

Major ideas take time to gather momentum in a democracy. One of the first things one learns in the White House is both how impressive and strong the Presidency is on the one hand and yet how incredibly weak it is if the American people do not accept and support and understand what it is the President wishes to do. And the only way a President can lead is with a set of priorities that are coherent and understandable and consistent and which the institutions and the American people can follow. Without that, inertia always wins. Our system is built to check and to balance and to slow down and deter. Thus the agenda and priority-setting are essential, and I helped work with the President toward that goal.

Throughout our term, I worked with the Congress to achieve our Administration's legislative goals. And in the process, I learned the meaning of the separation of powers, that concept I learned about at the law school. When I was a Senator, I used to look down Pennsylvania Avenue and say, "How is it that all the power is found in the White House?" And then I went to the White House and I looked down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the Capitol and said, "How is it that all of the power is in the Congress?"

Power is separated between co-equal branches of the government, and good relations between the Executive and Legislative branches are absolutely crucial to effective governmental policy. The President's need for legislative assistance is, I believe, much greater now than it has been for several years, for two reasons -- and it has changed a great deal since I went to the Senate.

First, the power is more widely dispersed today in the Congress than it used to be. Individual members are much more independent from central congressional leadership than in the past, and thus they tend to be more responsive to a local constituent's request than to a general national direction.

Secondly, without any doubt, the President's influence in Congress has declined. I hope that this can be the topic of another discussion, but for some fifteen years now, Presidential leadership has been ravaged by public reaction to Vietnam, by the appalling information that came out in the scandal we call Watergate, by the abuses of intelligence agencies some years ago. And the reaction has been not just to try to correct those problems, but in many ways to impede and undermine the authority of a President that this nation needs to deal effectively with our problems at home and abroad. Today, in the trail of those events, a President's powers are always open to question.

In the last four years the measures we tried to pass were not simple. They involved some of the most complex and controversial issues in American history -- a comprehensive energy program for the first time ever; the resolution of a natural gas pricing and distribution dilemma that had plagued our country for thirty years; the most complex and important arms control agreement ever submitted to the Senate, to name only a few.

One of the classic examples was the Panama Canal Treaties, a very complex measure. When we proposed the Panama Canal Treaties, the first poll that came out said that only eight percent of the American people supported us. Our opponents raised questions about security and foreign policy, and the benefits of the Panama Canal Treaties were intangible -- measured mostly in terms of the grief that we avoided -- and yet they were absolutely crucial.

As a matter of fact, some four or five Presidents of both political parties for fifteen years had tried and failed to pass Panama Canal Treaty legislation. In the end, we succeeded by a narrow vote in the House and by a single vote in the Senate, and I involved myself every step of the way -- meeting with members of the Congress, helping to coordinate the work of our legislative staff, mapping our strategies with the leaders, and presiding over the Senate during crucial moments of our deliberations.

There is one unique aspect of the institution of the Vice Presidency that is often overlooked: He is the only officer of the federal government who breaches the separation of powers, being a member of both the legislative and the executive branches of government.

I knew the Senate. I knew its rules and its methods, its moods and most of its members and was able to help adopt and ratify those treaties.

With the President's encouragement, I also acted as one of his principal spokesmen here and abroad. A President's public education responsibility may be the most important responsibility he has and, when properly conducted, the most significant power a President possesses. Teddy Roosevelt called it occupying "the bully pulpit." The public education role goes to the very heart of a President's capacity to lead and to gain the trust and support that he must have. And any President needs all the help he can get.

I worked to extend the President's reach to the public. I estimated that I traveled nearly 600,000 miles during the four years of my Vice Presidency. I visited nearly every state; met with editorial boards; had interviews -- everything I could do to support our policies.

I would talk often on specific issues like the SALT II accord, that we had to pull down because of the invasion of Afghanistan. I would go on the road for a week, sometimes longer, talking to foreign policy groups and others to argue the case for something that was essential.

Secondly, a President needs political support and, over the last four years, I campaigned for members of the Congress and Senate and others all over this nation. In 1980, I campaigned in the greatest number of primaries and caucuses our party has ever held. If you can believe it, I even ended up in a town that not even Hubert Humphrey had ever been in.

I talked with civic and political leaders around the nation and thousands and thousands of Americans. I hope this too will be the topic of another discussion some time: Most Americans think that campaigns are a time when a politician tells the American people what he thinks and intends to do. But the only campaigns that are worth anything are those in which the politician listens carefully and tries to learn and respond to the needs of the people of this country. And it was through the process of building political support for the President that I was able to gain information, suggestions, advice and insight which I would bring to the President whenever I returned from those trips.

Of all the areas in which I served, one of the most important to me was in the field of intelligence, national security and foreign policy. The President agreed that, in addition to my domestic role, I would be helpful in these areas. I headed several diplomatic missions abroad, starting two days after the Inaugural when I visited the heads of government of the United Kingdom; Belgium, including the NATO and Common Market headquarters in Brussels; Germany; France; Italy; Iceland and Japan. I conducted a wide range of diplomatic missions to 26 countries including Israel; Egypt; Thailand; the Philippines; Indonesia; Australia; New Zealand; Venezuela; Brazil; Panama; Mexico; Canada; Norway; Sweden; Finland; Denmark; the Netherlands; Senegal; Niger; Nigeria; Cape Verde; Yugoslavia; Spain; Portugal; Austria; the People's Republic of China; as well as a visit to speak to the U.N. Conference on Indochinese Refugees in Geneva, and an address to the Conference on Disarmament at the U.N. General Assembly in New York. I received literally hundreds of foreign leaders from all over the world in my office in the White House.

I worked closely with the President's security and foreign policy officials throughout the government. I was a member of a small group which met weekly, the so-called Friday morning Foreign Policy Breakfast, which became a little-noted but extremely important regular meeting with the President at which most of the crucial foreign policy decisions were made.

In addition, I spent hundreds of hours over the last four years in informal meetings, phone conversations and the rest, with the range of officers who make and implement foreign policy. These experiences were very, very helpful to me in permitting me to serve the President, for several reasons.

First, I was privy to all the information bearing on the decisions that had to be made. Secondly, because of the public perception of the role the President permitted me to play, I was able to bring about decisions within our own government bearing upon relations with other nations. You might say, "Well, what is so impressive about getting your own government to decide anything?" If any of you joins government, you will find that the toughest job is to pull different agencies together, to get differing points of view resolved, to get decisions made, to move on. It often is the most difficult of all tasks, particularly when the issues are tough.

Let me give you one example. In the summer of 1979, you will recall, the world viewed one of the most tragic human situations that has been seen in recent history. Thousands and thousands of Indochinese were expelled cruelly and barbarically out to sea in unsafe, overcrowded boats, with inadequate food. We estimated at one time that nearly one-half of them lost their lives before they could reach their destinations.

These refugees were subjected to piracy, which I thought was a thing of the past. They were literally overwhelming some nations -- Thailand, Malaysia -- and moving into the Philippines, down through Indonesia, all the way into Australia and even to New Zealand. It was an absolutely tragic, overwhelming crisis for the civilized world.

We had, coming up, a U.N. Conference on Refugees in Geneva. It was not at all clear that the conference was going to do anything but talk. The Vietnamese had built up a backfire against the success of the conference, and the hope for a successful conference depended on our own government's doing certain things that could enhance our leadership and, because of that, permit us to lead at that conference.

The President asked me to go to Geneva to represent our nation. In the process of planning for that meeting, I discovered there were several crucial decisions that we had to make in terms of funding, in terms of constructing facilities, in terms of coordinating our program with other countries, and, in my opinion, in terms of taking the Seventh Fleet and actually ordering it to go out and pick up these people from the ocean before they drowned.

We were able to get our government to make those decisions. We went to Geneva and, because of those decisions, were able to get the international community to move effectively, quickly, to put unbearable pressure on the Vietnamese to stop them. And now, as you know, there has been a dramatic change and cessation of that problem.

There have been many, many other examples. When I visited China on behalf of the President a year and a half ago, we had normalized relations but it was basically a non-relationship because we had not taken those specific steps in economics and trade and security and so on which would characterize mature relationships between the United States and other major powers.

We were able to make those decisions before we went to China. And I think it's not bragging to say that, as a result of that mission, the United States and the People's Republic of China was enormously enhanced, and we're on a fine and solid basis today.

The same is true of a mission that we took to Nigeria, where we had several outstanding, unresolved, long-delayed issues between our two nations that aggravated relations between the United States and that great country, the richest and most powerful black nation on earth. We were able to resolve those differences. And we entered into a range of agreements that are fundamental in nature.

I hope to point out these things because I hope that future Vice Presidents will be assigned this essential role. There are so many things that deserve and expect high-level, policy-sensitive attention of a personal nature.

A President simply does not have the time to do as much of that as the situation warrants and, if he tried, he could do nothing else. This is one role where a Vice President could be of enormous help.

The appendix is part of the body which once served a useful function but atrophied because, over time, the need for it disappeared. What I have been trying to stress this afternoon is that the Vice Presidency is virtually the mirror image, the opposite and converse of the appendix. Evolution, the growth and ferment of American political institutions, has transformed the Vice Presidency from a vestigial role to a viable and vital one.

For generations the Vice Presidency's unique qualities have all been dormant. But changes in the Presidency have meant that those qualities for the first time are being invigorated.

Over the years, the more intimidating the President's powers became, the less likely he grew to hear frank talk, and that is what the confidentiality of the Vice President's unique relationship can provide. The more the nation demanded a President personally to do, the less time he had to sort through and order those priorities -- and that is what the Vice President's special freedom from line responsibility can help him accomplish.

The more bureaucratic and street-wise the President's own Executive branch became, the less able he was to coax decisions from it. And that is what the Vice President's inherent distance from intra-mural allegiance can help him attempt.

The more complex the Congress became, the less sure the President grew that his legislative program would be acted on -- and that is where the Vice President's constitutional double-identity can be mobilized.

The more dense and intricate the issues facing Americans became, the less easy it was for the President alone to educate and lead the nation -- and that is where the Vice President's electoral mandate from all the people can be put to use.

The more complex and diverse our political life became, the less possible it was for the President to sense the texture that mayors and governors feel and listen to the music that members of Congress hear in their districts -- and that is what a Vice President's experience can help the President learn.

The more the American Presidency was drawn into the life and course of other nations, the less time there was to devote his calendar and presence to each region -- and that is where the Vice President's unparalleled ability to be deputized for foreign missions can extend his reach.

I began this lecture talking about my advice to President Carter. In a sense, the whole matter came full circle. This fall, when I met with Vice President-elect Bush and told him what I thought he should do as Vice President, I said to him then that I thought there was something in the relationship between President Carter and I that was more than personal. Though in the end everything depended on that initial relationship confidence and trust, I believe there were some institutional lessons to be learned about what we had done -- and I offered some of those lessons to Vice President-elect Bush in the form of advice. A few weeks into the new Administration, I believe Mr. Bush and President Reagan are showing every sign of understanding the potential of the Vice President's office, and I commend them both.

The advice I gave to Mr. Bush is what I would give to any future Vice Presidents.

One. Advise the President confidentially. The only reason to state publicly what you have told the President is to take credit for his success and try to escape blame for failure. Either way there is no quicker way to undermine your relationship with the President and lose your effectiveness. A President should not and will not tolerate it.

Secondly, don't wear a President down. He should be bright enough to catch your meaning the first time. Give your advice once and give it well. You have a right to be heard, not obeyed. A President must decide when the debates must end, this nation must move on, and you must be a part of that decision-making process.

Third, as a spokesman for the Administration, stay on the facts. A President does not want and the public does not respect a Vice President who does nothing but deliver fulsome praise of a President. He should want and the people respect sound, factual, reasoned arguments on his behalf. This office that I have held is important enough not to be demeaned by its occupant delivering obsequious flattery.

Fourth, understand your role as a spokesman. It's important, but always understand that you probably can't support every idea that comes out of an Administration. A wise President who values his Vice President will not make the mistake of forcing the Vice President to speak for something with which he fundamentally disagrees.

Fifth, avoid line authority assignments. If such an assignment is important, it will then cut across the responsibilities of one or two Cabinet officers or others and embroil you in a bureaucratic fight that would be disastrous. If it is meaningless or trivial, it will undermine your reputation and squander your time as most Vice Presidents have found. I can give several examples of duties that were offered that I turned down. One day the President announced that I was in charge of Africa. I declined. There were sighs of relief all through Africa and it wouldn't work, in my opinion, because, first of all, the personnel, the skills, the experience required to handle that were clearly beyond anything a Vice President could or would want to assemble. In addition, the skills in the State Department and elsewhere are superb and there is absolutely no reason why a Vice President could not work cooperatively with the existing agencies where he can be helpful in achieving these results -- and that's what we did. Another time it was suggested that I was going to be Chief of Staff of the White House. I turned it down on the spot. If I had taken on that assignment, it would have consumed vast amounts of my time with staff work and distracted me from important work.

Sixth, the Vice President should remember the importance of personal compatibility. He should try to complement the President's skills and, finally and in a real sense the most important of all roles, be ready to assume the Presidency. We all know the story of President Truman succeeding to the Presidency on Roosevelt's death with no knowledge of the Manhattan Project which, for a long time, had been underway. President Carter did not want me to need three or four months of on-the-job training in the Presidency if the need arose. As he said so often, he wanted me to be ready the same moment the nation would need me to be ready.

(More)

Political scientists have studied the Vice Presidency and have suggested a number of ways of changing it. Some propose that a Presidential candidate be required to name his running-mate before he enters the first primary. Others say he should leave substantial time open at the convention to let the delegates themselves independently nominate the Vice President. It has been suggested that the Vice President be given statutory or additional constitutional authority -- from running the White House Budget Office; to administering a Cabinet agency; and even this last year's suggestion of some kind of co-Presidency. Others have suggested that the office be eliminated entirely. I don't want to dwell on these specific suggestions, but let me make just two points in closing.

First, I believe that any change in the Presidency which would weaken, diminish, dilute or divide the Presidency is a grave mistake. To say that the increased problems the President faces require a new division of labor in the White House, in my opinion, gets it the wrong way around. The more a President must do, the stronger his office must be. There can be no doubt of who is boss and who is running the executive branch of the government. And the purpose of a Vice President is to add to his strength, not to sap it.

Secondly, I don't believe statutory or constitutional changes are the appropriate way to keep the institution of the Vice Presidency from returning to its centuries of hibernation. Instead, I think it's the force of evolution, the marvelous, resilient, adaptive energy of our free political system that is the more appropriate engine of change.

There is much in our modern government that is not part of our original Constitution. The political parties, the primary process, judicial determination, even the Presidential news conference -- all of these have evolved along with the nation.

And so have the enormous range of responsibilities that fall on a President's shoulders. In our century, as the President's powers have grown, so has his responsibility for the prosperity of our economy, the stature of our country overseas, the health of democracy abroad, and peace in the world. In recent years, the American President found himself the focus of rising expectations, the target of mounting demands. John Steinbeck put it this way:

We give the President more work than a man can do, more responsibility than a man should take, more pressure than a man can bear. We abuse him often and rarely praise him. We wear him out, use him up, eat him up. And with all this, Americans have a love for the President that goes beyond loyalty or party or nationality; he is ours, we exercise the right to destroy him.

Just as the demands on a President have risen, so -- President Carter and I thought -- could the office of Vice President be used to help him meet them. And in remaking the Vice President's role, we established a new tradition. I hope and I believe that we have broken new and significant institutional ground that has served and will serve our nation well.

Now, you may be wondering, now that I have sketched all the ground that has been broken, the duties that I have performed and the success that we have achieved, how is it then that we lost the election?

I have the answer but I am out of time.

Thank you.

###

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

February, 1981

MINNEAPOLIS, Feb. 24--Following is the edited transcript of a lecture by former Vice President Walter F. Mondale on the Sources of American Strength delivered under the auspices of the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota. The lecture was delivered at Macalester College here.

Tonight I want to do something I've done very rarely in my life, as a matter of fact, only once before, and that is not give a speech, but rather what in the academic community we call a lecture. I used to be amazed at how boring professors could be until I gave my first lecture last week -- and now I understand. I want to go into some depth on one of the most central issues bearing on American life and that is, what is American Strength all about. People have conflicting views on this issue and different ideas on what it takes to enhance it. At a time when our government proposes to make a massive reallocation of resources with one goal being to increase our strength, it is important for us to stand back to see whether there is a definition of American strength on which we can all agree.

Tonight I speak, having been blessed by the people of Minnesota and by the people of this country to have a range of experiences that few people in America have been privileged to have. I served for twelve years in the Senate and then I was privileged to serve four years in the second highest office in our land. Every morning I saw the President's Daily Brief, the same secrets as the President reads all day long. For four years, I saw the same data, the same information as the President. I sat through all the serious discussions about our defense, our security, our military and our intelligence budgets. I traveled over much of this earth in the last four years. I counted it up the other day -- to 26 nations, some of them more than once -- in Asia, in the Pacific, in the Middle East, in Europe, in Scandinavia, in Africa, in Central America, in Latin America, the People's Republic of China and the rest.

Tonight I want to talk about national strength based on what I hope I've learned, and can contribute to that discussion. During the recent Presidential campaign, we vigorously debated what was meant by 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 the history of our nation, and especially in the events of this century which called forth the United States to play a critical role among the nations on earth. With each succeeding generation, 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 historical continuing process, for it literally destroyed a quarter century of consensus about American power and foreign policy. And the students at Macalester now, I'm afraid, do not know what Mac and all the better campuses and communities went through during that war. The toughest speech I ever gave in my life -- I gave right under that basketball hoop to a crowded angry group of students and citizens from this area who were troubled about my position on the Vietnam War. I came home to do something that is very hard for us to do in politics -- to stand up and say I was wrong. I was wrong and I had to change my mind because it was wrong. And what I did, millions and millions of Americans did. We had pursued a course which was not sustainable. The tragedy in human lives;

The tragedy in the divisions of American life; the tragedy in terms of the poisoned dialogue on the American campuses was something that polarized this nation for years.

As a consequence, in the years since the national security debate has 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.

-- 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 had become a pitiful, helpless giant.

This polarization created a charged atmosphere which undermined rational discussion and made even more difficult the conduct of a prudent and realistic policy.

I believe and I think most Americans believe that 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.

Tonight I would like to suggest what I believe are the four cardinal principles that could form a 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. I believe they are needed, not just 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, I went to Moscow and spoke before what is called the USA Institute. At that meeting, I told the Soviets that their military buildup was exceeding, in my opinion, 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 who was in power in America, Americans would respond. We know, everyone knows, 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 Cuban 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 in 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 effort. 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 Israeli-Egyptian 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 in my opinion three requirements.

First, we must have a clear strategy for spending additional defense dollars that takes advantage of our technological strengths, and I don't know of any field that is more complex and difficult to master and understand than the technology of modern weaponry. And we must take advantage of the most advanced technology -- the precise amount we spend on defense may not be as important as how we spend the money.

We could embark for example on a program of matching the Soviet Union man for man, weapon for weapon, and I'm sure it would be a terrible 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 both affordable and reliable.

Many times, that desire to match bulk leads us to do things or tends to lead us to do things which I think wastes our natural and our national resources. One example would be: tanks versus anti-tank weapons. The Russians, the last twenty or twenty-five years, have had an unbelievable investment in the production of tanks which are deployed all along Eastern Europe and all along the border of China.

We could have matched them tank for tank. But instead of that, we took advantage of very advanced U.S. technology and have deployed some 150,000 extremely effective anti-tank missiles and we continue to deploy them five times faster and for less money than the Soviets do in deploying tanks. This is one example, I can give you many others of the importance of continuing to insist that we take advantage of Americas advance high technology.

The second requirement of a rational defense is to complement our defense efforts by seeking to restrain the overall military competition with the Soviet Union. Every Administration in the last 20 years 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. 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 this agreement fails. In Europe, we decided with our 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: the fact of it is, 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 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 ten years from conception until it is ready to be used. The strengthening of our defense demands a long-term commitment by the American people. And to sustain that commitment, the American people must believe that the needed sacrifices for defenses 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, the handicapped, the 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.

The need for a strong defense leads directly to the second principle of American strength, and that is this: we must build our relations with our 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 strengthen NATO, to put in place a Long-Term Defense Program to increase and enhance the ability of NATO as an alliance. We have agreed on a target of three per cent real growth in the strength of NATO.

It is vital that this commitment 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 areas -- 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.

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 alone wields the stick.

Japan is the anchor of our strength and security in East Asia. Japan gains immeasurably from its security relations with us, yet it must now too assume a greater role in preserving its own security. 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. 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.

Finally, we have the matter of relations with the third world, which by the year 2000 will contain three-quarters of all humanity. They are also crucial to the security of the United States -- and potential a source of enormous strength. We recognized that fact when we took the politically very unpopular step 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 I think a new 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. And here, I am talking about that unmentionable subject of foreign aid. It may be the single most unpopular item in this years' budget or any budget. I have participated in foreign aid debates now for twelve years on the Senate floor and four years as Vice President, and it brings out the worst in everybody. Nothing is easier than voting against foreign aid. The people who matter don't vote in the United States. And yet in my opinion, if there is one glaring, gaping self-imposed injury to American national strength, it's the failure to have an adequate, sensitive and responsive, prompt way of helping nations who need help. I think 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 forestall events that can cost many billions of dollars if U.S. military forces became involved -- not to mention the loss of lives. Foreign aid, also, when its at its best, reflects America at its best -- in helping people grow their food, build roads, seek better health, educate their children. Despite economic hardships, Americans remain the fortunate among the peoples on earth. It is our moral duty to stretch out a helping hand to the rest of humankind.

I have seen many examples of where the limits on U.S. foreign aid have served to adversely affect, in a crucial way, the security interests of our nation. Not long ago we were negotiating for military bases at Berbera in Somalia to protect our vital interest in the Persian Gulf. The Pentagon was prepared to spend literally hundreds of millions of dollars to develop the facilities. Yet we argued constantly in the bureaucracy and with the Congress over whether we could spend and provide ten million dollars in aid to Somalia, in order to strengthen our relationship and make our access to the facility politically acceptable.

For nearly a year, we tried to get help early after the fall of Somosa in Nicaragua, when there was a chance that the moderate elements of Nicaragua might gain strength and become the dominant force. We were unable to get a penny of help for over a year. And we strengthened enormously the extremist element in Nicaragua because they were able to point to the inability of the United States and others to arrive with the kind of help that would give that economy a chance to grow, get on its feet, and to give the moderates something to argue about. Time and time again, I have seen this happen unhappily to our country.

It is past time when we should understand the real importance to our nation of a strong foreign aid commitment. It is time, in my opinion, that the President of the United States be given a substantial foreign aid fund which he is able to administer himself, subject to reporting to the Congress, of course, and one which the President himself can use swiftly and effectively as a tool of foreign assistance. 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 than a good and a strong program of foreign assistance.

U.S. defense strength and effective relations with our Allies and other nations are fundamental to our future.

But it is obvious as well -- as a third principle of American strength -- that we need a strong and vital economy. When our national economy is in trouble, when we are suffering deep adverse balances of payment, high inflation and high interest rates, and unemployment -- when we are in those kinds of deep, difficulties, we are also adversely affected in terms of our national strength.

Tonight's not the occasion -- I can tell by looking at your faces -- to go into the economics of a strong economy. But let me just make one point -- and that is this: the energy crisis we're in is no joke. It is a threat to the independence of our nation. It is one of the basic sources of inflation in America today. It is as though we had voluntarily closed down half of the U.S. The subtle power of intimidation exerted by certain of the holders of oil, is one that runs through the fabric of international relations today. This nation never before has been short of something fundamental that it must have. Now we are short of oil -- energy -- something we cannot do without. It is a complex problem involving both production and conservation and I won't go into it tonight. President Carter once said it was "the moral equivalent of war." But I'm here to say this energy crisis is still the moral equivalent of war and this nation will not be fully strong until we've solved it.

We need to pay special attention to the need to revitalize our basic industries and to 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 our military strength. Each year as we sat in the Cabinet Room and discussed major weapons production bottlenecks, we found that many of the bottlenecks were due to a decline in basic industrial capacity. There is now only one foundry in America in the entire nation which can make the large castings required for the main battle tank. The hull of our most advanced strategic nuclear submarine -- the Trident -- is fashioned with a steel press made at the time of World War I.

Failure to reverse our industrial decline will squander a vital national resource .

The fourth and final principle of American strength must be the 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.

To be strong, I believe we must 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 required active and creative diplomacy. But we must also recognize that at times it required the deployment of military power -- as in the case of helping others resist aggression and threats to the peace.

Four examples come to mind. I recall when the Cubans working with the Angolans moved into the Shaba province in Southern Zaire - the copper mining area of that country. We moved quickly providing airlift forces for the French, the Belgian and the African troops . We were able to solve that problem quickly.

We sent significant quantities of military assistance to North Yemen. When the South Yemenese were coming in there , obviously with foreign support, we were able to stop that movement in its tracks.

We provided our modern Airborne warning Aircraft -- called AWACs -- to Saudi Arabia to help prevent the spread of the Iran-Iraq war. And we used U.S. naval forces to assure the permanent opening and security of that crucial sealane, the Straits of Hormuz.

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 commitments to Thailand. And I think helped reduce the prospect of further difficulties.

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 sought to advance our values directly and implicitly. We tried -- and I'm proud of this -- to advance human rights all over this earth -- not as an act of expediency, but because those 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 Shcharanskys was heard at Belgrade and Madrid. 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 hope for the future because the United States, despite criticism, did not turn its back on human rights. Time and time again on diplomatic missions I would take to nations which had been committing human rights violations, I would have to blend the combined need to serve our nations interests and to serve American values. And this constant, repeated, unrestrained espousal in a practical and sensible way of American values , I think has contributed enormously to the cause of freedom on earth. And may I say we've not been alone.

We were thrilled by the leadership of the Holy Father this past week in the Phillipines when he stood up for liberty and human justice in that land.

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.

For example, it was imperative to work with the new government of South Korea after the assassination of President Park. But we also worked long and hard -- and ultimately with success -- to save the life of the Korean dissident, Kim Dae Jung.

The basic lesson of our experience in struggling to promote human rights is that the advance of our own moral concerns for humanity, democracy, freedom and justice is profoundly in our national interest. It is a strategic advantage as we contest for support from the developing world and leadership of our alliance.

It is no accident that we are principally allied with democracies and that our adversary is principally allied with totalitarian governments. A world of tyranny would threaten our security. A world where pluralism predominates, where human rights are advanced, where there is freedom of religion, where democracy prevails would not be a world without conflict, but it would be a world safer for Americans.

Coupling our military strength with a sense of justice is not a call for intervention or for use of our might to remake the world in our image. And may I say that I am proud of the fact that we completed four years without engaging American military might anywhere on earth. We have too much faith in the diversity of mankind and the universal thirst for human freedom for that. Our power is not imperial. To be sure, it must be used to advance our security and our interests; but to be true to ourselves, it must also serve in the struggle against oppression and injustice.

Abandoning our values abroad is but the first step of losing them at home. We have seen enough in this century to know that our greatest strength at home is our love for the values involved in our Constitution and in our religious beliefs -- and that our greatest attraction abroad is the beacon those values cast in a world darkened by turbulence and oppression.

Our deep commitment to social justice -- a commitment to give opportunity to the poor and disadvantaged, to care for the old, to end discrimination, to safeguard the family -- this is the rock upon which our nation's true security is to be found. The inner strength that comes from our dedication to social justice makes the United States an inspiration to other nations.

To the young people here tonight who I'm sure often believe that values and beliefs, activities and involvement in trying to achieve our ideals may be irrelevant, let me just tell a little story out of my own life. When I was a student at Mac, official discrimination was permitted throughout this land. There were many states in which state and local laws prohibited blacks and whites and minorities from being on the same buses, in restaurants, from going to the same schools, from having anything to do with each other. We used to debate those issues here at Mac. And

I wondered then whether we ever would make any progress. And I remember during the darkest days of Stalin, that whenever an American diplomat would rise in an international forum of any kind, and criticize the abuses of the Soviet Union within their own country, inevitably and effectively the Soviet spokesman would rise and say what about civil rights and human rights in the United States. And try as you could -- you couldn't get around that corner. They had you. And then we reformed civil rights in America, while we've still got a long way to go -- in the last twenty years

there has been a peaceful, profound and magnificent revolution in this United States . We no longer permit laws that discriminate. And across the board through social and economic legislation we are trying to make up for these past wrongs so that every American, regardless of background of race, religion or color, will have a chance for the fullness of American life. And that is a matter of justice and values here at home. Just recently representing our country, I went to Nigeria, the largest, the wealthiest and most influential black nation on earth, a central player in the whole international scene; incidentally, the second largest supplier of oil to the United States and a great source of strength to our nation. A few years ago we were unwelcome in Nigeria. This past year when I went there, they had just had a free election under a Constitution that was patterned almost identically upon the Constitution of the United States. And wherever I went they said "tell me about this, tell me about that, how do you preside over the Senate?" America had become the ideal -- not the perfect ideal -- but the example that had achieved social justice, an ideal that was so powerful that Nigeria voluntarily and happily established a system patterned upon the example of our nation. And that is the basic lesson about national strength. The rest is important, but to the young people here tonight, let me say this: it is our ideals, it is our belief in democracy and justice and human rights, our caring and compassion, that is the greatest strength of this country. And let's never forget it.

# # # #

MINNEAPOLIS, March 2--Following is the text of a lecture by former Vice President Walter F. Mondale delivered under the auspices of the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota. The lecture was delivered on the College of St. Thomas campus here.

I am delighted to speak this evening at the College of St. Thomas -- this outstanding independent college of learning. For almost a century this college has had one overriding goal -- to teach the values that make good citizens. You have taught generations of Minnesotans and other Americans to respect hard work, to believe in God, to be useful to society, to pray for peace.

But the secret to your strength is that while the values have remained the same, the methods, the curricula, the people, have always kept changing. Today St. Thomas is just as devoted as it was when Archbishop Ireland founded this college to quality education -- but today that education stresses management as well as classics. You're just as determined to train for careers -- but today the careers include business and law and medicine as well as the priesthood. You're just as concerned with opening the minds of young people -- but in the last ten years you've opened your doors to the elderly as well. You're just as tough about who you'll admit -- but in the last four years this has become a school of women as well as men.

Here in St. Thomas your values are rooted in the traditions of this campus, but your outlook is widened, and I believe those same values are strengthened, by a vision of the future.

In a sense, the challenge you have been meeting on this campus every year is the one that confronts the progressive community today. We, too, as progressives, must adapt to changing times. We, too, must do so in a way that remains true to our values. And tonight I want to talk about where the progressive tradition comes from, what it faces today, and where we should go from here. And then I'd like to hear your opinions and take questions.

What does it mean to be progressive?

It means to have hope -- not the idle hope of sheer optimism, but the active hope of a free and fortunate people. It means to believe in this country -- not just because it is a good country, but because each generation has made it better. It means to have faith in our destiny -- not just because we are strong and fair but because we as a free people have the power to make it still stronger and more fair. Most of all it means to fight for the dignity and independence of individuals. When dignity is assailed by poverty or discrimination -- progressives call for social justice. When independence is overwhelmed by power, progressives call for liberation.

These are basic progressive values. They are unchanging. At different times they serve different causes, depending on whose dignity is threatened, and where the threat is coming from.

In the 1930's, when the modern progressive tradition began, it was ordinary working families whose dignity was threatened, and the threat came from economic forces larger than individual families could handle. Hubert Humphrey later recalled those years, when as a young man in the depression, he helped his father keep the family drugstore from closing. He said this:

"I grew up on a time when the poor were not those who had always been poor. They were once men and women of substance -- and they were struck down as if they had been rolled over by a mighty tidal wave.

- MORE -

I will never be able to forget it. I know that out of those days, experience came that helped shaped legislation later on. I was the original author in the Congress of the Job Corps: It came about because I remembered the Civilian Conservation Corps, and I remembered the young men who walked the railroad tracks in the days of the depression. I remember that many of them were considered to be useless and worthless by some of their more fortunate contemporaries, only to have them become generals, and governors, and businessmen, and labor leaders, and professors. I have not forgotten."

There were millions of others who never forgot. For all over America people lost their jobs, their farms, their lifetime savings. In response to this loss of basic security, progressives turned to government to shore up people's lives. And on the foundations of those New Deal programs, modern American society was built -- collective bargaining, social security, strong unions, the REA, the TVA, the CCC, and the rest of the glorious Roosevelt alphabet.

But if modern progressive politics were born in the dustbowl days, they matured in the Great Society days. For by the 1960's the economy was prospering, unions were strong, jobs were increasing. It was not ordinary working families whose rights stood the greatest threat, but the very poor -- whose independence was stripped by poverty; the sick -- whose health was lost to expensive costs; the minorities -- whose dignity was robbed by discrimination; the very young -- whose future was foreclosed by substandard education; and the old -- whose years of retirement were tarnished by struggle.

These were the people whom progressive government could help. And help them we did, Democrats and Republicans alike, with the most ambitious and compassionate legislation in our history -- Medicare and Medicaid, Model Cities and EDA, Title 1 for our schools and housing for the poor, civil rights, voting rights, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968.

I was privileged to serve Minnesota in the Senate during those heady days. We were able to cut taxes and increase revenues, fund new programs and add new jobs, with hardly any inflation at all. For it was a time of rapid economic growth. We were able to forge a national consensus behind this historic effort at social progress. For the progressive cause had bipartisan backing. To paraphrase what King Henry said of St. Crispin's Day at Agincourt -- We few, we happy few who were there, will never forget what feats we did that day.

But, sadly, St. Crispin's Day did not last long. Three stages of twilight fell, each eclipsing the progressive vision with an ominous shadow.

First came the Vietnam War. It distracted the nation from the progressive agenda. It set off an inflation that stunted the economic growth so essential to progressive generosity. And it divided the constituency so essential to progressive legislation.

Next came Watergate, in whose scandals were revealed gross abuses of power by those in Washington. A progressive spirit that relied on government action could not survive the suspicion of government which then ensued. A progressive platform that called for bold leadership could not fare well when our highest officials sapped our confidence in leadership itself. A poor person, a sick person, a mistreated person who turned to Washington for help found that Washington was far beyond help itself.

Third came our current economic difficulties. Back in the 1960s we had no inflation to speak of, no energy crisis, no OPEC, no high unemployment, no huge budget deficits, no high interest rates. Today we have all of these troubles, and they are all connected. It's one thing to share resources that are expanding, as we did in the progressive 60s. It's another to divide up resources that are constant or contracting, as progressives have harshly learned in the 70s.

Some would look at these three changes and say that progressives have taken a licking. I look at them and believe that progressives have learned some lessons. If our constituency was split apart, progressives must work at building new coalitions. If people see government as the problem, progressives must make government responsive again. If economic stalemate has stalled the progressive movement, then progressives must concentrate first of all on restoring growth and stability to the American economy.

Today, just as on so many days in our past, we stand at a new threshold. And the test of progressive faith will not be met by turning backwards, but by crossing the threshold into the future. That is the strength of the progressive tradition -- again and again facing up to new needs. Ours is not an opportunity to abandon old values, but to give them new life.

Indeed it is already happening. In the last few years, traveling around this country, talking with Americans from every walk in life, I have learned that progressive-thinking people are already looking at problems in ways that are completely new. Let me briefly run down the ten new directions of progressive thinking.

One: Progressives are taking inflation as seriously today as we have always taken unemployment.

Inflation hurts most the people living in the margins of society about whom progressives have always cared most. And beyond that, our support of civilized, humane, effective anti-inflation policies is the best way to create the climate of generosity which progressive programs need to survive.

For nothing can more surely transform a decent and compassionate people into a nasty, illiberal society than an inflation rate that destroys savings, turns the work ethic upside down, sours the dream of home ownership, and clouds people's hopes for their children. We have seen it happen to other societies; we are determined that it not happen to ours.

Two: Progressives realize they have a crucial stake in the energy crisis.

An America dependent on foreign sources of oil not only suffers intolerable inflation: Its policies are potentially vulnerable to intimidation from other nations. No generation of Americans has ever permitted our nation to buy what we need by selling what we believe. There is a line that connects the strength of NATO and of the entire industrial world, and today it is a thin line of oil tankers stretched around the globe. It has taken some heartache, and much education, to see that, but today progressives are supporting the programs we need to break the grip of energy dependence.

Three: Progressives have earned their credentials in the National Security debate.

In our past, it was the progressives above all others who stood up against totalitarian threats to our security. Interventions where our interests were not at stake, and intelligence abuses where our Constitution was jeopardized, were events of the past we opposed on moral, economic, and strategic grounds. But we stand second to no group in America in insisting upon an inviolable national security. And to maintain that strength, we should depend on the superior technology of American weapons.

Four: Progressives have learned the lesson of Vietnam.

No one suffered more than progressives during that tragic era. And today no one has a greater responsibility than progressives to draw the distinction between the legitimate use of power to protect legitimate American interests, and the indecent use of intervention in contradiction of American values. Today we have retired the idea that progressives are innocents incapable of recognizing, or confronting, a barbarian.

Five: Progressives are now worrying as much about implementing programs as they are about passing them.

From our hearings, from our mail, from our personal experience, we have learned that there is nothing intrinsically heartless about the public's demand to get their money's worth from social programs. There is nothing inherently boorish about the taxpayers' feeling that they are paying more and getting less. Complaints about waste and inefficiency are not all of them thinly disguised assaults on progressive values. Horror stories about red tape, paperwork, regulation, and bureaucratic meddling are not all of them crafty attempts to elude the reach of social justice. Progressives understand that if they fail to make programs effective today, they could fail to make programs at all.

Six: Progressives have rediscovered the world beyond Washington.

Hubert Humphrey got his start as a mayor: Those who inherit his tradition have also inherited his background. We have a federal system of Government: And we have demonstrated our belief in it by building our programs on all of its levels. We have a private competitive economic system: And we have proved our confidence in it by enlarging its capacity to create permanent jobs. We have a pluralistic and diverse society: And we have shown our respect for it by treasuring all the voluntary and civic and philanthropic and non-profit commotion that has enlivened our nation since the start.

Seven: Progressives have shaken the mythology of welfare-state dependency.

The distinction between the "worthy" and the "unworthy" poor is as old as it is pernicious. It is the origin of such illiberal caricatures as the freeloader on unemployment insurance, the welfare queen, and the T-bone steak purchased with food stamps. And in illiberal hands, the images become the blunderbuss with which the whole edifice of social justice is attacked.

But it is not enough to deplore the mythology: It must be punctured, and that is what we have done.

In the last four years I have been all around the country arguing that the purpose of social programs is not to foster dependence -- it is to give people the education and training and assistance to help them become independent of government. Our purpose is independence -- national independence, and personal independence. And everywhere I've been, people have responded to that idea.

We are a work-oriented, savings-oriented, and achievement-oriented society. Today, if a good program designed to promote work and independence acquires a record of creating dependence, it is the task of that program's friends to fix it -- before its enemies destroy it.

Eight: Progressives have become more pragmatic about their goals, more frank about their failures -- and better advocates for their successes.

Nothing is more appealing to reactionaries than the idea that no progressive program has ever worked -- because it is a quick hop from the failure of all progressive legislation to the dismantling of the whole enterprise. The fact is that the record is, at worst, a mixed one. Because progressives have acknowledged that, we have gained ground, not lost it.

We have learned to set more realistic goals for our programs. We have learned to protect the good programs by fixing or pruning back the bad ones. And at last we are beginning to proclaim our programs' successes with the same zest we marshalled to enact them in the first place.

It happens, for example, that federal education programs are making an enormous difference in student achievement. Head Start, Title I, Upward Bound, vocational education, student aid: They're all working, whether the measure is basic skills test scores, minority enrollments, or job placement. So long as that story remains veiled, those programs remain vulnerable.

Nine: Progressives are worrying more and more about quality.

We have two generations of concern for access and equity and equal opportunity to our credit. That struggle for justice is not over -- not for minorities, not for women, not for the poor or the handicapped or the elderly. But progressives now understand they have nothing to lose from making common cause with excellence -- and everything to gain.

When you emphasize access, as we must, everyone benefits, because you broaden the pool of talent that can serve the nation. When you emphasize excellence, as we must, everyone benefits, because the best is not the enemy, but the ambition, of the good.

Every time I've talked about excellence around the country, I sense that I've touched deep cords, and nowhere more so than on college campuses. It is from first-rate laboratories that the industry and jobs of the '80s and '90s will arise. It is from research at the frontiers of knowledge that the defenses of the next century will be fashioned. It is scholarship and art of uncompromising distinction that will capture our ideals and self-images for generations to come.

Ten: Progressives are becoming reacquainted with their constituents.

Two generations of progressive efforts have altered the American landscape. Millions have been pulled above the poverty line. Millions who once knew only drudgery now enjoy some of the rewards of American life -- a decent income, a measure of leisure, a sense of security.

People do not cease to count once they leave the shadows of disadvantage and injustice. It is not illiberal for a middle-income family to want help with sending a child to college, or relief from confiscatory taxes; it is not inappropriate for progressives to advocate programs to help them. We progressives are rebuilding our coalitions, and we are reflecting changes in our constituency by evolution in our agenda.

The transformation of the progressive tradition is not complete, and its renewal is far from perfect. But our tradition is stronger today than it has been in a long while because it has taken a leaf from its own book: We ourselves have adapted to changed times -- with the same vigor we have urged those times to change.

That unique progressive quality -- of always standing ready to adapt and change and carry our values into the future -- is what equips progressives to lead this nation. The future is here, with all its urgent new needs. And the decision progressives must make is whether we will face it and lead, or leave the leading to others.

As we find our way through the thicket of the '80s -- wrestling with energy, fighting inflation, making government responsive, rebuilding coalitions, and all the rest -- let us remember why it was we set out on the journey in the first place. Hubert Humphrey put it this way:

"The answer is reflected by the broken glass of our cities. It is glistening in the tears of a hungry child. It is standing in the stillness of the unemployment line. It is whispered by the dying man whose disease we could have cured. It is echoed by the family whose home we could have saved. It is running in the refuse in our lakes and streams and carried in the air around us. It is waiting wherever bigotry or injustice still survive, and wherever a man or woman is prevented from becoming the best that is in them to be."

That's how we got started. That's why we must go on.

#

#

#



# 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)