

SENATOR MONDALE

SPEECHES AND FLOOR STATEMENTS

HHH endorsement

GIVEN

REMARKS OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE
AFL-CIO CONVENTION
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
SEPTEMBER 24, 1968

The other day I told the delegates to the building trades conference about the remarkable similarity between 1948 and 1968. I'll never forget 1948 because it was the year I became fully involved in politics and I have never stopped since. I remember many of you from that time and you haven't stopped either.

In the spring of 1948 I was working in a very important job at the Fairmont canning factor—I was a pea lice inspector. This is a very rare skill; indeed I am the only pea lice inspector ever to be elected to the United States Senate (it is surprising how seldom this skill comes in handy).

Humphrey was running for the Senate and I just couldn't stay out of the race. I called Freeman and asked to for a minor job—anything—but they had no money. I couldn't take no for an answer and hitchiked to Mankato, set up a headquarters, raised some dough and started the campaign. The headquarters was called the Truman-Humphrey headquarters, but in fact we were working only for Humphrey because I knew Truman couldn't win. (I've never been so smart since)

How could Truman win? We had just had a terrible Democratic convention at which the Southerners had walked out and a new Party, the Dixiecrats, had been formed with Strom Thurmond threatening to take all of the Southern vote.

In addition, the extreme left had also given up on us and had their own party, the Progressives, with Henry Wallace, a popular liberal running for President. The polls were terrible; indeed so bad that Elmo Roper announced he wasn't taking any more—the election had already been won by that dandy from New York, Thomas Dewey.

And Dewey was running a perfect campaign—all of the Eastern Press agreed—with more money than he knew what to do with. In addition they were so far ahead that Dewey wasn't saying anything, wouldn't debate and wasn't making any enemies. Truman was licked—and everyone knew it—except the people.

One of them, I recall, was a farmer named Johnson who lived outside of Mankato. Johnson would come to see me about once a week and ask me what we were doing for Truman. He wasn't as smart as I was—I was in college and read Eastern newspapers—and I would patiently explain that all of our efforts were directed at HHH's election because Truman couldn't win.

I explained it all to him but he wouldn't understand. He came back in a week and I tried once again to get it through his head. Finally after several such conversations—and now within days of the election—he came in madder than ever before.

He said "Listen, young man, I don't know who you are talking to, but I just asked every farmer who came into our country elevator over the past week who he was going to vote for, and every one of them is going to vote for Truman."

The poor fellow just wouldn't understand. I tried once more to tell him that Truman couldn't win.

For at least 10 years I couldn't get close to Mankato without running into Mr. Johnson who would tap me on the shoulder and say "Hey young man, do you remember what I tried to tell you in 1948 about Truman?"

Well Mr. Johnson taught me a lesson which Mr. Truman was also trying to tell us then and told Hubert Humphrey the other day! "Tell the truth, even if it hurts, and you will win!"

Well, Hubert Humphrey is telling the truth and he will be elected President of the United States.

The Southern racists have their anti-union candidate; some are trying to start a fourth party on the extreme left; the Dewey of our day is running an expensive campaign and refuses to debate and won't say where he stands. Only one candidate is talking sense and is telling the truth about us whether we like it or not—and he will be our next President—Hubert H. Humphrey.

There is another important parallel with 1948, and that is the role of organized labor. You were enthusiastically behind Harry Truman then as you are behind Humphrey now, and then and now people were trying to take union votes away.

Then it was Henry Wallace's extreme left-wing crowd. Many ~~were~~ Communists who controlled unions around the country. They were telling the working man that they would do better following the communist line of Joe Stalin. I don't believe the fight was won by what the politicians were saying; it was won by what union leaders, stewards and members were saying to each other in the plants and at job sites across the country. You did your job then and union members across this nation and their families voted overwhelmingly for Harry Truman.

Today there is another effort to take the union vote away; this time from the extreme right. The right-wing racist anti-union American Independent Party, supporting another Wallace, George, is trying to tell Union members and their families that their best interests lie in forfeiting all they have believed to be right and in accepting instead an alien philosophy of hate, bitterness, and violence—and, although they don't say it, by electing George Wallace, who has been a patsy and front man for every bitter anti-union, pro right to work employer in Alabama and in the South.

I know you have spent all weekend discussing George Wallace and his program. Under Wallace Alabama has become a state which has established many records: it has led the fight against unions, decent minimum wage, Unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation laws. Alabama has one of the lowest wage rates, poorest education systems, and highest crime rates in the country; and under him Alabama has become one of the worst places in the country to be black.

With this record he is campaigning throughout our country as "a friend of the workingman." With friends like him, you don't need enemies.

In 1948, a man running a **po**lice state in Russia worked through his henchmen here to try to persuade workingmen that Communism was good for the workingman. But you the leaders of organized labor, beat him in the shops and work sites of this country. Now, in 1968, another person who has gone far toward establishing a police state in Alabama, is trying to argue that he is the workingman's friend and he will be defeated only if you do as good a job telling the true story today as you did in 1948.

I believe only you can do it, because many of your union members and their families have turned off the politicians. They think we have forgotten them; that we are soft on criminals, rioters, and prefer disorder to order.

You know that law enforcement is a local responsibility in this country, and that no states have done less well in curbing crime than Alabama and Maryland. But many of your members do not know this.

You know that under the Johnson-Humphrey administrations more has been done to broaden and strengthen federal crime laws and more support has been passed to help local law enforcement than in all of the years of our nation combined. But many of your members do not.

You know that the appeals we hear to establish "law and order" through naked violence, through intimidating the courts, and by violence visited upon innocent people, will rob this country of our most precious heritage—justice for all—and will result in more, not less disorder. But many of your members do not.

You know that in a free society Order and Progress are inseparable: You must have both or you will have neither.

In short, those who really believe in "law and order" will support their police with better pay, by adding more police who are better trained and equipped; by providing more courts and correctional officers; and by doing far more to rehabilitate the criminal instead of keeping him in cold storage in penal institutions which can often best be described as "criminal factories."

You also know that since the beginning of organized society man's willingness to support the laws of the society of which he is a party depends in part on his stake in that society.

Unemployed, poorly housed, ill-educated, sick, under-nourished, and frustrated Americans—who see wealth and affluence only on T.V.—and who daily feel the whip of racial discrimination—these citizens of the "Other America" are no more likely to respond to shallow appeals for law and order from Nixon, Agnew, or Wallace, than were the founders of organized labor who could not organize because of the sanctity of the "yellow dog" contracts, the wholesale court injunctions against strikes and the inhumane hiring of child labor, or than were the farmers of the late 1800's who found themselves near disaster with no control over their lives.

This is not to condone lawlessness or disorders; it cannot be permitted. But if one is serious about order, he cannot ignore the just needs of millions of deprived Americans either. The issue in the campaign in 1968 is whether we would "rather curse the darkness or light a candle."

Two candidates—Nixon and Wallace—would have this nation curse the darkness; only one candidate, Hubert Humphrey, is asking this nation to light its candle and that is why—with your help—he will be the next President of the United States.

May I make one further comparison with 1948. With your help we not only elected HST we also elected HHH, Blatnik, and three new congressman—Wier, McCarthy and Marshall. And we elected several new state legislators, and then went on to gain control of the Minnesota House of Representatives and of most State offices in 1954, including the office of Governor. We knew then that we must work on all of the campaigns in order to be successful in any of them. We knew then that a candidate for the legislature or Congress will stir up hundreds and sometimes thousands of votes for himself and the candidate for President that nobody else can bring to the polls.

Today I think we are in the same situation—we must work for Humphrey, but one of the best ways of doing it is to support Blatnik, Fraser and Karth—they must be re-elected—and our other candidates for Congress, and we must provide support for the many candidates for the legislature we must elect if the Minnesota legislature is once again going to respond to the needs of the workingman. The top jobs are only as good to us as is the support found in the Congress and Senate and in the legislature. We must carry on all of these campaigns at once, knowing that they are all important and that each campaign helps the others.

I hear from some that they are tired of the fight; tired of the divisions and tired of the bitterness. I confess that I get that way sometimes myself.

But I am also convinced that great progress comes in this nation only after great fights.

I am convinced that the people of this country only support progress by electing those who favor it as President, members of the Congress, governors, members of legislatures and City Halls and School Boards--only when they have become convinced that progress must be made and sacrificed for. Progress by trick is an illusion; progress in our free nation will come only by debate and discussion in a great campaign.

So let us not shirk from the great debate now underway; let's get involved and win it bigger than we have ever won an election before.

Let's do so remembering what John Gardner said not long ago:

"I believe," he said, "that when we are being most true to ourselves as Americans we are seeking a society in which every young person has the opportunity to grow to his full stature; a society in which every older person can live out his years in dignity; a society in which no one is irreparably damaged by circumstances that can be prevented The release of human potential, the

enhancement of individual dignity, the liberation of the human spirit -- these are the deepest and truest goals to be conceived by the hearts and the minds of the American people. And these are the ideas that can sustain and strengthen a great civilization."

HHH support

Speech file - Iowa speech

I am here today to ask for your support for the next President of the United States.

More to the point -- I am here to ask for your support for Hubert Humphrey. Hubert Humphrey will be nominated in August. He will be elected in November. He will be inaugurated in January.

This is good news. It is good news because Hubert Humphrey is the best we have in America today for the FOUR great leadership roles we will ask of him as our President.

An American President is the most powerful man on the face of the earth. He and his office is so powerful that even a failure to exercise the leadership it requires jeopardizes the peace of the world, not to speak of mis-use of its powers.

Let me describe just briefly the four great leadership tasks we ask of our President -- and which we certainly will ask of Hubert Humphrey -- leadership of our people; our party; the Congress; and the world.

An American President must first exercise the moral and spiritual leadership of his people -- of all the people -- of all races, colors, beliefs, on farms and cities, of every social and economic status. He must unify his people and stand for what is best in their dreams and ideals.

He must lead his party -- the Democratic Party -- the party of hope and of progress, the party of movement and movements, the party of reason and radicals, and I might add, the party long accustomed to having the best leaders and best programs.

Third, the American President absolutely must provide leadership to the Congress. All the rhetoric, all the oratory, all the personal magnetism, all the ability to motivate people in the world will only lead to the bitter disillusionment of disappointed hopes if the Congress balks at his leadership. The Congress, under the leadership of the President, must pass money bills, must approve new programs, and must overcome strife and internal division.

And equally important the American President bears a crushing responsibility for averting the terrible scourge of nuclear holocaust. He must lead the free world in its efforts to guarantee peace in the world, and work for an extension of freedom from want, misery, and tyranny for all the peoples of the world.

I submit that the record establishes clearly that Hubert Humphrey has proven his ability as a leader. Let's look at that record.

As a leader in the Congress, he has established an unmatched record of legislative achievement in education, concern for the elderly, civil rights, and as you all know, for agriculture.

Twenty years ago, the Senate subcommittee he headed reported an impacted areas bill that was the first in history to provide direct federal aid to elementary schools.

Hubert Humphrey's proposals for federal scholarships for college students, direct grants to colleges for needed facilities, and federal loans for college students were ultimately incorporated into the National Defense Education Act.

And his concern for youth extends beyond the classroom door. Eleven years ago, he proposed a concept of job training for unemployed youths that seven years later became the Job Corps, and last year, as Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, he directed an effort which turned up 1,400,000 summer jobs for unemployed boys and girls.

One of his final acts as a Senator was to see to it that "Project Headstart", one of the finest measures ever enacted for the underprivileged children, was enacted into law.

The very first bill he introduced as a freshman Senator in 1949 was to establish a program of health insurance for the elderly, financed through the Social Security system.

He has also led the moral climate and attitudes of this nation. He nearly singlehandedly made civil rights a national

issue -- a matter of national conscience in our time -- by speaking out as the voice of conscience of the Democratic National Convention in 1948.

But he also led the Congress in passing laws which at least removed the legal barriers against human rights. In particular, he was the floor manager of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and led his Senate allies through an 80-day filibuster to final victory.

And while we're talking about minority groups, let's talk about Hubert Humphrey's concern for another minority group -- the American farmer. And I can think of no better place to do this than right here in Iowa, the heartland of this nation's farm country.

Earlier this month, two celebrations of the 35th anniversary of federal farm legislation were held on the same day. One was held in the nation's capital, the other was held, appropriately, in Des Moines, Iowa.

You know how important our federal farm programs are. You know how important it is that we keep them, strengthen them, and improve them. And you ought to know how difficult this will be without strong leadership and support from the President, especially in this time of ever-decreasing rural representation in the Congress.

You will need a strong President, committed to parity of income for farmers, committed to equal opportunity and services for all of rural America, and who is committed to provide leadership for American agriculture.

I think you know which candidate is committed to these goals. In his 15 years in the Senate, Hubert Humphrey went to legislative bat for the farmers of this country 144 times.

Over that 15-year period -- 10 of which were spent on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee -- 22 Humphrey farm bills became law. Two of the giants on the list were the Food for Peace Act of 1954 and the Agriculture Act of 1961.

Food for Peace has saved millions of people from starvation and hunger since it was enacted -- and has lifted the burden of crushing market surpluses from the backs of the farmers of this country.

The Agriculture Act of 1961 marked the first upward turn from the devastating farm years of 1952-1960. This Humphrey measure was the keystone of a vigorous offensive against surpluses, low farm income, and rural credit needs, and served as the base of the landmark four-year farm bill enacted in 1965.

But Hubert Humphrey has not stood pat on these achievements, and will provide leadership in building on this base of progress. Ahead lay the challenges of increased farm bargaining power and decent income for family farmers.

Today everybody is talking about polarization in our society -- white against black, liberal against conservative, radical against reactionary, hawks against doves, and on and on. But there is another polarization developing -- which equally impedes progress. And that is the growing tension between rural people and city dwellers. Too often we see good rural people attacking the expenditure of government funds to meet urban problems and to battle the decay of our central city areas. And too often we see people from the large metropolitan areas attacking all farm programs as devices to make wealthy farmers more wealthy -- as payments to farmers for not working and not planting.

This is tragic -- because it does not recognize the stark truth that urban and rural areas are inextricably bound together -- and must sink or swim together. A healthy city depends upon a healthy rural economy. That's the fact.

Consider for a moment what has happened in this country since the close of World War II.

Nearly 3 million farms have disappeared in the wake of a technological revolution that continues to sweep through agriculture.

Fewer farmers mean fewer customers on Main Street. Fewer customers mean fewer stores and service businesses, fewer jobs, fewer taxpayers, and dying communities.

Where have they all gone? Well, nearly 20 million of them have gone from the countryside to the cities. And all too many of them have wound up in the teeming ghetto, where disillusionment, frustration, poverty, discrimination, congestion, and the lack of a sense of community have touched off summer and summer of social unrest.

And by the close of the next quarter century, experts tell us we can expect to find 100 million additional Americans piled up on top of the 140 million already in our cities and suburbs.

And that's exactly what will happen unless we do something to change the trend.

We can do something. The country to city migratory pattern is not inevitable. Empty towns and crowded city ghettos do not have to be. There is no reason to waste 98 percent of our continental land mass as we're doing now.

If we need proof, we need only examine what has happened in the past seven years. Under the impact of New Frontier and Great Society programs the trend has been perceptibly slowed. Rural development programs initiated or expanded by the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations have brought new life to some areas of the countryside, and have slowed the exodus. Your own TENCO, here in Iowa, is a good example of how regional planning, regional mobilization of resources, and optimum use of available Federal programs and services rejuvenated a ten-county area in Southern Iowa.

There are other such examples, scattered across the country, but the progress, heartening though it is, marks but a mere beginning.

What this country needs is a firmly established national policy of rural-urban balance, a national plan to create desirable geographic distribution of economic opportunity. Only in this way can we give all Americans a chance to live where they choose to live. . .and not where they're forced to live in order to make a living.

And we know, from the most recent Gallup Poll, that most Americans do not want to live in the metropolis. They want to live in the country, in small towns or small to medium-size cities.

We need to rebuild and revitalize existing towns and cities and create whole new cities out where there is clean air and pure water, out where Nature is close enough to restore serenity to the human spirit.

We need to put jobs where people want to live.

All of this will require the best of private enterprise, the best of all levels of government, the best leadership. And leadership is what Hubert Humphrey offers the American people and the Democratic Party.

We desperately need strong leadership in the days ahead.

We can have it -- and I ask you to join with us in assuring it for all of us.

Thank you.

GILLIGAN SPEECH

Mr. Chairman and friends.

Autumn evenings after dinner are good times to relax and dream a little. I would like to invite you to settle back and let your minds wander a bit toward the future. Specifically, I invite you to picture a scene: the year 1984; the place, a Cleveland high school classroom where students are discussing George Orwell's famous 1984, and what it means.

These students are as amazed at the book as we are today. For this book, with its vision of mindless men living in an automated, regulated society, seemed science fiction to the young people in that room as it does to us today.

The teacher then skillfully turned the discussion toward history. What was it, she asked, that kept this country from turning into George Orwell's nightmare. The students sat back in reflection. Some frowned, perceiving this was an indirect test on the history chapter she had assigned the previous day.

Nevertheless, the answers began to come, slowly at first, then faster.

America had been in danger of fulfilling Orwell's prophecy, the students agreed. One bright student pointed out that there had been a particular turning point in the history of this country, a period of about a year when the country was truly on the edge of the abyss. The year was 1968, a year of tumult and upheaval. The assassination of two ~~of the~~ country's greatest leaders seemed the peak of an accumulating wave of campus protests, ghetto riots, and escalating crime rates.

Time and society seemed out of joint. National foreign policy no longer reflected the will of the people. The domestic programs seemed unable to meet quickly enough the needy urban and rural poor. The political system seemed to freeze out the young, minority groups, and others whose ideas and ideals might have promised a renewal of the American spirit.

Political candidates mirrored the fragmented, disputing elements within the society. There was a man named Wallace, whose racism and militarism brought this country the closest it had ever come to confronting the specter of racism in its midst. Then there was Nixon, whose carefully constructed unity image failed to obscure his anti-intellectual, elitist bias, his spineless fear of confronting issues, and the dangerous outbursts of temper that obscured good judgment.

Finally, there was a man whose personal integrity was matched by his imagination, whose courage, vision, and sense of perspective pointed toward peace, unity, good progress, at home and abroad. This man was Hubert Humphrey, who in the past weeks of his campaign, turned the country around. HHH won the election, despite the predictions of polsters and political pundits.

What followed was a renaissance in American life. The President, aided by men like himself in both House and Senate, managed to do what they said they would do. There was peace abroad, and at home progress. The political process did become more inclusive. Old systems began to change. The drive for repression became a surge of support for rehabilitation, as economic development both for ghettos and for rural wastelands accelerated within an expanding economy.

Many kinds of people were leaders of this Renaissance, but none more important than the leadership of the Congress. They were rate men indeed.

They were men who cared more for peace more than war; men not seduced by the simplistic charm of "on-win" strategy arguments.

They were color-blind men who worked with equal vigor for the rights of whites, blacks, browns, yellows, and reds to the opportunities American promised.

They were men who cared as much about progress toward social freedom and justice as they did about law and order for the suburbs.

They were men who knew the difference between liberty and license, but who feared repression as much as they did anarchy.

They were men who had confidence in men, not machines, and who realized that human development required relevant education to the maximum potential for all Americans.

They were men of experience, whose breadth of vision encompassed cities as well as suburbs, the middle west as well as east and west coasts.

Finally, they were men who neither feared nor catered to any single segment of society--business, government, or the universities--but who instead enlisted all in the quest for means to conquer the social problems confronting the nation.

Who were these men? Men like Don Fraser of Minnesota and John Brademas of Indiana. And there was another name in the history books that meant a great deal to the young people in this Ohio classroom, for this man, was from Ohio himself. His name? John J. Gilligan, the U.S. Senator from Ohio.

Gilligan has shown the kind of man he was, and by statements made during the campaign.

He valued peace: "Discarding judgments about the wisdom of the past," he said "we must now act to secure and enrich our future by bringing the war in Vietnam to a swift conclusion. It is to this cause of early peace that we must devote our best efforts."

He valued law and order but also valued justice: While calling for strengthening police, courts, and penal institutions, he also said "justice should be as I believe it is, our highest objective...law and the machinery of law enforcement cannot be used as a weapon of repression by one segment of the society

against another."

He welcomed the challenges of youth: "We have more to learn from the youth of America than we care to admit... We should welcome their concern, their energy, and their enthusiasm. But most of all, we should welcome their values and the ideals they wish our society to achieve...the keynote of the responsible youth of today is participation...It is how our responsibility to see that abundant opportunities to participate in the democratic process are available to the responsible young people of today."

He was a man who valued people, and who saw the many interrelated needs they had: "We cannot afford to waste any talent in our society," he said. "To develop our human resources is a matter of great national concern...There is no question that the primary domestic issues of our time include education, employment, health, crime, housing, poverty, and related tensions. It is clear too that these problems are closely related - no one of them can be solved without dealing with all the others. The common thread running throughout these issues is the need of people: Their need for dignity in work, dignity in equal opportunity to share in the benefits of our wealthy society, and dignity in their whole way of life."

Senator Gilligan's past experience had prepared him well for the tremendous job there was at hand. He knew the problems of the cities at first hand, having served for seven terms as a member of the City Council of Cincinnati. He already knew what it looked like from the House side of the Congress, having served ably as representative of the First Congressional District in Ohio, and a member of the House Committee on Foreign Commerce.

His voting record during that first session of Congress had set the precedent for his Senatorial record. Gilligan had voted for all of the major health, education, economic opportunity and other bills designed to improve American life that came

before the Congress during his term. As Congressman, he had helped the Congress pass important legislation in fields ranging from Elementary and Secondary Education to Water Resources Planning.

His 1968 Senatorial campaign had showed what a fighter he was. According to the New Republic "Gilligan's historic upset of (Senator" Lausche ... swelled the confidence of the new Democratic-Labor alliance in Ohio."

Those who worked with him knew the fight had been far from easy. Gilligan has seemed particularly threatened in Cleveland at one point by the high registration of Wallace-supporting whites. In fact, in early October, observers had estimated Wallace's support in Ohio as high as 25% of the total.

The New Republic had declared that "Gilligan's dilemma is the toughest," pointing out that to win, he had to somehow gain the support not only of defecting bluecollar workers, but of activist former McCarthy supporters and party union hierarchies.

The same article had gone on to praise Mr. Gillan for speaking out forthrightly against Wallace, and stated what eventually came true and for while many voters had indeed supported Wallace for the Presidency, these same people had also voted for Mr. Gilligan.

But the history book also discussed something else that happened in the last critical weeks of the campaign. And that was the tremendous upsurge in effort that seemed to have begun October 17th after a seemingly routine testimonial dinner for the candidate. Suddenly, the same fire that had burned in Gilligan's spectacular upset of Senator Lausche was rekindled.

Those attending the dinner remembered that tremendous series of television documentaries on Gilligan's life-Silver Star winner, Notre Dame scholar, Xavier University English professor: man immersed in the urban crisis; man who realized there was a generation gap; man who argued that Congress must develop new foreign and

domestic policies relevant to "today's realities." With new enthusiasm, they set out to prove the pollsters wrong. Gilligan was going to win--despite, the polls, ~~dis~~ despite the odds, yet-even despite the way some Ohio voters should go on the Presidency.

And so they tried harder. They raised money, and their voices. They enlisted others in the fight. It was they who did it--with telephone calls, speeches, shoe-leather, and the sheer persuasiveness of people who know they are right, and have the facts to back up their position.

And they did win--and by a health margin at that. Those people had every reason to be proud, not only because of the part they had played in helping Gilligan to be elected, but also because it made them part of what Senator Gilligan was doing. For these same people did not stop with one campaign or one vote. They continued on to carry our similar fights for other men of similar sentiments, and to carry the Gilligan message on issues ~~to~~ families and friends.

These supporters became part of the new renaissance in American life that began that year. For they had found a new focus in their lives.

But now, ladies and gentlemen, I have spun this story long enough. The message of this parable is clear. We are on the brink of Orwell's image.

I believe this evening's dream of ^adifferent future can and must become tomorrow's reality.

This need not be the year and bubble bursts for the Democratic party. This need not be the year the mushroom cloud of defeatism and despair descends upon us.

I am convinced that Hubert H. Humphrey and Edmund Muskie can win at the national level---and that John Gilligan can win in Ohio.

The odds are all against us I know. But polls can be wrong and people can change.

The newspaper and magazines show us the nature of the challenge we feel in every precinct, in every state of the Union. But overcome we can, and overcome we must.

"Gilligan's the name." Humphrey-Muskie need you too.

I know I can count on all of you in this room to join in the fight.

Thank you.



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