVE NEED. I SAID THAT IF IT CONTINUED WE WOULD BE FORCED

TO CONCLUDE THAT THEY WERE SEEKING TO TILT THE MILITARY BALANCE IN THEIR FAVOR. AND I MADE CLEAR THAT, REGARDLESS OF THE PARTY IN POWER, AMERICA WOULD RESPOND. WE KNOW THE SOVIETS ARE WILLING TO EXPLOIT THE POWER AND INFLUENCE CONFERRED BY THEIR MILITARY BUILDUP -- WHETHER BY DIRECT AGGRESSION IN AFGHANISTAN, OR BY THE USE OF CUBA AND VIETNAMESE PROXIES TO INCREASE THEIR REACH IN ASIA, AFRICA AND EVEN LATIN AMERICA.

IF WE FAIL TO MAINTAIN THE MILITARY BALANCE WE WILL SEE THREATS TO OUR ALLIES IN EUROPE, SOVIET EXPANSION INTO THE VITAL PERSIAN GULF, THE SPREADING OF MOSCOW'S INFLUENCE DEEPER INTO DEVELOPING NATIONS, AND EVEN RISKS TO THE STABILITY OF THE NUCLEAR BALANCE.

DURING RECENT YEARS, WE RESPONDED TO THIS CHALLENGE. WE REVERSED THE DOWNTURN IN U.S. MILITARY SPENDING. WE WORKED HARD TO MODERNIZE FORCES ACROSS THE BOARD. WE PARTICULARLY SOUGHT TO STRENGTHEN OUR POSITION IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND PERSIAN GULF REGION, THROUGH CAMP DAVID, THE ISRAEL-EGYPT PEACE TREATY, AND THE CREATION OF FORCES THAT COULD BE DEPLOYED IN THE GULF.

THESE EFFORTS TO REDRESS THE BALANCE ARE FAR FROM COMPLETE. TO CARRY THEM FORWARD POSES THREE REQUIREMENTS.

FIRST, WE MUST HAVE A CLEAR STRATEGY FOR SPENDING ADDITIONAL DEFENSE DOLLARS THAT TAKES ADVANTAGE OF OUR TECHNOLOGICAL STRENGTHS. INDEED, THE PRECISE AMOUNT WE SPEND ON DEFENSE MAY NOT BE AS IMPORTANT AS HOW WE SPEND THE MONEY.

WE COULD EMBARK ON A PROGRAM OF MATCHING THE SOVIET UNION MAN FOR MAN, WEAPON FOR WEAPON, BUT THAT WOULD BE A MISTAKE. WE ARE NOT SURROUNDED BY ADVERSARIES AND UNWILLING ALLIES. WE ARE SURROUNDED BY FRIENDS AND BROAD OCEANS AND WE HAVE STRONG ALLIES. WE SHOULD NOT ALONE SEEK TO MATCH SOVIET BULK. RATHER WE MUST EXPLOIT OUR TECHNOLOGICAL STRENGTH TO MAKE SUPERIOR WEAPONS, WHICH ARE MORE AFFORDABLE AND RELIABLE.

FOR MANY YEARS, CRITICS OF THE PENTAGON CHARGED THAT WE WERE WASTING MONEY ON "GOLD-PLATED" WEAPONS. I JOINED IN THAT CRITICISM. I BELIEVED THEN, AND BELIEVE TODAY, THAT IF WE END UP BUYING FEWER AND FEWER NUMBERS OF EVEN MORE EXPENSIVE AND UNWORKABLE SYSTEMS WE RISK SPENDING OURSELVES IN THE DIRECTION OF WEAKNESS RATHER THAN STRENGTH.

IT IS RIGHT AND PROPER FOR OUR MILITARY SERVICES TO SEEK THE MOST ADVANCED WEAPONS POSSIBLE. WE MUST HAVE THE "BEST"; BUT WE MUST ALSO STOP DEFINING THE "BEST" AS THE MOST COMPLEX.



FOR EXAMPLE, WE DEVELOPED THE HIGH TECHNOLOGY CRUISE MISSILE TO BE LAUNCHED FROM OUR B-52 BOMBERS, FROM SHIPS AND EVEN FROM TRUCKS. AS A RESULT, WE HAVE A LESS EXPENSIVE AND MORE EFFECTIVE WEAPONS SYSTEM THAN THE INCREDIBLY COMPLEX AND INCREASINGLY OBSOLETE B-1 BOMBER. INSTEAD OF TRYING TO MATCH THE 50 THOUSAND SOVIET TANKS AIMED AT WESTERN EUROPE, WE DEPLOYED 150 THOUSAND EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE ANTI-TANK MISSILES AND CONTINUE TO DEPLOY THEM FIVE TIMES FASTER THAN THE SOVIETS DEPLOY TANKS.

AS THESE EXAMPLES ILLUSTRATE, WE CAN EXPLOIT THE CREATIVE GENIUS OF AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY TO OBTAIN WEAPONS SYSTEMS WHICH ARE NOT ONLY MORE CAPABLE, BUT ALSO MORE RELIABLE, MORE EASILY MAINTAINED, AND LESS EXPENSIVE. A RATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM MUST INVOLVE A LONG TERM COMMITMENT TO EXPAND OUR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS TO FOCUS SPECIFICALLY ON THESE GOALS. ONLY WITH SUCH A STRATEGY CAN WE RESOLVE THE ENDLESS DEBATE BETWEEN QUANTITY AND QUALITY WHICH HAS LESSENERED OUR ABILITY TO PROVIDE EITHER ONE.

INNOVATION IN TECHNOLOGY MUST GO HAND IN HAND WITH INNOVATIVE TACTICS. WE NEED TO ENCOURAGE OUR YOUNG MILITARY OFFICERS TO EXPERIMENT IN TRAINING, MANEUVERS, AND OPERATIONAL TESTS WITH NEW TACTICS -- AND IN WAYS TO MAKE SIMPLE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE DESIGN OF EXISTING WEAPONS. THE BEST NEW IDEAS OFTEN

COME FROM THE BOTTOM. A RATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM SHOULD STIMULATE AND REWARD IDEAS THAT COME FROM THE EXPERIENCE AND INGENUITY OF THE AMERICAN FIGHTING MAN.

THE SECOND REQUIREMENT OF A RATIONAL DEFENSE POLICY IS TO COMPLEMENT OUR DEFENSE EFFORTS BY SEEKING TO RESTRAIN THE OVERALL MILITARY COMPETITION WITH THE SOVIET UNION. EVERY ADMINISTRATION IN THE LAST TWO DECADES -- REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC ALIKE -- HAS UNDERSTOOD THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS OBJECTIVE.

DURING THE LAST FOUR YEARS, WE CONTINUED THE STRATEGY OF STRENGTHENING OUR DEFENSE WHILE SEEKING TO HOLD DOWN THE SOVIET THREAT THROUGH NEGOTIATION. FOR EXAMPLE, WE CONCLUDED THE SALT II TREATY, WHICH WOULD PERMIT ALL OF OUR NEEDED PROGRAMS TO CONTINUE WHILE CUTTING OFF THE SOVIET UNION AT LEVELS AS MUCH AS A THIRD LOWER THAN WILL EXIST IF SALT FAILS. IN EUROPE, WE DECIDED WITH OUR NATO ALLIES BOTH TO MODERNIZE THEATER NUCLEAR FORCES AND TO TRY NEGOTIATING EQUAL LIMITS ON THESE FORCES WITH THE SOVIET UNION.

IT MAKES NO SENSE TO SAY THAT WE MUST CHOOSE BETWEEN A STRONG MILITARY POSTURE AND ARMS CONTROL: THEY GO TOGETHER. THERE IS NO WAY THAT EITHER THE UNITED STATES OR THE SOVIET UNION CAN COMMIT ITSELF TO AN UNLIMITED ARMS RACE AND CALL

ITSELF SECURE. IF WE ABANDON THE SALT PROCESS, LINK IT TO SECONDARY PROBLEMS, OR SURROUND IT WITH UNJUSTIFIED DOUBT AND DERISION SO THAT IT BECOMES USELESS, WE CANNOT CLAIM TO BE MAKING OUR BEST EFFORTS TO PROVIDE FOR THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE THIRD REQUIREMENT IN MEETING THE SOVIET MILITARY CHALLENGE IS TO SHARE FAIRLY THE BURDENS OF OUR DEFENSE EFFORT.

SOVIET MILITARY POWER DID NOT GROW UP OVERNIGHT. OUR DEFENSE WILL NOT BE REPAIRED IN A DAY. A TYPICAL WEAPONS SYSTEM TAKES FROM FIVE TO AS MANY AS TEN YEARS FROM THE TIME IT IS CONCEIVED UNTIL IT IS READY FOR USE. THE STRENGTHENING OF OUR DEFENSES DEMANDS A LONG-TERM COMMITMENT BY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. AND TO SUSTAIN THAT COMMITMENT, THE AMERICAN PEOPLE MUST BELIEVE THAT THE NEEDED SACRIFICES FOR DEFENSE ARE BEING SHARED FAIRLY AMONG ALL OUR PEOPLE.

FOR GENERATIONS, ONE OF THE INHERENT STRENGTHS OF AMERICA HAS BEEN OUR COMMITMENT TO SOCIAL JUSTICE. THAT MEANS ENSURING THAT MEN AND WOMEN WHO PRODUCE OUR ABUNDANCE OF GOODS AND SERVICES CAN PROVIDE GOOD HOMES AND HEALTH AND EDUCATION FOR THEIR FAMILIES. IT MEANS DEALING FAIRLY WITH THE POOR AND THE INFIRM, WITH MINORITIES, AND WITH OUR SENIOR CITIZENS.

IT MEANS PAYING THOSE WHO VOLUNTEER FOR THE MILITARY A LIVING WAGE, AND IT MEANS PROVIDING HOPE FOR OUR YOUNGER CITIZENS -- LIKE THOSE OF YOU HERE, TONIGHT -- THAT AMERICAN SOCIETY WILL BE BOTH PROMISING AND JUST IN THE FUTURE.

OUR IDEA OF A JUST SOCIETY ALSO MEANS SHARING FAIRLY THE BURDEN OF HAVING A STRONG MILITARY AND A SOUND DEFENSE. TODAY THAT BURDEN IS NOT SHARED FAIRLY. BOTH THE GOVERNMENT AND OUR POLITICAL PROCESS HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ENSURE THAT IT IS. THAT IS A NECESSARY CONDITION IF THE SACRIFICES REQUIRED FOR NEEDED DEFENSE INCREASES ARE TO COMMAND THE ENDURING SUPPORT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

THE NEED FOR A STRONG DEFENSE LEADS DIRECTLY TO THE SECOND PRINCIPLE OF AMERICAN STRENGTH: WE MUST BUILD OUR RELATIONS WITH ALLIES, WITH CHINA, AND WITH NATIONS IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD SO THAT THEY COMPLEMENT OUR OWN EFFORTS TO PROVIDE FOR SECURITY.

CLEARLY, RELATIONS WITH OUR ALLIES ARE MOST IMPORTANT. DURING THE LAST FOUR YEARS, WE WORKED HARD TO REVITALIZE NATO BY UNDERTAKING A LONG-TERM DEFENSE PROGRAM TO INCREASE NATO'S MILITARY EFFORTS OVER THE NEXT DECADE AND A HALF.

THIS INCREASED EFFORT WAS BASED ON A VITAL COMMITMENT REGARDING THE SHARING OF THE BURDEN: THAT ALL THE ALLIES SHOULD INCREASE DEFENSE SPENDING BY AT LEAST 3% PER YEAR IN REAL TERMS. DESPITE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DIFFICULTIES THIS COMMITMENT HAS BEEN HONORED BY MOST OF THE ALLIES.

IT IS VITAL THAT IT CONTINUE TO BE HONORED, AS A FUNDAMENTAL SOURCE OF ALLIED STRENGTH AND A NECESSARY ACT OF ALLIED SOLIDARITY. IF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE TO BE ASKED TO SHOULDER NEW BURDENS FOR WHAT IS, AFTER ALL, THE COMMON ALLIED DEFENSE, THAT BURDEN MUST NOT ONLY BE SHARED FAIRLY AT HOME BUT IN THE ALLIANCE AS WELL.

IN ADDITION, OUR EUROPEAN ALLIES MUST NOW JOIN WITH US IN MEETING NEW THREATS TO OUR COMMON SECURITY OUTSIDE NATO'S TRADITIONAL AREA -- ESPECIALLY SOVIET ACTIVITIES IN THE REGION OF THE PERSIAN GULF WHICH CAN DIRECTLY THREATEN BOTH EUROPE'S AND AMERICA'S OIL LIFELINE. WHERE A DIRECT MILITARY PRESENCE IS NOT APPROPRIATE, OUR ALLIES MUST TAKE PART THROUGH ECONOMIC SUPPORT, BY PICKING UP THE SLACK IN NATO, AND BY SUPPORTING AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS SUCH AS THE CAMP DAVID EFFORT TO STABILIZE THE MIDDLE EAST. THEY MUST RESIST THEIR INCLINATION TO SEE ISRAEL AS THE SOURCE OF MIDDLE EAST TURMOIL. THE WAR BETWEEN IRAN AND IRAQ, THE 1978 WAR BETWEEN THE YEMENS, THE THREAT OF CONFLICT BETWEEN SYRIA AND JORDAN, AND LIBYA'S

EFFORTS TO DESTABILIZE THE REGION, ALL PROVE THE CONTRARY. ISRAEL IS A STRATEGIC ASSET FOR THE WEST IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

AS AMERICANS, WE MUST UNDERSTAND THE DESIRE OF EUROPEANS TO SAFEGUARD THE TANGIBLE GAINS OF DETENTE, TO ASSERT THEIR GROWING SENSE OF UNITY, AND TO EXPAND MARKETS IN THE SOVIET UNION. BUT AT THE SAME TIME, EVERY ALLY MUST BEAR ITS FAIR SHARE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR COUNTERING THE ACTIONS OF OUR SOVIET ADVERSARIES. WE CANNOT PURSUE A DIVISION OF LABOR IN SECURITY MATTERS IN WHICH OUR ALLIES WIELD THE CARROT AND AMERICA THE STICK.

JAPAN IS THE ANCHOR OF OUR STRENGTH AND SECURITY IN EAST ASIA. JAPAN GAINS IMMEASURABLY FROM ITS SECURITY RELATIONS WITH US, YET MUST NOW ASSUME A GREATER ROLE IN PRESERVING ITS OWN SECURITY. TO BE SURE, WE MUST SHOW GREAT SENSITIVITY TO THE LIMITS OF JAPANESE MILITARY EFFORTS. BUT WE CAN AND MUST CALL UPON OUR JAPANESE ALLIES TO SHARE OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES WITH US: BY INCREASING FOREIGN AID; BY ASSUMING A LARGER ROLE IN MANAGING THE GLOBAL ECONOMY; AND BY DEMONSTRATING "FAIR PLAY" IN TRADE COMPETITION.

OUR RELATIONS WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA ARE ALSO A SOURCE OF STRENGTH IN OUR EFFORT TO MAINTAIN GLOBAL STABILITY. TWO YEARS AGO, WE COMPLETED THE NORMALIZATION OF U.S. RELATIONS WITH CHINA. AT PRESIDENT CARTER'S REQUEST, I VISITED CHINA IN 1979. MY OWN EXPERIENCES THERE MADE CLEAR THAT IT WOULD BE GOING TOO FAR TO SAY THAT WE AND THE CHINESE HAVE COMMON SECURITY BURDENS TO BE SHARED. BUT WE DO HAVE SOME PARALLEL STRATEGIC INTERESTS WITH CHINA, UNDERSCORED BY THE FACT THAT IT TIES DOWN FULLY ONE-QUARTER OF MOSCOW'S MILITARY POWER ON SOVIET EAST ASIAN FRONTIERS. BILATERALLY, OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA IS DEEPENING. OUR TRADE ROSE SEVENFOLD OVER THE LAST FOUR YEARS TO MORE THAN 4 BILLION DOLLARS.

WHILE WE AND THE CHINESE ARE NOT ALLIES, WE ARE NOW FRIENDS -- AN HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT THAT SERVES OUR NATIONAL INTEREST. IT WOULD BE A TRAGIC MISTAKE IF ANYTHING NOW HAPPENED TO REVERSE THIS COURSE, DEVELOPED UNDER THE LAST THREE PRESIDENTS.

RELATIONS WITH COUNTRIES IN THE THIRD WORLD, WHICH BY THE YEAR 2000 WILL CONTAIN THREE-QUARTERS OF HUMANITY, ARE ALSO CRUCIAL TO THE UNITED STATES -- AND POTENTIALLY A SOURCE OF STRENGTH. WE RECOGNIZED THIS FACT WHEN WE TOOK THE POLITICALLY UN-POPULAR ACT OF CONCLUDING THE PANAMA CANAL TREATIES -- AND CREATED THE BEST BASIS FOR PRODUCTIVE RELATIONS WITH OUR SOUTHERN NEIGHBORS IN A GENERATION. WE RECOGNIZED IT WHEN WE WORKED TO RESOLVE THE CRISIS OVER ZIMBABWE, AND SHOWED REAL SENSITIVITY TO THE PROBLEMS OF BLACK AFRICA.

BUT IF WE ARE TO BUILD CLOSER TIES TO NATIONS OF THE THIRD WORLD -- ESPECIALLY NATIONS UNCERTAIN WHICH WAY TO TURN, OR FACING SOVIET-BACKED THREATS -- WE MUST HAVE THE TOOLS TO DO THE JOB. OF COURSE, I AM TALKING ABOUT FOREIGN AID.

I BELIEVE WE TEND TO UNDERVALUE THE CONTRIBUTION MADE BY FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO OUR OVERALL NATIONAL STRENGTH. A FEW MILLION DOLLARS IN ECONOMIC OR MILITARY AID CAN OFTEN FORESTALL EVENTS THAT WOULD COST MANY BILLIONS IF U.S. MILITARY FORCES BECAME INVOLVED -- NOT TO MENTION THE POTENTIAL COST IN AMERICAN LIVES.

FOREIGN AID ALSO REFLECTS AMERICAN VALUES IN HELPING OTHERS TO HELP THEMSELVES -- IN GROWING THEIR OWN FOOD, BUILDING ROADS, SEEKING BETTER HEALTH, AND EDUCATING THEIR CHILDREN. DESPITE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP, AMERICANS REMAIN THE FORTUNATE AMONG THE PEOPLES OF THE EARTH. IT IS OUR MORAL DUTY TO STRETCH OUT A HELPING HAND TO THE REST OF HUMANKIND.



I HAVE SEEN IN MY OWN EXPERIENCE THE FOLLY OF DEPRECIATING THE VALUE OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE:

-- WE NEGOTIATED LONG AND HARD TO GAIN ACCESS TO A FACILITY AT BERBERA IN SOMALIA, TO HELP PROTECT OUR VITAL INTERESTS IN THE PERSIAN GULF. THE PENTAGON WAS PREPARED TO SPEND HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO DEVELOP THE FACILITY. YET WE ARGUED CONSTANTLY IN THE BUREAUCRACY AND WITH THE CONGRESS OVER WHETHER TO PROVIDE TEN MILLION DOLLARS IN AID TO SOMALIA, IN ORDER TO STRENGTHEN OUR RELATIONSHIP AND MAKE OUR ACCESS TO THE FACILITY POLITICALLY ACCEPTABLE.

-- WE SOUGHT 75 MILLION DOLLARS TO HELP SUPPORT MODERATE POLITICAL ELEMENTS IN NICARAGUA. BY THE TIME THE MONEY WAS AVAILABLE, THE MODERATES HAD BEEN UNDERMINED AND THE GOVERNMENT WAS ALMOST HOPELESSLY DEPENDENT ON CUBA.

-- TIME AND AGAIN WE SOUGHT MODEST AMOUNTS OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC OR MILITARY AID, ONLY TO BE THWARTED BY SO MANY CONGRESSIONAL RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS THAT IT BECAME IMPOSSIBLE FOR AID TO ARRIVE IN SIGNIFICANT QUANTITY, ON TIME, AND EFFECTIVELY. SOME OF THESE CONGRESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS ARE MERITED; BUT TOO MANY ARE SIMPLY A LEGACY OF VIETNAM-ERA FEARS OF RUNAWAY U.S. INVOLVEMENT AND, IRONICALLY, THE TEMPTATION TO TELL OTHER COUNTRIES HOW TO RUN THEIR AFFAIRS.

IT IS PAST TIME WHEN WE SHOULD UNDERSTAND THE REAL IMPORTANCE TO OUR NATION -- POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND MORAL -- OF A STRONG FOREIGN AID COMMITMENT. AND IT IS TIME THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD BE APPROPRIATED A SIZEABLE CONTINGENCY FUND FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID FOR WHICH HE SHOULD BE FULLY ACCOUNTABLE TO CONGRESS, BUT WHICH HE CAN SPEND TO MEET UNFORESEEN NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES. MEASURED IN TERMS OF RELATIVE AMOUNT, NO MONIES APPROPRIATED BY CONGRESS ARE LIKELY TO MAKE A MORE DIRECT AND DECISIVE IMPACT IN ADVANCING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS. AND ECONOMIC AID TAKES ADVANTAGE OF OUR STRENGTH IN AN AREA IN WHICH THE SOVIETS REALLY CAN'T COMPETE -- AND WHERE WE, NOT THEY, REPRESENT THE FUTURE FOR HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF THE WORLD'S PEOPLE.

U.S. DEFENSE STRENGTH AND EFFECTIVE RELATIONS WITH ALLIES AND OTHER FRIENDLY NATIONS ARE ALL FUNDAMENTAL TO OUR FUTURE. BUT IT IS ALSO OBVIOUS THAT A STRONG AMERICA IS VITALLY DEPENDENT ON A STRONG ECONOMY.


SO THE THIRD PRINCIPLE OF AMERICAN STRENGTH IS THAT WE MUST HAVE A POWERFUL AND INTERNATIONALLY COMPETITIVE ECONOMIC BASE.

HOW TO STRENGTHEN OUR ECONOMY IS THE MOST IMPORTANT AND CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE FACING THE NATION TODAY. THIS IS NOT THE OCCASION FOR ME TO GO INTO DETAIL ON HOW THIS SHOULD BE DONE, BUT I DO WANT TO MAKE A FEW SPECIFIC POINTS THAT RELATE DIRECTLY TO AMERICAN STRENGTH IN THE WORLD.

MOST IMPORTANT, ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE MUST GO HAND IN HAND. IF THE EFFECT OF STRONG MEASURES TO RENEW THE ECONOMY IS TO TURN AMERICANS AGAINST ONE ANOTHER, WE WILL NOT BE STRENGTHENED. IF THE EFFECT IS TO DIVIDE US BY REGION, WE WILL NOT BE STRENGTHENED. IF THE RESULT IS HOPELESSNESS FOR THE POOR AND DISADVANTAGED, HOSTILITY BETWEEN ECONOMIC GROUPS AND RACES AND GREATER POLITICAL EXTREMISM AND APATHY, AMERICA WILL NOT BE STRENGTHENED IN THE WORLD EVEN IF WE INCREASE OUR MILITARY MIGHT.

IN NO ECONOMIC AREA IS OUR SECURITY MORE THREATENED THAN IN ENERGY. WE HAVE BECOME VULNERABLE TO INTERRUPTIONS IN THE FLOW OF OIL FROM ABROAD. WE HAVE BECOME HOSTAGE TO OIL PRICES DICTATED BY OTHERS WHICH FUEL INFLATION AND DAMAGE OUR PRODUCTIVITY AND BALANCE OF PAYMENTS. FOUR YEARS AGO, THIS NATION BEGAN A COMPREHENSIVE EFFORT -- IN CONSERVATION AND PRODUCTION . . . OLD SOURCES OF ENERGY AND NEW -- TO REDUCE OUR GROWING DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN ENERGY IMPORTS, AND TO CREATE THE BASIS FOR CONTAINING ENERGY PRICES IN THE FUTURE. THE PROGRAM IS WORKING. THE FIRST EFFECTS ARE EVIDENT. U.S. IMPORTS OF OIL THE DAY WE LEFT OFFICE WERE ONE-QUARTER BELOW WHAT THEY WERE ONLY FOUR YEARS EARLIER -- THE FIRST TIME THE UPWARD TREND HAS BEEN REVERSED.

IT WOULD BE TRAGIC FOR OUR SECURITY IF THESE EFFORTS WERE NOW REDUCED OR DISMANTLED. THE EFFECTS WOULD BE FELT NOT ONLY IN THE CORROSION OF GREATER INFLATION. A RENEWED INCREASE IN AMERICAN VULNERABILITY TO OIL CUT-OFFS WOULD TEMPT POLITICAL INTIMIDATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES. CURTAILING THE BATTLE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE WOULD UNDERMINE ALLIED SOLIDARITY IN BOTH ENERGY AND FOREIGN POLICY. IT WOULD CHALLENGE OUR CREDIBILITY, BOTH AS A GUARDIAN OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND IN OUR EFFORTS TO KEEP OUR EUROPEANS ALLIES FROM BECOMING TOO DEPENDENT ON ENERGY FROM THE SOVIET UNION.

I BELIEVE IN A FREE MARKET ECONOMY. BUT IT CANNOT ALWAYS ALONG  SAFEGUARD OUR NATION'S SECURITY. IN THE FIELD OF ENERGY INDEPENDENCE, GOVERNMENT ACTION WILL BE REQUIRED IF OUR NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS ARE TO BE PROTECTED. ✓

THIS IS ALSO TRUE AS WE SEEK TO REVITALIZE OUR BASIC INDUSTRIES AND INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY. THERE ARE THOSE WHO DEPRECIATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HEAVY INDUSTRIAL SECTOR OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY. BUT HEAVY INDUSTRY IS VITAL TO CREATING MILITARY POWER. AND THE BLUNT TRUTH IS THAT OUR COUNTRY IS DECLINING IN THE ECONOMIC CAPACITY REQUIRED TO SUPPORT OUR DEFENSE EFFORT.

EACH YEAR AS WE SAT IN THE CABINET ROOM AND DISCUSSED THE PRODUCTION OF MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS, WE FOUND THAT INCREASED COSTS, BOTTLENECKS, AND DELAYS WERE OFTEN DUE TO A DECLINE IN BASIC INDUSTRIAL CAPACITY. THERE IS NOW ONLY ONE FOUNDRY

LEFT IN THE ENTIRE NATION WHICH CAN MAKE THE LARGE CASTINGS REQUIRED FOR OUR NEW MAIN BATTLE TANK. THE HULL OF THE MOST ADVANCED STRATEGIC NUCLEAR SUBMARINE IN THE WORLD -- OUR TRIDENT SUBMARINE -- IS FASHIONED WITH A STEEL PRESS MADE AT THE TIME OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR.

FAILURE TO REVERSE OUR INDUSTRIAL DECLINE WILL SQUANDER A VITAL NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCE -- THE EXPERIENCED MEN AND WOMEN OF OUR MACHINE SHOPS AND PRODUCTION LINES WHO TOO OFTEN ARE NOW UNEMPLOYED OR ARE DRIFTING INTO OTHER LINES OF WORK WHEN THEY CAN FIND WORK. THIS IS NOT A REGIONAL ISSUE, OR ONE ONLY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE, OR EVEN OF OUR OVERALL ECONOMIC HEALTH -- IT IS A MATTER OF BASIC NATIONAL SECURITY. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT, NOT JUST THE MARKETPLACE, TO ENSURE THAT IF EVER AGAIN THE WORLD TURNS TO AMERICA AS THE ARSENAL OF DEMOCRACY, THE ARSENAL HAS NOT BECOME AN ABANDONED INDUSTRIAL PLANT.

IN ADDITION, WE MUST DO ALL WE CAN TO MAKE U.S. INDUSTRY MORE COMPETITIVE ABROAD.

TWO DECADES AGO, FOREIGN TRADE WAS NOT AS VITAL TO AMERICAN STRENGTH. FOR MOST U.S. BUSINESSES, FOREIGN SALES WERE REGARDED LARGELY AS A BONUS TO BE ADDED TO THE HUGE U.S. MARKET.

TODAY THIS HAS CHANGED. THE PERCENTAGE OF OUR GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT TIED UP IN FOREIGN TRADE HAS MORE THAN DOUBLED, AND WE FACE HUGE DEMANDS FOR FOREIGN EARNINGS BECAUSE OF OUR

ENERGY IMPORTS -- EARNINGS THAT CAN COME ONLY FROM INCREASED EXPORTS.

MEANWHILE, HOWEVER, U.S. BUSINESSES ABROAD ARE BEING HANDICAPPED IN PROMOTING U.S. EXPORTS. FOR EXAMPLE, TEN YEARS AGO, IF YOU VISITED ONE OF OUR COMPANIES ABROAD, MOST OF ITS MANAGERS WERE AMERICANS, WHO NATURALLY TURNED FIRST TO OTHER AMERICAN COMPANIES TO SUPPLY THEIR NEEDS. BUT TODAY, IN U.S. COMPANIES ABROAD, YOU FIND NOT AMERICANS, BUT MOSTLY FOREIGN NATIONALS WHO OFTEN TURN FIRST TO THEIR OWN SUPPLIERS -- AS TAX AND OTHER BURDENS PLACED ON AMERICANS DOING BUSINESS OVERSEAS DRIVE THEM OUT OF THE MARKET.

THERE ARE OTHER EXAMPLES WHERE TAX AND OTHER PROVISIONS PENALIZE U.S. BUSINESSMEN LIVING ABROAD AND HAMPER U.S. COMPANIES AS THEY TRY TO COMPETE INDIVIDUALLY AGAINST FOREIGN TRADING COMPANIES WHICH GAIN STRENGTH FROM CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER. WE MUST RE-EXAMINE OUR LAWS TO ENSURE THEY ARE NOT DENYING TO US FAIR COMPETITION ABROAD.

NO INVENTORY OF THE SOURCES OF OUR NATIONAL STRENGTH WOULD BE COMPLETE WITHOUT CITING THE MORAL PURPOSE OF AMERICA. NO SET OF PRINCIPLES CAN GUIDE US THROUGH AN UNCERTAIN FUTURE IF WE HAVE NO MORAL COMPASS OR ABUSE OUR POLITICAL PROCESS.

THE FOURTH AND FINAL PRINCIPLE OF AMERICAN STRENGTH MUST  
BE SUPPORT FOR OUR MORAL VALUES.

IN THE REALM OF NATIONAL SECURITY, THERE ARE THOSE WHO ARGUE THAT WE SHOULD PLAY DOWN MORAL JUDGMENTS AND OBJECTIVES. THEY INSIST THAT WE FOCUS UNASHAMEDLY ON OUR INTERESTS ALONE. ✓

OTHERS WOULD HAVE US SERVE MORAL ENDS IN CRUSADES THAT MIGHT BLIND US TO THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES FOR OUR NATION'S INTERESTS AND WELL-BEING.

I BELIEVE THAT WE MUST SEEK TO RECONCILE THE TWO. IN FACT, IT IS THE DETERMINATION TO DO SO THAT IS PARTICULARLY AMERICAN AND A SOURCE OF OUR STRENGTH. PERHAPS MORE THAN ANY OTHER QUALITY, THIS PENCHANT TO BLEND THE PRACTICAL WITH PRINCIPLE, TO SYNTHESIZE OUR INTERESTS AND MORAL CONCERNS, HAS PLACED US AT THE FOREFRONT OF WORLD HISTORY.

SAFEGUARDING OUR INTERESTS AND VALUES OFTEN REQUIRES ACTIVE AND CREATIVE DIPLOMACY. BUT WE MUST ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT AT TIMES IT REQUIRES THE DEPLOYMENT OF MILITARY POWER -- AS IN THE CASE OF HELPING OTHERS RESIST AGGRESSION AND THREATS TO THE PEACE.

ON AT LEAST FOUR OCCASIONS IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS, WE HELPED TO CONTAIN CONFLICT THROUGH THE SWIFT BUT CAREFULLY LIMITED USE OF MILITARY POWER:



-- WE AIRLIFTED FRENCH, BELGIAN AND AFRICAN TROOPS TO ZAIRE, TO OPPOSE THE CUBAN-SPONSORED INVASIONS OF SHABA PROVINCE FROM ANGOLA;

-- WE SENT SIGNIFICANT QUANTITIES OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO NORTH YEMEN ON SHORT NOTICE, TO HELP THAT COUNTRY TURN BACK AN ARMED CHALLENGE FROM A SOVIET SATELLITE, SOUTH YEMEN;

-- WE PROVIDED OUR MODERN AIRBORNE WARNING AIRCRAFT -- AWACS -- TO SAUDI ARABIA TO HELP PREVENT THE SPREAD OF THE IRAN-IRAQ WAR. WE USED OUR NAVAL POWER TO KEEP OPEN THE WORLD'S KEY SEALANE OF OIL SUPPLY, THE STRAIT OF HORMUZ; AND

-- WE AIRLIFTED A SMALL BUT SYMBOLICALLY SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO THAILAND LAST YEAR WITHIN HOURS AFTER VIETNAMESE ATTACKS. THIS HELPED MAKE CLEAR OUR READINESS TO MEET OUR LONG-STANDING SECURITY COMMITMENTS TO THAILAND, AND SO FAR THERE HAS BEEN NO FURTHER FIGHTING IN THAILAND.

IN EACH CASE, THE PROMPT BUT PRUDENT SUPPLY OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROTECTED BOTH OUR OWN INTERESTS AND THOSE OF BELEAGUERED STATES FRIENDLY TO US IN A WAY THAT WAS CONSISTENT WITH OUR VALUES.

WE ALSO SOUGHT TO ADVANCE OUR VALUES DIRECTLY AND EXPLICITLY. WE TRIED TO ADVANCE HUMAN RIGHTS -- NOT AS AN ACT OF EXPEDIENCY, BUT BECAUSE THESE RIGHTS ARE DEEPLY ENGRAINED IN OUR OWN HISTORY



AND ARE THE ESSENCE OF THE ASPIRATIONS OF MANKIND. AT THE CONFERENCES ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, WE PROCLAIMED TO THE WORLD THE ABUSES AND MORAL POVERTY OF THE SOVIET POLITICAL SYSTEM. WE SAW TO IT THAT THE CRY FOR FREEDOM -- THE CALL OF THE ORLOVS AND SHCHARANSKIYS -- WAS HEARD AT THE BELGRADE AND MADRID CONFERENCES, AND WE PUT THE FULL WEIGHT OF THAT PROCESS BEHIND THE PRINCIPLE THAT THE POLISH PEOPLE SHOULD BE ABLE TO WORK OUT THEIR PATH TOWARDS LIBERTY BY THEMSELVES.

IN THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE EARTH, THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE ARE ALIVE TODAY, AND MILLIONS MORE HAVE REAL HOPE FOR THE FUTURE, BECAUSE THE UNITED STATES, DESPITE STRIDENT CRITICISM, DID NOT TURN ITS BACK ON HUMAN RIGHTS. WE RECOGNIZED THAT OUR OWN STRENGTH AS A NATION CAN BE -- AND IS -- ENHANCED BY OUR STANDING UP FOR THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS.

THIS HAS NOT ALWAYS BEEN EASY. THERE ARE COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES WHOSE STRATEGIC POSITIONS ARE SO IMPORTANT TO US THAT WE MUST WORK TOGETHER EVEN THOUGH WE DISAPPROVE OF THEIR GOVERNMENTS' HUMAN RIGHTS POLICIES. BUT EVEN WHERE WE DO SO, WE MUST NOT LOSE SIGHT OF OUR MORAL PURPOSE. IT IS ESSENTIAL TO THE POLITICAL CONSENSUS SUPPORTING OUR FOREIGN POLICY.



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers 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](http://www.mnhs.org)