

• **Fort Pitt Chapter, Association of the United States Army, May 31, 1961**

General Hay, Members of the Fort Pitt Chapter, Association of the United States Army:

On June 6, 1944, the United States undertook, on the beaches of Normandy, one of its greatest military adventures on its long history.

Twenty-seven years before, another American Army had landed in France with the historic declaration, "Lafayette, we are here."

But on D-Day, unlike the situation in 1917, the armed forces of the United States came not to reinforce an existing Western front, but to establish one.

D-Day was a team effort. No service, no single Allied nation could have done the job alone. But it was in the nature of things that the Army should establish the beachhead, from which the over-running of the enemy in Europe would begin.

Success, and all that it meant to the rights of free people, depended on the men who advanced across the ground, and by their later advances, rolled back the might of Nazi tyranny.

That Army of Liberation was made up of Americans and Britons and Frenchmen, of Hollanders, Belgians, Poles, Norwegians, Danes and Luxembourgers. The American Army, in turn, was composed of Regulars, National Guardsmen, Reservists and Selectees, all of them reflecting the vast panorama of American life. This Army was sustained in the field by the unparalleled industrial genius and might of a free economy, organized by men such as yourselves, joined together voluntarily for the common defense.

Beyond the victory achieved by this combined effort lies the equally dramatic fact of achieving Western security by cooperative effort.

From Turkey westward to Hawaii, the North Atlantic nations remain to this day bound in a common effort, an effort dictated by a common destiny.

As on D-Day, 1944, we stand or fall on our ability to sustain and to strengthen our own internal unity, the unity of the North Atlantic Alliance - our other important Alliances - and the United Nations. Having established as our goals a lasting world peace with justice and the security of freedom on this earth, we must be prepared to make whatever sacrifices are demanded as we pursue this path to its end.

Regardless of race, creed, political conviction or economic status, we must sustain this unity of purpose. Without it, we would be swept away. With it, and with the help of Almighty God, we shall attain our goals.

Thank you.

• **Republican Congressional Testimonial Dinner, National Guard Armory, Washington, DC, June 1, 1961**

It is good to be again at a Republican reunion. This time I come as a recent graduate of as tough a political cram course as anyone could devise - six years with an opposition Congress. Any President with that experience is bound to have learned more about sheer politicking than he dreamed possible. I offer this thought tonight - that we see to it - starting now - that in 1962 we Republicans afford my successor the same opportunity for political enlightenment during his final two years in office.

Seeing here so many old friends, I am tempted to talk of years gone by. But I am not here tonight to dwell on the past.

Not that the past isn't useful. It sharpens perspective, warns of pitfalls, and helps to point the way. But we must never let it divert our attention from the future.

We have a right to be proud that these past eight years, in matters both foreign and domestic, we kept faith with the American people.

So I do not suggest that we sit idly by as our past accomplishments are misrepresented. Neither should we allow others to point with self-serving pride to programs that we long ago proposed and tried vainly to get

them to support. But this is simply “keeping the record straight.” While important, it has no forward thrust.

I consider our Party’s record, at home and abroad, an excellent springboard into the future. We can gladly leave that record to the verdict of history. Time will be far more objective and accurate than present-day politicians in judging the past eight years.

Let us, then, leave the past behind and concentrate instead on our present and future.

Of course, our first duty is to make emphatically clear the views that we hold on the country’s needs. This is not simply our right, it is our obligation.

For we must not forget, or let others forget, that only seven months ago we were the Party that made gains in both the Senate and House of Representatives; we were the Party that received more popular votes than any other Party in America; it was our national ticket that won a majority both of the States and of the Congressional Districts. To be sure, the Presidency was denied us by a paper-thin percentage. But from tens of millions of Americans we have a clear mandate to speak out forcefully on the great issues of the day.

I have heard talk about the “role of the loyal opposition.” This implies that we should now have a different purpose than when the White House was in our hands. But, my friends, we Republicans do not change our ideals, our aspirations or our programs, just because the other party is temporarily in power. We continue to stand for what we believe is wise and sound; we continue to fight against the unwise and the unsound.

Indeed, anyone, in either party, who resorts to irresponsibility when out of power does not deserve the responsibility of power. As Republicans, our checkpoints are simply these: “What is best for our country - and what is the best way to carry it out?” We need no other yardsticks in power or out! We want America to know that we are not simply Republicans, but also that we are right.

Indeed, the greatest service our own - or any political Party - can render the American people is to be a trustworthy vehicle for strengthening freedom in a world at peace.

As to this, we have no better guide than the statesman who died ten years ago this April - Arthur H. Vandenberg. He, too, was of the minority. Yet he powerfully influenced the creation of the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, and the North Atlantic Treaty.

Arthur Vandenberg told us in January 1945, “We cannot drift to victory. We must have maximum united effort on all fronts. We must have maximum united effort in our councils...”

In this, he still speaks for me, and he speaks for you.

His advice needs attention today. Not only because there is great ability in our Party -- not only because we have proven executive competence -- but also because this Republic cannot exclude anyone of worth from its national security deliberations.

Everyone of us appreciates the gravity of the world problems facing our nation tonight. We Republicans encountered similar problems when the power and responsibility were ours. All Americans realize that only one individual, the President, can speak for our country as it strives in the world arena to solve those problems. As the President attempts to preserve our freedoms, as he seeks to strengthen peace, as he confers with foreign leaders whether friendly or hostile, he has the hopeful and sympathetic good will of all loyal Americans, regardless of Party. History will adjudge the wisdom of his efforts. But we cannot allow, today, the nation’s basic unity of purpose to be in doubt.

By the same token, Republican leaders must frankly, but always constructively, speak their views. And Republicans rightly expect to be consulted before, not after, the hour of decision or the moment of action.

I was proud when, in recent crises, members of our party did not attempt to criticize, condemn or belittle those in authority. This we did even though some seemed disposed falsely to blame us. We did not scurry about in search of a “scape goat.” We decry anyone’s efforts to do so. Here I pay my personal tribute to the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, all the members of which body I have known long and well. It is my conviction that America possesses no group of men more dedicated, more patriotic and more capable in meeting grave responsibility.

I say again that Republicans, while dutybound not to withhold justified criticism, stand always ready to consult and advise. We have had some experience in careful and effective planning. In Iran, off Formosa, in Vietnam, in Lebanon, in Guatemala and elsewhere we have known - and met - similar crises.

We believe, measuring today’s international situation, that our nation’s needs include these:

A widespread understanding of the present dangers we face.

The will to unify ourselves against those dangers.

Steadiness of leadership, care in planning, prudence in word, firmness in deed.

Wisdom to support the necessary, and the character to defer the merely desirable.

A strong, balanced defense, adequate to the threat but not wastefully over expanded.

Assistance to emerging nations determined to help themselves in a society of liberty.

Alliances that will move forward the defenses of freedom.

Realistic progress in arms control and peaceful settlement of disputes - progress which, for the sake of all humanity, cannot much longer be safely deferred.

Foreign economic policies that, by reducing trade discrimination, will further mutual respect and mutual advantage.

Programs of individual and informational exchange that underscore the common aspirations of all men.

A creative program of space exploration geared to the rational and related not to hysteria but to the nation's scientific needs.

Finally, my friends, there must be a calm, confidence among us all, inspired by our country's proud history and traditions. By holding true to these traditions, our people may live their lives and raise their families as Americans unafraid, knowing that no matter what may be the evil designs of arrogant dictatorships, this nation will push ever forward toward its appointed destiny as a leader of freedom and peace.

Of this I am certain: For these great ends we of the Republican Party will unhesitatingly make any sacrifice. Certainly these ends reflect the objective we sought to attain during the past eight years.

Now to our domestic concerns. Here, for America's sake, we take sharp issue with the leadership now in power.

What, exactly, do we stand for here at home? We Republicans see Mr. American in his high station as a free, self-reliant, proud individual. We are convinced that he can plan his own life and spend his own money better than some possibly benevolent bureaucrat can in his behalf. Any action that weakens any citizen's self-respect is wrong. That is the reason we oppose the ever-increasing concentration of power in Washington.

All agree it is criminal for one man to steal from another. But over-powerful government can rob the individual just as surely - only the scale is grander, the stakes are greater, and the loss far more tragic. For what is stolen by paternalistic government is that precious compound of initiative, independence and self-respect that distinguished man from the mob, a person from a number, a freeman from a slave.

Too much government planes off the peaks of excellence, hones down differences, dries up diversity, and leaves a bleak sameness.

No one can stand, simultaneously, for more individualism and more centralized government. The proposals now flowing in such abundance to the Congress can lead to nothing but greater centralization.

We Republicans take our stand for the individual!

And our respect for his inherent rights and ability will not be compromised away.

We will not barter local and state responsibility for centralization, nor will we trade a little government intervention for a little hand-out.

We consider it sheer arrogance to believe that people in government know better for the people than they know for themselves.

We are, therefore, against programs that would substitute coercion for cooperation. The new farm proposals creating an agricultural czar are a case in point.

We are against programs that erode away citizen, local and state self-reliance. Federal payment of teachers' salaries - as distinguished from needed construction - is a case in point.

We are against the insulting concept of government by Big Brother. Excessive public housing, rampant public power, Federalized youth programs are cases in point.

But as we fight the unwise, we Republicans proudly stand for positive programs in every area of public concern. We have long stood for advances in such programs as education, agriculture, minimum wage, medical care and area redevelopment.

But here is the great difference - our Republican watchword is "Responsible Progress."

At all levels government must have a heart as well as a head - and its assistance must go freely as needed to individuals or localities that cannot help themselves. But this must be so done as to avoid over-centralization in Washington. Thereby, the local need can be accurately met with least injury to responsible citizenship.

There is, therefore, a vast difference in what we Republicans propose and what we oppose. This crucial difference is that our programs are kept oriented to the citizen and not to political expediency. They respect local responsibility, avoiding excessive Federal interference in matters better handled back home.

It follows that we believe in paying as we go for what we do or get.

I believe that continued deficit spending is immoral.

It forces our children to support spendthrift parents. It visits upon voteless youngsters a mountain of unpaid bills. It is government by credit card, with the bill to be paid by our children not merely in money but also in liberty.

Even in the short run, unnecessary deficit financing is just as wrong. By debasing our currency, it leads to inflation - the most cynical of all policies, for it strikes most cruelly at the retired, the pensioned, and those who have the least.

So the means that are used are not necessarily justified by the ends being sought.

Too often we hear it said that if we believe in a certain goal, the method and amount used to get there are mere details. But, my friends, frequently method and amount can go straight to principle. One morphine injection may be exactly what a suffering patient needs; a dozen would be fatal.

I look in vain, and with deep concern, for fiscal responsibility today in public affairs. As I note the mounting expenditures, I often think how easy it is to buy things when you're spending the other fellow's money. That this must stop is one of the things that a strong, unified Republican Party should be teaching and preaching - and, so doing, can stop.

So, my friends, I trust that the aim of every good Republican in these times is to strengthen and unify, not to divide, our Party.

Choosing up sides now for 1964, for example, would be a grave dis-service to us all and, more important, to our country. More than one man has found that in pushing too fast to get to the front, he has lost a following. Those who run too fast into the future sometimes trip over the present.

All of us, at this point, must work together to build up the entire Party, so that our combined voices and influence will command ever wider respect and support.

So I urge this - that we eagerly recruit young people, independents, and Democrats into that great company of men and women who want for America individually-oriented progress that is sound and solvent. To every person who so believes, let our door always stand wide open.

As a Party, we have today one overriding mission - to achieve more brilliant victories in the local, State and Congressional elections this year, and then in 1962. We have seen what can be done in Pennsylvania, in Tennessee, in Texas. It is to carry forward this great effort that we have come together tonight. Only after we have laid a solid substructure through victory in 1962 can we start erecting our great skyscraper of 1964.

So now, let's go hard at it to perfect the Party organization from the grass roots up. One job is to raise adequate financial reserves, and in this your participation tonight is a good beginning. Another pressing task is to seek out and encourage aggressive and attractive young men and women of high integrity to be our candidates. Then we must carry to every citizen, most especially the youth, our Republican message of dedication to integrity, progress, responsibility and concern for the individual. We must let everyone know that we do not appeal simply to the citizen's stomach, but we appeal as well to his head, his heart and his self-respect. Finally, we must help our countrymen understand that what we stand for is a future of opportunity, of prosperity, of growth in continued liberty.

If we should neglect our pressing financial, organizational, teaching, and recruiting jobs until tomorrow, we will surely find that tomorrow is the day on which elections are lost.

My friends, everyone of us should be deeply proud to be a member of this great Republican Party.

For ours is the Party that fights for equality of opportunity for all, when it is easier - perhaps more immediately popular - to offer special rewards to special groups.

Ours is the Party that calls for self-reliance, when it is easier - perhaps more immediately popular - to depend on a condescending bureaucracy.

Ours is the Party that asks free men to continue to earn and to value their freedom, when it is easier - perhaps more immediately popular - to erode away self-reliance through public hand-outs.

The Republican Party has an abiding faith in the sturdy quality of the American people. Ours is a nation of men and women who have moved mountains, built great factories, tilled vast lands, harnessed mighty rivers and, in times of peril, have offered their lives for their country's sake. Our imaginations cannot comprehend what such resourceful men and women can and will do over future years, but our faith in them is complete. They will not, just as we will not, become slaves to class and mass, to so-called minorities, and to the use of divisive labels.

Believing these things, striving always to live by these principles, our dedication to Republicanism is our dedication to Americanism.

These truths, I believe, we must confidently lay before the American people - today and every day. So doing, in 1961, 1962, and then 1964, will be years of victory for our Nation, led by Republicanism, proudly flying the banner of Responsible Progress by Free and Self-Reliant Americans.

• **World Conference on Local Governments, Washington, DC, June 15, 1961**

The opportunity to join with you here today in this unique conference is one I heartily welcome. Perhaps I might sum up how I feel about the importance of your mission this way: Last year I made 140 speeches; my appearance here today is for my second scheduled talk since I left office in January. Even so, gentlemen, as I have studied my mail over the past five months I have often thought about Gladstone's remark made in his eighties - that it's easier to get into politics than out.

What brings us all here, of course, stands high above brittle partisan politics.

Two deeply held convictions unite us in common purpose.

First is our belief in effective, responsive, local government as a principle bulwark of freedom.

Second is our faith in the great promise of people-to-people and sister-city affiliations in helping build the solid structure of world peace.

One of the most deceptive doctrines is that political centralization is the great detergent which can cleanse all the nagging social, economic, educational, and organizational disorders that beset mankind.

Excessive centralization is a never-ceasing threat to our democratic future.

Since my first remembered experiences with government as a boy in Abilene, Kansas, and my first readings of the teachings of Jefferson and many others, I have lived in the conviction that the form of government which operates most closely to the people is also the most responsive to the real needs and desires of the people. Eight years as Chief Executive of this nation served only to strengthen this conviction.

Significantly, our word "civilization" stems from the Latin word for city.

A nation is mirrored in the reflecting glass of its great cities - Paris, Rome, Rio, London, Tokyo, Copenhagen. Aware of the staggering problems confronting cities, our Third President, Thomas Jefferson, spoke long ago of towns - not cities - as the "pure elementary republics" upon which the entire system of representative government rested.

Today in this country there are about 100 thousand units of local government. Nearly 100 million of our 180 million people live in cities and suburbs. One-fourth of our homes, mostly in urban areas, have been built since 1950. Urban living, of which Jefferson was so fearful, has become the normal way of life for most Americans. Throughout the free world, cities and their functions assume a constantly increasing importance in our national life.

The change is more than a quantitative one.

In our country, as an example, Americans, as never before in their history, are being called upon to meet the test of an entirely new environment. No item on the agenda of domestic affairs is more crucial than the task of coping with problems arising out of the concentration of population in great metropolitan areas.

In the heart of the city and radiating out into our suburbs, we encounter all the blemishes and problems of congested living. They include inadequate transportation facilities, crime and juvenile delinquency, and the disappearance of "open spaces" available for recreational purposes. Another problem stems from the costs of a multiplicity of local jurisdictions, many of which compete or overlap in providing some services, while other responsibilities of Government are neglected.

I would not dwell wholly on the dreary side of the metropolitan complex, for there is, also, a quite definitely shining side. Cities provide heightened economic efficiency, better education, vaster social and cultural opportunities. I cite one example which the London Literary Times recently applauded. In 1920 there were less than one hundred symphony orchestras in the United States. Today there are over a thousand. My own town of Gettysburg now boasts a symphony orchestra.

Each local Government represented here today has a unique variety of relationships with its national authority.

There is nothing strange about this circumstance, for the simple reason that the world supports a wide variety of systems of central government. And I am not one who believes that our particular system, in this nation, is necessarily the best for others. Far from it!

But no matter what these relationships may be, the common task of all cities is to strengthen the invigorating currents of local responsibility. Only by so doing shall we master the day-to-day problems of urban living, and keep vital government close and responsive to the needs of the people.

That is why Conferences such as this can be so very helpful. By the candid sharing of experiences in local government problems that criss-cross the earth, we can be sure that the fruits of such discussions will surely help to advance the cause of freedom and progress.

There is another way that municipalities can lift our hopes toward a better world for tomorrow - one close to my heart - the Town Affiliation of Sister-city Programs.

Five years ago I asked representatives of American citizens in all walks of life to join me in a discussion of how people could best get to know and understand each other across the barriers of language and geography. I then expressed the hope that thousands of private links from people to people would lead governments in the direction of peace.

More than a thousand organizations and some one hundred and fifty American cities and communities, ranging in size from New York City and its millions, to Oakland, Nebraska, with a population of sixteen hundred people, have responded. These 150 communities have established regular communication with their counterparts in more than 40 countries of the free world. Requests for other affiliations have poured in from both the great cities and small villages; from both the more developed and less developed countries of the free world.

The process of entering into Sister-city relationships has resulted in world-wide cooperation of many peoples, institutions and associations of a completely private, non-political nature. Such affiliations focus the talents and resources of entire communities upon what I believe to be the most urgent task of our day - that of increasing international communication and understanding.

My friends, out of a lifetime's experience I have become ever more convinced that peoples everywhere, regardless of the nature of their society or their government, desperately want peace. If by some magic manipulation people across the earth could take their destiny into their own hands, there would be no war. I believe that the most potentially fruitful task that peoples can undertake is to increase their effectiveness in working for mutual understanding within the political structures where they now abide.

Unfortunately, formidable barriers impede people-to-people communication between the Iron Curtain countries and the free world. A further fact merits emphasis: On one side of the world struggle for the minds and hearts of men, we witness a monolithic political and economic structure which brooks no internal disagreement. It permits its people to know only what their political leaders want them to know. Thus total power is centrally controlled and centrally manipulated.

But in the free world, we have a vast community of juridically equal nations, dependent wholly on persistent cooperation for effective protection of the values we cherish. All the divisive forces that normally make for human disagreement are at work in each of, and between, our countries. If we are to achieve and

maintain dependable cooperation among the partners of the free world, it is obvious that we must use every effective method at our disposal to promote understanding among us all.

In pursuit of our objective we now use many methods, including student-teacher exchanges, publications, scientific exchanges, radio programs.

Yet none can be more effective than direct, close and abiding communication between cities, where indeed most of our people now live.

Mutual understanding alone, of course, will not make peace. But neither will there be peace without understanding.

And - there are no short cuts to the achievement of genuine understanding. It can not be synthetically accomplished merely by speeches professing good will or by making unredeemable promises.

The patience to listen and learn cannot be created at once. And even where such patience is forthcoming it is not of much help if people have been pre-conditioned to listen only to the sounds and not to understand the spirit.

The kind of understanding the poor old world needs can only come through the broadest diffusion of soundly conceived good will and helpful projects - projects that will banish barriers and possibly enlighten leaders who have so long frustrated world-wide cooperation for peace with justice.

So it is with deep sincerity that I congratulate you for recognizing the great potential of your world-wide movement in bringing about that mutual understanding so essential to progress toward peace.

There is much to do. And delay itself imposes risks. Democracy today is a minority system of government among our nation states, but we shall never allow it to fail. We reject leadership that jeers at human dignity; twists testimony; that would reincarnate class struggles; that seeks to still the impulses of democratic government - in short, a leadership that arrogates to itself complete authority over all society.

The fountainhead of governments based upon the consent of a free people is the community; your presence here today signifies your determination, through a united community effort, to build a mighty temple in which the world can work, in peace, to banish poverty, ignorance and disease from the earth.

I salute you and wish you Godspeed.

• **Manufacturers' Association of York, Pennsylvania, June 20, 1961**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Brenneman, and my neighbors from York:

It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be received by such a company as this and to be welcomed so cordially. I am not only honored, I am deeply grateful.

To be a little bit more intimate, and speaking about this body itself, I think I have never seen another one that shows such appearance of extraordinary intelligence. But, there may be here one or two Democrats, and recognizing their right to be so mistaken, I would like, in the few words I shall speak to you, to do so on a non-partisan basis. However, I will certainly be political: but the aspect of politics to which I would like to attract your attention is its individual factor.

You are in politics whether you know it or not. Our government has, in some cases necessarily and others I think rather arrogantly, shoved itself into your business to a degree that I think most of us do not consider with a sufficient degree of discernment and alarm. We always think of the government, especially when paying taxes - but that is only part of it.

The tax program of course is something to make anyone shake his head if he's going to stay in business, particularly if he's in any foreign business. If he's got anything to do with farming, he had better hold on to his hat - but there are other things of this kind that put the government more and more and more into your business.

Your defense is that of any self-governing nation. Your defense lies with you - each of you. Are you going to take the trouble to lay out for yourself the kind of political creed by which you want to live? Are you then going to apply this creed to the problems that beset our nation - national in character or local? Are you going to do this and then say - in order to get the kind of people in Washington that we need to represent our views - that we start to do this now, this evening? We want everybody from city councilmen, right on up to the

governor of the state and the senators and the congressmen in our congress to represent the views which we believe are those that spell both sound progress and sanity in our fiscal affairs!

If we want this, we cannot expect to gain it just by hoping that our congressmen - Congressman Gooding, here present - can by himself secure the support that he needs to remain in Congress and so to represent us from his great district. We must look for ways to help him. And I mean not merely by means of money; I mean we should help select the rest of the slate of candidates that will provide support and make sure that he's going to be returned to Congress.

Right down the line it is time for every single citizen of the United States to understand that politics has become one of the greatest factors in his business, and he's got to handle it exactly as he would if he were trying to sell a recalcitrant potential purchases - or, if he's trying to do better in the production and sales and distribution field, he's got to put his business sense into politics.

I can't tell you how profoundly I believe (and this without regard to party), that unless each of us takes a very serious and earnest look at the progress and the trends of free government in the United States, we are going to wake up some day and be very, very sorry that we didn't take action quicker.

I don't mean to come with words of greeting to tell you how happy I am to be back in this state of my paternal forebears with a word that may sound somber - I don't mean it that way. I mean that each of us today ought to shake himself a little bit when he gets up and say to himself - am I doing all my duty, or am I just waiting for someone to come around saying, "Bill, aren't you going to give me a couple hundred dollars for this campaign?" Are you volunteering your services so that you can have the maximum influence in the things that are being done by the House of Representatives, the Senate, and, indeed by the President? Your influence is going to be nil unless you exert yourself.

But if we do that, we can laugh at Communism throughout this nation. If we, each of us, will look at these problems with the sense and the judgment the good Lord may have endowed us with, we need fear no foe, and we need not be afraid that self-government is going to be injured during our time.

So let's find young, personable candidates for every office we can find. Let's make all of our processes open and above board. Let's get the best candidates there are, and support them no matter what may be our individual and detailed political prejudices. Follow your own conscience and this country will be safe. Good-night.

• Boy Scout Conference, Pennsylvania State University, July 6, 1961

Thank you very much for the cordiality of your welcome.

Mr. Firestone, members of the ruling hierarchy of this organization, and explorers and scouts and friends and friends of scouts. For a good number of years I've been connected with this organization. I don't recall exactly the year that I became a member of the Executive Council, probably about '47 or '48, but in the meantime I have been a little bit busy and so much so that I haven't gone to any meetings since my days in Columbia. But I do want to say this - I was so proud of that position that it is the one organization from which I refused to resign when I became President of the United States. So that position is still mine and someday I hope to do something a little bit more active about it.

Now, all of this I recite merely to assure you of the admiration and respect I have for scouting, for what it is doing for you now and what it is doing for our country, has done in the past, and is certain to do in the future.

Scouting gives training in character. The greatest qualification that any individual can have is to have it said of him, "He's a man of integrity and of real character."

And it teaches health habits, fitness of the body. And another thing I want to talk about today is training in leadership. Now, I'm not going to talk about the individual capacity of each of you to take a squad out for a camping trip and making certain that the cooking is good and the policing is done properly and all that sort of thing; I'm not going to talk about leadership in that sense. I'm going to talk about the preparations that you people should do, in my opinion, for fulfilling your greatest potentiality for leading this Nation.

Now, this is admittedly a serious and possibly a ponderous subject, but I don't think it is too serious or too ponderous for any of us to be persuaded that he doesn't need to train himself in these affairs or indeed that this kind of training is not vital.

Now, what I want to talk about leadership is this: There is no set pattern because leadership has to be exerted in the situation and in the times for in which it must be operative. The world changes so rapidly today that a kind of leadership that might have been of great value at one time is no longer possibly even smart or wise. For example, as late as our War Between the States, General Officers drew their sabers, got in front of the advancing line and said, "Charge!"

Well, of course, today such a general would be the first man killed and then who'd run the brigade or division? That isn't the kind of leadership you have now in war and certainly it's not the kind that you should have in peace.

Now, there were patterns established during the years and centuries that the world was in many respects a stable place. Did you ever stop to think of this, that the mobility of Napoleon's army was exactly that of Alexander's some 21 centuries earlier. The horse was still the best means and most rapid means of land transportation and the sailing vessel, slightly improved, of course, as time went on, did the same at sea. Even until the Battle of Crecy in 1346, gunpower had never been used in European warfare; and although the ancient Egyptians were reputed to be really great archers, in both the Battles of Crecy and Poitiers the bowman was the decisive factor.

The world was stable. There were no great changes except possibly in the field of art. So the material world that we knew as the 1800's burst upon us was not radically different than that which Pericles knew in the Fourth Century B.C.

Now, all of that changed with the coming of the industrial revolution. And, indeed, to get a little bit closer to home, I would say this: The changes that have come about in our thinking and in our material world since the first atom bomb was exploded in 1945 and up to this minute are greater in significance than all of the changes that happened between the ancient Pharaohs and the day before Hiroshima. We have for the first time come face to face with the possibility of our own destruction en masse.

Now the kind of leadership, therefore, that's going to keep this catastrophe from happening is first of all, an individual of character, with a body that will carry and nourish the brain and the heart, and then an absolute determination to keep up with the times as to exactly what we mean about leadership and what kind we should be exerting.

Let me take such a simple word as freedom. We are likely to think of freedom in traditional terms and so go back to our founding fathers to determine exactly what we mean. Well, our founding fathers meant freedom from political domination - political - from a state or despot. They were talking about political freedom, but we hear nowadays much said about something called the new freedoms.

Now, what are these new freedoms? Well, if you go far enough in them you will find that they are talking about a sort of melange of security, state care for you and all of your younger brothers and sisters and your grandfathers and people as old as I and older...this is a new freedom, they say, because they are talking about the freedom from want, the freedom from hunger or privation or ill health or anything else.

In other words, freedom gets a new meaning for the simple reason that there takes place a greater governmental authority over your lives in order that you get these new freedoms. Therefore, you, yourselves have to determine what is the kind of freedom we're talking about. It is something certainly between the concept of freedom when there was no other economic theory except that of laissez faire way back in 1787 and today when we talk about, at times, a welfare state.

So you've got to think of this word "freedom," never forgetting Patrick Henry when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death," so that we know exactly what we're talking about. That's the first thing you must find out - what are these terms, and particularly, what is the individual's freedom, how he should define it for himself and how he should use the term in talking with his fellows. In the same way we talk about political freedom and about economic freedom. Take the businessman - he talks very eloquently about economic freedom when he's in favor of keeping the government from interfering in his business and controlling him with prices of wages and things, but he isn't quite so eloquent when someone wants to reduce a tariff, and yet a tariff

certainly does deprive you of the freedom to buy the cheapest thing you otherwise would - or the antitrust laws - he doesn't like to talk about them in terms of freedom.

But the labor leader is in the same fix. He doesn't know exactly what he means. He wants to urge the freedom of a man to join the union but he's not so very eloquent in condemning secondary boycotts that deprive some other person of freedom or a man the right to stay out of a union.

So we must think of these things and get definitions fixed in our heads. Now I come to the message I want to leave with you. It's this: We must remember that the relationship between government and our people, their businesses, their lives, their organizations, and even their individual welfare and liberty is coming closer and closer together all the time. Life has become so complex and so different from what it once was that we have this closer relationship. Because of this, if we are going to retain those aspects of political freedom that our founding fathers guaranteed, we must be very careful that government doesn't come too far into their lives.

And so I would say that if you are going to prepare properly for leadership, there are three courses in your high school courses that should be "musts" and in my opinion if they are obtainable in your high school, anyone that neglects them is damaging his own potential, his own capacity to be of real use in society. And, my friends, in the long run that's the only place you will get any real satisfaction.

I don't care how many yachts you may come to own or how rich you may become, how much you may travel, your final, basic satisfaction will be your conviction that you can do something for the society of which you are a part.

So I would say the first thing we ought to study as a must would be American history. What did our founding fathers mean and what do we mean today when we talk about the same word? What are our concepts of freedom, both political and economic? What are our beliefs with respect to gigantic industrial concerns and industrial unions? What do we believe about them? And American history will show their development and give us a good base on which to work.

And the next thing I believe we should study is a course in civics. What is this relationship between government and you as individuals, and how is it developing wrongly and what can you do to keep it on better lines?

And finally I'd say a year in economics. Not long ago I was talking to a businessman in York, Pennsylvania and he said - he had a medium-sized company - he said, "We, in hiring all of the men that we hire of high school or higher educational achievement insist that they have had one year of economics because we find that they think more clearly about their jobs, their positions, about the company and its relationship to the men. They are just more valuable to us. And no longer are we hiring a single man in that classification that has not had a year in economics."

Now, I'm not one of these pessimistic fellows. As a matter of fact, I'm quite sure that if I had been very pessimistic, by this time I would have been long gone from this earth. I believe in optimism; I believe in self-confidence; I believe that the world is a pretty good place to live, and I would be the last to want to speak to you so somberly, so lugubriously, that I would leave with you an impression that, oh, my goodness...this is all too heavy for me; I want to forget.

I say every one of you has got the brightest opportunities that any age has had because today we've got these new sciences, these new great opportunities. If these are not merely used for evil purposes and the destruction of man, they can lead us into the kind of world where standards of living for billions can go up rapidly, where the opportunities for culture, self-fulfillment are almost unlimited. In the proportion our world has changed from a lazy, lackadaisical sort of place where we had no improvement that was noticeable, in thousands of years, to one that has seen, in these last sixteen, these marvels of science become part of our daily lives, we can take advantage of these new opportunities to create a better life for humanity.

In that same way your capacity to lead has got to come up much faster than did those of a generation that is now much older than yours. We didn't have the same opportunities.

So, I leave you with this word...Congratulations to every one of you because what you are already doing is a great part of what I believe you should do. And I commend to you these three studies as one of the best ways I can think of as a good preparation for the kind of careers that you are already cutting out for yourselves as explorers and scouts and friends of scouting.

Thank you very much.

• **Hagerstown, Maryland, Cemetery Dedication, September 3, 1961**

A full century has passed since our nation underwent, in bitter and prolonged Civil War, a grave threat to her existence. Irreconcilable differences in the convictions of a divided citizenry put to the test of arms the asserted right of any state to withdraw from the Union, as opposed to the belief of others who held that we are - always have been - and must ever be, one nation, indivisible. Under this earth, where we now stand, lie men who, in that war, gave their lives in defense of the convictions they held to be right.

In the background of the tragic conflict was another issue old as history - the struggle for human dignity in all places, in all climes, in all ages.

That war, fought with courage and tenacity, and ending only when one side reached utter exhaustion, settled the political issue in favor of national unity; while the cause of human dignity in the world was advanced still another step in its long and tortuous progress toward fulfillment.

As we meet today to pay tribute to the gallant fallen of that conflict we sense, with all our faculties, that our nation, now united, is living through another dangerous trial of strength which, though not accompanied by the clash of arms, is waged on a global scale.

On the one side are those who, seeking world domination, hold that man is a soul-less creature born to serve, without choice, the decrees of an all-powerful state and, on the other, those who see man as created in the image of his Maker, guaranteed the blessings of liberty and master of the government under which he lives. The threat strikes at the very foundations of our nation, at all the values that free men cherish.

Dedicated, without reservation, to the advancement of our faith in man's Divine origin, we thank these men, now almost a hundred years in their graves, for the inspiration they - and their equally dedicated opponents in that war - have given us in their shining example of courage, endurance and fidelity. May we, always, in the long and bitter contest stretching out before us, feel our convictions as deeply - and so faithfully sustain them - as they.

Our salute to them - our prayer for them and for our nation - is this: "May you rest well in this place, and may your sons and daughters ever be the proud possessors of, and live in, the strength of conviction, the courage and the selflessness that you so richly displayed."

• **Everett Dirksen Testimonial, Chicago, Illinois, September 16, 1961**

This morning I left my farm in Gettysburg and journeyed some hundreds of miles to join you tonight, for one compelling reason. It is identical with the one that has brought you here. We like, and we respect, Senator Everett Dirksen, and we gather here to thank him again for his tireless service to us and to our nation.

Particularly, we honor him for the courage, intelligence and firmness in which he has calmly played his important part in the threatening world scene.

We know that living today in Chicago is akin to living today in Berlin. Every free people, on every continent, are in effect the people of Berlin. Like them, we are face to face with threat of Communist domination. We share the responsibility for preserving, against that threat, all that we hold dear in this world.

Looming in the background is a grim reality. Nuclear-tipped missiles place all of us - even in Chicago - but 30 minutes from Armageddon - tonight, every night, every hour of every day. There is no spot on earth assured of safety from obliteration. The maximum warning time is measured in minutes.

Friend and foe possess, for the first time in history, the capability of mutual annihilation. In such a period each one of us - and this includes our leaders - is being tested on the firmness of his faith, the stoutness of his heart, the steadfastness of his courage.

Americans have always been confident that, in time of international crisis, their leadership would hold to principle, would never yield to threat or take a backward step - a leadership always ready to defend the

rights, uphold the ideals, and meet the responsibilities of this free Republic. In this confidence we Americans are determined that where the Commander-in-Chief stands, there we must and shall stand.

I realize these are gloomy words to utter on this, a gala evening, where we are met to honor a great American.

Yet, we know this is not a time to measure lightly either our own present, or our children's tomorrow. In such a time silence is not necessarily either golden or prudent.

By no means are we failing to support national leaders when we recall recent events disturbing to us all.

How could we fail to be sorely distressed over Laos, and more especially over Cuba, and the seeming indecision and uncertainty that characterized governmental action there.

We have been troubled over quasi-official pronouncements implying basic policy changes respecting Communist China and Outer Mongolia.

We have been concerned by unrebuked criticisms of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our intelligence gathering agency. We have been puzzled and chagrined by expressed doubts as to the allegiance to American ideals of the officer corps of the armed forces.

Personally I have a profound faith in the capacity and readiness of our men in uniform to provide for us the maximum in security.

And I ask you not to misinterpret these expressions of uneasiness about matters of the past. None is mentioned in a spirit of destructive partisanship or of carping criticism. My object, indeed, is exactly the opposite. For though we may have, and may continue to have, misgivings, all of us are, with our men in uniform, standing guard tonight in Berlin. No matter what our reservations, the President has our unstinting support as he employs all his will and wisdom against those in the world who scoff at freedom and regard humanity with contempt.

There is no doubt as to the immensity of our nation's power, both economic and military. It is unmatched. And as we look out across both our oceans, we do so as a single people - united in our determination to keep our nation strong and our devotion to liberty and justice unmistakably clear, every place in the world. That strength stands as a warning beacon to any would-be aggressor; it provides also a firm platform from which we patiently and earnestly seek a peaceful and just solution to world problems.

To preserve that strength is the common and continuous responsibility of all of us. This is why we look anxiously inward to the domestic pillars - the spiritual, economic and military supports - of our national power. For well we know that our spiritual and economic health are as essential to our security and national purposes as are the most awesome instruments of war.

To make sure of their vitality is a compelling national duty.

Our spiritual strength is found in a re-kindled dedication to the noble purposes set forth in our founding documents. Steadfast support of the concepts of justice, individual liberty and human dignity is as vital to our security today as are all of the destructive bombs deployed across our country and in bases abroad.

And here may I observe, particularly, that it would be fatal if America's spirit of confidence and of dedication should ever give way to despair and fear. Do we not remember that, as each of our pioneering forebears, ploughing his field, had to carry always a defensive musket, yet he persisted in raising his family and finding happiness in his freedom. So it is today; over our shoulders and around us we see the dangers of our existence, but we must steadfastly refuse to abandon those priceless rights guaranteed to us on July 4, 1776 - one of the most important of which was, the pursuit of happiness. And that pursuit remains just as important in time of crisis as it does in what has been called the "humdrum" days and years of peace.

Our material strength rests on a free competitive enterprise, generating a steadily expanding economy measured always in a stable and respected currency, worth next month, next year, next decade what it is worth tonight.

That is why I have in these times so gravely viewed unnecessary Federal spending. It weakens power and confidence abroad.

At the very least might we not defer buying tickets for a trip to the moon until we can pay cash for the ride; and do so without mortgaging the old homestead to repair a leaky room. Addiction to a soft-headed philosophy that Federal money can cure every national ill could undermine one of the greatest resources of

America - the sturdiness and self-dependence of the individual citizen; it could ultimately cost our people their liberty.

I believe that responsibility or self-discipline, balance, common sense and faith in the individual and locality are indispensable to the perpetuation and functioning of self-government.

One imbalance, always to be fought, is monopoly, a continuing menace to our free system. It is bad when unwisely exercised by gigantic, centralized government or big business. It is equally bad if irresponsibly exercised by organized labor. Monopoly is a result of lack of balance and common sense.

Inflation is bad. It is bad whether generated by spendthrift government or by industrial price abuses. It is no less bad if caused by unjustified wage increases, or by demands of self-preserving pressure groups. One of its sources is a lack of a sense of responsibility.

The unending drive for Federal domination of the nation's power and water resources, and the ever increasing Federal involvement in urban problems, agriculture, housing, care of the youth and the aged, the ill and the poor, and the temporarily unemployed, can end only - if unchecked - in a dangerous centralization of power. Continued, this tendency will ultimately destroy the will and the ability of the individual and community to govern themselves. But it can be stopped in its tracks by balance and by faith in the individual and the locality.

If we believe these things then let us not divide or weaken ourselves by the use of such self-imposed and misleading labels as "conservative" and "liberal".

I suspect that more conservative and liberal blood has been shed over attempted definitions of these political terms than over any public policy or program.

Political labels will not influence thinking citizens.

America wants progress of a kind that is consistent with our traditions, our ideals and our free institutions. We do not want the so-called "progress" typified by credit-card government which bills our children for our profligacy, or which is measured in rubber dollars.

Consequently, when we choose political leaders, let this be our yardstick - faith in the individual - faith in the ability of each American citizen to run his own life and spend his own money better than some bureaucrat can manage either for him. If we are disciples of this simple faith, then any doctrinal differences among the Nixons, Rockefellers and Goldwaters - all respected leaders in the Republican Party - are as ripples in a cup of tea when compared to the hurricane type of towering waves of conflict that create the cleavages between the factions and divisions of the party now in power.

Note the unbridgable differences between the Congress and the Administration on lavish proposals for federal aid to education, on back door financing, and other projects. Even worse is the total lack of any administration recommendation to the Congress for balancing the Federal budget, and for civil rights legislation, both solemnly pledged in platform and campaign only a few months ago.

Today the controlling party dominates both branches of Congress by almost a 2 to 1 margin. If its members cannot legislate, it can be for only one reason: they are at war with themselves!

For our part let us agree to discard the tired and divisive political slogans of yesterday in favor of a common effort to keep our nation not just moving forward, but moving responsibly forward - always attentive to human need beyond the power of the individual or locality to meet, faithful to the public trust in expending our citizen's funds, and devoted to our constitutional processes. What we are striving for is the kind of progress for America that can endure because it is responsibly and sensibly achieved.

My friends, with us tonight is at least one citizen who holds such views - Everett Dirksen.

In recent years, as the Minority Leader of the Senate, time and time again he has stood at my side, undeterred by criticism, to do what the national interest has required.

In matters concerning our nation's security, he is informed, tireless, and absolutely non-partisan. Yet, when so doing will strengthen our country, he is unhesitating in voicing constructive criticism and in fighting for constructive measures.

In domestic concerns, Senator Dirksen is daily the advocate of the responsible progress which I have roughly outlined tonight.

As a parliamentary tactician, he is unsurpassed.

Few people are as widely beloved, and in my White House years, I never heard Senator Dirksen speak meanly of another person.

My friends, it is knowledge of these things, personally experienced, that has brought me to Chicago tonight.

Proud of his service to our country - grateful for his personal loyalties - admiring his ability and character - prizing his friendship - I join the people of this state in saluting a great leader of the United States Senate, the statesman from Illinois - Everett Dirksen.

Thank you very much.

• **Naval War College, October 3, 1961** [published in US Naval Institute Proceedings, June 1971, pp 19-24; copy in Vertical File, DDE Speeches, 1961-69]

The reason that I have so much enjoyment in this kind of meeting is not that I think I can particularly give you any new ideas; I can only, as one of you, testify to my faith in the officer corps and the enlisted units of our great services and ponder with you briefly some of the problems that confront the armed services and our nation.

The most I can do is to emphasize such truths that may escape you, or give you some mental stimulus for thinking about these things in a slightly different light.

When Admiral Nimitz and I were youngsters, our only thought outside of the annual Army-Navy game was learning the techniques of our own service. And they were rather simple. The equipment we had, as compared to the equipment of today, would be like a bow and arrow compared to a machine gun. We lived in relatively simple times and it was a relatively simple life that we led. Even the War of 1914 did not fully awaken us to the tremendous changes that were then just over the horizon.

When we came out of that war, we went back into our narrow channels again. I happened to be a junior officer in the War Department in some of the years between the wars, and I was at times a party with the groups that were trying to arrange cooperation or coordination between the, then, two services. All of us had a hard time. And strangely enough - I think it is all right for me as a relatively old man to say this - we as young officers did not find the difficulty in getting along together as did our bosses. We got the orders from them, and, as young men will, we generally took a rather recalcitrant attitude - but that's the way it was. Everybody had his job; the Navy was going to fight on the sea, and the Army on the land, and that was that. We looked upon the Air Force as a mere interloper - at least our bosses did. How this has changed!

Today, for anyone to be a good naval officer, an Army officer, an Air Force officer, a Marine officer, any kind of officer in the armed forces, is to dedicate himself to a study of the world, its history, its situation as it now is, and particularly the conflicting ideologies in which most of the world lives. He must also study economics, particularly the economy of this country and of other countries that are independent of Communist domination. He has to think of the moral or spiritual side of his country's strength. The military side comes almost last in his calculations.

Therefore, your research and your study means that you've got to understand what a new weapon or new weapons system means to the economy, what it does to the psychology of our people. To illustrate what I mean, we know that the Communists seek to break the economy of the United States - an economy that is based on free enterprise and a sound currency. If we, therefore, put one more dollar into a weapons system than we should, we are weakening the defense of the United States.

Consequently, an adviser to the President cannot say, "I am interested only in the Polaris or a new fighter, or a new bomb, a new missile." He must ask himself, "What does this mean to the United States?" and "What does this mean to our psychology?" Because now we see in our magazines that we are going to fight wars by making an exchange of our nuclear stockpiles and that is called "war." It isn't war! Not as we understand it! That kind of war is not one opponent against the other; that is just potential destruction against survival.

Therefore, as you become one of the leaders, one of the teachers of your fellow military men, and one of

the teachers of your compatriot lay citizens, you have got to think of all of these different factors - different influences - if you are truly going to lead. This applies as much to anyone who is in the State Department, or the AEC, or the CIA, as it does to the uniformed services.

It is not enough that we just have weapons. The mightiest armaments in all the world cannot themselves assure the successful defense of the things in which we have the greatest interest. We are not defending merely territory, not even homes, not even our lives; we are defending a way of life, and it can be destroyed in more ways than one.

This is the kind of burden of responsibility which is upon you as a member of the great group - and in some direct or indirect way, you will always be part of that group - to give the product of your thinking and your brain and your heart, to your next superior so that the most broadly-based advice possible is given to the Commander in Chief.

This brings me to another point: America long ago rejected the theory of superman government. We distrusted the despots of Europe in the 1760s, '70s and '80s, and we established what we call representative or self-government.

As Americans, you must have a comprehension of human psychology; you must have a knowledge of our free enterprise systems, you must understand the different types of threat to our way of life - and you must understand how all of these factors relate. You naturally cannot be an expert in each of these. The only answer is to have a general understanding of these things. We have certain people in the military who are experts in these fields and we blend theirs and others thinking together to make one, great, orderly exposition to our chiefs so that they can make the decisions. What you, the leaders of the armed services become, then, is this: the hinge. You are the hinge between the great body politic, the 180 million people that make up this nation, and the top leaders who finally have to make the decisions controlling your destiny. You, of course, have to be masters of your profession. You have to know how to run the ships and fire the missiles and all the rest. But, you will not ever be doing your complete duty if you desire only to be the greatest navigator or the greatest bombardier, or the greatest technician in your own service. The challenge is larger than that; for, in a very real sense, the struggle is spiritual.

Frankly, gentlemen, I think we would be a stronger nation if we examined ourselves a little bit closer about religion. If there is one certain difference between Communism and representative government, it is that we believe in a Supreme Being of some sort, while they say we are cattle. I think, therefore, we ought to think about this great difference. None of us would stand up here and say, "I am nothing but an educated mule for my government to use as it sees fit and with no other end in life except extinction."

What I am trying to say, again and again - probably very awkwardly but nevertheless very sincerely - is that we, as military men sworn to defend our nation, must constantly remind ourselves that we are dedicated to the defense of something that is even more precious than life itself. We must recall from time to time the majesty of Patrick Henry's statement in the Virginia Convention, "Give me liberty or give me death."

We must also muster our material strength - all of the capacity of this great industrial and agricultural productive machine that is the United States - to support us in our struggle for long periods of time. When we talk about crisis, we must think, not in terms of a war of three or four years or seven years, we must think about defending our way of life for years and decades if we are going to win. Therefore, we must so pace ourselves that we do not destroy the systems and the beliefs that we have held which have made America great.

These are the things that I would urge upon you - they are facts, they are merely stated in generalizations. I see no reason for talking about Berlin, because Berlin itself has become not only a place but a symbol of our determination, of our dedication to freedom, of our devotion to principle rather than a place. It is not merely a spot on the earth that we are going to fight about. We must think of it in terms of moral values and basic institutions of freedom. So I say again, if we do these things, I believe we will have no real differences among ourselves arising out of the different colors of our uniforms, or even differences between ourselves and the population of which we are a part. We will be dedicated to seek undying values and we must so condition ourselves in our thinking, our beliefs that we shall never let down the nation that we so dearly love.

These were the thoughts that I wanted to express to you this morning, gentlemen, and I would rather subject myself to climbing the cross of trying to answer questions than go further with my own philosophizing.

Q: General Eisenhower, could you comment on any problems of coordination among allies in a joint unified military operation?

A: I ought to start by reminding you of a statement that I saw a long time ago in a Staff College study. The author started this study off with the statement, "I have always admired Napoleon very extravagantly, and I thought of him as the greatest soldier the world ever knew until one day I looked through all his history and saw that he fought only allies."

The greatest problem that faces any commander is to teach his own staff and his own army group that they must divorce themselves from the traditional command channels that they have known. If each man, for operational problems, writes to, or telephones, or telegraphs his office at home, soon there is no unified plan and no unified direction. This is indeed difficult and I think the difficulty probably goes up in geometric proportions according to the number of nations you have in the command.

The first problem is to make certain that all of the commands look to the commander for their direction in the fighting of the war. Now this presents the problem of differentiating when it comes to logistic support, because, naturally, the recruits from Britain have to come from Britain, and the supplies have got to come from Britain because they are of the calibers and makes that only the British use. Thus, you have the very many complicated problems that give the commander a reason for staying in close touch with his own government.

But the biggest problem - and I think all the other problems you could possibly conceive flow out of this one - is that any time that you do not have the military loyalty and operational loyalty of the command, you will be in trouble. I could give you many examples. I think, though, that if I stated that one truth, you would find all the other problems would soon be solved by getting that kind of operational subordination from your allies.

Q: General, due to the problems of security, can there be a meaningful public debate on military policy and military posture in a democratic society?

A: Like most problems that involve vast numbers of humans you have to find a proper, logical, middle ground. I might add, parenthetically, my conviction that, except in the field of morals, there is no extreme that is ever correct. So what you have to do here is find the middle way. The populations must be informed, because we have self-government. Even in time of war we have to have our elections. How can an individual make a reasonable, logical selection of the people he wants to represent him in the highest office or down to the councilman unless he is informed in some way? On the other hand, I think the revealing of secrets that we know to be secrets is almost the worst crime that anyone can commit. Consequently, it is a job that can be solved only by the rule of reason. Every one of them, within broad limits, presents a problem of its own. We were all shocked in World War II when one newspaper put out the news that the Navy had broken the Japanese code. To this day I think this is one of the worst things I ever heard in my life. On the other hand, to keep secrets that a country ought to know is almost as bad. We are still not able, except for the most tortuous process, to get some of our papers of World War II made public. I think the worst of all the secrets that you can divulge are sources of information, because then you can break down an entire intelligence system.

Q: General, would you recommend any changes in the present-day command structure of the military service?

A: I think not particularly. I believe greatly in organized study. I believe that this derogation of staffs on the theory that they are making committee decisions is tommyrot. But, by and large, the system of command we have set up for our several services and for our unified commands is very satisfactory. It comes back to this: no detail of organization is really too important if you've got the right men. The right men can make any organization work.

Q: General, the Grand Strategy of the United States, NATO, and the Free World is a defensive one. In

view of the Communist doctrine of world domination should not the Grand Strategy of the United States and the Free World be changed to a more offensive one to protect our rights and values?

A: I think in the moral field, it should be. We have not been sufficiently articulate in expressing our true dedication to the high ideals that our Founding Fathers spoke about. They said that we are endowed by our Creator with certain rights. That was the explanation they gave for our kind of government. In other words, they said this: unless the human has a soul, our kind of government doesn't work. Now, when we speak of the Soviet Union, we are talking about an aggressive philosophy that seeks power for its own sake, and, although I think there are dedicated Communists, I think they, too, pursue power for its own sake. When they talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat as an interim measure, they are really saying that "through our lifetimes, we will be dictators." The theory that someday Communists will be dictators of Americans' lives is a dream that will never come true. Consequently, in the field of moral values, we can be far more aggressive than we are. But when we come to the physical - the use of threats and so on - I ask you, how do we do this? Because the advent of the bomb, the guided missile, and the Polaris, and all the other deadly weapons has constantly accentuated the element of surprise. How can a democracy carry out surprise unless its leader says, "All right, I will defy democracy. I will make myself superman and I'll push the button and that will be that."

But, the question, I think, was: "How are we going to defend our rights and values?" Well, the answer is that we can't defend our values if we have destroyed them by our own acts. So therefore, democracy, even one democracy, cannot be aggressive, as I see it, because you have to make decisions that are represented and reflected by the action of the President and of the Congress. While that is going on, what is the enemy going to do? Because now we are talking about minutes, not about the time when you had sailing ships and cannons that would shoot one mile. I don't believe that, in the military field, we can take an aggressive, positive action other than that of making certain of our own defense. But from this position of confident strength, we can both morally and economically act more intelligently and more aggressively than we have in the past.

Q: General, would you give us your opinion on the political and military significance of the race to the moon?

A: Are the doors locked so no one can get out? This is what I believe. The United States has got priority tasks, and we ought to keep our minds on those tasks. In the defense field, they are strong enough to command our greatest effort within the services and in our productive capacity. I believe that someday humans are going to circle the moon, take some pictures of it, and maybe even get to a planet and back if there's time - I don't know - but I believe those things ought to come about as a by-product of all the research we are doing today in missiles and in bigger engines and so on. I think to make to so-called race to the moon a major element in our struggle to show that we are superior to the Russians, is getting our eyes off the right target. I really believe that we don't have that many enemies on the moon.

Q: General, you established certain institutions as President which have since been removed. Do you consider that action justified or wise?

A: I wouldn't want to comment on anything that has happened since my tenure of office that would indicate some repudiation of some of the things I instituted. I think there are different methods for achieving our aims and consequently I would certainly uphold the right of any President to organize his staff, his own personal staff, his whole system of study and work to get what he needs and therefore to make decisions. I do not, however, believe that any man in the office of the Presidency can act efficiently unless he is very careful in the kind of organization he sets up for himself and the aims he sets, including the fighting of the Cold War. Those aims he must set up very clearly for himself and he must find the highest type of individual that the nation affords to help him out. So, I wouldn't want to comment specifically on the action to which you speak.

Q: It has been said that the Free World's method of decision-making which involves considerable

consultation and deliberation puts us at a disadvantage with the Russians who can make decisions unilaterally. Would you comment on this?

A: I think all of you, from the day you entered the military service, have learned to distinguish between those things which have to be decided this moment, and those things which can take a little consultation. I believe that you reach the best conclusions when you have the atmosphere in which real analytical study takes place. I believe that finally we must insist that one man makes the decision. But I do say he should be compelled to make immediate decisions only when the situation demands it. I would assume that the naval officer, in fighting his ship, has to make decisions every two or three minutes. Everything from changing direction to changing range to changing targets. I don't know - I haven't been one. But I do know that, when you've got time to study a problem, you should use all the brains God gave you, use all your training, use your staff, make your decision, then don't be afraid to stick with it.

The same applies to our allies. Insofar as I know, and certainly in my time, the agreements of our allies were that we did certain things in consultations. But, always, there was a proviso that in an emergency everyone would take care of himself, whether he was abroad or at home. He would have to make that decision, and we would assume that the others would approve it. But I really believe that the people who write about these things in our columns and so on, have really never had to make a decision. And they never even understood the word "organization." They think of organization as something static, routine, stogey, that brings everything down to the mediocre. We, as people who have commanded squads or sections, have learned that organization for all human affairs is absolutely necessary. Far from delaying proper decisions, it facilitates them. I think most of the understandings we have with our allied nations are about as good as they can be made so as to permit action in emergency but to give us opportunity for consultation when times are normal.

Q: General, do you have any comments on the status of the Atlantic Alliance?

A: Yes, indeed I do. As a matter of fact I can quote myself. I made a speech on 4 July 1961 at the Pilgrims Club in London in which I pointed out that in western Europe we have some 225 million highly educated and cultured people. We have a group there that has a skilled labor force something almost double ours. Combined, they are a tremendous power and products of the same culture. They are as dedicated as ourselves to human dignity and freedom. If those people unite and realize their true potential - economically, militarily, and spiritually - there will be two great forces in the world confronting the single, atheistic, dictatorial, aggressive ideology that we have to look at unafraid and firmly. However, in our case, we also have to be conciliatory. But with those two powers I think that our security would be vastly increased.

Q: General, in one of your final speeches you warned of the dangers of a military-industrial complex. What can the military do to prevent this from happening?

A: I think that my earlier little sermon was about as good an answer as I could give you on that question. What I did say was this: it wasn't merely the armament industry. I said that we are getting such combinations of influences which affect our own interests in so many places that we must be very, very careful that we don't go down the wrong path. For example, if, as an Army officer, I am offered more armies or more missiles, I will consider this as double insurance. All the other services certainly feel the same way. We want all we can get. The JCS constantly would tell me that the sums placed before Congress for our defense were quite ample. But each always said that he needed a bit more of the pie.

If we are going to solve this particular problem, we have got to recognize that the nation's resources are not unlimited. The congressman who sees a new defense establishment in his district; the company in Los Angeles, Denver, or Baltimore that wants an order for more airplanes; the services which want them, the armies of scientists who want so terribly to test out their newest views; put all of these together and you have a lobby. This lobby has not necessarily been formed deliberately, but it is a lobby which has been formed out of a community of interests - and it touches almost every individual in the United States. This is the thing we have

got to watch out for. And I think all of us must be very, very careful not to let those unconsciously formed lobbies influence our thinking too much. The heavy responsibilities that fall upon you as advisors must be carried out with complete disinterest and disassociation from your own personal ideas. You cannot permit yourselves to ask, "Wouldn't it be nice to have another half dozen carriers, or a hundred more Polaris?" This is what I was talking about six months ago.

Q [Admiral Nimitz]: General, we frequently have heard that wars are too important to be left to the generals and admirals. Do you agree with that?

A: Well, Chester, I think you might make a corollary and say that peace is too important to permit the diplomats to lose it. If we are thinking only in the military fields, then we shouldn't be allowed to run the wars, because war is not just the fighting forces on the battlefield. The armed forces are simply the cutting edge of a machine; a tremendous machine, as I said before, which is made up of the spiritual, intellectual, economic, and military power of this whole country. The morale of your ship is more important than her guns. The same applies here. There is a power which this nation needs. Therefore, Admiral, I will say this: if we can make sure that all of our officers are growing up to understand the problems of the citizen and the citizen leaders, as well as military tactics and strategy, then I say the generals and the admirals ought to be, while subordinate to their commander-in-chief, running the war, rather exclusively.

Q: General, do you have a concept as to how a united states of Europe could come about?

A: I believe that it will eventually come about by necessity. You must remember each of our colonies was very proud of its own traditions and history. The Puritans were religiously widely separated from the Maryland colony. Georgia was made up originally of debtors from prisons. We had all sorts of differences. As a matter of fact, at times Washington despaired of getting the cooperation of these different peoples in winning the war. The federation of states then, was very unsatisfactory, but it was our first recognition that certain functions had to go to the nation as a unit. The treaty of 1783 was with the British. In return for paying debts we owed them, the British were going to abandon the forts, particularly around Detroit. Well, the colonies wouldn't pay the debts and the British wouldn't abandon the forts, so we were almost at war again. Now, the United States of Europe is going to come about in the same way. Maybe their differences are founded in greater, older traditions and different languages - that's one thing we had in common, although some people have said "a common language separates the English-speaking people." There have been a number of separate movements bringing them closer together, and you, I think, are asking "can they be brought together politically in a tight enough federation that they can have a common foreign policy, etc.?" That will take some years because it will have to be a generation that has grown up under the constant influence of these centripetal forces. It won't occur, in my opinion, suddenly.

Q: General Eisenhower, in our present form of government, is there any effective way to nullify or negate the influence of pressure groups that operate not in the best interests of our nation?

A: This is a question that has certainly plagued presidents - including me. I don't know exactly how this can be brought about. But I do know this: successful democracy implies self-restraint. Now, I thought when a president finally has a congress that by composition was politically compatible, he could go to the committee chairman and say, "I hope you will not create dissension by asking to get every single individual in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines who happens to differ with the Administration's plan to appear before your committees simply because he does differ; under the guise of free speech and speaking his own convictions to a committee, he will get publicity which is not warranted by the importance of his particular conclusions." I believe that the people who find themselves differing with the decisions of their chiefs, owe it to their chief to say, "Sir, I differ; I ask to be sent to line command," instead of getting some columnists to publish these differences. It's all right for the officer to have his own ideas which differ with the admiral, the general, or the

Joint Chiefs of Staff, but I don't believe he should go down to the Hill and say that, out of his personal wisdom, he disagrees completely.

I think until we can inculcate this self-restraint among our people we will have problems in this democracy. There is nothing a Congressman likes better than to get his name in the headlines and for it to be published all over the United States. And maybe sometimes others of us like it, too. But the point is, we have a higher duty than to just air our own personal convictions when we are part of the body that has laid its recommendation before the Chiefs, and after they have modified them or approved them, and then, sent them to the President. I do not believe it is our duty to go down before the Congress and show they were wrong.

Q (by an officer of an allied country): Will men ever be able to live together in peace?

A: This is a problem that has engaged the attention of philosophers for so long that I feel almost embarrassed to attempt to give an answer of any kind. Because we have known so long that man's genius for inventing things which were evil created for him problems of control, sometimes it seems that his spiritual strength is not up to the task. I believe that in a way the military forces are a priesthood. I cannot tell you how deep is my respect for the responsibility they carry. Our problem of course is this: we have an intransigent enemy. He is going to bluff, to threaten, and to use everything that will divide us or our nation from yours. He has no spiritual values. I think the best thing we can do is for us and all those nations with which we are allied or are our friends, to realize that the forces that bind us together are far more important than the little problems which divide us. We have problems about buying cotton and subsidizing cotton, and trade, and all those forms of problems involving prestige. If we will put our eyes on the values that bind us together, then I think we may at least control our side of this material destructiveness, and this may be the strongest element we have in making the other fellow be very careful himself. This is the best defense we have both against the other fellow and against ourselves.

Q: General Eisenhower, do you consider the Russian economic growth a serious challenge to the United States.

A: We are far more productive than the Russians, but since they started from a very low point their rate of growth is quite good. The big danger is this: they, by their dictatorial methods, can direct all their productivity toward the particular things that they want to use. It is interesting, for example, to talk to a Russian about automobiles. I think, as I recall, that they produced about 100,000 last year, we produced 6 1/2 million. I took Mr. Khrushchev for a chopper ride around Washington, and he was amazed at the number of big roads running out of the city. He said, "We don't need roads like this." And I said, "How do your people get around?" and he said, "They don't want to travel." Then I very proudly showed him all the housing developments, each with its own individual yard, and he said, "We don't believe in individual houses; they're very expensive and our people don't want them. They want to live in apartment houses." Those of you who have been to Russia have seen how far they have gone in building these great apartment houses. So, when you talk about the Russian economy, it's an economy directed to the particular things the government thinks should be achieved. And we can't do that. Ours is a free thing and we each want to satisfy our own wants.

You can be sure that the things toward which they are directing their productivity are those things which they think will frighten us, that will tend to divide us from our allies, or that they can use in uncommitted countries. They will probably give a sufficient amount to consumer spending in their own country, to show that there is a little bit of reason for hope and satisfaction. I am sure that in certain phases Russian morale is quite high, but by and large this country can outproduce them, and certainly will for decades - very very materially. The only thing is that if they finally get us to responding so much to every threat that we hysterically raise our spending and spend ourselves into bankruptcy - this will be the biggest victory they will ever need, and they can stack their arms. So I think this contest between economies must be such that we stay faithful to our system, get the things we need and give them first priority - the old saying "guns before butter." The Russians are bound to do that. Their system does it, so we have to be careful for that reason - not for the overall productivity of the

nation. That contest won't come for a long, long time, but the use you make of the productivity really does pose a problem. We must accept only those things we know we need and we must look at every other dollar of expenditure and ask, "Was this dollar necessary?"

• **Pennsylvania Republican Finance Dinner, October 12, 1961**

My warm greetings to all of you, whose presence here evidences your devotion to good government and your determination to do your part to assure it.

Thinking citizens recognize that this year and next our elections are vitally significant to every American.

The issue is irresponsible, spendthrift, inefficient government - as opposed to the Republican dedication to responsible, capable, selfless leadership in our political affairs.

We, and all who share this dedication, support Constitutional principles, fiscal responsibility and individual self-reliance - the mainsprings of America's human and national program.

Each of us, therefore, must concern ourselves with the coming elections.

We need concentrated effort, especially here in Pennsylvania.

Only apathy could cause us to lose the governorship and other top elective posts of the Keystone state.

Great majorities throughout the nation will gladly support Republicanism, once they realize that at least one return for their effort will be a renewal of financial stability, common sense, efficiency and confidence in government - local and national.

Some 34 million people supported our cause a year ago; I am convinced far more will do so now.

It is up to us to make certain that every citizen understands what is at stake.

We must all work and talk to this end.

Let us pay no attention to self-labelled conservatives and liberals - terms not understood by anyone, including those who use them.

We cannot embrace the extremes of either right or the left; to do so is the path to political ruin.

Speaking as one Republican, I believe in responsible progress - balanced, sound, forward-looking government.

Let us, therefore, support the ideals, principles and fundamentals upon which we, as thinking citizens, generally agree, rather than expending so much effort debating the petty details on which we may have differing opinions.

And as we work for true progress, on which we can unify our resources and energy, let us hold out the hand of welcome to those not presently allied with us, but who wish to share in our efforts to provide good government for Pennsylvania and throughout America.

So doing, we will win - not because we are Republicans, but because we stand for the things that are right for America.

• **James Mitchell Campaign, New Jersey, October 17?, 1961**

To every one of you, warm thanks for your cordial welcome and hospitality. You of New Jersey have an especially warm spot in our hearts. In the years I have known your state you have been more than kind to my wife and me, especially in 1952 and 1956.

Additionally, during most of my eight White House years, you lent me a splendid native son, whose leadership and counsel in dealing with the great problems of our time were invaluable. To all of you, we are deeply grateful for Jim Mitchell.

During the 1952 campaign, several of my advisers suggested that I by-pass certain places in New Jersey. They said that the electorate there was by and large becoming a captive of political bosses. This situation, by the way - one not restricted to New Jersey - has in recent years put a curious connotation on the word

“Democratic.” The modern political axiom seems to be that the less “democratic” an area tends to be, the more likely it is that it will be under the control of the Democrats. So I was told, back in 1952, to save my strength and campaign where more of the people would be freer to work their will. In effect I was told that New Jersey was tending to become so undemocratic, at least in some places, that the state was bound to vote with the Democrats.

So I came to see you!

The evils of bossism are universally recognized. Of course petty political tyrants will always fight tooth and nail to keep their power and political control. Such people thrive on the captive prosecutor and the quashed indictment. They sap the resources needed for school classrooms, hospital beds, and even swings for the playgrounds. In the meantime, working men and women suffer under resulting higher taxes, cities and counties wither, the population declines, and slums increase. And as respectable industries move away, steady and well paid jobs disappear. Thinking citizens cannot long tolerate such conditions.

A society so blighted takes the heart out of a state, and takes the heart out of a man. It delimits the goals that in our system every citizen has a right to aspire to for himself and his children.

My friends, where ever evils of this kind occur, their elimination requires experience and courage - the highest order of firm leadership - and an ability to inspire the people. The people of every state are entitled to leadership of this high quality.

Clearly, Jim Mitchell is such a man - in practical government, seasoned and astute - in public administration, combining the patient skill of the craftsman with the daring vision of the architect. The art of raising mundane administration to practical idealism he knows first-hand, as well as the great difference between leading and driving in getting things done. He is a big man used to handling the big problems of big government. But more important is his integrity. In private or public life, I do not know a finer man; sound - energetic - far seeing.

Let me particularize by a story I believe I have not publicly told before. Early in my first term, a longhand note came to me from Secretary of Labor Mitchell. He had just traveled the country on a Departmental mission and during his journey had concluded that America's highway system had fallen critically behind present and future needs. The problem of course was not directly his as Secretary of Labor, but it deeply concerned the entire Administration. Secretary Mitchell suggested a dramatic new Federal-State program criss-crossing the nation with modern, safe highways, built to quality standards, as required for present-day America. From the seed of that letter has grown our huge highway program. In most states we have already built hundreds of miles of magnificent roads. Scores of hundreds of lives have been saved. Secretary Mitchell's identity with the road program is one evidence of his practical vision.

But, of course, in the Cabinet he was conversant with every major problem of our country and, as a result, he brings a nation-wide understanding to many of your major concerns. An example is the economic situation here, one in which the unemployment rate has, in late years, consistently exceeded the national average. New industry, new jobs - surely these are among your urgent needs. Again, in Jim Mitchell we find a comprehensive understanding. He has dealt with every major union and virtually every major business in the United States. Better than any man I know, he can induce great economic groups to pull together for the common good.

Let me tell you of another Mitchell incident. Some years ago, he became interested in the controversial problem of work practices in the railroad industry. Charging into the very heart of the problem, he dealt man-to-man with representatives both of management and of the Brotherhoods. For years the interests of these groups had appeared irreconcilable, with neither side willing to yield an inch. Finally, after hundreds of hours of painstaking search for an acceptable solution, he recommended appointment of a Presidential group to bring the warring parties together, improve their relationships, provide cheaper and better service, and stabilize this sick industry.

But here is the significant part of the story: Once Jim Mitchell had persuaded the contestants to sit down and talk over his recommendation, they both demanded that he serve as chairman. This appointment I very proudly made. In such an accomplishment is revealed more than patience, understanding, or even skill. There is a finer quality, especially for government service. It is that people instinctively trust Jim Mitchell and that he

merits their trust.

My friends, I am aware that the polls forecast a Mitchell victory. But there could not be a worse time to rest on your oars. Many a battle has been won or lost in the very last days and hours. Every single voter in this state must be reached and the issues clearly and forcefully presented down to the very last minute of the campaign.

I hardly qualify as a political expert. Likewise, Secretary Mitchell is no professional politician. But I suggest that this election, like many others, can well be decided by those who stay at home. By coming so far today, you good people - especially you ladies - demonstrate your keen awareness of the importance of universal effort and voting.

Of course, in a Presidential year people pour forth by the tens of millions to cast their ballots. But in state elections, the following year, about one in four stay home. These sunshine political patriots are the secret weapon of the machine politician. Captive voters always dominate a short vote. The one certain cure for bad government is an avalanche of votes on election day. So I urge each one of you to keep working tirelessly to get every voter to the polls - every Republican, Independent and discerning Democrat. On such voters, eager for responsible, progressive, decent government, I have often relied - and not in vain.

I congratulate you on what you have thus far done so well, and especially the ladies who arranged this enjoyable visit. Mrs. Eisenhower and I well know it is the women-folk who take the time, who provide the zest and determination, and who give the inspiration needed for political success. God bless you for your splendid service to your State and country.

Now - Jim, my friend, I most earnestly wish you, and the State and people of New Jersey, simultaneous victory on election day.

• **Journal Square, Jersey City, October 17, 1961**

It is a privilege to visit in Hudson County once again. Indeed, for a long time I have wanted to come to thank you for your hospitality to my wife and me in years past. To be here, today, gives me a personal opportunity to do just that. Your welcome warms my heart.

I realize of course that your friendly attitude is not unanimous. Only today I was told that I and my former associates in government have been referred to by one of your state's political figures as "discredited carcass" and "tattered remains."

Now for my part I can well understand that I might look far less than youthful. After spending 7 score years in life's battles and a half century in America's service, I am sure that I carry numbers of scars and marks of the struggle. Certainly more than once I've felt battered - and I think the few remaining hairs on my head - standing like weary warriors on an otherwise forsaken field - are well described as "tattered." As for the "discredited" part, I leave that to you, completely. But when it comes to the words "remains" and "carcass," I personally object. The men and women of my administration and their millions of supporters are not inanimate bodies - they are vital, driving warriors in a crusade to install and sustain honest, progressive, sound administration at all levels of government - city - state - Federal.

I shall not detain you to list even a few of the constructive accomplishments of that eight year administration - but two things I know:

first, the people of the United States then lived in a feeling of self-confidence; secondly the Republican Party, responsible for that Administration, far from being moribund, is girding itself like a giant going into battle, and when it goes to the polls this fall and, even more so when it marches on them in 1962, it will make a mockery of such silly and futile charges. So look out for those carcasses and remains!

A very special purpose of mine this evening is to testify before you as to my respect and admiration for Jim Mitchell. While, as a citizen of another state I cannot properly comment upon the particularities of the New Jersey situation, I can, because of my intimate knowledge of your candidate for Governor, urge your enthusiastic and untiring efforts for his election. He was, for eight years, one of my efficient co-workers in the cause of honest and good government, and out of that experience, I want to share with you some reasons for my

high regard for him.

First, however, so that from the outset there may be no mistaking the character of this regard, I want to express my personal conviction that by electing as Governor of New Jersey, the nation's former Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, you will be giving your State one of the finest Chief Executives in its entire history.

The battle for progressive, decent, prudent conduct of public affairs never ends. That battle ebbs and flows according to a number of factors, one of them the calibre of the leadership. So let's dwell for a few moments on the leadership qualities needed to win and to hold the initiative in the constant struggle for good, effective self-government here and throughout America.

One needed characteristic in a leader is fairness; another is a reservoir of moral courage - an unhesitating willingness to do his duty to the public - the right thing at the right time, regardless of personal consequence. A leader needs imagination and vision - the ability to rise above the immediate and the petty in order first to measure, and then to mold, the shape of the future.

Again, for effective leadership, is needed compassion, genuine human sympathy, a sincere concern for the well-being of others, including their self-respect. A good leader is selfless, he willingly subordinates his personal gain to the common good, asking no more of his followers than he himself is willing to do.

Finally, above all else, the good leader needs integrity - a deeply ingrained honor, honesty and decency. For when a leader possesses a sturdy character, the public instinctively tends to trust his decisions in the knowledge that, whether or not his actions gain, at once, wide-spread approval, they are never tainted by selfish or corrupt influence.

Because I so deeply believe that Secretary Mitchell is richly endowed with these characteristics, I further believe that his election as governor would be in the best interests of the Nation, as well as your State. I include the Nation in this statement because the election of such a man would be a fine tonic and shining example for all who take a deep interest in good government in city, state and nation.

Evidencing his selflessness, I happen to know that Jim Mitchell tossed aside an excellent position in private life when, years ago, I asked him to come to Washington. By doing so he knew he would have to work longer hours, for less pay, and would be subjected to constant criticism by people who could not possibly know how earnestly he was working for their welfare. Yet he came, in order to serve America, well realizing that his daily fare would more often be brickbats than bouquets.

Today, in seeking your governorship - as I strongly urged him to do - he has once again thrust aside all thoughts of personal reward. He is no professional politician but again he has rejected lucrative business opportunity in order to place his experience and ability at the service of the people of New Jersey.

Often we forget that the honest road to elective office is rocky and exhausting. It is a continuing American misfortune that so many of the ablest people in our country shy away from these contests, too often leaving them to lesser men of questionable ability and character. So, I repeat, I think you are fortunate to have such a man as Jim Mitchell available.

He opposes profligate government spending and the wasting of your tax money. He believes in encouraging opportunity and individual initiative. In short he believes in what we like to call the "American way."

Today, I heard that in this coming election his opponents are feverishly spending to defeat him and our party. I have heard that the spending ratio is something like 3 for them to 1 for us. But that, if true, does not trouble me overly much, even though it would be most convenient for us to have that kind of money.

His is a vital character; he heads a revitalized party that, with him, stands for progressive, prudent, and honest government. So I believe the people will turn out, three weeks from now, to record their support of Jim Mitchell because they know his is the kind of leadership they want and need.

It is said, further, that the Republican candidate for governor must run against a Democratic party organization that is entrenched, wealthy, and grimly determined to hold to perquisites of power. This means, of course, that the fight will be a bitter one, and hard to win. But I see at least two advantages for the Mitchell side, which cannot be overwhelmed even by entrenched power. First, is the extraordinary quality of the Republican candidate. This has universal appeal; an appeal that will not only inspire every Party member to register, work and vote, but will also reach out beyond party boundaries to bring to the Republican banner masses of

Independents and discerning Democrats.

Second, having read of New Jersey's concern over political boss-ism, I know that the election of Secretary Mitchell as Governor will have real significance for the people of this state. We know that in extreme cases bosses, by handpicking candidates and dominating voting blocs, can control executive appointments, pass or defeat legislation, select prosecutors and influence indictments, and obstruct justice. They can channel tax dollars to favorite contractors and friends.

Unavoidably, the evils of the "boss" system are not inflicted on just a few. From the \$40 a week wage earner, right on up, everyone is hurt. Moreover, a county or city so ruled soon finds that honest industries, providing good, steady jobs, move out. Sweat shops move in. As taxes go up, so do the rents. The ordinary citizen loses heart. Even children are injured as they grow up where the standard for advancement is not what you know, how hard you work, but whom you know!

Happily Americans are, I think, determined that the political bosses everywhere must go. And I am certain there will be no room for boss-ism to flourish in your state with Jim Mitchell as your Governor.

As to his fairness, both in private business and in government, Jim Mitchell has lived by the principle that men should be judged by ability, not antecedents; that men and women should be employed according to their qualifications, not according to their color or the power of their friends.

He has proved his capacity as a public servant. In his federal office, he won the respect of both Labor and Business - both have honored him. A man does not win that kind of acclaim unless he is touch, clean, able and just. And on one other point - in world affairs he carried on his part with equal success. In the International Labor Organization - in which he represented our nation - he took the lead in opposing the seating of the puppet delegation from Hungary, calling upon the member countries to reject the sleazy credentials of that Soviet dominated delegation. He forcefully reminded the Organization of the way the Soviet Union used brute force to crush a rebellion against dictatorship in unhappy Hungary, and of the way the Soviet Union imposed upon it a government, which was in no sense representative of the Hungarian people nor responsive to their will. The ILO stood firmly by Jim Mitchell, even though this was the first time in the Organization's history that a government's credentials had been rejected and its delegation excluded. The following year, Mitchell again addressed the ILO. Again he succeeded in blocking a Soviet puppet from taking their seats.

Here is a picture of a fighter, a fighter for human dignity, and for what he believes to be right. That fact, also, has great meaning for the people of this state. Here is a man who will never cave in under pressure - whether born of political influence or of wealth. He will assume no selfish obligations to be repaid against the interests of the state. Experienced, able, energetic, he is and will be unafraid of any person or any pressure group.

I know that with his election, you will have a leader of honor and imagination, of common sense and compassion. It is for such reasons that I believe that you of New Jersey, by an overwhelming majority, will elect him you next Governor. Indeed, may I add that, such is my regard for him, I wish it were my privilege to join you in voting for James P. Mitchell on November seventh.

May success attend your efforts.

• **Al Smith Dinner, New York City, October 18, 1961**

It is a privilege once again to meet with those who gather together once each year to pay tribute to honor the memory of Alfred E. Smith.

Seventeen years have passed since Al Smith left the world scene. Tonight, many may feel little relevance between our circumstances and those he knew. Certainly, the environment of men has changed mightily since his day. Machines and the pace of the economy; electronics and communication between men and nations; space ships and the horizons of human exploration; arms and the character of war - in all these and in a multitude of other fields, revolutionary changes and advances, on the face of things, mark this an era totally different from all earlier history. Our most urgent problems bear no surface resemblance to the urgent problems of October in 1944.

But there is more to the record - at which Al Smith like to look - than the advent of new wonders, or new horrors. Behind the turmoil of change - calm and clear - stand the high peaks of great truth and great principle - eternal in their worth and validity. Freedom of conscience; dignity of man; self-reliance; love of neighbor - these concepts, and all their limitless corollaries, are as sharply pertinent today as they were before nuclear fission; or the harnessing of steam; or the invention of gunpowder.

Fixing our eyes on these priceless values, we do not come here to indulge in nostalgic reminiscence of the good old days that can never be again. Nostalgia - at least for the older generation - may be one easy escape from confrontation of reality, for men have always thought that earlier times than their own were easier for living because simpler in their problems. But I recall an old army saying of half a century ago - The army is not what it used to be! And it never was. So clock-turning, ancient in human wishfulness, cannot stay the sun in its course. And we are not here to try it.

Rather, this gathering is in recognition of and a tribute to ideals and concepts typified in the life and works of Al Smith; ideals and concepts that still endure. They are and must be for all the future unchanged in their essential truth and worth, unchanged in their powerful impulse for good and growth - despite cataclysmic changes in the material circumstances of human living. In this recognition and in this determination is the fundamental justification of any attempt to honor one whose life was mortal but whose inspiration of example survives through generations.

We honor the memory of Al Smith because - in his life's work - ended seventeen years ago - he was true to his own concept of man - man's origin and capacity and destiny - a concept that today is as potent and compelling as it was seventeen years ago - seventeen decades - or seventeen centuries ago. Al Smith saw man as a person of inviolable dignity because - made in the image of his creator, endowed with divine rights, moved by divine ideals, strengthened by divine grace - man was placed on earth to prove by his works and by his use of his talents, his divine worth. To Al Smith, man was the child of God and the master of the State. But to the communist, man is the creature of the State and the master of nothing in his own individual right.

Pondering these things, I become more and more convinced that the deepest reason for the world tensions of today and for the cold war is a commitment to spiritual values on one side - outrightly expressed or implicitly understood - and their total denial on the other. Here is the critical distinction between the free world and the communistic systems.

In all else, and in spite of palpable differences in material standards of living, a visitor from another world might be hard put to distinguish between us. He would see but little contrast and would care even less about it, in the machines used, in the research pursued, in the techniques employed, in all the material instruments of power and even in the propaganda promises of comfort and ease and carefree security.

Only in the assessment of man and in the political structures that have been erected to conform to these violently differing concepts of his nature and destiny, could such an inter-planetary visitor make a sharp and clean-cut distinction between this earth's two systems.

On the one side man is viewed solely as an economic entity - nothing but a tool; on the other he is seen as a political, economic, intellectual and above all, spiritual being. Our visitor would see these truths through their practical manifestations. Here he would note the readiness of free men to help those who hunger, who suffer, who are helpless. He would see these things done, not mainly under compulsive law, but by the compassion of the individual, providing clear proof of our dedication to the concept of man as a spiritual being. These he would not see in Moscow.

And as surely as free men, stifling their nobler impulses, seek to shift to government the responsibility for helping the less fortunate, their spiritual strength will wither and our other world visitor could find less to distinguish us from the Soviets.

All of us know "you cannot take it with you." But sometimes I wonder could it be that we might send it on ahead? By no means do I imply that money can buy a favored place in the hereafter. But as we cultivate and obey the impulse of generosity - as long as we listen to those words spoken 2000 years ago - "in as much as you do it to the least of them, you do it unto me" - whether we have the widow's miter or the wealth of Croesus to contribute - we cannot believe that the entry on the books of Eternity will not be on the debit side.

The weakness of Communism is the narrowness of its appeal; restricted to the materialistic that is

measured in size or efficiency; Communism denies the eternal hopes of spiritual man for inspiration from things beyond this world - faith and hope and love - which will not perish as all things of the earth must, soon or late, perish. Only because we conceive of man as a being of many attributes, is our purpose larger, our goal more rewarding, our cause greater in its universal appeal. And further: since in this conviction is our unique strength, we must capitalize on it. Because our objective is enduring good for humanity - not tomorrow's propaganda headline - we must not be diverted to an alien approach that momentarily seems more effective.

Visitors may go to the Soviet Union to see for themselves whether Communism is ahead of us in science or education or economic planning - or international programs. But whether or not the Communist way works for the moment is beside the point. The value of a political system is measured by the ultimate destiny of those who live under it. If it robs man of his soul, of his dignity, of his freedom, it must be renounced - whatever the immediate result may be. In such an atheistic system the injunction "Love thy neighbor" would never be heard. And ultimately, such a system is self-destructive, and as this is true for the individual and for the family - so for the nation.

Since World War II, our people have in countless ways lent a helping hand to the rehabilitation or development of almost every nation this side of the Iron Curtain and to many on the other side. We have contributed more to others than has any other single nation in history. In so doing we have made mistakes in amounts and in the manner of distribution. And, in some cases, there has been a lack of appreciation of our generosity. But these things should neither dismay or deter us; without the help we have given to others the world skies would be greatly darker today - possibly already portending disaster for freedom.

Enlightened self-interest, of course, provides a major incentive in our programs of foreign assistance. In no other way can government - using the tax dollars of its citizens - justify vast expenditures abroad. But these programs began and continue with citizen support because those who pay the bill are deeply moved also by moral factors - by the understanding that liberty and human dignity are priceless values and should we neglect to help others sustain them we would risk their loss ourselves.

The motivation of the communistic programs is not, "Love thy neighbor" but "Use thy neighbor that he may be a tool to implement your plans for dominating the world." Given time, there can be no question which motivation will win the hearts and minds, the loyalty of men.

But it will be pointed out instantly: We may not be given time. This we must insure by the strength of America's position. That strength is military, economic and spiritual. The first two of these are material and vitally important, but only when multiplied by America's spiritual vigor does the nation's power reach the highest peak attainable.

To be strong spiritually costs nothing of itself; it is a matter of dedication to the precepts we learned at a mother's knee. And the assistance gladly given to others by the spiritually strong brings to an individual or to a nation that great inner satisfaction that comes from an active response to the divine injunction, "Love thy neighbor." This is why you are here tonight.

And you are here because of your respect and admiration for our friend, the Cardinal, who has emphasized that such love is, next to love of God, the greatest manifestation of good in man. And we do honor to the memory of Al Smith, whose concern for the poor, the halt, the unfortunate, is legendary.

And you are here as an example of the eternal truth that as men and nations increase their spiritual strength - as they live true to America's concept of man - so do they strengthen themselves and their country in power, in purpose and in permanence.

• Columbia - Presbyterian Medical Center, October 23, 1961

As an Honorary Doctor of Columbia University, as one of its Trustees Emeritus and its only living ex-President, I am deeply appreciative of the opportunity to be one of this gathering assembled to mobilize new resources for the Columbia Medical Center. Here is one of those outstanding institutions for human benefit that mean so much to America.

During the past sixteen years, I have had to make many public talks on a wide variety of subjects before

all kinds of audiences, gathered in places that circle the globe. Inescapably, I have often found myself wondering about my competence for dealing with the subject of a particular address. Inescapably, too, I was often sure that many of those listening were wondering what my credentials might be. So, on this occasion, I submit my credentials in advance. They are three in number.

First: In recent years, I have had quite a bit to do with doctors - much of it far from voluntary. But I am, indeed, a walking witness to the marvels of modern medicine and surgery. As a patient, naturally, I consider myself - next to the doctors and surgeons themselves - an expert in certain areas; and as one who owes his life to medical research and skill I feel I should not be an unwilling witness or a silent expert. Indeed, I frequently find myself inflicting my medical wisdom - without invitation - upon ailing friends but - I hasten to add - also without fee!

Second: Some years ago, among regular visitors to my office in Low Library were Charles Cooper and Willard Rappelye, respectively the heads of the Presbyterian Hospital and the Medical School of Columbia. Our common purpose was to determine the exact whereabouts of the money that would permit the fullest development of Columbia-Presbyterian. We never quite found the answer. But to be sure that I knew precisely the character of the requirement, they once took me on a day-long tour of the Center from below ground floor to the animal quarters on the roof. Before they were through I was ready for a doctoral degree in the "Opportunities and Needs of Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center." So tonight I can speak out of some first-hand knowledge about them.

Third: Within your campaign is focused the American belief in voluntary, cooperative, free enterprise; rooted in dedication to spiritual values; animated by an abiding sense of personal stewardship; aimed at the betterment of health and living for individuals as neighbors and fellow-men. Opposed to this belief is the communist creed of compulsory, socialized, regimented effort; based on a completely materialistic assessment of the nature of man; powered by a relentless greed for control over man; directed at the elimination of the spiritual and the enthronement of a man-made ideology.

In the conflict between the two ways, I have been privileged to play a part. So doing, above all else I have learned this: In the conflict between the American belief and the alien creed, all of us are in the battle line; all the time - on all the fronts that comprise our way of life. We do not discharge our duty merely by the payment of taxes; by faithfully voting our convictions every election; by scrupulously observing the letter of the law. All these are minimal observances of an American's responsibility, even if there were no slightest threat to our survival. Into the winning of a desperate conflict, we must put first the zeal that does not fail in adversity; the steadiness of perseverance that does not waver before distraction or alarm; the willingness for sacrifice that does not fade because many sacrifices may be asked.

That truth brings us here tonight. The goal of this campaign is 50 million dollars, measured in material terms. But the purpose of the campaign is the greater good for men and women and children, as fellow humans worthy of our concern, regardless of their race or creed or position in life. And the motivation of this campaign fundamentally is spiritual, a recognition that we live on earth within a brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God; that we are stewards of what we have received from our forebears and of what we have added to our heritage. The final accounting demanded of us will be concerned with the good we have done, not with the money we have locked up in a vault.

This campaign is, in its field of concern, an instrument of faithful stewardship; a way to accomplish the good expected of us.

The benefits of a successful campaign will be manifold:

To the individual patient who needs care.

To the advancement of research in the cure of human ills.

To the furtherance of what we like to call the American Dream.

Briefly, I shall touch on each of these points:

The individual patient: Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center - by grouping all the wide varieties of medical and surgical skills under one roof - brings into effective focus all the help needed in a given case. Every ailment of every patient can be diagnosed and treated with the best possible allocation of talents and facilities.

The advancement of research: You don't take the Kingdom of Research, any more than the Kingdom of

Heaven, with gold alone. Important though it is, more than money is required. Trained skills, dedicated men and women, ideas and ideals are essential. These you have at Columbia-Presbyterian - and the list of awards, Nobel and others, won by its men and women tell part of the story. But the millions of lives saved by the work there tell the story best of all. Indeed, it has been said, and I think accurately, that there is not a person living in the world today who has not benefited in one way or another from the research work done at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center. A successful campaign now will mightily advance the cause of fruitful research at the Center.

Finally, The American Dream: For as long as our Republic has existed, foreign visitors have been struck by the responsibility that Americans, on their own, assume in carrying forward projects in the common interest. Presbyterian Hospital is an illustration. It was started by a man, Mr. Lenox, who was aroused because he could find in this city no hospital that would accept a colored servant as a patient. He got together people who agreed with him that there should be at least one place in New York where a patient would be assured of good and skilled and devoted care, regardless of race, color, creed or ability to pay.

That is a commonplace idea today. But 93 years ago, it was radical. A social outpost was established - with private funds and individual initiative - out of a sense of brotherhood and stewardship.

This evening we mark the 50th anniversary of the association of Presbyterian Hospital with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University. Another venture in human betterment was achieved - it led to the establishment of the Medical Center. Again, private initiative and private money were responsible. No bureaucrat devised the venture; no Federal agency paid for it.

Rather, hospital and college and center were the creation of men and women who shared in the American Dream that - given freedom and faith and farsighted vision - responsible citizens can make of this continent the sort of living place that mankind has sought throughout all ages. They are the sturdy individualistic citizens who, faithful to Lincoln's belief in the proper function of government, turn to the public treasury for help only when their own resources are exhausted or national interests and responsibilities are directly involved.

I know that among us tonight are individuals who control many millions in funds; and more than a few who may not control much in the way of funds but who are willing to work very hard - to use a lot of shoe leather - to help in this drive. Each of us, no matter how large or how small our means, can do something to help along the cause of the Center.

When you give and when you work in this cause, you demonstrate that the flame of individual conscience, of faithful stewardship, still burns brightly - a beacon to the world and its people.

Your original leader in this campaign - Lucius D. Clay - is such a beacon. In the dark days of the 1948 Berlin blockade he proved that one free man of indomitable will and courage can be might in the shaping of human affairs.

Still of indomitable will and courage, he freely assumed the leadership of the Center drive. When months ago he asked me to join you this evening, I felt that the objectives of this meeting and what he had done for the freedom of man converted his request into a compelling obligation for me.

Since then, all of us are yet more in his debt. Now he is serving as the President's personal representative in Berlin. His presence there is a reminder to the people of Germany that they have in their midst one who has once before, with them, stood unafraid in the face of Soviet threats. To us he again proves his capacity and readiness for self-sacrifice.

But his instant response is what every American would expect of one like him whose whole life exemplifies the highest patriotism.

Lucius Clay's work for the Center - from which he has taken only a leave of absence, I am told - is above and beyond the call of duty. I am sure that his enlistment on behalf of the Center was because he saw in this effort a great human venture whose contribution to American - and all peoples' - betterment will survive political and economic and military crises - in fact, will better fit us for the solving of such crises.

He - and Fred Eaton and all who are concerned in this campaign - are doing far more than the erection of a visible and valuable institution of health.

More importantly, this effort renews and refortifies the American will to act, to give generously, freely

to cooperate for the good of our neighbor. They do so, not under the compulsion of government or party decree; but rooted in a lively conscience; and a sense of stewardship; and a faith that free men and free women, as volunteers, constitute the mightiest of temporal forces.

This spirit within America - rather than its wealth or size or power - moves Lucius Clay and all like him to serve the Republic in courage and selflessness and dedication.

And this spirit makes of the meeting tonight, of this entire campaign, a noble episode in the endless effort to achieve on earth the ideals of our forebears and the hopes of our children.

• Cleveland, Case Institute, November 10, 1961

This is an academic occasion. But I hope, in the presence of so many associates and friends of long-standing, I may be permitted an entirely personal - it not entirely non-political - remark at the outset.

The last time I spoke in Cleveland was a few days before the election of 1960. What I had to say may not have even slightly influenced the crowd gathered that day in the Public Square; but I return here still delighted by the knowledge that a majority of Ohio's citizens voted in accordance with my expressed hopes and counsel.

But now, we are not engaged in a political campaign among ourselves. As a people we have been for a long time - and for years to come we shall be - engaged in a global campaign against a hostile ideology. In this campaign it is our purpose to keep our nation free and in a position of intellectual, spiritual and material pre-eminence just as we are determined, for as long as may be necessary, to keep ourselves militarily secure.

The outcome will not be settled, within the foreseeable future, by a count of votes at the polling places of the earth. Too many possessors and seekers of power so fear the voice of the people that they will not soon permit the free expression of that voice. We Americans believe that the aspirations and the prayers of humanity, even as our own, can be answered better by ballots than by bombs - by friendly seeking for mutual agreement rather than by wild threats of fearsome annihilation.

Our belief, unfortunately, will never become world fact unless we settle down in patience and persistence to convince people everywhere of its truth and efficacy. This is no mission to be accomplished by fine words or dramatic gestures. Conviction of mind respecting principles and commitment of heart to ideals - along with steadiness of will in purpose - are demanded. And, in seeking to breach the entrenchments of fear, ignorance, selfish power and corrupt privilege, we cannot fix limits in terms of time; intelligence, patience and stamina will be the decisive weapons in our effort.

This truth is difficult for us to accept. Turbulence in human affairs begets in us a passion for quick assurances; quick answers; quick settlements. And the quick, in these times, may be deadly wrong. Moreover, though we Americans - since we are human - earnestly try to read the future, grasping at the latest rumor for renewed hope, resenting the latest alarm with heightened tension, are nevertheless prepared always to sacrifice that there may be a future. This spirit is a vital asset of our nation. How to concentrate it on the achievement of great national and human goals, is the chief question of our time and the most difficult to answer.

The modern world suffers under the clamor and the pressure of those who create crises; peddle false panaceas; merchandise hate; trade in terror. And this Republic is not a haven, exempt from such clamor and pressure. At times, we add some of our own. We engage, for example, in fruitless argument about the yesterdays of a quarter of a century. When the finding of scapegoats for today's trouble reaches back into the long ago and becomes an engrossing enterprise, the development of leadership for tomorrow's opportunities suffers from lack of the attention its paramount importance deserves.

Among us issues of duty and objectives are not always clean cut and clearly comprehended - bewilderment can result. As an example - I, for one do not fully understand why, in the midst of a plethora of necessary and costly activities, our nation should be required, urgently, to develop a capacity to put men on the moon and challenge our principal opponent to a race in doing so. The setting of priorities is the business of government, of course, but unless this is done publicly and intelligently, there should be no wonder if the individual citizen seriously questions his own ability to contribute anything to his country's good. Suppose we

ask ourselves the same question.

The campus of Case Institute and this occasion constitute, I think, an appropriate place and time to consider, even though - of necessity - sketchily, a few simple but basic ideas about the course we should follow as a nation or individuals. As a national institution of higher learning, Case has set for itself high educational goals in science, engineering and management. Indeed, in these fields of specialization, this institution is recognized as one of America's most outstanding schools. Here, also, as in other great institutions of learning, students and faculty are deeply concerned with the heritage of art and knowledge that is comprised within the humanities and social sciences. So concerned, they come to recognize that in cultural wealth all nations are borrowers and lenders, one from and to another. None is so primitive as not to have enriched the most advanced; none so weak as not to have helped the most powerful.

By education in the humanities and social sciences, Case prepares its graduates to see within mankind everywhere, aside from all the differences of surface appearance, an identity in hunger for beauty and truth and understanding of ourselves and our institutions.

By education in sciences and technology, Case prepares its graduates to push back ever farther the Iron Curtain of ignorance and to apply the new knowledge thus gained to the betterment of mankind. Its students and faculty recognize that in the vastness of the universe, there is room for all who can and will search the unknown for man's greater good; they know there is need for all the brains the human race can muster for this search.

Thereby, Case graduates are better citizens of America because they are better fitted to work for American convictions and ideals among all the peoples of the world. Above all, they realize that only with the attainment of a just peace among nations can the full energies and talents of men be mobilized for the work of assuring the maximum in human progress. They realize that knowledge alone can be sterile; that it must be understanding knowledge to bear great fruit. Such men conceived the International Geophysical Year, a daring venture in international cooperation. Extending that conception into an International Science Century, they could help in designing a permanent cooperation as an exemplar of human unity in the field of science. Given that exemplar, massive and enduring, we can realistically hope for like advances in many fields.

Peering into the future against the backdrop provided by the purposes and accomplishments of Case Institute, its students and faculty - our course as a nation of free individuals simplifies, I think, into a choice between two postures.

We can choose: Absorption in crises, forever straining for their immediate solution; steeling ourselves against their constant recurrence; improving sudden tactics at extravagant cost; accepting partial defeat as often as partial victory - all in the hope that those who oppose us will be exhausted before we exhaust ourselves.

Or we can choose: Absorption in the American Future, calmly informing ourselves of what America can accomplish in the immensity of our resources and joining with our neighbors toward the realization of community goals and the formation of national opinion about great goals for the Republic - even as we make sure that the present, current strength of America is adequate to meet any peril.

Thus we make the business of America our own and most important business - all in the realization that our Government, in its policies and conduct, reflects the attitudes, desires and purposes of our people - whenever the people speak clearly their informed judgment.

Between the two alternatives there is no question of choice for a nation of free individuals. Crises are the proper concern of Government, so using the resources of the Republic - material and human - that crises do not become a way of life.

But: the American Future should be the principal concern of the individual, in concert with his fellows, influencing his Government at all levels to accomplish what he and his fellows, have concluded to be community, state, regional, national goals - and which lie beyond their own accomplishment as individuals or voluntary groups.

In this context let us turn specifically to the field of education. In primary and secondary education, despite all our self criticism, we lead the world. And in those communities where citizens are committed to the best possible education for their children, we have the best schools in the world. Beyond the high school, however, the situation changes.

For one thing, higher education for every American who wants it and merits it and can use it for the

good of the country and humanity is still beyond the financial capacity of thousands of our young every year. Moreover, two years of education beyond the high school is becoming an outright necessity for all American youth who have the capacity or desire to make use of it.

For a life of full citizenship in the closing years of this century, far more must be taught and learned than was needed forty or even twenty years ago - when a high school diploma was still acceptable evidence of preparation for full and productive living.

Some states - Ohio among them - are facing up to this need. But desperately needed is a ground swell of national talking and thinking about this critical element in the American Future. The transient crises of our daily headlines, compared to it, are dwarf worries. They will be taken in stride if we are to do something better to fit our heirs for the crises of their time.

For example, if we believe that every American youth, capable of learning, should have access to two years of college education at local, public expense, cannot we also support this further belief: beyond two years, only continued merit and motivation - two ingredients that would give reasonable assurance of a further contribution to society by the student - justify the spending of money and of teaching talent for the further education of any individual. The affluence of a parent can scarcely of itself be such a qualification.

We know that in an enterprise so large and so costly as higher education, the danger of waste is ever present. We must guard against it. Today, a great amount of private and public money is spent on those who seek only the status symbol of a college degree. Money so saved could be far more profitably spent on those who now find even a year of college beyond their financial reach.

This entire matter - of such consequence to the American Future - cannot be left to Washington. Educators - those closest to the problem - would generally agree, I think, that here the American people must be aroused and informed and of themselves move toward action.

Nor are increased expenditures of tax money the sole answer to the financing of expanded higher education. Where citizens are alert and vigilant, money so raised at the community and state levels is efficiently and effectively spent. But in the vast Federal Administrative network, both efficiency and effectiveness are reduced by the inescapable companions of bigness that range from red tape to political log rolling.

American citizens have always recognized these truths by their traditional giving to colleges and universities. In recent years private foundations have made possible daring experiments and break-throughs in education.

Certainly, in educational ventures like Case Institute, whose advanced progress and research benefit all America, the merit of the work done, the worth of the work to be done, should be the sole criterion of financial support. This criterion, on a national scale, cannot be well observed by bureaucrats distributing Federal tax revenue.

Corporate industry is coming to recognize its obligation and responsibility beyond the inescapable payment of taxes. And, in this recognition by industry, Ohio corporations through the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges, are setting an example for the entire country. Here in Cleveland the commitments of some of your leading corporations to give not less than one percent of income, before taxes, in aid to higher education is an outstanding example of corporate responsibility.

Now the conditional but magnificent gift of the Ford Foundation to Case Institute to strengthen still more its undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate program surely will accelerate the pace of voluntary support for this and other colleges and universities. But even more important will be its effect, if we here this evening are by it aroused to do all we can for the expansion and advancement of higher education for those best fitted to receive it; thus we shall become crusaders in arousing our fellow Americans to face up to this critical challenge. For what will it profit us to be armed so mightily today that none dare attack us - if our economy stagnates, if our leadership becomes dull, and if our technology sinks to second-rate; if we become disunited on basic issues, all because we allow ourselves to be losers in the world race in education?

Every citizen of this nation has a responsibility, I believe, to help assure that in this truly vital and even inescapable race, America will be first. For as an informed public opinion is the crucial influence in determining our national goals and the means for their attainment, so it is the greatest assurance of American progress as a world leader in the search for truth and in the pursuit of a peace with justice.

I salute the men and women, the friends and supporters of Case Institute. They are among the leaders who are facing up confidently and courageously to this serious situation - and are doing great things, planning even greater things, to meet it successfully.

• **Kansas City, November 11, 1961**

We meet today to rededicate - to humanity's hope for a tranquil world - this memorial, first erected in honor of great accomplishments by American fighting men of the past. As it has commemorated the courage and fortitude and patriotism of America's sons in war, now it is to stand as a beacon to light the way for those who persist in Man's age-old and never-ceasing quest for peace.

Here in the heartland of America - a sparsely populated wilderness a scant century and a half ago - in a city whose beginnings were only yesterday as we measure the calendar of time - we are come from all the continents of the earth. We come from places venerable in their antiquity; from cultures immense in their impact on human affairs; from nations whose origins are most ancient and from nations whose independence is newly won. And as we gather here for this rededication, mindful of the lessons of history, we are hopeful that we, ourselves, may help to shape a new and happier future for the community of nations.

Four decades ago, tens of thousands of Americans assembled on this same spot - in sorrow for those who had died; in pride that they and their fellows had fought to victory; above all, in hope that a like sacrifice in blood and valor and treasure would not again be asked of the nation. But it was; and on a vaster scale. The hope of Americans, of all people, was denied. Tyrannic power, possessed by a few and wielded by them in the lust for yet more power, destroyed the hope of people everywhere.

But hope has arisen still again. Today we seek so to array the peoples of the world in a common cause that they, by their united strength, will nullify despotic power, wielded despotically. The aspirations for peace with justice in freedom are shared by peoples of the free world; by those in the uncommitted nations; and by those behind the Iron Curtain. No people is so unaware of the tragedies, suffering and heartaches that are the inescapable accompaniment of war as to fail to see in the eventual abolition of this scourge, the greatest forward step in man's long and tortuous progress from darkness toward the light. But less universal than man's longing for peace is the faith that one day this peace - this greatest of blessings - will be achieved.

Indeed there are times when all but the stoutest are driven to the pessimistic conviction that the future will always have its tyrants who, aping those of past ages will not - in their greed for power and indifference to privations and sufferings of others - hesitate to lead peoples through another Gethsemane of war. We can scarcely wonder that those, who accept the inevitability of successive world catastrophes, can discern no way by which may be avoided the ultimate Armageddon.

Happily, in every land there are thousands who refuse to fall prey to this defeatist attitude. They recognize that man has never, in all history, been able to develop the intelligence, the intensity of conviction and the strength of spirit to turn the world's natural forces to humanity's betterment rather than its destruction. But they believe that only in striving for such development can the true road to peace be found and pursued. And because they are people of faith their numbers will increase until one day pessimism will give way to joyous anticipation and mankind's greatest goal will be in sight. Its attainment will come, then, through the sacrifices of those who - because of the depths of their convictions, will persist - in spite of setback and the defeatism of the weak!

True it is that to pursue these purposes fruitfully we must be assured of immediate security. In the realities of today's world we, the free nations, must so strongly maintain ourselves that threats and alarms and actual incursions by the disciples of force can never overcome us. Only thereby can we hope to avert tragedy. Free people, responding to the instinct of self-preservation, cheerfully pay the material costs and sacrifices of necessary security preparations.

This must be our course, even though we realize that any nation involved in such an effort is devoting its man hours and its resources to a purpose that is no more than negative; all its sweat and tears are spent only to keep and protect that which is already its own. Thus it is that even the threat of war is sufficient to prevent the

turning into productive channels all man's potential for self-improvement.

But as this price is being paid, other armies of men and women make the attainment and preservation of a just peace their prime objective. They will not be content with reliance on force alone. They are working constructively for objectives lying far beyond the mere holdings of an aggressor at bay. They are seeking to make it possible for the peoples of the earth, the poorest and the richest, the weakest and the strongest, to dedicate all their resources, all their intelligence, to improving man's lot on earth spiritually, intellectually and materially. It seems incomprehensible that even dictators would fail to join with others in this cooperative effort to remove from the backs of men the useless, futile and stupid burdens of war, freeing vast reservoirs of resources and energy for constructive purposes.

We recognize that the greatest danger today to peace is the closed society. In this sort of society, dictators refuse to allow their own people to participate in fateful national decisions or even to know what is going on in the world. Such secrecy is responsible for much of the mutual misunderstanding and prejudice that so plague the earth - a secrecy that can never exist among a people who enjoy freedom and practice self-government.

Those who control these politically walled-in nations are experts in distortion, deceit and coercion. They trade in fear and hate and false accusation, glorying in their arrogant usurpation of power over their own populations and in the apprehensions they create elsewhere in the world. So long as they are allowed to do so, they make most difficult the attainment of mutual understanding among the peoples of the earth, all of whom passionately desire to live in peace.

But the truth cannot forever be prevented from seeping into all the corners of the earth; ignorance cannot always hold sway over men. Such a program offers no spectacular or revolutionary changes in the world climate, to be seen or felt at once. But as it grows and spreads and becomes sturdier both in spirit and in size, the curve of progress will be sharply upward. Once it has reached the heights where the influence of mutual understanding is seen and felt by those despots who have heretofore stood so obstinately against progress, they will be compelled to change their attitudes or themselves be brushed aside.

But as every people, itself hoping for peace, begins to understand that all others live in the same deep hope, the fearful world dilemma in which we seem now to be frozen, will begin to melt. Our effort must be directed not so much, if at all, toward the tyrants who deliberately refuse every honest proposal for cooperation with others to fulfill mankind's greatest need. Their selfish purposes will not yield to persuasion - only to irresistible national and world opinion.

We turn our minds inward, to ask "What can I do?" This question is the inspiration for - the foundation of - The People to People program.

This movement, starting almost spontaneously throughout our nation, has inspired the organization of numerous committees representing cities; schools; churches; professional and vocational groups; and individuals. They are dedicated to the establishment of the indispensable foundation of a permanent peace - international and human understanding. In other nations similar movements with similar purposes are becoming prevalent everywhere on our side of the Iron Curtain. And all this work will become more influential as it becomes better unified.

To this end, it is hoped, here at home, that through a voluntary federation of all our committees there will be more effective coordination of the national effort, better cooperation with like groups in other lands. Such a movement has been initiated here in Kansas City.

In all this, the individual is still the key to success whether he operates through the groups and institutions which he may join, or merely as he himself meets others in the world and communicates to them his desire to learn about them, their histories and cultures and ways of life. Governments can speak to governments. And the results - or lack of results - are dramatized in the headlines of our newspapers, our radios and TV's. But more often than not drama is the only product. Policies don't change; relations don't improve noticeably even in the most spectacular circumstances. But if the peoples, represented by these governments, are mutually convinced of each other's good will, honesty of intention and decency of purpose, governments will begin to hear plainly the voices of their own millions, and even the most arrogant will have to listen.

The methods by which world pressure for peace can be engendered are without number. For example,

during my administration, our government engaged in many efforts to help strengthen the economy and independence of Indonesia. But I firmly believe the single most effective step in presenting America as a warm and good friend of Indonesia was a venture by the doctors and nurses and dedicated laymen and laywomen who supported and manned the hospital ship Hope - a part of the original People-to-People Program. That ship, moving from island to island throughout the Republic, its doctors and nurses working for the better health of individual human beings, erased from the minds of millions all propaganda that we are a war-mongering nation, a power-seeking nation. Instead, Indonesians came to see in these individual Americans the warm and generous heart, the friendly concern of all America.

To go even further back: when I was in Manila last year, a senior senator of the Philippines Congress, old enough to remember well the arrival of Americans in the islands, said the two great contributions of America to Filipino development were the elementary school and baseball. And the second was as important as the first, he thought. American soldiers went into the barrios, not as armed men but as human beings interested in their fellows, teaching ABC's and starting the boys and young men playing our national game. The result, he said, is an ingrained conviction among Filipinos that Americans are not - for our soldiers were not - imperial exploiters of weaker peoples.

The People-to-People program should be, on our side, an effort to learn more about and to understand our fellows, accompanied by an expanding crusade to portray the American way, the American system, the American people. The work done by the men and women of the hospital ship Hope, by our soldiers in the barrios of the Philippine Islands - is our example. It must go forward in all areas of our national being, cultural and intellectual, recreational and social, professional and economic. So doing, we shall help the world's peoples to achieve mutual understanding, based on truth proudly and fully exposed. Then, the day of the dictator will be done; the closed society will disappear.

And finally with this understanding and this exposure will come the day of honest and fruitful negotiation. And so - God willing - man will emerge from the dark shadows of war, to live ever after in the sunlight of peace, with justice, in freedom. With this prayer in our hearts we rededicate this great monument to Peace.

• **Century Association, December 7, 1961**

I am told that, by the terms of the Constitution of the Century Association, its members are to be men of "breadth of interest and qualities of mind and imagination which make them sympathetic, stimulating, and congenial companions, in a society of authors and artists." Undoubtedly, in the minds of its founders, or at least in their hopes, the Association would become a peaceful oasis, free from the clamor and pressures of daily crises. In such a place men could concern themselves with the enduring values of life; and could look at the affairs of mankind with a sort of calm, century-long vision, rather than in a hurried, sometimes harassed, short term view. In pursuit of this purpose the members of this association have, I am sure, never, in spite of the Association's enviable reputation, attained complete success; indeed they could not do so, for who can define for us with accuracy the difference between the long and short term! Especially whenever our affairs seem to be in crisis, we are almost compelled to give our first attention to the urgent present rather than to the important future.

Twenty years ago this morning, December 7, 1941, the military maneuvers of that fall - the largest ever carried out in our nation in peace - were behind me; but with my associates I was still working night and day to complete necessary reports and recommendations growing out of them. I was physically and mentally fagged out. The biggest thing on my immediate horizon was a planned Christmas leave with Mamie, to visit our son, John, a cadet at West Point.

On that Sunday afternoon I laid down for a nap in my tent quarters, leaving strict orders that I was not to be disturbed. But I was disturbed, violently and totally, by an aide bearing news of Pearl Harbor.

I do not doubt that the instant reaction in the back of my head was, "There goes another leave down the drain and how am I going to explain this to Mamie?" I do doubt that there flashed before my eyes any four-year

panoramic view of a vast national program that would carry our fighting forces across two oceans from disaster to victory.

Like most others, at that moment I reacted with an instinctive focus on short-term possibilities - and a fleeting hope that this report simply could not be true. But failing to sense, this evening, in this pleasant company any such explosive potential, may we not address ourselves to three topics that are century-type in their reach, implications and effects. They have to do with America's leadership toward a firm and just peace.

The first of these is: The achievement of unity within the nation as an essential requirement for survival, growth, and the realization of the American Dream, which is still the brightest light in an often dark world.

Second: Allocation of American resources for maintenance of American leadership and the eventual attainment of the republic's great goals.

Third: Cooperative effort among nations of the Western World - eventually with all nations - in the common purpose of achieving a durable peace.

History is not so ancient as to describe for us the beginnings of men's efforts to work together to perform a piece of work appearing worthwhile to the entire group. But if we come at once to the circumstances of our own time, we have no difficulty in recognizing the strength that is the product of unity among ourselves. Whatever the resources and strength of a nation, it is inevitably made greater and stronger by unity - cooperation among themselves - of its people.

We might assume that the spirit of nationalism, alone, could make us a completely unified people. But obviously this is far from the case; indeed it can never be true except as we are careful to point out that by using the term unity, we do not mean conformity. True unification of a free people can be achieved only through their common - indestructible - and patriotic dedication to the same basic principles and values. These are eloquently expressed for us in our founding documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

So let us consider some individual responsibilities and duties in perfecting the basic cooperation we need.

Among the first of these is to obtain a clear and universal understanding of the values we most venerate - including human liberty, individual rights and dignity, and national security - our dedication to which is the cement that makes us one. To attain such understanding means education, formal or practical or both, because through education we learn not only facts - the fundamental building blocks of understanding - but also how to put them together to erect the structures we want.

As a second principal responsibility we should, I think, try to select at all levels, through the institutions of self-government, the leaders we believe best able to identify for us the causes of any disunity and the positive programs which will best help to correct them. They will be fair minded men, able to distinguish between the important and the petty. An attempt to find unity in little things could create weakness, just as working for it in big things should produce strength. For we do not want a dreary regimentation of individuals in speech, dress, habits, in appreciation of aesthetic values - or, indeed, in thinking on details of current problems. Understanding and cooperation are advanced by lively discussion and honest debate.

This kind of discussion and debate cannot be confined to any narrow base - it must comprise the entire platform on which national strength and the national potential rest.

We must be first concerned with our spiritual strength, by which I mean our deep devotion to the priceless values of American life. The physical, alone, cannot protect or advance our nation. Respect for moral law, intellectual striving, patriotism that surmounts personal sacrifice and even risk of life - these are some of the characteristics of the spiritual strength by which nations have grown truly great - including and especially our own.

But just as man is a material as well as a spiritual being and must sustain a durable body in which a strong spirit may work, so does the strength of the nation comprehend material assets, what we call the economic structure. Without pausing to discuss the nature and the needs of the American economy - an economy which has carried us, up to this very moment to the very heights of economic supremacy - it is quite clear that without economic freedom we cannot, in the long run, preserve the fullness of personal freedom. A planned or ordered economy is one that is supposed to work by somebody's authority; a free economy does work in America by the millions of individual decisions made daily by millions of free people. The second we

begin, as a people, to trade a little liberty for a promised increase in material things, our unity, our idealism, and our strength will begin to diminish.

A third factor to which we must give our attention - if our nation is to be secure and strong in this day - is the adequacy of our military establishment. All of us have been concerned on this point, particularly since the outbreak of the Korean War. We seem at last to have learned that military weakness invites attack - strength instills caution and restraint on the part of any would-be aggressor. Particularly in view of rapidly increasing destructiveness and complexity of weaponry, I think it well to remind ourselves that military strength is something that can be achieved only through the pursuance of steady, studied policies. It does not and cannot change quickly in response to immediate crisis - it takes time to produce the weapons, the training, the organization and logistic support of great fighting forces. As a single example of the influence of the time factor - there was not a single model of American airplane used in World War II that was not already on the drawing board and planned for production before we entered that conflict in 1941. The need for thoughtful planning - for avoiding the ups and downs of our own effort, corresponding to alternate bullying and blandishments of potential aggressors, must be clear to us all.

The second long term subject earlier suggested is the allocation of American resources for maintenance of American leadership and the eventual attainment of the nation's great goals. Balance is needed, for there is a clear interdependence between spiritual, economic and military strength and should we give our attention and resources too much to one of the values, the others could be irreparably damaged.

If we are too deeply concerned, in the short term, with higher wages and bigger profits and with greater national affluence, the eventual result might be, for example, a neglect of the military that could be disastrous; as it easily might have been more than once in our history except for fortuitous circumstances. On the other hand, if we make the mistake of over-militarizing - with unnecessary billions laid out in a futile effort to assure our safety by weapons alone - then its damaging influence on our economy and national morale will be serious and the final effect will be not only a weakened leadership in the world, but a lessened ability to protect ourselves. Unnecessary expenditures for any purpose would have a similar effect according to their size.

The careful allocation of our resources for the attainment of our national goals is primarily the business of government. But it also is the business of government to inform us accurately - within the limits of discretion - as to what is needed, so that through this common understanding greater cooperation and overall strength will be ours.

Finally, we turn for a moment to the last and greatest of all these national purposes, the achievement of cooperation among nations. Attainment of this goal has defied the best efforts of statesmen for more than 24 centuries. The Delian League, with Athens at its head and founded in 487 B.C. for collective security, was successful for only a few short years. Then it descended into a form of imperialism and in some eighty years was destroyed. An attempt to revive it a century later was even less successful. The fate of the League of Nations we know; the United Nations is still on trial.

In war and peace I have lived and worked with nations and national leaders where differing goals, traditions and cultures made cooperation sometimes difficult to achieve. But those differences are not to be spoken of in the same breath as those that now beset the world. A large part of the free world is today opposed by atheistic dictatorships. We are engaged in a gigantic effort for world cooperation where ideologies, basic principles and interest are all in deep conflict. The new and underdeveloped nations cry aloud for help that must come from somewhere; but their road is long and hard and there are limits to what we can do.

There is much excuse for an immediate reaction of "Why try?" This one problem so concerns us as individuals and as a nation that it has definitely divisive effects even in our own homeland. The cynical or the merely pessimistic say "We are trying to buy cooperation and are being cheated and scorned because we do." They preach "Let us mind our own business, let others take care of themselves." On the other side of the coin, too many seem to believe that only money has any importance in this effort; that the more we pay out, the more secure we shall be.

We cannot believe either extreme, for as we cast our minds forward - what do we see? The preservation of liberty is a basic goal but can there be true liberty in a world that may become nothing but one huge - but divided - armed camp?

Human dignity is a priceless value but can there be any human rights and dignity when payment for an inexorable piling up of arms may finally rob the individual of his every opportunity to advance himself beyond a bare subsistence level?

Can there be any virtue in quitting? Suppose Washington had quit at Valley Forge? Can mere money from the outside strengthen the weak? What about dedication and determination? They must come from within.

Do we fancy that we can live as a free, leading, rich nation, an island of liberty in a sea of tyrannical communism surrounding us? Whom and what, then, would be leading? In such circumstances could we preserve our way of life? Neither abandonment of others or wasteful spending gives any promise of safety.

Certainly I can provide no blueprint for success. I can conceive of no better international forum - even though some improvements would increase its stature and influence if others would permit - than the one we now have. To destroy the United Nations would merely pile up more wreckage on the rock of Communist intransigence. Yet the United Nations obviously cannot today provide the confident security we seek.

So, admitting the difficulties before us, there are still a few things I do firmly believe:

Through mutual understanding cannot of itself bring peace, without understanding there will be no peace!

Peoples everywhere want peace, but governments that suppress rather than enlighten their populations prevent an honest expression of the peoples' will, and impede progress toward this world goal.

Man is made for striving - to strive nobly is his greatest happiness and satisfaction. To surrender is to cease living!

We and the world have weathered many storms of the past - we cannot doubt that we shall do so again.

We do not know the duration of the world battle - but knowing well the inevitable and heavy costs to win it, we can cling more firmly to patriotism, courage, tenacity, patience and faith - and our sense of humor.

So doing, we shall grow ever greater in resolution, wisdom and strength, and become a worthier leader toward a permanent and just peace.

May God speed the day!

• **Constitutional Convention of Michigan, December 13, 1961**

By the terms of the invitation that I received from this Convention by the hand of Mr. Romney, I have the honor of speaking to you briefly as you meet in the bipartisan purpose of re-writing the Constitution of the great state of Michigan.

Such a purpose, pursued in such a setting, cannot fail to bring to me, as an out-of-stater, renewed respect for my late friend, Senator Arthur Vandenberg. As the first individual of our nation to give true significance and real depth to the concept of bi-partisanship in our country's international affairs, it would be strange indeed if any of you engaged in this worthy effort should fail to feel a sense of guidance from his spirit and his mature wisdom. I am certain that all of you here are convinced - as I am - that his passing was a grievous loss to his state, his nation, and the world.

Because in political work at the state level, I have had no experience whatsoever, it would be far from fitting for me to urge upon you any notion of mine respecting either the form or content of the document you are engaged in preparing. But since I did have the privilege of serving for eight exciting years as head of the Federal government, it might be appropriate for me first to express to you some personal thoughts as to the desirable relationships between state and federal levels of government in this nation.

The several states - at least the first thirteen of them - are the collective parents of the Federal government; our Constitution recognizes that each of them possesses a sovereignty limited only by the specific grants of authority given by them to the central government.

If it were possible for us to have here, at this moment, a temporary reincarnation of any one of the framers of our Constitution, telling us with what care those men defined this relationship and how they believed it would develop, I am quite sure that we would be astonished by the differences in his vision in 1787 and the reality of 1961. By the same token our spiritual visitor would be bewildered, if not dismayed, by the result he

would see around him.

For example, some years ago a court decision extended the meaning of that section of the Constitution which accords to Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states - so as to include in the term interstate commerce, also those things that "affect such commerce." The changes that have grown out of that decision are indeed great - for the better or for the worse is here beside the point. But because we are bound by the judicial interpretations made of any part of the Constitution, the effect has been to place in the hands of the central government more power over the nation's internal commerce than was previously, and popularly, supposed to have been intended.

So as you set about the re-writing of your Constitution, it seems to me you must take account of other governmental changes in our nation. Such an examination is timely and I have felt - and surely you have felt - that there are tendencies developing that affect adversely our cherished ideas of government and tend to revise the structure built by those who preceded us. Of those principles I refer specifically to one drawn from the colonists' bitter struggle against tyranny and from man's progress from serfdom to liberty and self-government. That principle is this: Those who would be and would stay free must stand eternal watch against undue centralization of power in government. Faithful to that principle, our founders saw to it that governmental authorities would be diffused - counter balanced - checked, hedged about and restrained so as to minimize the possibility of its abuse. In that principle and in those precautions, we have believed was established the true anchor of our freedom.

Due to our decentralized system, most political economic questions can be approached in many reasonable ways. With our Constitutional checks and balances, with our State and territorial governments, our multiplicity of county and municipal governing bodies, our emphasis upon individual initiative and community responsibility, there is encouraged unlimited experimentation in the solving of America's problems. Through this diversified approach the effect of error is restrained, calamitous mistakes are avoided, and the self-governing genius of our people is perpetually renewed.

In this vast system of self-government, the state echelon is of vital importance, and was so recognized by our forefathers.

Being accustomed to decentralized authority, we are too often inclined to accept as an ordinary fact of life, and to assume that it will always endure. But in other lands millions, helpless before concentrated power, have been born and lived and have died in slavery; or have lost their liberties to despots. Today, in those areas, any one who speaks does so as the government directs, or he speaks no more. A meeting such as this one would be unthinkable in those nations.

Contemplating those things, we in America gain renewed determination to hew to the principle of diffusion of power, knowing that only thus can we be sure to avoid drifting irretrievably - even though so slowly as to be almost imperceptible - into the grasp of some form of centralized government.

Our governmental system has survived longer than any other attempt to conduct a nation's affairs by the authority of the people themselves. Yet we have often been cautioned by responsible observers that in the measurable future, if present trends continue, the states will finally degenerate into powerless satellites of the national government in Washington.

The tendency of bureaucracy to grow in size and power does not bear the whole of the blame for the march of political power toward Washington. Never under our Constitutional system could the national government have syphoned away so much state responsibility and authority without the neglect, acquiescence, or unthinking cooperation of the states themselves. Every state failure to meet a pressing public need has created the opportunity, developed the excuse and fed the temptation for the national government to poach on the state's preserve. Year by year, responding to transient popular demands and localities seeking special advantage, the Congress has increased Federal functions. The pendulum of power has swung far from our states toward the Federal government.

Eight years ago, I publicly expressed the conviction that unless we preserve the traditional power and responsibilities of state government, with revenues necessary to assure exercise of that power and discharge those responsibilities, there will not forever be preserved the kind of America we have known. Eventually we shall have, instead, another form of government, and therefore quite another kind of America. That conviction I

hold just as firmly today.

In that same year I obtained Congressional authority to establish a Commission to study and report on Intergovernmental Relations. The study brought long-needed perspective and pointed the way to improvement in areas of mutual concern to the states and the Federal government. Unfortunately sound recommendation and resultant action are not always the same.

Opposed though I am to needless Federal expense and centralization of power, I found it necessary at times, during my terms in the Presidency, to urge Federal action in some areas traditionally reserved to the states. In each instance, state inaction or inadequate action, coupled with undeniable national need, forced emergency Federal intervention. But I tried to keep the word "emergency" of real significance in such legislation so that the invasion which I felt forced to accept, would not be of long duration. These recommendations applied to such problems as classroom shortages, slum clearance, urban renewal, relief in the case of natural disasters and matters of traffic safety.

In varying degrees and varying circumstances, both Federal and State responsibility in some types of activity has been, is now, and will continue to be indispensable. But I would urge that the states insistently contend for the fullest possible responsibility, well-knowing that with responsibility there goes, in the long run, authority.

Take the matter of traffic safety. This, happily, is still a state and local responsibility, but day by day the American people are paying a fearful price for the failure of the states to agree on such safety essentials as standards for licensing of drivers and vehicles and basic rules of the road. Each year, from 35,000 to 40,000 persons are killed on our highways, a million and a half citizens injured, of whom many are disabled for life. In addition, the estimated cost to the country, in the year 1956, for example, was almost five billion dollars. We simply cannot let this go on. The human and material costs of inaction are prohibitive. Who is going to fill the vacuum? Someone must and someone will. I believe that the Federal government has a function, but only as a leader and coordinator. The basic responsibility and authority should be with the states among which there should be effective cooperation.

I believe that the preservation of our states as vigorous, powerful governmental entities is essential to permanent individual freedom and to national growth. But it is idle to champion states' rights without upholding states' responsibilities as well. So I hope that the rewritten draft of Michigan's constitution will define carefully the responsibilities that its people believe should belong to Michigan, and that they will forthrightly assume and exercise the authority essential to the carrying out of those responsibilities.

So acting, they will do something, positive and effective, about problems that directly concern their fortunes, their welfare, and their lives - the spending of their tax money wisely and efficiently; the development of programs and institutions best fitted to fill the present needs and to promote the future well-being of Michigan; the creation of long-term policies that will foster in the state a climate of opportunity for every citizen and his family, a reasonable assurance that opportunity can be used for his and his family's good.

Of and by and for themselves, they will be using their money; improving their present; exploring their future - as these things can never be done by a distant and centralized bureaucracy, preoccupied with its own amplification and the manufacture of inflexible master plans for the infinitely varied circumstances of fifty sovereign states and many thousand communities.

The responsibilities, best exercised by the people of a state, can be returned to them in all fifty states. And Michigan can lead the way.

The only limit placed by the Constitution on the kind of state government established by its people is that it must be republican in form. I believe, therefore, that this body, awakened to the trends of our time, has an opportunity to establish greater respect for the vital place that state government has filled in our national development. Michigan's example of self-examination and its assertion of responsibility and authority could lead to like action in other states of the union.

Let us not forget that the American people are not completely dependent upon Congressional action to accomplish any amendment in the national Constitution if they should believe such action desirable. On the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, the Congress is compelled to call a convention for proposed amendments. It is quite clear that if two-thirds of the states wanted our Constitution so amended as

to define more exactly proper relations between the Federal and State governments, they could accomplish this by gaining the approval of three-fourths of the states.

Now a final word which may be shooting far wide of the target at which you are aiming. It is my hope that in its preamble or in accompanying documents of your new Constitution, there will be greater emphasis placed, particularly before our young people, on the opportunities rather than merely upon the problems and fears of our age. The hope of life-long individual security is a natural one; but it is not an inspirational impulse. It does not encourage exploration, venturesomeness, ambition. Unless the individual is inspired to dream, work and accomplish according to his own needs and desires, he will be courting a dreary, dull and eventually an insecure life indeed. I pray that the language of your new Constitution will bring to its people a message of hope, a feeling of greater courage and confidence, a pioneering urge to sustain and enjoy freedom to the full. With such confidence the people of Michigan, your state government, and other state governments, will cheerfully assume their own responsibilities, assert their proper authority over them, and repel any temptation of whatsoever kind to surrender these to the government in Washington.

Put it this way - if our people are to be tireless, two-fisted champions and workers for America's great goals, they should have two-fisted, sturdy, alert and tireless state governments to preserve their opportunities and give them example.

• Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, January 31, 1962

In the American Constitution our Fathers brought forth a governmental experiment - a plan new in the world - with new prescriptions for the functions of the State and for its relationship with the citizenry. The Founders conceived government as the servant, not the master of the individual. To assure fulfillment of their idea, they provided for a dispersal of political power, both functionally and geographically, and added to the original document ten Amendments, popularly known as the American Bill of Rights. They provided for the untrammelled liberty of the individual - limited only by his obligation to observe similar rights of others - and allocated only specified powers to the central government, reserving all others to the states and the people. They assured that economic activity would be based upon the right to private ownership of property, individual initiative, and equality of opportunity - and established a workable system of representative government.

They thus provided that political and economic freedom would go hand in hand, believing that neither could be fully enjoyed without the other.

This new system of government and the public institutions established thereunder came to test through practical use, and as we grew in power this country became known around the world as the land of opportunity, the home of freedom, the place where dreams could, through ability, become true.

As time went on oppressed people from many lands flocked to our shores. But America became more than a haven for the weary; it was soon known as a land in which the individual's right to legitimate self-betterment was unlimited. Blessed by a continent wealthy in natural resources and populated by venturesome, courageous individuals ready to make the most of opportunity, the American experiment enjoyed striking success.

But the truth is that the American concept is still a revolutionary idea; our form of government is still on test, with its long term durability yet to be proved.

Of the many later, similar, experiments in other nations, few have enjoyed a success proportionate to ours or have been able to sustain their system on the lines established.

In our case, during the years that have followed our founding, the nation has grown beyond any dimension ever imagined by those who conceived the plan. From a population of three million at the time of the adoption of our Constitution - and only thirty-five million in the days of Lincoln, we have expanded to a citizenship totaling something like 185 million souls.

And by no means is our progress to be measured merely in numbers of people. American achievements have been such as to astonish the world - among which are unprecedented attainments in the field of public education, high living standards, and extraordinary social progress. Moreover - at a time of unending

international tension - our nation has emerged, under God, as the outstanding hope of the world as a power for peace. All these changes - as well as the disappointing experiences in so many other nations - suggest the need to re-examine and, where necessary, strengthen the forces which have made us great and kept us free.

I personally believe that these forces constitute the character of our people.

Fundamentally, it is the goals we seek, the policies we pursue, the principles we espouse and the ideals we enthrone, that are the forces that determine what we are as a nation. Wealth, productive capacity, living standards and education, are not in themselves so important as are the uses which we make of them. Human liberty and dignity, equality of opportunity for all, with maximum responsibility on the individual, and a just peace, are among the goals that America has set above all else - our striving for them shapes our nation's character.

Economic strength of course constitutes a major element in our nation's stature, and because the authors of the Constitution placed their hopes for material progress in a free and competitive economy, there has been fostered among us respect for individual initiative and responsibility. And these human characteristics have sustained freedom in the economy. Thus through the 172 years since Washington's Inauguration, our national character and our economic institutions have acted and reacted upon each other. Whatever acts adversely upon freedom and competition in the economy damages also the national character.

Among these weakening influences are monopolies of any kind, pressure groups seeking selfish advantage at the expense of the whole, anti-business complexes on the part of so-called brain trusters in prominent positions, and lethargy, indifference or ignorance on the part of the public.

Respecting monopoly the men of 1787 were concerned primarily with preventing a concentration of political power. But during the intervening years our people learned that other centralized power, whether of finance, management or labor, can be equally damaging. So on the books there have been placed many laws affecting our economy. They are meant to prevent monopoly, to sustain an atmosphere in which free enterprise can flourish, and to foster and regulate labor unions. But there are grave doubts that the present legal framework designed for these purposes really fits the problems of today. We set competitive markets as our ideal; but attempt to insulate the great agricultural industry from the operation of competitive forces. We exhort business concerns not to hold prices artificially high; but warn them not to drop them to "unreasonably low" levels. We rightly encourage the growth of democratic labor unions; then seem reluctant to provide their members with adequate safeguards for individual rights and opportunity. We give lip service to the prerogatives of the states and local governments; then seek to solve all problems with a new Federal law.

The present would seem to be a propitious time to overhaul current practices and laws - to examine into their efficacy in this changing world in strengthening initiative and self-reliance, creating opportunity, and sustaining the spiritual and material strength of the nation. There are many areas in government, in business, universities and in professional research organizations, in which to make exhaustive studies of any developing deficiencies and to propose measures, including revisions in pertinent laws, to correct adverse trends. I think all should be used. Indeed, it occurs to me that support for such a project might make a good plank in a political platform.

The pressure groups and the pandering to them by opportunistic politicians and candidates present a different kind of problem. Their influence can scarcely be diminished or eliminated by laws. This is the business of all of us. Most pressure groupings exist primarily to influence city councils, state legislatures and the Congress itself. The only way that these governing bodies can be immunized from selfish pressure is for all of us to support for public office only individuals of courage and character - people who are ready to think of the nation instead of a self-seeking section thereof, and are determined to act upon their own convictions.

Unrealistic, you say? What do you suppose people thought of the whole theory of self-government a few centuries ago? Many said fantastic; others impossible! I believe that unless our citizenry universally devotes itself to electing men of character and some wisdom as their leaders - we could, one day, lose the right to elect anyone. I am delighted to know that the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce shares these convictions.

Next - all of us must understand that if our system of free enterprise is to flourish and prosper, its members - of all sections and classifications - must respect work. Wherever malingering in any group or class is condoned - whether in management, scientist or worker - progress is destined to be slow. Adequate leisure is

not only desirable, it is healthy for mind as well as body - but unwarranted idleness in any part of the population cannot fail, correspondingly, to slow up rate of growth.

A free economy strives to induce workers to put forth their constructive efforts voluntarily. Unionism, though good in itself, must find some way to provide to its members opportunity for promotion and advancement to management levels. Thus they can again make it possible for each one of its members, given the ability, to become president of the company. Assurance of this opportunity can easily become more important than immediate - and sometimes imaginary - financial gain. But our greatest need is for a productive process so operating that the worker's interest, the investors' and managers' interest and that of the entire society are not in conflict but are, in effect, identical. So long as all these groups recognize this need and, through free choice, strive toward its fulfillment, our economy will remain, as it is today, the strongest and most effective in the world. And we will remain free of control by designing politicians.

It is difficult to see how anyone can urge, for example, a satisfactory rate of real growth in the economy, which we need, and at the same time a restriction of the work week to twenty-five hours. The two surely do not go together - certainly not at this stage of our development. And how can such a development lower our production costs and aid in a reciprocal lowering of tariffs and promoting an acceleration of international trade - an ever increasing need of our society.

During the depression years of the 30's, our country became accustomed to, and finally grew suspicious of, "make-work projects" both public and private. Later on, in the 1940's, huge demand for all varieties of goods and services led to inefficiency and to the neglect of true productivity in work performed. Today we are not lacking in specific indications that we are drifting toward a feather-bed economy.

In saying this I am not referring merely to the make-work rules adopted by some unions; rather I think we should be concerned with all the practices and trends in fields that may put present affluence above needed accomplishment - that may diminish incentive, stifle competition and, in the name of security, lessen opportunity. We need to sustain and ever strengthen the national character; a need that grows more insistent as foreign competitors are increasingly challenging our ability to produce more, of higher quality, at lower cost.

When the individual is responsible for his fate he tends to manage his affairs best. Starting with a sense of duty to himself and his family, he learns self-discipline; he weighs the consequences of his choices, takes the long view, orders his priorities and acts accordingly. In short, he becomes a sturdy, confident, proud citizen of this nation.

Should the majority of our citizens abandon or surrender to the State their personal responsibilities, the state itself cannot, for long, sustain the restraint which its citizens have foregone. In such circumstances, if we and our government lack the political courage either to raise taxes or to limit spending only to the necessary, deficits are inevitable. Long pursued, such a policy invites retribution. Inflation appears, with all its evil effects both on our economic health and on our national character. The dollar is depreciated at home and abroad. If we do not discipline ourselves and put our domestic fiscal affairs in order, we must suffer both in credit and in prestige.

For a trustworthy currency is more than a mark of solvency; it is one aspect of sovereignty and evidence of national self-respect. And perhaps we should emphasize more the mutual dependence between self-respect and self-reliance, both individually and nationally.

We know, of course, that a vigorous, expanding economic system such as ours does not operate faultlessly. Inherent in any plan which offers rewards for success are penalties for failing. There may be the loss of savings through ventures unsuccessfully undertaken; there is the possibility of joblessness through no fault of one's own; there is the privation sometimes suffered when the family breadwinner dies; and there is the fear that the end of one's working years may mean poverty or dependence.

The distressing human problems which beset those who may be economically disadvantaged in our system are a proper public concern. Dedication to human welfare is and should always be a major factor in the make-up of our people. But I believe that the stronger our economy and the more vital the national character, the better will be solved these problems - close to home, and without loss of human dignity.

Our society is oriented to the future. It must either grow or wither. It has grown in the past because men were willing to take risks, were proud of a job well done and were stimulated by a system which rewarded

individuals largely on their performance.

It is sometimes the fashion for critics to deprecate these qualities of character which helped shape our past. We hear it said that the extraordinary complexities of modern life - the Cold War, accelerating technology, urbanization - all make obsolete the strengths of the past. Such critics do not over-estimate the difficulties of our times. But they have lost faith in the ability of the American people to overcome the intricate problems confronting us - and conclude that we must rely more on a powerful, dominating, central government rather than on the strength of the nation's character. Such critics are defeatists. The problems are complex - but it is only a resolute, resourceful, responsible people who can provide their ultimate solution.

Nothing can ever stop us from steadily enlarging our nation's bright record except ourselves. We, all of us, make up the nation and the nation's character. So long as that character is one of ideals, courage, humaneness, self-reliance and integrity, America will grow in strength and prestige, and her influence in leading the world toward a peace with justice will be multiplied.

So, as a people, I devoutly hope we will always be vigilant in detecting and breaking up monopoly or concentrated power of every kind. I likewise trust that we will make it our business to repudiate feather-bedding and to glorify hard work at all levels; to rely on ourselves rather than seek selfish advantage from a compliant government; to pay our way rather than pile up mounting debt on our children; to draw inspiration from freedom's accomplishments rather than to fear its future; to be alert in combating weakening trends in the national character. Above all, may we never be tempted, on any excuse whatever, to belittle or demean our nation and her accomplishments and power. America is not merely a continent filled with teeming millions - it is a way of life that commands the best efforts and everlasting devotion of every loyal citizen.

Theodore Roosevelt put it this way: "Americanism means the virtues of courage, honor, justice, sincerity and hardihood - the virtues that made America. The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, peace-at-any-price, safety-first instead of duty-first, the love-of-self-living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

By preserving such an America we will not only assure our own safety and prosperity, but we will increase our ability to pass on, unimpaired, the continuing American experiment in representative government, with its guarantees of human liberty and dignity and individual opportunity.

• Republican Closed Circuit Television, Los Angeles, February 1, 1962

All across the land, this evening, thousands of Republicans, in these great gatherings, are thinking earnestly about our Party and the nation - something about their past and present, even more about their future. You, assembled at these Republican dinners, are crusaders who will strive to insure a happy destiny for our country. I deem it a great privilege to volunteer with you for the work ahead.

During 56 of the 72 years following upon the election of Mr. Lincoln, the electorate consistently entrusted the nation's political leadership to the Republican Party. Those were the years that saw the settling of the West, the building of national systems of railways and electrical communications, the transformation of an economy predominantly agricultural into a strong industrial society, the beginning of the air age, and the transition of our once largely isolated nation into a major world power. They were productive and fruitful years - years of growth and progress under Republican policies and programs.

But looking back over the past three decades, the brightness of this Republican picture has dimmed. Beginning in 1932, Republicans have won the Presidency but twice. During all that thirty year period we have had control of Congress only four years. In 1930 there were 30 Republican Governors in 48 states; now we have 16 in 50. Today in the House of Representatives we are outnumbered 3 to 2, and in the Senate by 2 to 1. Only 14 of the 41 big cities of the nation produced Republican majorities in 1960.

These facts, though depressing, are no cause for defeatism; but they should inspire, I think, rigid self-analysis and a compulsion to seek honest answers to the questions: "Why has all this happened?" and "What do we do now?" and make the answers the starting point for a new climb to victory for the Republican Party and to the restoration of sound guidance of the nation's future.

There is no need to take time here to criticize and attack the policies and actions of our political opponents, although they have provided a vast and inviting field for such an assault by every good Republican. Rather, I suggest that we concern ourselves tonight with reasons for the present state of Republican fortunes, entering into the task thoroughly and soberly - noting our assets as well as searching out our weaknesses.

I shall give you a few personal thoughts as to how we might begin.

First, let us look at the basic reason for the existence of a political party - the support, by its members, of a commonly-held political philosophy. The logical standard by which to make valid comparisons of opposing party doctrines is the degree in which each conforms to American ideals, promotes real progress, is faithful to concepts expounded in the Founding Documents, and stimulates national greatness. In such a comparison, by such standards, our Party stands forth vastly superior to anything our opponents can offer.

For example: We Republicans place our faith in the citizen's capacity to carry the nation further and faster along the road of true progress than can any planned economy or paternalistic bureaucracy. The opposition's practice is to espouse bigger public assistance programs and to create more powerful central government and controls.

Republicans strive to create an atmosphere favorable to real progress by encouraging individual initiative and competitive incentive. The opposition believes in legislation against self-reliance and for "cradle-to-grave" over-protection, without regard to need. Consequently it has consistently indulged in profligate spending - leading to inflation.

We insist that laws and governmental programs be so designed as to affect fairly and evenly all segments of the population and that good government depends upon fiscal integrity, with federal funds belonging to the people and not to any political party. The opposition caters to special interests and to various voting groups, advancing wasteful governmental programs whose cost must come, directly or indirectly, out of the family budget. Some of the slyly labelled growth programs are nothing but bureaucratic bloat!! In the meantime our political opponents want the government to live on a flood of IOU's which burden us and threaten to inundate our children.

We think it important for all parties and individuals to testify to their pride and confidence in this great nation, its strength, and its purpose. The opposition leaders have in the past not hesitated to belittle our country, alleging gaps and weaknesses in American strength and security programs, deficiencies which they themselves have had later to admit did not exist.

I could go on with such comparisons, but to do so only serves to emphasize this crucial question: "Why, with so much to offer that is logical and sound, and a record of living up to our Republican promises, does the electorate choose to buy the inferior product of the opposition?"

Our opponents have been winning, we have not - a circumstance that has not, happily, induced Republicans passively to accept the role of habitual losers. But perhaps our fighting spirit has not been made manifest throughout the nation: we must look like, act like, and be, winners.

As I travel about this broad land, I've become convinced that morale is high among the inarticulate rank and file of the Republican Party - and that the Party's principles are supported by millions of like-thinking Independents and discerning Democrats. Nevertheless our story, good though it is, has not been getting across - our product too often is left on the shelves of defeat, while the less reliable goods of the opponents are accepted by the electorate. The conclusion would seem to be that our marketing system is not good enough - a defect that must be quickly eliminated. Indeed, already many are hard at work to do just this; all of us must get into the act.

We should look first, I think, to the organizational phrases of our sales force! Does it reach effectively into every nook and cranny of the entire country? In a recent gubernatorial race I was told that in three counties normally expected to yield large Republican majorities, the vote was far lighter than the average in the state, probably accounting for the defeat of our ticket. For such a result either complacency or lack of thoroughness in organization must have been the cause.

Every precinct, every block, should have its own dedicated Republican workers for sound government, and each worker must be properly joined with his next higher superior until the entire Party can operate effectively as a unit.

However, organizational excellence cannot, alone, produce an efficient marketing system. We need

intelligent, personable, dedicated and energetic leaders. These men and women are the Party's salesmen and they must know exactly the composition and value of the political programs they present, on our behalf, to the public. This applies to candidates, to precinct and district leaders, to county and state chairmen, to the National Committee and every Republican holding an office of public trust.

All this work must be persistent. From one election to the next, each of us must help to inform and to recruit - and on every election day make certain that all Republicans, and all the people that we have reached and educated, will be on hand to cast their votes.

Such work takes money - lots of money; to solve this financial problem none is so poor that he cannot help. The pennies of those who can afford to give no more are as valuable as the big checks of the affluent. For when giving from our pocketbooks, we also give something - far more important - ourselves.

Next, we must assure and maintain the unity of the entire force. The little details of doctrine that may seem to divide us are not nearly so important as the basic principles that unite us.

But those divisions among us that may be created, at times, by inordinate personal ambition, or by the use of divisive and confusing words and definitions, can be harmful.

We should discard, I believe, such shopworn and meaningless terms as "liberal" and "conservative," one reason being that I have never yet found anyone who could convincingly explain his own definitions of these political classifications.

At one end of the political spectrum are the so-called "liberals" who seek a planned economy direct from Washington. At the other we see extremists - masquerading under the name of conservatives - who are ready to abandon self-government in favor of the "strong man" concept. With both ends of the political spectrum supporting centralized power and control over our nation, what are the true meanings of these worn-out terms?

Instead of trying to describe what we are, why not say what we are for? I deeply believe that we, as a Party, can truthfully say - and should - that we are for responsible progress, by and for free individuals.

Another item: For the Republican Party, 1964 has, of course, a great importance. But it is two years away. 1962 is here - with much work to be done. We are like an army that, to launch a great and effective attack, must fight first for its jump-off line. Our jump-off line is resounding victory in '62 - after which we'll be all set for victory in the big campaign of '64.

Now that our minds are on battle, another point comes to mind. All of us know that when the fighting gets tough - good and faithful allies are a tremendous asset. The Republican "welcome mat" should always be out for potential allies - all kinds of citizens who want to help promote sound and progressive government. Many of these organize themselves into groups.

This kind of organization, political but not publicly partisan, is especially appealing to younger citizens. Such groupments can help to carry the message everywhere. They will strengthen the atmosphere of idealism in political activity - and, as they become experienced in political work, will tend to affiliate with political organizations and individuals they represent and admire. As a Party we need only to demonstrate the integrity, common sense and unselfishness to attract them to us, and the hospitality to make them welcome.

One more word: Our aim is nothing less than to make all citizens see how much the Republican program and its leaders offer to them in sustaining individual liberty and promoting security, opportunity and sound material progress. We will not be diverted from this work not divided among ourselves. We are out to win, working with our hands, our hearts and our pocketbooks for an ever stronger nation of freedom and a world peace with justice.

With a nation and a world at stake, let's roll up our sleeves and get going!

• **Eisenhower Library Dedication, Abilene, Kansas, May 1, 1962**

While I am not an official part of this program of dedication, I still ask for the privilege of standing before you to thank all of those people who, with their moral support, their financial support, their imagination and their leadership, made possible the erection and maintenance of this library. And through the Governor I

should like to make known my gratitude to all the people of Kansas because of their very special part in providing certain of the features of this project that otherwise would have been difficult to provide.

As I stand here, my mind goes back to something that Senator Darby just said. He recalled that this is the one-hundredth anniversary of my Mother's birth. For those of the Eisenhower family, this statement has a very deep meaning and a very special significance because I think that all of her sons - indeed, all of her close relatives - would, today, like to think that she knows that they still revere her teachings, her strength, her refusal ever to admit defeat in small or great things. She was truly a remarkable person! And if her helpmate, our Father, was the same, but because he was working and she was home, we had so much more of her teaching that I think our thoughts normally go first to her.

And I think - to those people of Abilene who do not know it - I think it is a very nice coincidence that my oldest friend in this town has his eighty-fourth birthday today - Charlie Case.

If we cast our minds back over this century, to which I have just alluded, we are amazed to think of the changes that have come about. From the time of the Civil War until this very day, we have experienced the greatest, most marvelous period for the development of scientific thought, accomplishment, industrial improvement - every kind of advance that we can conceivably think of for the betterment of standards of living and for the material benefits of all our people. These changes are so great that there is no need to go into the fields of communication, and transportation and all of the other things - even down to the point of men circling the earth in space and returning to tell their story. But, if you would indulge me for a moment, I should like to contemplate with you for a few seconds whether these changes, all of which, when properly used, are for the good of mankind, have marked a similar advance in our ideals, our aspirations, the morale of our country - indeed, its soul.

We venerate the pioneers who fought droughts and floods, isolation and Indians, to come to Kansas and westward to settle into their homes, to till the soil, and raise their families. We think of their sturdiness, their self-reliance, their faith in their God. We think of their glorious pride in America. Now, I wonder if some of those people could come back today and see us doing a "twist" instead of a minuet, whether they would be particularly struck by the beauty of that dance. Now, I have no objection to the "twist," as such, but it does represent some kind of change in our standards. When we see movies and the stage, and books and periodicals, using vulgarity, sensuality - indeed, downright filth - to sell their wares, do you think that America has advanced morally as we have materially? When we see our very art forms so changed that we seem to have forgotten the works of Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci, and speak in the present in terms of a piece of canvas that looks like a broken down tin lizzie, loaded with paint, has been driven over it, is this improvement? What has happened to our concept of beauty and decency and morality?

Now, America today is just as strong as it needs to be. America is the strongest nation in the world and she will never be defeated or damaged seriously by anyone from the outside. Only Americans can ever hurt America.

And so I am very proud of the fact that so many people have banded together - associated themselves together - to build a certain record of the past. The central theme of the documents in this beautiful edifice will be, of course, the policies and programs and decisions and personalities of the Federal Government during the years 1953 through 1961. But just as no political program can be carried out in a vacuum, so can no record or history of that time be properly portrayed except with a background of the events and the times in which they lived.

And so there will be a record of all of our material progress, all of our philosophic advances, all of our changes in education, and all of our differences in our expressions of faith in our God and in our country. And I personally believe that as these things flow up and down like a tide, ebbing and coming in, that we are about to see, and are seeing, a renaissance in American pride in America - in American pride in the characteristics that have made America great - in the qualities that we so much admire in our leaders, from Benjamin Franklin through Washington, right down to our own times - where those people have been honest and straightforward and courageous - ready to do their duty - and are dedicated to you - all of you - instead of to themselves. I believe, as we contemplate their lives and all the things they did, our spirits go up. We remember again such words as those of Patrick Henry and of Nathan Hale, to which, as children, and from the time that we were

children, we have responded to with our entire hearts.

So, my prayer is merely this: That all of us will be inspired by the examples of those men long gone. And we will be inspired by the people who have thought it proper to preserve for America in a written form the record of the era through which this generation is passing. I believe, from this, we will get inspiration in our material achievements. I am confident that the American people will see to it that our spiritual strength - the morale of this country - is just as strong, just as outspoken, and is just as much a source of pride for all of us as it was in the days of Lincoln or Washington or the others. As long as this is true, America will always be the greatest government, the greatest nation, because then we need not fear that we will suffer the fate of Rome - rather, we will go on, up and up, into a stronger position of world leadership, until at last we can all enjoy peace with justice, freedom and liberty for all. Thank you very much.

• Union League Club, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 14, 1962

An American who comes to Philadelphia to address a gathering of her citizens cannot escape a feeling of humility, if not apology. However deeply felt his words may be or strongly expressed, the best within him is faint and fleeting after what was said and written here during the early summer days of 1776.

The speaker can only so strive that, his talk ended, he may hope to echo Lincoln, in Philadelphia on the eve of his inaugural: "I have said nothing but what I am willing to live by, and, in the pleasure of Almighty God, die by." Of course, in trying too hard, in taking himself too seriously, the speaker may fail utterly. His end product may be solemn platitude of pompous insignificance.

To avoid such offense against your time and ears, I shall, with your permission, speak only in a personal vein, offering you some personal reactions to this occasion and to the days in which we live. In a Pennsylvania city I think I can appropriately do so, because of my own Pennsylvania citizenship and of family ties that reach back more than 200 years. Here my forebears came before the mid-mark of the eighteenth century and here they lived through its second half and most of the nineteenth century. Through all those years, Philadelphia was for them the big - the great - city. Then a little over two hundred years after their arrival, my wife and I, after a life of world wandering, settled here to live in the Keystone State. Now, once again, in the second half of the twentieth century, three generations of our particular branch of the Eisenhowers call Pennsylvania home.

This evening, if I were to choose a strictly personal text for my talk, the most apt would probably be: "Time Certainly Flies." Memories of my boyhood in Kansas - a long way from Pennsylvania - would be their beginning.

In those days, in that town - as in every place where Americans were gathered - where people talked of The War, only one war was meant - the War Between the States. During the conflict the Urban League was born, and now we celebrate the centennial of that birth.

Veterans of the Civil War by the thousands were, in my youthful years, still in the prime of life. They walked the streets of almost every American community. They were leaders in American enterprise. In particular, they performed a Homeric function, for they transformed us who listened to them - as they fought over old battles and re-tramped weary marches - into vicarious actors in events that seemed to us more current than historic.

Moreover, in those days, too, when people talked of a centennial they meant the one - that of 1876 - held here in Philadelphia's Fairmount Park, to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the birth of a new nation. In my boyhood hardly a front parlor in an American home lacked a book portraying and describing the buildings and exhibits and wonders of that Centennial Exposition. And its pages were as avidly devoured by the youngsters of that day as is TV now.

So, to me at least - and I would guess to scores of others here tonight - this Union League Centennial seems more a recall of a recent yesterday than a memorial to a long distant past. Indeed to us of my age bracket, this celebration emphasizes the relative youth of the Republic. After all, just as in our younger years we talked familiarly with the veterans of the Civil War, they, in their boyhood, certainly talked with old soldiers and sailors of the 1812 War and even some few of the Revolution.

In the perspective granted us, we know the road thus far traveled is, under God and through the vigor of its peoples, the first short march on the nation's route to destiny.

Such confident knowledge is one privilege of birth before the 20th Century began. While we still have time, I hope we who enjoy that privilege will never cease to speak out our faith in America and Americans.

For my own part, I would venture to say to all who would listen:

In every trial; in every crisis; in every hour when the voices of fear and despair cry loud of defeat and doom; when voices of the self-centered seek to lead into unworthy paths; when the voices of weakness and doubt call for easy compromise or flight from stern decision; the history of the American epic provides for our people the surest guide to the goal of continual progress and achievement. The Americans before you - men and women of like flesh and spirit to you, of far less means and who were tested endlessly, even as you will forever be - found strength within themselves, inspired by the ideas and the ideals of the Republic, to labor tirelessly, courageously and faithfully, that they might be found worthy in the eyes of those who followed them - you.

What they accomplished, you can expand mightily in the same inspiration; and you will be found worthy in the eyes of those who follow you through centuries to come. You have inherited greatness. May you ever be great in your stewardship of that greatness so that, down all the years, America may be rightfully regarded as the teacher and effective leader toward human dignity, liberty, and freedom in a world of peace with justice.

Of course, for most Americans of a generation later than ours, a centennial such as this is concerned with men long gone; with deeds recorded in yellowing newspapers and musty pamphlets; with words stirring to those who heard them but, in the main, possibly unknown to the present celebrants.

For some, then, a centennial - even including those who most zealously observe it - may be only an exhibition of sentimental reverence for successes and accomplishments that shaped and expanded the American heritage. In the rush of world affairs, under the impact of endless crimes, amid the strife and the turmoil of this period, the American past may seem to younger citizens to have little relevance, worth only a ceremonial salute or hurried observance of standardized amenities. But counterfeit regard for the great moments of our history does hurt to both the present and to the future. Pro forma testimony of reverence for America may mask a woeful abandonment of inspiration for the times of trial; of courage for the times of risk; of faith for the times of doubt and fear. Indifference to the past could easily stultify the future.

A centennial in America, whether it be of a long-enduring institution or a heroic deed accomplished within minutes, of a man or movement, merits of us all more than passing thought.

By our participation in it, we recognize that much of what we have now was begun, fostered, preserved and extended, through no dealing of our own. We testify that, even if in our own time, we have been and are and will continue to be builders; we began as heirs already in possession of a goodly structure.

We strike once again Lincoln's "mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave, to every living part and hearthstone, all over this broad land..."

And we are better Americans, better fitted for tomorrow's demands, because - if only for a moment or an hour - we have thus been touched by worthy emotions.

And this is good, for the emotional element in American life - every bit as essential to creative and dynamic and sustained action as the rational, the scientific, and the economic - seems to be nourished best in study of our forefathers' tests and trials and triumphs.

In all our big and little crises, in the world conflict with Communism, in the disputes within our own economy, we too often neglect the emotional, sometimes ignore it entirely. Absolutely convinced of our own rectitude, we become preoccupied with proving that our position is uniquely and overwhelmingly rational, and with fortifying it by facts and figures, spelling it out in terms that we feel must compel instant agreement by all men of sense and good judgment. And often our exposition falls upon deaf ears or the reaction is a rejection of the rigidly logical as only half the story - the inhuman half.

When we appeal solely to the minds of men, rather to their minds and hearts, the best we can hope for is to win half the battle. The founders of the Urban League avoided that pitfall of cold and futile argument.

Among them, I am sure, were shrewd men of business whose paramount concern, on the surface, was the soundness of the dollar. And there were professional men among them who were sticklers for the rule of law

or of reason or of science. Very few of them, I suspect, would have called themselves idealists. But when they sought a common denominator for their unity in a cause, a slogan or a motto that expressed their singleness of purpose, they did not propose anything like:

Preservation of the Union means higher wages, bigger profits, and a safer future for all.

Or: Only the Union is constitutional, legal, economically fruitful and politically valid.

However potent such slogans might be in their impregnable logic or factual truth, the League would have none of them. Instead, it went back many centuries, across the oceans, to an alien people whose stoutest shield, whose first strength, was their fiery patriotism.

From them, the Union League founders took as their motto a phrase of universal appeal to men, of universal truth in its application to transitory problem or prolonged crisis - "Love of Country Leads."

In the constant proclamation of that motto by word and example, the present and future members of the League may find their most worthy mission through the years given them to work for the Republic.

The cynic, the sophisticate, the materialist, I am sure, will deride so simple an appeal. Such people are convinced that men must be bought by guarantees of profit or place or prestige; and that, although the price may vary, every man has his asking price.

They may speak out of malice or weariness with problems not easily solved. But I am certain they speak, too, out of a total ignorance of the American nature - and of all human nature, for that matter.

My own experience in life and with my fellow-citizens is not more narrow and limited than the experience of those who proclaim that Americans move only when lured by bribe or promise of material reward.

I have worked with Americans of all sorts and conditions, in all the varying circumstances of war and peace, in many parts of the world. Time and again I have seen these men and women, out of love of country, so rise above themselves, that they forget all else - profit, place, prestige, particularly safety and security - that they might serve their country well.

Their lives - and many of them gave their lives for the Republic - their sacrifices of self and fortune, their readiness to risk, their fortitude under the fire of caricature and criticism as well as under the fire of guns; all these prove to me that in the 20th Century, even as a century ago or two thousand years ago, love of country still leads men and women from the ruts of selfish preoccupation to the heights of patriotic enterprise.

Should we, as a people, ever weaken in our conscious and proudly proclaimed love of country, then indeed will our nation be in grave danger. Whatever official of government may mis-use his position and authority in a fashion inconsistent with his duty of devoting himself wholly to America and her institutions, freeing himself completely from any thought of personal advantage or transitory popularity, is not worthy of the trust his fellow citizens have placed in him. Whatever citizen deliberately seeks through political means his own selfish ease of living or advantage at the expense of others does violence to the truth, that Love of Country Leads - a truth as old as Rome itself.

And any citizen, any group, any party, any administration that hopes to stir a community, a state, the entire nation to greatness of endeavor must appeal, after God, to America's love of country. Therein, for us all, whatever our church or party of walk of life may be, is our common and greatest inspiration.

And so I would conclude these random and most personal remarks with two statements that are for me validated by a long and happy life within the Republic.

America is in the dawn of its destiny: Only Americans themselves - should they forfeit individual opportunity in exchange for governmentally guaranteed security, or abandon the path of proved principles and ways and ideals, to concentrate on selfish profit or soft life - can imperil its attainment.

And: The brightness of America's destiny will be the product of her mind, vitality and heart. Our industrial plants may flourish, our universities thrive, our commerce may crowd the markets of the globe; but all this will be sterile and finally lost unless love of country transforms material success into spiritual greatness.

This has been the story of America's past; may it be always so of her future!

I am grateful for this invitation to Princeton. It gave me the opportunity to join in these exercises in order that I may give my personal tribute to the work and accomplishments and life of Foster Dulles. It is not my purpose to eulogize one who needs no eulogy. I simply am here in the great hope that I can make others share something of my conviction that to Foster Dulles the world of today owes a great debt, and particularly because of the last six years of his life's work. Except for the members of his family and his long-time associates in business and in united and common ventures, I think I am the closest associate that Foster Dulles had in these last years.

He was a man of strong convictions, and there were, in some other parts of the world, people who knew the depth of his convictions and were uneasy about his appointment to his important post. There was one foreign statesman who even requested me not to appoint him as Secretary of State. I am happy to report that this statesman, before he left his office, came to regard Foster Dulles as a great exponent of the principles upon which free governments are established, and what they must do in order to protect themselves against the wicked, implacable threat of Communism, supported as it is, by the power of the Soviet-China Communist bloc. I know of no person who, once he realized what Foster's work was, did not respect him.

My basic hope today is to deal more personally with his work and our common association than would be possible in a formal address. Within a few months of our undertaking of our common tasks and work in the new administration in 1953, there developed between Foster Dulles and me a trust, a faith in each other, that was never for a second broken. He believed that there should be morality in international agreements and in the diplomacy through which nations dealt with each other. He was furious when in one book a man, acknowledged to be an expert, denied the usefulness of morality or that it had any place in foreign relations. Foster Dulles said, "Of course we have not had it. If we had, the world would be in peace. But is this any reason for us not striving to make sure that nations will become moral in their dealings with each other? Do they have to abandon moral law, truthfulness, integrity, decency, in dealing with each other?" I sincerely and earnestly agreed with his thoughts in this matter.

In getting even more personal, I must tell you this. Foster and I soon began to do our work on a very informal basis. We worked through little notes, telephone calls and, the most valuable of all, conversations which would take place in the late evening, when he would come over to my office and we would discuss affairs of the moment. It has been brought out from this stand this afternoon that he believed in firmness and strength. This he did, but he held also that our nation would meet with others in a spirit of give and take but would never appease; would always extend the hand of friendship to any who would take it honestly and in sincerity.

When in the evenings, our business was done, a strange habit developed. It was that of throwing the papers to one side and beginning conversations on broader subjects. These conversations became, particularly on Foster's part, rather philosophical - a sort of inquiry into what was happening at home and in the world - because after all, we cannot fully separate domestic affairs from the foreign. His favorite speculation was, "What is the future of representative government? It is a fine form of government. We all believe in it. But what is its future?" He was well familiar with some of the predictions made by Macaulay, the observations made by De Tocqueville, and he used to wonder aloud whether or not some of the things that these people had prophesied or feared were really coming about.

He did not always talk in such a serious vein. I must tell you a story to show that he could laugh at himself. In the very early days of my Administration he came to me for approval of an appointment of an ambassador. I noticed that he was not too enthusiastic about this man, but he said it would be a very good thing and I, not knowing the individual too well, said "All right," and we appointed him. Then about two years later we found that the man had not worked out and we had to get rid of him. Foster came to see me to give the reasons for the change, to tell the whole story. He said, "You know, Mr. President, when I recommended that man I had a specific reason, and not a very noble one. As you know," he said, "the Senate was then divided almost fifty-fifty between the Democrats and the Republicans, and there was one Republican who could cause me a great deal of trouble in the Foreign Relations Committee, probably even defeat some of our purposes, unless we would appoint this particular man as an ambassador." We were both learning some of the tricks of

politics! I listened to this explanation and he said that he was not too happy with the appointment when submitted but after all, he had done it! I then asked, "Well, Foster, here two years later you fired the man, now what is your reason for this action?" "Oh," he said, "that Senator was defeated."

That was his little apology to me, and he remarked that he would never suggest that I appoint any man on such a basis again. What I am trying to get at is that our relationship was a definitely personal one. Every single evening when he was abroad I had a telegram. Every day that he was home we discussed the present and the past, to see whether it would give us an inkling into the future.

To say that he was not successful in most of the things he undertook would be a completely erroneous allegation. If you would go back to 1953 and look at some of your news headlines, you will find that some of our foreign problems included the Korean War, the danger in the Formosan Straits, the Indo-China War between the French and the Communists, the great risk that Iran was about to be taken over by the Communists or to be led into their camp by Mossadegh, the problems of Trieste and of Guatemala. All of these, with this man's tireless energy, strict adherence to principle, fairness and justice - cooperating with our Allies - were solved so well as to place the country and every single member of this audience under obligation to him.

I will never forget his willingness to undertake any problem, any action, no matter how onerous or how inconvenient. I think it was when Pope Pius died I sent him to Rome as my representative, just as something new was happening at Formosa. His only transportation available was one of those jet-tankers. If you have ever ridden in a jet-tanker, an empty one, you will realize what a lonesome, uncomfortable trip one can have in it. He immediately wired me and said, "I think I had better take off over the North Pole and go to Formosa." So in the length of little more than one day - from Rome from Alaska and Formosa - I received reports from him as to how things were going. The trip was made bearable because his lovely Janet was with him, but it was a very great inconvenience and certainly physical discomfort that the man and his wife had to go through to carry out what he conceived to be his simple duty, and what I thought what was his duty.

I cannot scarcely do more than hint at some of his conclusions concerning the future of free government in these conversations that would come about after our normal problems were disposed of. One was that pressure groups in this country were making it difficult for the government's elective representatives and the Executive to carry out their proper missions. He believed that there was too much division, too much divisive influence coming about because of the special interests of these people who had found that by appealing to Congress they could get this or that or the other thing, none of which was particularly of value to the nation as a whole. With his strict Presbyterian conscience, he viewed these things with horror and at times he would speak in tones of pessimism. But the rock-like faith that he had in his God, that he had in his country, would always come to his rescue. And invariably as I would walk with him to the door of my office he would come out with some little wise crack or some bon mot to put us in better humor and with both of us feeling, "Well, after all, this country will probably do pretty good if all of us will just look at the matter of self-government and determine that each will do his duty about it."

So, I must testify to the fact that to him, to his character, to his insight, his courage, I owed personally a great debt. He made my load much easier to carry. I think that you're living today in a better world because he lived in it and worked in it. And I would hope that all the Princeton students of the present and the future who go into that Library and see over the doorway "John Foster Dulles" will recall either consciously or unconsciously that here is a man to whom they, too, owe much; that as they think of others who have written their names large in the history of our country, they will see his name and think of the selfless, courageous type of service that this nation will have to have if self-government is going to last in perpetuity in this land, and finally in all the world.

I am grateful for this opportunity of meeting with all of you who came to honor the memory of John Foster Dulles. Thank you!

• **Congressional Campaign Dinner, Washington, DC, June 22, 1962**

On occasions of this kind, most of us are accustomed to speakers who use exaggeration and frenzied

rhetoric to stir us up against the common political foe. Tonight we have no need for either forensic device. The realities facing our country today are packed with drama, as just a few facts make clear.

Our national economy has become uncertain, fearful, ill at ease. Stock prices have plummeted by scores of billions, to the consternation of the investing public. Persistent unemployment, in spite of promises of the late campaign, remains, as in past years, a cancerous problem in many areas. The nation's rate of economic growth, so bitterly criticized two years ago, falls behind the rate of prior years. The adverse balance of payments and outflow of gold are still gnawing concerns and, if present policies persist, could grow worse. Federal spending is still pushing rapidly upward. Revenues fall short. Deficits grow larger. Confidence, at home and abroad, weakens.

These are ugly splotches in the beautiful picture of the economic future painted for us in 1960 by confident New Frontiersmen. Today these blemishes can no longer be blinked or ignored.

The end of this is not yet. Recently we were told that next year the Administration will increase spending still more, yet will simultaneously cut taxes! Here is political paradise! It suggests that if only we can get the government to spend fast enough, we can soon do away with taxes altogether!

Such untoward developments have prompted some to advocate the election of Republicans not primarily because these people believe our leaders and our programs are worthy, but merely because they think we cannot possibly do as badly as the Democrats.

If this purely negative approach should be our only claim to support this year, I for one - and, I believe, the vast majority of our citizens - would be deeply resentful.

So I trust that Republicans will never succumb to a sterile negativeness. Mere resistance and complaint, and criticism of the mess back in Washington, will never be enough. Happily, we have programs that are truly constructive, and a leadership competent to serve the Nation's needs.

These programs make sense. They are not only positive, progressive and responsible; they are also salable. But to sell them we have got to work day and night. We should not spend too much time, manpower and money bemoaning the glaring failures of the opposition.

By this I do not mean that there is not room for - indeed, a need for - rational, responsible criticism. The American people know this. They expect us to criticize. They want us to protest. It is our duty to do so - always vigorously, but always fairly, and always responsibly.

To list all examples of political mal-administration, mal-functioning and mal-adjustment in Washington is here impracticable, but to mention a few will help us understand better how profoundly Republican and Democratic philosophies differ.

Quite obviously, this Administration is floundering - thrashing aimlessly and a bit desperately about - in the surging financial, fiscal and economic currents of our times. Its difficulty appears to stem primarily from an inadequate understanding of our American system - of how it really works, of the psychological, motivational and economic factors that make it ebb and flow.

One cannot doubt that the principal figures in official Washington today are academically proficient. As the Administration modestly asserts, it is sophisticated. But its actions have started the whole nation to question its ability to comprehend.

For instance, the Administration seems almost driven to alienate major elements of the business community. Even in its speeches, which are publicly advertised as friendly toward business, menacing language somehow has to appear. Indeed, the official Administration posture can be interpreted only as: "Business, get friendly - or else!" (This does seem a singularly aggressive way to win friends and influence people!)

Additionally, the Administration is publicly disgruntled with the entire medical profession, and has apparently persuaded itself that doctors are against people.

We find newspapers blacklisted for failing to handle news White House style. We hear that reporters are verbally spanked for writing critical passages. The Administration even annoys a growing faction within its own party, including many southerners in the Congress.

Now all of us are taken to task by references at Yale a few days ago to myths and incantations. Particularly we were admonished to stop living by clichés. One so singled out was the virtue of the "balanced budget." Let us consider this one a moment!

America has always held that it is honest to pay one's bills - dishonest to repudiate them. So we have thought a balanced budget was not simply a basic requirement for sensible government but a hallmark of honesty as well. But now, are we to throw out - as a myth or as a cliché - Ben Franklin's old adage, "Honesty is the best policy?"

Perhaps what is now called "sophistication" will indeed destroy all hope of a balanced budget. But Republicans will continue to believe that it is bad for America to stop practicing frugality, prudence and self-discipline.

This use of the word "sophistication" seems to include quite a number of things! Among them, apparently, is a planned economy - that is, the central government should undertake to fix prices, determine the appropriate level of profits, control wages directly or indirectly, and otherwise manipulate and guide the economy. Recent events suggest it also means that government has the right to use the FBI, the Internal Revenue Service, the Defense Department, the Justice Department, as well as the White House, to control labor-management affairs, especially to dictate the economic decisions of management.

Well may we ask: In all such matters is a Federal club of reprisal to be held threateningly over the heads of citizens, ready for instant use, with or without sanction of law? Is the only authority needed for the club's use an Executive assertion that this is in the public interest?

"Sophistication" of this kind can penetrate into many fields - iron control by a Federal bureaucracy over every farm decision - the usurping of the responsibilities of the states - spending more and more every year from the national treasury regardless of fluctuations in the national income. At all events, we know from the Yale address that the full potential of "sophistication" will be realized when we design Federal bookkeeping to make today's dull deficits appear tomorrow as bright surpluses.

One sharp-penciled New Frontiersman, I am told, recently computed that more than 18 billion dollars - 20% of the present Federal budget - ought to be lumped together and charged off as capital investments. In this way the Administration could develop a real bookkeeping "surplus." But "sophistication" abruptly halts here as we crash into the obstacle of how to pay for the "written off" 18 billion dollars. Such a performance strikes me as something less than "sophistication" - rather it looks like old-time medicine show skullduggery - now made respectable by top hat and tails.

But let us hurry to a few other things that baffle and amaze the unsophisticated.

We learn that we should give to one man rather than to the Congress the right to cut income taxes and undertake vast public works. We learn that one regulatory agency should be permitted, independently of our courts, to interdict any business activity it finds distasteful. We hear and read much about a ponderous system of medical care, which for some millions of people will provide help that is not needed, for a few million others will give inadequate help, and for still other millions will give no help at all. In the meantime, it would overburden and possibly founder the Social Security System.

Is it, indeed, a yearning for "sophistication" that impels us to include in our vast space expenditures huge sums for low priority projects? Estimates for space exploration are already reaching almost four thousand million dollars a year and will shortly reach seven thousand million dollars a year - all this while urgent needs on earth must go unattended and our fiscal affairs are in such serious array?

Clearly such administration policies and deeds invite our extensive criticism; we shall not neglect this critical function in our free society.

But what contrasting principles and programs do we Republicans offer?

My friends, the principles we follow are profoundly significant to free Americans. They are founded in an unshakable faith in the people of our country. It is this faith that makes us cleave to constitutional government, that leads us to maintain a diffusion of power, to respect the checks and balances on the national level, to work for strong, effective government on local levels, and always to keep government as close as possible to home and community.

It is likewise our faith in the individual that incites us to be vigilant sentinels of liberty. As such we fight, as against a plague, the whole host of national planning and spending schemes that would destroy the enterprise and individuality of our people.

So our Republican programs are citizen oriented, not state oriented. They reflect our certainty that it is

the individual citizen back home, not the far-away bureaucrat, who knows best how to meet the needs of himself and his family.

What, then, are some of the Republican programs that evolve from the principles which I have just stated in general terms? I cite just a few.

As for matters projecting beyond our shores, I simply reaffirm this truth - Republicans will do their part, in recognition of the constitutional responsibilities of our elected President, to maintain the bipartisan approach in foreign affairs which, with minor lapses on the part of both parties, has prevailed since World War II.

Essentially this approach is one of advancing justice, freedom, peace, and human betterment everywhere in the world. It presumes continuation of our world-wide systems of alliances; our great interlocking defensive measures; the courage to stand firm against communist bluster and force. It implies a never-tiring quest for a peaceful resolution of the great issues tormenting mankind, leading, we prayerfully hope, to universal disarmament at some future time.

On the military side of our security efforts, we Republicans will continue to work across the political aisle for strength unencumbered by waste, and strength not bloated by hysteria. Here I must record my personal belief that substantial amounts in our current defense budgets reflect unjustified fears, plus a reluctance in some quarters to relinquish outmoded concepts. Accordingly, I personally believe - with, I am sure, very little company in either Party - that the defense budget should be substantially reduced. At least, all America understands that every defense dollar wastefully expended, that every defense dollar needlessly appropriated, weakens this nation. It is always necessary to examine critically these appropriations and to stop assuming that mere spending means increased strength.

Turning to fiscal and economic affairs, we Republicans, here, sharply divide from the opposition.

We are steadfast in our insistence upon balancing the Federal budget in all but emergency periods. Indeed, we see dedication to balanced budgets as one measure of responsibility in political leadership. We reject the New Frontierism that this effort is no longer desirable. I deeply regret the Administration's apparent change of heart on this point. It bodes ill for America.

Now as to tax reform, and its counterpart, spending reform, nothing could be more beneficial to America at this moment than a tax bill so designed as to rebuild confidence in the consuming public and among investors - provided always, however, that such legislation is accompanied by a clear reduction in Federal spending. To the Republican Party, it is simply irresponsible to keep spending ourselves ever deeper into debt.

The adverse balance of payments and gold outflow are likewise gravely significant. Here some of our immediate problems are, first, to induce our allies - particularly those who have profited measurably from our help - to do more to help carry the burden of the common defense and foreign assistance; next, to subject our spending programs to the scalpel; next, to generate more exports for America. Unless these corrective measures are taken, and swiftly, fiscal calamity must be the eventual consequence. We Republicans are already enlisted in these urgent efforts. Hopefully we await a like determination on the part of the Administration.

Concerning education - here we stand for temporary help, according to need, for the building of elementary and secondary classrooms. We are not for using federal funds for operating costs, not for broadcasting tax dollars nationwide regardless of local effort or necessity, and not for undertaking a permanent Federal responsibility in this construction area. Republicans are behind the concept that whatever is done in education must be meticulously circumscribed to preclude any possibility of Federal control.

In agriculture - we demand that the ground rule be not only economic health but also the return of freedom. We believe that whatever would further constrict the farmer's freedom is headed in the wrong direction, that whatever moves toward restoring his freedom has at least a presumption in its favor.

Thank heaven that viewpoint prevailed yesterday in the House of Representatives. I salute Charlie Halleck and Charlie Hoeven, our other House Republicans, and the band of courageous Democrats who joined with them in defeating the legislative monstrosity that was based upon a ruthless concept of ruling or ruining American agriculture.

As to human welfare, Republican programs are a marriage of head and heart. This is evidenced by our great expansion between 1953 and 1961 of Social Security coverage and unemployment insurance, as well as

increases in their benefits. We blended these advances with attempts to reduce public assistance payments made unnecessary by the broadened Social Security coverage. We oppose the dole approach, the paternalistic approach, the shepherd of the people concept, which seems to hold so much appeal for our opponents. We Republicans insist that welfare efforts should strive constantly to build self-reliance, initiative and self-respect, not destroy them!

We believe that all such must be administered with painstaking care to avoid abuses harmful both to the recipient and the taxpaying public.

Republicans stand for partnership, not Federal monopoly, in many aspects of public affairs - for example, water resource development. We are for effective and diligent but not vindictive enforcement of antitrust statutes; for labor-management negotiations kept free of Federal domination; for helping the aged meet the crises of catastrophic illness but avoiding compulsory participation in programs of medical care; for giving needed aid to colleges to help them meet exploding enrollments; for continuing civil rights advances with a responsible appreciation of the profound sensitivities with which this area has always been charged.

As to the power-concentrating trends of New Frontier legislation - Republicans are as united in resistance to these as we are united in support of efforts to keep the power of government properly balanced and diffused. In this posture I believe our party is four square with the American people.

This is why, my friends, it is so important that we work as we have never before worked for increased Republican strength in both Houses of Congress. Our first objective is to win control of the House of Representatives.

It is not to win power for its own sake that we must strive for these gains; neither is it to satisfy anyone's personal ambition. Rather, we are attempting to assure governmental results in harmony with the principles I have outlined.

As for us Republicans, we are simply trying to do for our country, not trying to have it do more and more for us.

If American is to stay free - if our nation is to stay solvent - if local government is to survive - if the worker and his family are to be able to do for themselves, to acquire more for themselves, and to bequeath to their children an America burgeoning with opportunities - I believe that the first great step is for Republicans to win the Congressional elections this Fall. A sure-footed and dedicated Republican Congress can help preserve the necessary balance and perspective in government - even as our forefathers intended.

Now, my friends, one final thought. Recently I read that the word "victory" has been expunged from certain New Frontier dictionaries. Personally I - and I think all Republicans - still like the word.

So starting tonight, let's set out on an unremitting campaign, with all our talents, all our numbers, all our resources, to make certain that victory will be ours - victory in 1962 - and then, victory in 1964!

• College of the Air, June 26, 1962

I am happy indeed that for the first time a full course in economics, at the college level, is available to all Americans free of any charge, in their own homes. This fact itself represents a triumph of the American economy. More than 85 percent of the American people have this program within viewing range.

The course represents also a triumph of freedom - freedom of the academic profession to teach not only in the classroom, but throughout the nation without government or private control or censorship. The course in economics is what the teacher and his academic colleagues think it ought to be; it represents no special interest. The teacher does not have to agree with his government, and the student can disagree with his teacher.

Understanding how our economy works is essential if we are to make wise choices as citizens and as participants in our basically private enterprise economy. The essence of economics is the necessity to make choices. There is not enough of everything for everybody to have everything that he might like to have. In a free society we must make choices among those things that we can afford and those things that we can do without - a choice of occupation, choices about how much the government should do and of what it should not do. The strength of our society and our economy depends on how wisely those choices are made. This necessity for us

as citizens to make wise choices represents the basic difference between our free system and the authoritarian system of communism.

Closely related to the necessity for wise choice in our economic affairs is the need to understand the miracle that is worked every day in the free markets of our great country. This miracle results in the right goods being produced in the right quantities at the right prices so that we as buyers can make our choices without standing in line or doing without what we want and are able to pay for.

Behind those free markets there is an organization of men and equipment, transportation and finance all coordinated by impersonal forces of supply and demand and prices, wages, and interest rates. Nobody plans the whole of it, yet the whole of it works for us.

In this course you will be able to get behind the scenes and find out what it takes to build the great industrial, commercial and agricultural production of this country, which supply us so well. I think that you will share the impression that I have of our great country, that the sure way to improve our standard of living is by more and better investment - in plant, equipment, machinery, and facilities and investment in the skill, talent, and understanding of people. Without investment of both types, I believe that our progress would come to an end.

And so I can commend to you the investment of your time - 160 half-hours - to achieve a better understanding of what makes our economy grow, what makes it serve us so well, and how it can be made to serve us even better.

• **All Republican Conference, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, June 30, 1962** [text in RNC Clippings, box 39, folder Eisenhower Addresses, 1962-63]

This is a business meeting and, while I hope there will be some expression of approval here and there to what has been said and what has been done by the speakers, we will certainly try to keep the social side down to the minimum, excepting that we will have a little recess after a couple of hours.

My principal pleasure is to welcome you all here to the farm. They thought this was a nice place, at least big enough to accommodate a crowd, apparently the press and the ever-present photographers. I hope that they themselves will learn a lot from what we are going to talk about today.

Just assuring you again of my hearty welcome to you today, to all of you as friends and as fellow Republicans, I have a few ideas I would like to express because of things I have been reading and papers I have been studying. Some of these have given me a great deal of food for thought.

One of these things is a little magazine about which some of you have probably heard; it is called Advance. There are certain things about it which I believe recommend it very highly. It is very small; it is very inexpensive and it is Republican. Also its editors are under-graduates of Harvard. I have read at least one of its copies this last winter, containing a piece "Advise and Dissent," but in any event it was one of the most thoughtful magazines, particularly dealing with the subjects that appeal to young people that I have ever seen. I would commend it to each of you and recommend to you the habits of getting in touch with these people. I believe that there are four issues put out each year and then there are some little in between things which they call "Advance Notices" or something of that nature.

The man who has been its editor in the past and who wrote the article with which I was so enamored, it named Chapman, and I believe he is here today - is the man named Chapman here?

[Mr. Chapman stood up and acknowledged the compliment]

I think if we had an exit from this tent we would put him there and have him take subscriptions as you go out, but I think you can find him. He is 21 years old and I feel this is the kind of thing we need to sponsor and to think about, and to see if we cannot make an effort to get something similar in more colleges.

The other thing that I wanted to talk about is an article I read in Fortune, in the July issue. This talks in a rather philosophical vein about some of the differences between the Republican and Democrat parties - not so much in their doctrines because the man whose name is Wade, obviously sounds at least like he is a Republican. However, he looks at both parties objectively and he brings up one thing that strikes me with very great force.

He says that the Democrats have succeeded in making politics in this Nation a very challenging and heart-warming experience; they make it their principal business; they try to make it romantic and emotional. While the Republicans believe in the logic of their position and the integrity of their intent, have failed to follow through the old truism that people respond far more, and far more easily, to emotional statements and sentiments in political appeals than they do to logic, statistics and facts.

He thinks, as I read his article, and it isn't too easy to read, that we have a good bill of fare, or, you might say, stock of goods upon the shelf, but the trouble is that we think because they are good in the cans and packages, we can let them get dusty on the shelves.

He thinks the Democrats have less value in their goods, but they paint up the can, tidy up the store, and then they have a better, more appealing idea to put before the prospective customer.

Now I think we ought to read these very objectively and see wherein we are weak and wherein we are strong, and see if we are happy with the package - and incidentally I would be very remiss if I did not compliment the group which, under Congressman Laird, developed a whole series of principles and doctrine for the Republican Party - but I think we should find out whether this is saleable and we ought to use salesmanship in getting it before the public.

I think some of the things that will be discussed today will be the methods of selling that kind of a program, and I do commend all of you reading this little magazine and this article from Fortune about which I have spoken.

For my part I think our country is facing a very critical period and I believe that only some resurgence of Republican control in our government is going to keep things on a more level keel than seems to be the case at present.

I would like to point this out: We have been called the party of business. Well, I for one am proud of that allegation for the simple reason that the people who become successful in business have shown qualities of organization and leadership; they have led their businesses into positions of existence if not of pre-eminence. But the point is, I believe, that business men now have to do a little bit of waking up because of this: The business man in the past has assumed, and I think rightly, that his own business could function pretty well no matter what party won, simply because there were well defined and well observed limits beyond which government would not go. Therefore the business men have made their primary business almost their sole business concern, to their stockholders, to their labor and to their sales groups, and so on - and they have had successful businesses. Today I believe that every business man has been awakened to the fact that politics mean much more to his business than ever before, and that up to this point he thought had been the case.

Therefore, I think he has got to make - and this applies not only to the business man but to every intelligent person - he has got to make his politics his first business; he has got to go on the theory that until we have a sound nation, one whose policies and procedures in government he can understand and approve, he is not going to be successful in the long run.

I think we have got to go from here and carry this message to business men everywhere: "Brother, you had better take a look at what is happening to you, and as you look, think what you can do about it. You had better get into politics and you had better get into politics right away - quick. You had better go back into politics, over the history of this nation, and see what part it has played up to this moment, where our basic principles have been followed and how we can go forward with the movement of civilization and scientific discovery and all the rest of it."

If we go along with these basic principles, we should be leading off - and of course we are not standing still - but we do not and must not abandon the immutable principles, and this, I think, the business man as he turns from his pre-occupation with just profits and loss - and I said "loss" advisedly - his pre-occupation with dividends, I think that he must say "Let us take a look at the connection between politics, government and the business man," because that relationship is closer than it has ever been in our lives, certainly except in time of war.

If we can get that message to everyone I really believe we are on the road to real victory in 1962 - and that is our objective.

• **Stockholm, Sweden, July 31, 1962**

To salute you, who are stewards of wisdom from ages past, and teachers, whose words and the ideas behind them will profoundly help to influence future generations of mankind, is a valued privilege for any layman. So it is with a sense of personal distinction that I pay my tribute to the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Professions. And I thank you sincerely for the honor done me in your invitation to address this distinguished company.

I am especially happy that this convention is held in Sweden. In any event this is the country that my wife proudly points to as the birthplace of her maternal grandparents. Moreover, it was my good fortune to know and admire two of the world's modern leaders for justice and peace, both of whom lost their lives in the service of the United Nations, Count Bernadotte and Dag Hammarskjold, both citizens of this nation.

As Chairman of the movement known in America as People-to-People, I bring to this gathering warm greetings from its members. This movement proposes, on the grand plateau of our common humanity, to confront men and women everywhere with the fact that their deepest aspirations and hopes and dreams are identical in nature. People-to-People believes that what all populations most earnestly seek - peace and justice, freedom to live our own lives and opportunity to live the best possible lives - can be most surely attained in friendship, in partnership, in brotherhood

People-to-People - not an arm of agency of government, not a creature of party or of narrow doctrine - reflects a truth in human relations that is implicitly recognized in America's founding documents.

Its content is that men and women, however varied their ancestry in racial and national origin, however diverse the creeds they profess, however different their ways of livelihood or their personal goals - all of them can work together in unity of basic purpose and in common hope of just reward, so long as their fundamental aims are friendly and unselfish.

The purpose of People-to-People is to take full advantage of all the new and greatly improved methods of communication and travel to make many millions of individual contacts on a friendly, personal basis in the hundreds of ways available among the citizens of all nations. Thus will be promoted the knowledge and understanding that are necessary ingredients in establishing a lasting, universal peace with justice.

Of all these methods none can be more effective than classroom exchange of letters, scrapbooks or handicraft projects with classrooms of other nations. The process can be, not only educational, but can help develop many lasting friendships, so needed in our rapidly changing times. The youngest pupil can help; collectively these young students can not only produce solid friendships among themselves, they can help their parents and grandparents to be more understanding. These purposes of People-to-People are akin to those of the true educator.

Under the guidance of the teachers represented in this body, the children, the youth, the young men and women of almost four score countries are now advancing from the rudiments of elementary schooling up to the highest realms of creative research and profound scholarship. The dedicated teacher is possibly the most important individual in our modern world.

With you, committed to this task, I am proud to claim a former relationship, though admittedly a tenuous and temporary one. At the end of World War II, when I was looking forward to an early release from military service, I had one definite ambition - to make a connection with a small, rural college in our nation, so that I might continue my lifelong association with young people. I hoped to give them a realization of the need - approaching the absolute - for an enduring peace, and some conception of what they might do toward furthering progress toward such a goal.

By that time in my life I had traveled much about the world. My experiences in war and peace in meeting peoples of other nations had convinced me that many of the important difficulties separating humans were based on ignorance and sheer lack of understanding. I had come in contact with thousands of people who knew little of anything except their own immediate surroundings and acquaintances; their entire interests revolved around their personal need for shelter, food and clothing. They were cut off, practically, from all else in the world.

Because of national jealousy and prejudice I saw soldiers in one army sometimes suspicious and resentful of those in another army in an allied force, even though the men of both were giving their lives for identical purposes. These experiences created in me the determination to make every personal effort, through honest education, to erase this evil.

When finally I left the army in 1948, fate decreed that I would go to a university, but it was not small nor was it rural. Because of this, the attention I could daily give to students on the playing field or the campus - during my 2 1/2 years at Columbia University in New York - was indeed limited. But, leaving there, I determined that no matter what else I might be called upon to do in later life I would never abandon my purpose of encouraging and supporting any teacher who was dedicated to truth and to the promotion of mutual understanding between individuals and nations.

I always think of yours as an inspiring task. The results you achieve will be largely measured by the character, goals and insight you have helped to nurture now among those who will be the men and women to guide, in the coming years, the nations here represented.

If the leaders you have helped to train are to serve well the cause of universal peace and justice, then the very foundation of their training must be truth. Truth may not - sometimes cannot - be easily recognizable. But some of its principal enemies are quickly identifiable. They are found in a whole complex of irrational bitterness and prejudice, of suspicion and fear, of short-sighted selfishness, of cherished myth and enforced ignorance. Indeed there is probably no single nation that has not in the past felt deeply the internal wounds inflicted upon itself by one or more of these enemies.

Witchcraft and with-hunting, religious intolerance, racial prejudice, and class warfare have been more than once the cause of domestic conflicts, accompanied by blood baths, persecution and human suffering. In like manner, bitter international rivalries, born of mutual ignorance, political fixations, or national hatreds have been the cause of devastating and unnecessary wars.

You teachers recognize these enemies and are striving day by day to eliminate them. As you teach and inspire your students, so they will do.

Because of this, I wish I could spend days among you, talking with you, and, more important, listening to you. For so deeply do I believe that what and how you teach today will vastly influence human living in the twenty-first century that, could I be thoroughly steeped in your composite thinking and work, I would feel it possible to visualize the form and character of those future years. Though nothing can permit me to see, personally, the world of that century, my concern in it is deep and intimate; my grandchildren, God willing, will spend their later years within it.

Because I have an abiding interest in the sort of world my descendants will inherit and possess, I presume to address a few thoughts to you who are directly involved in its development.

I do not bring to you any product of scholarly study. Rather, I am before you solely as a witness to and a participant in the affairs of the world during a half century.

That period has been marked by tempest and turmoil, ravaging wars, revolutionary change and violent reaction; and by instances of appalling corruption of national purposes and inhuman abuse of human beings. At times respect for moral law has seemed to disappear from vast areas of the earth.

There is, therefore, excuse for those who label this period the most shocking, the most brutal in modern history.

In the same years, however, great tidal waves of new knowledge have washed away forever plagues and evils that had scourged mankind through many centuries. New machines and devices of science and technology have erased physical barriers and reduced the vast distances that once separated men and nations.

One of the greatest advances made during this era has been the world's recognition that education is the birthright of every individual; independence, of every nation; peace, of mankind. In response to this recognition most of the world - renewing its faith in the need for and the power of moral law - in 1945 founded the United Nations, that these birthrights might someday be fully realized.

There is, then, ample justification for those, not enshrouded in pessimism, who would term these recent decades the prelude to a golden age. I am one of them.

For your part, the strength of your dedication to the profession of teaching is the measure of your faith in

the destined upward movement of humanity. May both your dedication and your faith be unfaltering!

Now, turning more definitely to the future, I speak to you - inescapably of course - in the context of American life. For this latter, however, I need not apologize before this audience.

As the world knows, America is a cross-section of mankind; almost two hundred lands and regions and nations have contributed, and still add, their blood to our country.

Our culture is a blending of the most ancient and the new, of east and west, of every continent and of every era. I doubt that there is any country represented here today that has not sent to us some of its sons and daughters to influence and, in turn, to be influenced by other Americans.

In every field of human enterprise, such progress as we at home have achieved has been in large measure due to our willingness to exchange knowledge, to welcome foreign talent and investment, to borrow and to give and to share.

No race, no culture, no idea can be alien to an American who strives to live by our forebears' declaration that all men are created equal, divinely endowed.

So, with this American background, I turn briefly to the role of the teacher in the years immediately ahead.

Always, his first concern must be the truth, the truth about himself, his nation, the world. In the search for it, he can recognize no externally imposed limitations; else he may never find it at all or, at best, find it only in part. In its dissemination, he can tolerate no dictated bounds, else he becomes a mouthpiece of the propagandist. Consequently, above all other men, he must stand for freedom of conscience and intellect and speech.

This human responsibility is weighty, oft times beyond the burdens of those who guide governments. Indeed, the teacher may at times find himself in conflict with government or under the threat of subordination to it. For even as spreading truth is the teacher's objective, power over others, including teachers, has been the objective of self-seeking men in more than one instance and in more than one nation.

We, in our time, have seen the calamitous results of arbitrary political domination over teaching. Under Hitler's and Mussolini's compulsion, opportunity for genuine education - the fruitful ability to think and to judge and to do wisely - was eliminated. In its stead, sterile capacity to create for the state, to read orders and to enact them, became the dictated goals of state-controlled teachers. Highly literate, capable and dedicated nations were reduced to inarticulate, unthinking tools of despotic designs.

The influence of this kind of teaching was clearly evident during the years of World War II. The young men who formed Hitler's military machine - particularly those who had been for some years exposed to his school system - almost invariably accepted as gospel and without question any communication from the high command, no matter how improbable its content.

In North Africa, in 1943, when the remnant of Rommel's army had been captured, we found that the prisoners from the Afrika Corps still confidently expected a crushing victory over the Allied forces in that region. Because Hitler had told them otherwise they refused to believe the evidence of their own eyes as to the completeness of the Allied victory, the overwhelming strength that we had built up in Tunisia and Algeria, and the security and effectiveness of our supply lines throughout the Mediterranean.

Instead these products of Hitler's schools chose to believe his radio boasts that his forces were in possession of northwestern Africa, that the Tunisian victory was only local and temporary, and that his planes and armies would quickly come up on our rear, capture us, and free our prisoners.

The firmness of their belief in this fantastic propaganda could not be doubted. No matter how earnestly we tried by explanation and demonstration to disabuse them, they closed their eyes and ears to the truth and scornfully cried, "Propaganda!"

This is one example - admittedly as dramatic one - of the results of education perverted to serve the purposes of a dictator.

Such unconditional surrender of judgment to corruption by indoctrination can scarcely happen when the teacher, joined with his fellows in professional organizations such as the kind represented here, courageously insists - against any threat of and character - that the integrity of his profession, the objectivity of his teaching, the supremacy of his educational goals be respected by government.

The world needs your zeal and integrity and wisdom; it needs also your conscience, for as a corollary to your role as teachers, you have a moral role. Respect for the truth is a tenet of the moral law. As private groups concerned with a public function, you must be alert watchdogs that your own standards of integrity, objectivity, decency and dedication are not disregarded by governments or rejected by our youth.

The policies of government may sometimes be as capricious as the weather; and politics may be just as often selfishly practiced, bringing only dross to its practitioners and peace to none.

But truth endures eternally; the teaching of truth profits all who listen, strengthens them in knowledge and understanding. From the teacher's classroom - where burns the torch of truth - there is lighted the way toward fulfillment of the deepest hopes and dreams of humankind.

And just as truth is eternal, so is it universal in its worth and reward.

To be sure, some governments insist upon regimentation and the closed society for their peoples, while all others may today prudently require a policy of secrecy about new knowledge affecting their own security.

But as truth and understanding spread across the world, security reasons for secrecy will disappear. World enlightenment will speed the day when the burdens of armaments and the fear of others will be removed from the backs and hearts of men. Then no slightest justification for the closed society will exist.

This day will dawn most surely out of the effort by people working with people - teacher with student, stranger with stranger. Government can rarely be as effective in developing international communication and exchange and in promoting mutual understanding between populations as can voluntary groups and even single individuals. In this field, every government is suspect all the time by at least some of the people it attempts to reach. But organizations such as yours create no fear, no suspicion.

Instead, they open wide avenues of communication - especially among the young - on whose convictions and actions depend the world climate of tomorrow.

Teachers of many nations are already active in voluntary, cooperative ventures to further the increase of understanding between the people of differing nationalities. The world confederation, which you represent here, should be especially effective in advancing the same cause; it is a great clearinghouse for new ideas, new ventures, new approaches, and the development of methods to assure the universality of their use.

As an adjunct to machinery now existing for promoting a universal attack on the enemies of the truth, I should like to suggest one final thought that, as a private citizen and without any authority whatsoever, I place before you. It is the possibility of creating an international school - as a new and different kind of clearinghouse for world thinking and learning in the vast field of human relations. Such a world institution would be dedicated to the education of young people, particularly in world history, diplomacy, politics, international communication, and teaching. Its students, numbering possibly two or three thousand, could learn - say in a two years course - about the things that separate nations and tend to prevent them from living peacefully and securely together.

On the campus of such a college would be gathered an international faculty of scholars whose concern would be objective truth, purged of national and regional bias, hatred and prejudices.

To secure such a faculty the United Nations General Assembly might want to call upon such organizations as yours for assistance and nominations. Thereby the college would be guarded against seizure by rigid doctrinaires, propagandists and proselyters.

The history of humanity in all aspects would be taught; but never any political dogma as a panacea for present or future. I am certain that the men and women who have lived in freedom would be quite content to let truth rather than propaganda plead their cause.

The student body would, of course, be representative of all nations that might desire to participate, and all nations would be welcome provided only that each would agree that only truth and objectivity have any place in the school curriculum.

A thousand details would have to be worked out before such a venture could be launched; but I suggest to you the desirability of giving some thought to its possibility.

Critics will raise objections on many scores. All of them, I think, could be overcome. The language barrier, possibly the most obvious in so multi-national a faculty and student body, can be reduced - for example - by modern techniques in language instruction, joined with youthful eagerness to learn.

The financial costs of construction and operation, if widely shared by the member nations according to their economic capacity, would present no great obstacle to success.

In any case, I would stress that however high the price of a school for global understanding might be, it would still be a minute fraction of the monies now spent by governments on defenses against global war.

Incidentally, just before appearing on this platform, I received a letter from a Swedish gentleman informing me that the Swedish National Board of Education has recently approved plans for the first Scandinavian international high school. Students from all the world would be accepted, and from the underdeveloped nations scholarships would be provided. The curriculum will specialize on history, religion, social sciences and literature. I'm delighted that, at another level, the idea I have proposed has already been adopted.

And now, may I express again my appreciation of your invitation to meet you here in this memorable convocation in this lovely capital city. And may I join you in the prayerful hope that through your teaching, your dedication, and your leadership the world will naturally and gradually turn aside from the road leading to suicidal war. As it does, we shall all then enter and follow the broad highway of mutual understanding and tolerance, at the end of which will be found a just peace in freedom - the dream of men and women for all the centuries of recorded history.

• **U.S. Embassy Staff, London, England, August 14, 1962** [1962 Principle File, box 23, Trips-European-England-Corr. (1)]

Ladies and gentlemen, through a number of years of public service, it's been my opportunity and privilege to visit many American Embassies. Rarely have I left any city, any capital city, where I haven't sought the opportunity to meet with and greet, no matter how briefly, the people who are carrying on America's work in our country's capitals.

My admiration and respect for their work is indeed deep and it is not so much that I am persuaded that our official work is always done - I put it this way - our work in support of our official mission is not always done perfectly because diplomacy cannot work that way, but I am sure of this: Your unofficial mission, that of representing your country, each of you, individually and collectively, in the capitals of other countries, is possibly even more important than the official position for which such establishments as this have been erected and maintained. By no means do I decry the work of diplomacy. Diplomacy is supposed to keep the peace and it was always my profession, you know, to try to regain it so that they could lose it again. But through all these years they have been charged with the task of keeping the peace and developing the official understanding between nations that is so important to keeping peace.

But I am, have been, for some years, devoted, really dedicated, to the proposition, that people-to-people in the long run have a greater influence in promoting, furthering progress toward the peace that we all so much want than can any formal diplomacy. So much do I believe this that I accepted a chairmanship of an organization of our country called People-to-People, and that whole effort is between this country and ours, between all other countries and ours, and indeed between those other countries among themselves, is to develop understanding, not merely facts about the United States, the physical, human facts about it, but the understanding of those facts in their meaning for us and for others. So what I am reaching toward is this: the opportunity to tell you that I not only support your work, I am trying to be a part of it, in the unofficial part of it - in the business of letting others know that we are not indeed exclusively selfish in our purpose of achieving greater prosperity, of better standards of living and wanting to live our own lives in peace and in tranquility. We want others to do the same, well knowing that there can never be a truly effective peace until it is universal, and is based upon justice.

You have all sorts of opportunities and duties in this great effort of understanding. For example, the United States was born under founding documents that set forth some of the noblest ideals that people and nations strive to achieve. We do not always, and possibly never will, achieve all of these perfectly. We have the problem as all of us know, in the equal treatment of people before the law in our own country, regardless of

their religion and their race or any other inconsequential - and you might say, extraneous - factor.

But the point is we strive to do it, and if we can let other countries know that we are striving for a worthy ideal, then I think that we are placing America in the proper light before others and begin to understand that since we do this thing among ourselves we are trying to understand the same thing about them in the international scene.

So I come here first to tell of my admiration of the Foreign Service and the work that is being done, has been doing, and frankly I think we have one of the finest foreign services in the world and comprised of the ablest people of whom I know and the people that are assisting them - I do not exclude - I do not mean to address myself merely to State Department people, there are the Agriculture and Labor and the armed service contingents, and so on. All of you have the admiration of one who has indeed seen a great deal of this world. Some of the misunderstandings and the prejudices that separate us and those things that really keep us from achieving the kind of understanding that is necessary to peace, for although understanding, knowledge and understanding may not assure peace, I do know this: that without it there can be no permanent peace with justice, the goal that humans have held before their eyes and in their hearts for all these centuries.

So I come back. I conclude by saying, thank you all for the work you're doing, and you know that at least there is one American who is proud of what you're doing, grateful for what you're doing and hoping that you will keep at it even harder than ever before.

Thank you very much and goodbye.

• **The Pilgrims luncheon, London, England, August 14, 1962** [1962 Principle File, box 23, Trips-European-England-Corresp. (5)]

I stand before you a man of mixed emotions. The first one I feel at this moment is embarrassment. I have been so generously, so extravagantly, praised by the officers of your organization that I just have the feeling that whatever I am going to say, it had better be good.

But my real instinct at this moment is to indulge in reminiscence, for in this company, and particularly around this Table A, are so many associates and so many good friends of mine, dating back to the war days, that I assure you that any two of us could spend the rest of the afternoon saying "Do you remember when..."

I was spoken of as one of the architects of victory and commended for my success in organizing an Allied Headquarters and Force that could operate effectively - something that was, of course, difficult to attain in the past. You will remember that when Napoleon was once praised extravagantly by a writer another one said, "Well, did you ever think that he never fought except against allies?" My associates and I knew of the difficulties involved. Therefore, success was not the work of any one individual, because these people, many of them of far greater experience than I in the European theater and in the actual business of conducting World War II., were ready to accept me as their senior commander, because all of us were dedicated to one cause: that of winning the war, of destroying Hitlerism, of asserting and making good again the truth that freedom must prevail and that if men have to give their lives for it, they will do so.

Those are the sentiments that brought the Allied Force to a state of efficiency so that they, as allies, could match a single command and defeat and destroy it. To every single individual of that command, British and American, I have always owed a very great debt of gratitude for the warmth of their support of decisions once made.

Therefore, since it will be impossible for me to speak personally to each of those individuals, both civilian and those in uniform, I should like here to say that my gratitude to each of you is not only deep; it will be everlasting for as long as I am above ground.

I must not go further without stating one thing about this inability of the Americans to learn cricket. I do not know the reason for this, because I have never been exposed to the game too deeply. I have never seen it played for more than three hours at one time. But I have a grandson and he has a friend, both of whom are traveling with me. Together with my grandson's sister, they are playing baseball in Hyde Park, in Regent's Park, in the backyard of the American Embassy and in every place where they can possibly get a recruit from

Britain. So far they have gotten one Inspector of Scotland Yard. They are true crusaders now, trying to get along just with a pitcher, a batter, a catcher and one fielder. They would like to get one or two other fielders if it were possible.

Now, I should like to talk to you people about the future. I should like to talk about it because of my knowledge that those of us - and I think that there are none that do not come in this category in some form or other - who have experienced war know that war as it might possibly occur today could conceivably result in such tragedy that the world is now compelled to devote its entire efforts to make certain that we have peace with honor and with justice.

To do that, there are many things that Government can do. We read about talks in Geneva and about test bans, and we have long and sometimes dreary conversations that get nowhere about disarmament. But I submit that no matter how difficult this problem, we, as men who refused to get discouraged when Hitler seemed dominant in the summer of 1942 over every force opposing him, cannot possibly become discouraged as we address ourselves to the problem of creating conditions under which the progress towards peace can be furthered.

I submit that knowledge and understanding themselves cannot guarantee peace, but I do say this: without mutual understanding, there will never be peace. Consequently, we have a great problem before us.

You people, now celebrating your diamond jubilee, have been, in a sense, committed to this task of promoting mutual understanding for sixty years, because although you started as a society, and have been a society, advocating and propagating friendship between the peoples of the United States and Great Britain, the fact is that this is only one phase of the problem of creating better understanding elsewhere in the world.

Between ourselves, we must do better what we have done up to now. Between us, the progress toward understanding that has been made by such organizations as The Pilgrims must continue; we must rededicate ourselves to the problem of creating mutual understanding - everywhere in the world.

There are all sorts of means by which this cause can be furthered. I myself happen to be the Chairman of an organization known in the United States as "People-to-People." Those three words simply mean that Governments, although they may be kindly disposed one to the other, cannot of themselves be wholly effective in getting their peoples to understand the lives, the traditions, the history, the aspirations and the hopes of their peoples. This is not truly the function of governments. But we can all - you in The Pilgrims have been doing it in our two countries - do it throughout the world.

Under the aegis of the People-to-People program, there are such things as sports committees, "twin" cities, associated universities and even classroom "pen pal" associations. That is to say, somebody in the classroom of the second form picks up the job of writing to the second form in the United States, or in Ghana, or possibly in Australia. By this means, we find, at an early age that people are not mutually antagonistic by instinct. They may absorb and even hold to their chest the bitter animosities, prejudices and mutual antagonisms that have separated one nation from another in the past. But if from the very beginning - and one of the simplest of ways is in the field of sports, of education and of arts - we can establish a feeling of partnership, each one of us has not only an opportunity, but a great duty to assist.

Each of us is intelligent to know what could be the results of a new war. Therefore, all that we have, all that we can pledge, is to make sure that mankind has at long last found the necessity of making its understanding reach the same level as its intelligence and its technical capacity. If the understanding and tolerance can be the same as that which animated the military leaders and the Governments of World War II, if it can be as assiduously practiced, I for one do not question the possibility of saving our future.

Your war leaders used to chide me once in a while. Sir Winston, in one of those conferences that all too frequently lasted until about 2:45, would say, "My dear General, it is very good for Generals to be optimistic, but we political leaders have to look the facts and probabilities in the face." To this moment I can remember that admonition - and I know all the facts that stand as an obstacle towards our creating better understanding, a better climate and a better atmosphere for the propagation of peaceful causes. But Sir Winston also said: "But I think, with the forces you have, you will really reach the objectives you have set for yourself." Now, I think, we can reach those objectives.

One of the things I have been bold enough to suggest is that to further this kind of effort and cause, we

should establish an international college, taking, let us say, students after their first two years of college and giving them two years in company with representatives of all the nations of the world - including the Communists if they are so minded - provided only that all of us, both faculty and student, are dedicated to the proposition to seek truth and the propagation of truth and to have nothing to do with doctrinal politics, with emotion or of a particular ideology.

If we could do that, with each country playing its own part the expense would be negligible. I dare say that one of the test missiles that we throw up around the moon or around the world costs no less than it would take to run such a school for a year. That cost would be infinitesimal in comparison with what we have spent these last two years on armaments. We should teach in traditional methods of diplomacy, world understanding, the history of different nations, the advancement of the different civilizations and the great potentialities for disaster that armament races hold for all of us. I have no doubt that when people from such a school went back to all their nations, including those which are among the most backward and undeveloped, there could not fail to be a result that would make us all proud of whatever sacrifices were demanded of us in supporting it.

I started at the outset by saying that I could devote myself today to reminiscence for the entire afternoon, and it would be a great joy. Here are some of the greatest friends I have. I value the friendships that were established in war and have been nurtured and maintained in peace. But it seems to me that I would be really false to the basic reason that brought me to Europe this time if I were to do only that. As Chairman of the organization of which I have spoken - People-to-People - I wanted to go to Sweden, where I could meet 500 teachers coming from all countries other than Iron Curtain countries, and to tell them about the opportunities that they as teachers have to bring up a generation that would think more clearly than ours did - more intelligently and more deeply - so that this greatest of all tragedies will not occur again and so that the burden of armaments, and all that armaments mean, can be lifted from the backs and the hearts of men.

So I, with my inadequate, feeble words, want again to say that I for one, so long as I am allowed to live, will never cease in the search for whatever I can do to support every kind of organization such as this and any other that has as its dedication the promotion of understanding, understanding of one another, and on the basis of that understanding form great pools of international thought, the burden of which will always be a peace with justice and always in freedom.

My friends, thank you very much.

• Rensselaer, Indiana, Charles Halleck, September 13, 1962

Ten years ago this fall - as I hope you remember - I was a candidate for public office - an office with a residence attached to it.

My first purpose here is to thank you of the Second District of Indiana for the compliment of your favorable vote in 1952. I was even more gratified when, again a candidate - for the same job - the Second District, after a four years' trial of me, increased my plurality substantially.

Thereafter, a certain amendment to the Constitution made it impossible, perhaps fortunately for me, to test what you might have done for me, or to me, the third time around.

In any case, this is my first opportunity to thank you personally for the confidence you then displayed in me. And I am deeply grateful that, in the office I held, you provided me with a loyal, fighting, and deeply patriotic legislative leader, Charlie Halleck. He was and is my warm friend; a staunch supporter and a champion of Republican principles and programs.

And here - an important point about Charlie, one of which you of this district have every right to be proud. In security affairs, foreign affairs, strengthening our ties abroad, forging bulwarks against the probings of Communism - indeed, in every matter concerning the strength and safety of America - Charlie Halleck has put America above every other consideration, no matter what its character.

Votes he has cast have no doubt opened the door to demagogic abuse; but you will never find Charles Halleck backtracking and taking to the political bushes where America's vital interests are involved. And this is true - no matter which party may be in power. This I know at first hand. I commend you for it, as I do Charlie.

At this rally of his friends, I could of course take up the night in personal reminiscences about him and my experiences with him in Washington. The times and his record, however, demand more than a personal tribute directed only to him, his neighbors, and the Republicans of his district. He is interested, as I am, in all men and women - Republicans and Democrats - and to Independents who, on election days, pick and choose among all the names across all the columns of ballot or voting machine.

And I address also those who, because of a blind assumption that the American system will automatically work forever, deny themselves the right and privilege of a voice in the conduct of political affairs. The non-voter stupidly steals from himself his most priceless heritage.

From this state where Abraham Lincoln grew to manhood, I address myself to all Americans that accept his concept that the Republic of the United States is a Government of, by and for the entire nation.

True to this basic concept, representative government must be conducted by men who feel themselves answerable directly to the people; and who believe that the record they establish in office should be freely exposed to the voting public which must determine, periodically, the future fate of its office holders.

And they must be people who, like Charlie Halleck, have faith in the common sense of Americans and who regard public business as a call to daily and unremitting service. If Government is to fulfill its proper function it must be conducted by men who judge carefully the merits and faults of every proposal before them. Thereafter, they move decisively when the greatest good of the greatest number is evidently assured; move cautiously when men of integrity and wisdom are, roughly, equally divided; move not at all when there is proposed a tinkering and tampering repugnant to the American system and people; budge not an inch in their resistance to unwarranted Federal erosion of individual freedom.

Such men are, for example, for farm programs that foster initiative and self-reliance in the individual farmer; against programs that reduce the farmer to a mechanism for bureaucratic direction.

And here I would insert a personal parenthesis.

At first hand and through some years, I have watched the ceaseless efforts of those who presume they can blueprint the entire economy to the slightest detail, particularly in agriculture; who want to prepare vast charts of governmental instructions covering the use of even a hedgerow corner; who proclaim that their view is panoramic and prophetic - and deride the farmer's as narrow, selfish, short-sighted.

I concede that such theorists are masters in propaganda. But in a corn field, they would likely wax and polish a tractor until it outshone the sun, and fail to put fuel in the tank - and then wonder why it would not run.

For Republicans - certainly as you and I see it - the fuel in American agriculture, as in every area of our economy, is individual energy; ambition; pride in work; confidence in self; a decent hope for reasonable reward honestly earned. Every governmental program affecting agriculture - or business or labor or science or education - should, I believe, be based upon that truth.

This is the reason that the Republican Party is dedicated to the creation of a governmental atmosphere that gives our people the fullest possible opportunity to live their own lives - to live the lives they themselves believe most satisfying. That dedication, I firmly believe, is also shared by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Then, why, it will be quickly asked, are not Republicans overwhelmingly in control of the Congress? The instant and easy answer would be: As long as we have Charlie Halleck and Everett Dirksen as leaders we don't need overwhelming numbers. Certainly, frontiersmanship, confronted by their statesmanship, has had to abandon a number of its Alice-in-Wonderland adventures into areas lying beyond the horizon of common sense.

But this easy answer is not the right answer. Never can we Republicans be satisfied exclusively with holding actions even though they often restrain and block headlong plunges down the road of more controls; more waste; more taxes; more Washington in our lives; and less freedom to live them in our own way.

What we Republicans want is positive, progressive, productive, constitutional Government that represents the people and serves them. And to get that we must work for quantitative as well as qualitative leadership in the Congress; numbers as well as brains; greatness in strength as well as in spirit.

This is the way we shall have a favorable climate in which the enterprise and energy of our people work at their best.

That climate is not fostered merely by appeals for rigid cooperation with programs presented by an

Administration. And it can be destroyed utterly, if these programs are devised by theorists with free rein always to dream up bigger and more glittering Federal projects.

Nor is such a creative climate nourished by the constant seeking for more governmental power over all our economic life.

This is one of the most disturbing trends of our day - the apparent thirst for more and more power centered in the Federal Government, particularly in the Executive Branch. At times it seems we are losing sight of a fundamental principle in our political institutions - a simple principle, basic to democracy. This is it:

Political leaders in a democracy are not the source of power, they merely direct it. As Lincoln said, "Power derives from, and must remain in, the people."

This suggests that we should never forget the great place and the heavy responsibilities of the Congress in our Constitutional system. Congress makes the laws - the President executes them. For Congress, therefore, it is vitally important that we choose men and women of character, integrity, wisdom and a clear understanding of the enduring principles responsible for our nation's greatness. We want people in Congress - and in all other offices - who believe:

That a free, competitive economy is essential to the existence of maximum human liberty;

That maintenance of a sound, stable currency is essential to the growth of a free, competitive economy;

That deficit spending by the Federal Government is justified only in emergencies of the gravest kind.

We well know that the inevitable effect of endless deficits is to place an increasing and stifling burden upon the economy and to rob the future of its legitimate heritage;

That the promotion of the over-all national good must always take precedence over any attempt of a special group to advantage itself;

That the need for balance in governmental programs is always present - a balance between current pressures and future good; between individual liberty and the meeting of nationwide requirements by government; between creature comforts provided by the state and the maintenance of a national creative capacity depending upon individual initiative, self-confidence and self-dependence.

Now, I do not fear that we are teetering on the brink of internally established totalitarianism - the monolithic state. Extremists on this point make it more difficult, by their sound and frenzy, for sensible men and women to concentrate on the main objective - good Government.

Yet one cannot help wondering how far we can go in constantly investing Washington with greater and more detailed power over the lives of people - without arriving at something quite different from the free society we have known.

Moreover - I believe that most citizens resent the claptrap that theorists voice these days against essential elements in our system - profits for risk and work and foresight, for example.

They resent the blackjacks inherent in recently proposed legislation - the well-nigh explicit threat, though couched in legalistic language: "Go along with us - or else."

They reject the obsession that money can accomplish anything and everything, that headlong Federal spending of your money is evidence of Federal vision.

In this regard, the dictum, "The power to tax is the power to destroy" has a corollary. "The power to spend is the power to impoverish and to bankrupt."

What we Americans want - a return to a creative climate in Government, an end to our reasonable fears about current trends - can be done by real leadership; a leadership of action and example as well as words.

The first step toward such leadership is the election this year to the Congress, in both its Houses, of men and women genuinely representative of the people, responsible only to the people and their own conscience.

To that end, Republicans and concerned Democrats and thoughtful Independents can learn valuable lessons from this district.

I am told that, here, you tolerate no voting of vacant lots and tombstones, and century-old city directories. In this district, honest votes are not nullified by ghosts and goblins.

Second: Here the use of the ballot is regarded as an obligation and a duty as well as a right and a privilege. You do little hiding out on Election Day. And, consequently, the earnest and informed and responsible voters are not thwarted by the stay-at-homes who are, in fact, in many places, the chief allies of

boss-run machines and selfish minorities.

Third: You are enthusiastic about the cause you espouse. You organize to excite a like enthusiasm in all your neighbors. You scrutinize the performance of the officials you elect but when they perform well you never let them down. And you pay them, in demonstrations such as this honoring Charlie Halleck, the tribute of friendship and loyalty and outspoken support that means to a public servant more than salary or prestige.

Many other lessons, valid for every Congressional District in the Republic, could be learned here in Indiana's Second. But if these three lessons alone become a charter for Republican action this year, I give you one - and only one - guess on the name of the next speaker of the House of Representatives.

What I am talking about here is no partisan venture in small politics. I just believe the American system should not be the victim of infidelity to the obligations of citizenship, whether through ignorance, laziness, indifference or a pious prejudice against political activity. The country needs more political activity by all its citizens.

Representative, responsible government - personified by Charlie Halleck and men of his conviction; cherished by Americans for generations; its fruitful worth demonstrated by near two centuries of trial and test - is, nevertheless, always under threat; its champions forever under attack.

Arrayed against representative and responsible leaders, bitter in the ceaseless onslaughts on them, are those who treat government as a paradise for theorists; the country as a playpen for the exercise of their notions and abstract fantasies; the people as a captive horde to be manipulated - benevolently, of course, for their own great good, as the theorists imagine it but - inexorably manipulated.

In public life, too many men confuse dreaminess with vision, wild fancy with foresight and wisdom; fluency in words with clarity in ideas. They do have a knack in concocting slogans; but the slogans are slick rather than profound.

For example: "Get America moving." This has a fine sound, even though the word "get" in their slogan implies that American has been sitting - immobile and alone - on Plymouth Rock since 1620.

I wonder what these sloganeers think America has been doing over all these years.

No sensible American - certainly no Republican - is against progress. None of us wants to stand still and decay. All of us know we have competitors in the world and downright enemies, greedy for our destruction.

So, I should like to propose a question to the slogan makers. This is it: Get America moving where, in what direction, to what purpose?

Climbing a mountain is slow, tedious, sometimes painful and arduous labor. Falling off it is easy, fast - and disastrous. When you fall, you sure do move, but not to where you might like.

With all our hearts we say: Keep America moving ahead!

We salute Charlie Halleck as one who wants to go ahead, who opposes those who would turn the Republic into an experimental farm for the sowing of wild theories; irrigated with political eyewash; whose crop will be financial ragweed and social thistle.

Charlie Halleck represents you. He is responsible to you. Fourteen times you have elected him to the Congress. Now, once again, he submits his record to you for your scrutiny and his official future to your vote.

I am sure you will return him to the Congress. I hope it will be by the largest plurality of his career.

• Scranton, Pennsylvania, September 14, 1962

I appreciate the warmth of this welcome from my fellow Pennsylvanians. And, for one specific reason, I am glad to be here this evening. I come to endorse a highly qualified man for the post of Governor of our State.

For years I have been urging that Republicans always seek out, as candidates for public office at all levels, vital men and women of integrity, character and broad experience, who are mindful of their responsibilities as Americans and vigorous in the discharge of them, who are dedicated to the well-being of community and country rather than to their own political fortunes, and who are loyal to American principles and are real leaders in the application of them to current problems.

It is this kind of man that we Republicans have nominated for our Governor - William Warren Scranton.

In time of war, he proved himself a good and loyal soldier; since then, he has proved himself equally valuable in public service to his community and to his country.

Consider some highlights of his experiences: here in Scranton, he was joined with you in an inspiring demonstration of what neighbors can do when faced with the threat of local economic disaster. You - and he with you - put your heads together; rolled up your sleeves; and rebuilt for this city a new and stronger economic foundation. This was do-it-yourself courage; the kind of self-reliance Americans have always admired; the kind of initiative and confidence that moved our forebears as they conquered a thousand different frontiers. These qualities, these accomplishments, we need today!

Unhappily, now-adays, more and more decisions are made by the bureaucrat and fewer and fewer by the people. Unless we do something to change the trend toward Washington's concentration of power over local matters, we shall lose the self-reliance and individual determination which revitalized this city.

Fortunately, Bill Scranton, through convincing personal experience, here in his home town, realizes that Americans - to get things done - need not become wards of Washington, dependent on handouts and grants and entangled in the red tape of bureaucratic management. He knows the true greatness of America is within its communities, within its homes. For the genius of America is not, and never has been, in Washington. It is found in the enterprise and energy, the faith and common sense and wisdom of the American people - the source of all power under our Constitution. And his knowledge, and his faith in the capacity and spirit of Americans, will transform and brighten the economic outlook of Pennsylvania from the moment he sits down at the Governor's desk.

To that desk, moreover, he will bring a comprehensive grasp of world affairs in terms of their impact on every-day living in this commonwealth. This is no little thing, because the prosperity of our communities here in Pennsylvania measurably depends upon the prosperity of the nation and of the Free World.

As Special Assistant for two years to Secretary of State Chris Herter, our candidate shared in the application of America's foreign policy on a global front. He helped to represent the Republic at international conferences in Europe, Latin America and the United Nations. Recognizing Pennsylvania's inescapable relation to the rest of the world, he will assure the Commonwealth vigorous leadership of breadth and vision.

Finally, in the Congress of the United States he and his running mate Congressman Van Zant have been sturdy exponents of the American tradition, demonstrated by their concern for the preservation of home rule, local self-reliance, government close to the people. I am told that another Pennsylvanian, now in Washington and prominent in another Party, derides as mere slogans and symbols, these fundamental elements of the American system. The most effective answer to him and his sort is the election in their stead of Republicans like Bill Scranton and Jim Van Zant and their associates.

It may well be, as some critics have frequently charged, that I am not a "politician." To such a title I make no pretensions, but this much I will say: in pursuance of my duties in the Army, on a University campus, in the White House, I have had to measure men for specific tasks of vital importance, in war and peace. I sought only the best in character, in ability, vigor, loyalty and leadership.

My standards have not changed.

Therefore, I pledge to William Warren Scranton my vote for Governor of Pennsylvania, and to Jim Van Zant for U.S. Senator. I hope their victories will be overwhelming!

• **State House, South Carolina, September 22, 1962**

It's good to be back. The last time I addressed an audience from the steps of this historic state house was in 1952. I came here, despite the dire warnings of some on my staff that my visit was a waste of time. There were only 5,000 Republicans in the state, they said, and why bother? You won't see a "corporal's guard" of folks.

Well it turned out, shortly afterwards, that more than 168,000 South Carolinians voted for the ticket I headed. Maybe they were not Republicans. Maybe they were not even Democrats. Very likely they were just plain Americans, voting out of a patriotic concern, who were:

Sick and tired of the monotony and sterility of one party rule. Sick and tired of Washington's presumptuous claim that the South was safe for anyone or anything the Administration put up. Sick and tired of a party that - everywhere outside the South - blatantly played up to the worst sort of greed - something for nothing.

In any case, after the ballots were counted back in 1952, those of my staff whose arithmetic was prophetic had a two-word explanation. "Personal magic," they said.

Naturally, being human, I may have been a little pleased by this glib explanation. After all, most of us like to hear remarks that reflect credit on us or attribute to us a unique capacity to get things done. But, at the same time, I was sure something far deeper, far sounder, far more revealing than a single personality was involved.

So, then, I was delighted in 1960 when 188,000 - 20,000 more - South Carolinians voted for Richard M. Nixon. I would guess that some Democrats up in Washington - and in Boston - did not draw an easy breath that election until the last South Carolina ballot was counted.

Now, I am here this year because I believe this state is safe only for those candidates who profess an authentic American creed. This is it:

First: Belief in the dignity and ability of the individual, endowed with rights under the law and the Constitution to use his God-given talents to the utmost.

Second: Belief in sound fiscal policies for our Government that will protect the generations following us from engulfment in a bankruptcy produced by our reckless spending on the wasteful and the futile.

Third: Belief in the people's ability to run their own affairs without interference by bureaucrats or big-time politicians manufacturing issues to hoodwink voters.

I think the people of South Carolina are committed to that creed. Certainly, if they want to preserve their independence, their freedom from the strait jacket of Federal controls, their security against the threat of punitive regulations and interpretations, they should think twice about any association with a single party.

The two-party system, aside from the Constitution, is our best guarantee wherever we live - north, south, east, west - of government committed to the good of all the people.

In this, I sound like a Republican, and I should. I am not going to claim I'm a Whig or a Jeffersonian Conservative or a Wilsonian Liberal - even though I might be something of all three. I am a plain, simple Republican because, as one, I think I can best be a good American.

The other day, Earl Mazo, a South Carolinian, told me that not so long ago in southern newspaper offices it was considered libelous to call a man in print a Republican! Fortunately, Republican is at long last a respectable word in the South. And we Republicans have - all through the South - candidates worthy of your respect and votes.

Two of them are with me here: William Workman, who, I am told, is an outstandingly well-qualified candidate for the United States Senate; and Floyd Spence, the Republican candidate for Congress in the Second District. Bill Workman, as author and columnist, has demonstrated keen insight into the problems of nation and state. He is not the Senator Claghorn type. And Floyd Spence, like so many other Southerners, a new recruit to the Republican crusade for two-party government, has been a leader all his life.

Of course, both as a Republican and an American, I hope you will send them to Washington. There, I am confident they will be firm champions of principles Republicans and discerning Democrats espouse.

Let me briefly talk about three of these principles - as an American, entirely aside from my party affiliation.

One: The leader of a democracy is not the source of power; he merely helps direct it. Power derives from, and must remain in, the people.

The principle has a corollary. This:

The power in the people will wither unless an overwhelming majority of them constantly exercise it, wisely and well, by their votes. And they exercise it wisely only when they divest themselves of the shackles of out-dated prejudice and, in the secrecy of the polling booth, before their conscience and their God, vote what they honestly believe is for the good of all America.

My second principle is this:

Washington does not create the wealth which supports Federal spending programs. The people - you - pay for them. And the corollary to this principle is a hard, dollars and cents fact I read about the other day.

According to the story I saw, the average American now works two and a half hours each day - practically one day out of every three - something like 17 working weeks a year - just to meet his tax bills. Only after fulfilling this obligation can parents try to feed and clothe and school a family and provide something for their own and their children's future.

The third principle is this:

The only valid guides to our conduct as citizens are the truths in which America was born and, in whose application to every problem, America has grown great. The corollary of this principle is:

The labels plastered on us by the sloganeers are often meaningless and usually designed to confuse, to distract, to divide. Take conservative and liberal, for example.

As President of the United States, through eight years, I tried to be a conservative in the spending of other people's money. At the same time, I tried just as hard to be liberal in all things that concerned the good and the well-being and the welfare of every American. Government, as I saw it, had to use its head in fiscal affairs, listen to its heart in human affairs.

These three principles: Power belongs to the people; the people pay the bill; the truths of our heritage are our best guides - these principles, I hope, will be in the minds of all South Carolinians this coming election day and every day as they consider public problems or act on them as citizens.

Now, in closing, permit me to return to my role as a Republican.

Ten years after the event I want to thank you of South Carolina for vindicating me in quarreling with my advisers by increasing thirty-three-fold the number of Republicans and like-thinking South Carolinians they said lived in the state. You surprised and delighted even me, an incorrigible optimist.

And one final word of advice: keep the number growing.

• Hershey, Pennsylvania, September 27, 1962

This morning I had a talk with a newspaper man who has known me since World War II days. He put to me one very blunt question. This is it:

"Why, General, at your age, with no political future before you, are you working so hard in this campaign?"

A question of that sort coming out of the blue is not easy to answer quickly and concisely. But during my free moments today I have been asking myself, "Why am I?" and trying to come up with an answer satisfactory to myself.

Indeed there must be a number of you who have asked themselves the same question. People who have done their bit - now possibly retired - say, "Why should I be worrying about politics?"

I can answer only for myself. As a Republican, I am loyal to my party. But far above this, I am an American. I want to do all I can to assure the country positive, progressive, productive, constitutional government that represents the people and serves them. To do my part toward that end, I believe I must work hard for responsible leadership in every area of Government from my home county to the Congress of the United States.

I have only one vote of my own. So I am trying to arouse in everyone who will listen to my voice a fervor about the rights and privileges, the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship. The former can best be enjoyed, the latter best discharged, I think, in the conditions and the circumstances of 1962, by the election of qualified Republicans to office.

Of course, there are decent, patriotic Democrats. But that party as a whole is committed to a political philosophy that stresses the alleged weakness, the incapacity of the individual to help himself on his own, or joined with his neighbors in community or state.

Importance of government in life of business grows. It's bound to grow, but let us now be so careless as to let it grow too important.

What were we promised by the New Frontier? A prompt and successful solution of all our foreign problems - for all these the Frontier had an answer. We're still waiting for them!

The farm problem was easy for them. They tried first to put over a solution which would have apparently put some of us in jail.

Budgets - these they were going to balance, and we have a right to ask, "And how?" and still we ask, "And when?"

They talked of reducing taxes, but when are they going to reduce the expenditures that make the longed for tax cut possible?

Do we want to continue paying taxes for stunts in space - challenging the Soviets to a race to the moon rather than to a race for leadership among those nations who value national independence and human liberty?

Do we want to desert responsible progress in favor of fanciful "pie in the sky" proposals so dear to the hearts of those who live beyond the horizon of common sense?

They promised us an end to unemployment - the only success they have had here is in placing some additional thousand of New Frontiersmen on the Federal payroll.

Why go on? What can I do - what can either you or I do to bring back a reign of logic, fact, judgment?

The Republican Party is committed to the contrary philosophy that the enterprise and energy of individuals is the source of progress.

The Republican candidates in Pennsylvania are for that philosophy and, consequently, I am trying to persuade people to be for them.

• National War College, October 3, 1962

I think the first words I should like to say are that it is good to be back home again.

I have been asked to talk about the presidential function in planning national security and then to make some observations on the matter of organization on order to implement preparatory and peacetime policies so as to be ready in the event of an emergency to act with some intelligence and in orderly fashion. I shall try to avoid all subjects that are more or less technical and professional in character. I shall try to talk about presidential responsibilities in this broad subject. But I must warn you that no President can operate in a vacuum; therefore, he has to talk about his relations with others, with associates, with subordinates, and often with the Congress.

In talking about these things I must tell you also that I cannot possibly be doctrinal in the approach for the simple reason that, like all other officials, Presidents do have personalities and, therefore, they are going to do things their own way. Since they are in position where there is no one normally able to say "Nay," they don't have to feel that someone is looking over their shoulder.

Therefore, I shall try, as far as I can, to make this an historical presentation, going back to some of the things I have seen happen, some of the things that I believe, and possibly at least set up a platform and a background for questioning, which I understand is to come sooner or later.

I think, if I am going to do this, maybe I should talk a little bit about some of the contacts that I have had with Presidents when I personally was not an occupant of the White House. I shall tell you one example to show you that a presidential action does not follow any pattern; it depends upon the times; it depends upon the sense of urgency that we feel about these great matters of national security; it depends to a great extent upon the way any individual likes to approach his problems.

Many years ago I was a part-time instructor in the Industrial College and, as such, was involved deeply in what we called "industrial planning." This was the very beginnings in planning for industrial mobilization. But we were a sort of orphan in the War Department in those days and the mighty general staff looked down their collective noses very definitely on anyone who should be engaged in such a mundane and uninteresting subject as the mobilization of the nation's industry to support their brilliant ideas in strategy and tactics.

In order to get some standing for ourselves, we got up an outlined plan - the first one, I think, that attempted to go into the general business of organizing for industrial mobilization - and to lay down certain basic rules and methods that would apply. We thought we could get a better understanding of our work in the

War Department if we could get the President to approve this. So my chief put a few dollars out and we got it up in a big red binding - it was not a very large paper; we took all the tiresome addenda and statistics out of it and we sent it to the White House. We didn't even get a notation back. We heard from an assistant that the President was far too busy to pay attention to drivel that had no application to the times and to the problems of the day.

Now contrast that attitude on the part of the white House at that time with the terrific importance and indeed publicity that attaches itself to the problem of stockpiling today - the billions that we have in copper, nickel, steel, manganese, and all the rest of the items - to make sure that we will not be caught short in the event of emergency.

So you can see that different times and different senses of emergency will very greatly affect the action that any President may take.

Because, like you people, I spent my adult professional life in the military, it was quite obvious that, as President, I should want to get the kind of information and recommendations that I would expect from subordinates in a military formation. In other words, I would use some kind of organized staff. In the political organization of the United States you cannot have any organization that is truly comparable to the general staff. You have your Cabinet officers, and heads of independent agencies who might be roughly compared to your Army commanders or corps commanders in a great military operation, or fleet commanders or air divisions. But a general staff as such could not possibly be organized in the political offices of our country. But you have to take some bits and pieces of a military type of staff in the executive offices of the Government in order to carry out the kind of orderly study leading to what we always hope are sound, sensible, firm decisions and then provide for their implementation. That, in more detail, I will talk about a little later.

When we are talking about national security I think we must remember we are not talking merely of the defense of territories or of lives, of our home and families and hearthsides. We are really talking about defending a way of life. This way of life is one that recognizes human liberty and human dignity. Therefore, in our planning, we cannot plan in terms of a Hitler or of the communists or any dictator. We have to plan to preserve a democratic or representative form of government.

The strength of a nation, whether it be for defense or anything else - speaking of security in an international world - is made up of three great factors. One is its moral or spiritual strength; another is its economic strength; and another is its military. These factors are mutually interdependent. You cannot conceive of a strong military establishment long maintained if it were bleeding its economy unconscionably. For example, there is no question that the Japanese war lords, striving to get ready for the war that they wanted to conduct, had ruined Japan's economy. And it was clear that they had to win soon, or they couldn't possibly win at all.

In the matter of morale, particularly after World War I, you will recall, as the morale of Romania and Bulgaria began to wane - those nations of a secondary level in power - began to leave the Axis ship, and Germany was left alone, without allies. Of course, if there is no military strength, it must be developed, secured some way quickly in an emergency, or you are gone.

We all remember the 1940 experience of Britain when it was practically disarmed. But morale was so high that almost overnight the British began to arm and rearm, and with help from outside they finally became again a very powerful military force in that great struggle.

So let us not forget that we must not make plans that are damaging to our own economy or to our morale. We are a free people. If we place unnecessary burdens upon our people too long there will be a reaction, and that reaction could have unfortunate results in our strength on the military category.

You can say these things are not your business in the uniformed services. But they are. While the President, at the head of all his different departments and executive staffs, is finally the individual that has to make decisions in the proper measures that he believes will maintain and sustain this kind of balanced security - which in the long run is the only effective one - then anyone who comes into this problem of planning for the national security must have a general knowledge of the other two factors over and above his own. If he does not he is failing in duty of preparing himself for this very serious business of planning.

Since each of these factors is vitally necessary to the security of the nation, military people, particularly

as they get into positions on defense staffs in the Pentagon and advisors to the President, have to see themselves as not merely guiding the operations and the thinking and the development of the military establishment, they have to think of themselves as part of the hinge that connects the great productive organism of America with the cutting edge of the machine, which is the military. You are part of that hinge.

Because of our common background, we are, in detail, concerned in the military. But, I say again, you must never lose sight of the great factors of morale and economic strength.

As we approach this problem of planning, and look to the Commander-in-Chief or to the President for guidance, we consider first our possible enemies. We look at those people who could or who may want to injure us. Of all the things that we need, the first is intelligence.

Reliable intelligence is always difficult to get. To my mind, until the end of World War II, this matter had never been treated in our government or in the military as seriously as it should have been. When I went to Europe in 1942, it is not too much to say that I was completely dependent upon the British for any useful intelligence in the entire eastern Atlantic area. We Americans had practically nothing. We had a few military attaches, and we could read reports about what they said about the British people, the German people, and others; but as far as intelligence was concerned, we had no gathering agency, almost no evaluating agency. There was certainly nothing that the President of the United States could get except that he got from people who later became our allies.

Today, intelligence has its proper place, at least organizationally, although possibly not as well coordinated as it should be. There seems to be both duplication and some lack of coordination. These things will take time to correct. I believe that everybody who is assigned to high position in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps should look at intelligence more as a governmental function and not necessarily as just his own particular baby. Intelligence should be gathered and evaluated on a national basis, and we should use every proper means and appropriate agency for helping to collect it. We should make sure that the evaluating people are competent and that we finally get a true conception of what the enemy's strength is - military, economic and moral. We must find what his intentions are so far as we can see them, interpret them from his actions. And, above all, we should not be getting in each other's way. We should make sure that the field is covered very accurately and completely, but without too much duplication.

This is where we come to a specific duty, as I see it, of the President. He must personally examine intelligence activities so he can understand how well this is being done or is not being done.

Among other things, certain types of intelligence gathering can affect very deeply the political situation. If I just mention the one expression "U-2" you will understand that it does. Parenthetically, to make one observation about that incident, which became so publicized in our papers and on which almost every expert columnist in the world expressed his opinion, I just want to point out that I have never yet found anyone who would agree that he would give back all the information we ever got out of U-2 in return for the refusal to allow Powers and all the other U-2 pilots to fly over Russia.

A President does have to take the responsibility of acting in certain things that can cause you deep trouble; but it is up to him to do that. On that particular point, some columnists, and indeed some rather political-minded people, said that the President by no means should take responsibility for the U-2 projects. This is the kind of responsibility that someone else has to take, these people say, and if you have to crucify that man, that is just too bad; you must keep the President and the White House's hands completely unclouded and undirtied in all this kind of business.

Now, my friends, I ask you this. Everyone of you people are so well-informed as to the process of collecting intelligence that if a President should get up publicly and say: "I have no responsibility; I didn't know about this; I am going to find out who it is; and I will fire him and possibly try him." Well, know, what would be the President's stature in your minds? That man is the Commander-in-Chief, on whose shoulders rests the responsibility of acting in case of great emergency, and his subordinates certainly have a right to feel that their boss is ready to take responsibility for his necessary part of it, in spite of any so-called partisan political consequences.

We not only consider our enemies, but we are concerned not merely with their tanks and missiles and atom bombs and divisions; we are concerned also with their economies and the morale.

Therefore, since we see the importance of these things, we must again make certain that our plans are broad enough to combat all types of possible threats. There is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that shortly after the close of the Korean War the Soviets came to the conclusion that it wasn't a very good wicket they were going to get on if they were to rely completely on force or the threat of force in order to carry out their dominant purpose of communizing the world.

I think about that time they began to think (it was a transition, of course) about economic penetration and political penetration in the belief that by these means they could conquer the Free World, the Western World, better and more effectively than they could by using the military. Of course, they were going to keep up the military threat to keep the world uneasy and tense. There is no question that only as the world knows that we ourselves are powerful enough to counteract and to deter these people that we are going to have that tranquility of mind that will allow us to continue productive work and to make sure of the continued progress of humanity throughout the world - certainly in the western part. So, as the Communists go into these economic areas of aggression, again you see that there is a relationship between their military threat and their actual actions in the economic field.

We begin to see that we have to be closer and closer relationship among all the groups and bodies that are responsible for studying the economies of other nations, and those that are responsible for creating the kind of climate in which our own economy can perform creatively and freely.

So we have to get a grouping, a coordination of these ideas and these factors in front of the President so that he, seeing them laid out, can finally make decisions that will allow intelligent and comprehensive planning to go ahead. The military services couldn't possibly do this kind of thing in a vacuum. Neither the Defense or State or Commerce or any other department can do it by itself.

Along with it all, this subject of morale has really no place for its thorough and comprehensive study. I am talking now of national morale, not of morale of your units, of your fleets, and so on. There is no place to study this subject except as you can set up groups and bodies that, each from its own view point, bring this whole thing in front of the boss to make the decision.

Now to take a look at your problem - all democracies work under one very great handicap. That great handicap is that they can never make a surprise attack. The political processes which must be gone through before we go into a major war are such that we, as a democracy and certainly as part of free coalitions, cannot make or deliver the first blow. It cannot be done. Consequently, you are always, so far as directing a campaign or a war is concerned, just a bit back of the eight-ball. You have to be prepared as rapidly as you can to strike back. Ideally, if we can strike back as we see somebody else ready to pull the trigger, that would be the very best. We can't do that. Again intelligence and planning must work together so that surprise blows that could be delivered on us are not really crippling.

I cannot emphasize too much my belief that one of the biggest jobs we must perform is to be alert to the danger and produce the mechanisms and the systems and the help that will make it ever and ever a better method of finding out what the fellows are doing, particularly as the situation becomes tense, and to make certain that we are not defeated or damaged so badly that we cannot respond effectively.

Because we cannot have this perfection of warning we have to use dispersion. Our own power must be so deployed and distributed that it cannot be fully reached. As quickly as the Polaris idea was brought forward, one of the great reasons for the enthusiastic support of that idea - along about '55 or '56, I guess it was, possibly a little earlier - was that here you had something that could not be destroyed by a surprise blow. It widened our possibilities for dispersion and deployment and, I think, gave a very nasty shock to the Soviets at the time; although, of course, they are working hard to do the same thing.

The atom bomb is a thing that has put great importance on this matter of surprise attack. America probably never had any reason to be truly frightened or too apprehensive until we found that an enemy had this great and destructive weapon and was developing means to deliver it.

So here you sometimes have a feeling that we on our own part should be ready, regardless of allies, regardless of Congress, regardless of anything else, to start a war. But if we start such a thing, this means a dictatorial form of government and this in turn automatically destroys what we said we were defending - a way of life.

Democracy, of course, has to accept these disadvantages under which it works so far as its enemy and the possibility of use of force are concerned and must be strong enough, quick enough, alert enough to win, in spite of the other fellow's ability to do something, which from the purely strategic military view we would, of course, like to be able to do.

This brings up another thing that becomes a part of the President's direct duties.

If you are going to be ready to react promptly, there necessarily has to be a decentralization of authority - the kind of authority that will allow our people to operate without waiting for communications or orders from Washington.

The conditions or the circumstances or the situations under which such a delegated authority can be employed by a subordinate have to be very carefully described, and there must be very clear limitations on the authority of a subordinate to do something that could bring on, unwanted and unwisely, a general war. In certain instances and a number of times, this we tried to codify and simplify such instructions; and occasionally these papers would be revised. But since these responsibilities, such as the matter of releasing all the force of which a country is capable, are right in the President's hand, this is something on which he must be advised by his military continuously - how can you authorize some decentralization and still be safe.

As a matter of fact, in the Air Force, they had a method they called "fail safe." Well, in the same way, all of our planning for war, since we necessarily have to try to be right up to the minute as to what this fellow is going to do, since we must watch this matter of a surprise attack, we must be certain that we can operate effectively and efficiently but never recklessly or carelessly. I know of nothing that presents to the military advisor to the President, no matter who he is or what group it is, such a delicate problem.

Related problems are: Where do you deploy these destructive weapons? You have to decide where they are to be and how they should be kept. Originally, you know, none of these things could get out of the hands of the Atomic Energy Commission. But now all of that, I think, is pretty much straightened out, and they are at positions and localities and so deployed that it would be our hope that they could operate effectively and efficiently in case of need.

I have not, and will not go into the type of conditions that were laid down governing these matters other than to say the directives published, were issued under my responsibility. But I do say that is something which is one of the toughest problems the President has.

The next thing that comes up and is presented to the President time and again is the difference between small wars and big wars. I have never been quite sure where the big war starts and the small war ends, because the great advocates of the small war say: "Well, it is all right; you must have enough so you can take care of one in Vietnam; even though you are going to get one in Iran, and then another one somewhere else." I said: Now how far do we go before we are in a big war. If I am fighting in Korea, Formosa, and Vietnam, and in other areas, the conflict is getting pretty big.

I finally came to this conclusion, that if you get into any trouble where general mobilization of this country is necessary in order to provide steadily the resources that the fighting forces in a number of places are consuming, then you are in a general or global war.

The next problem that comes up under these conditions: Are you going to go after the head of the snake or are you going to content yourself with cutting off his tail and just let him strike all over the world whenever he chooses? - another problem that the President has to decide for himself.

Incidentally, again referring to my friends, the columnists, I have seen many pieces where they tell how any individual reaches his decisions; and then they give you a very great deal of instructions that possibly would scarcely be valuable for you people. They talk about what they call the committee system of operating and deciding and the individual system.

Well, certainly so far as I know, since our Civil War there has never been any committee system for the making of military decisions, except insofar as the British method of three separate Commanders-in-Chief, each controlling his own service, as a sort of command group. But when they disagreed, I suspect they went right squarely back to Whitehall, that is, to single command. I didn't have that kind of problem because our governments set up an Allied Commander in each area.

I have never in all my military experience, which goes back to 1911 at least, heard of a council of war or

heard of any kind of decision that was made, except by the man who was responsible. Everybody, subordinates and staff, can of course argue prior to the decision. An example:

After we captured Tunisia in Africa we wanted to go into Sicily. There was some question whether Sicily or Sardinia would be better, but our bosses said they wanted us to go into Sicily. So we planned it. We decided that the little island of Pantelleria should be taken as a preliminary operation. For many years Pantelleria has been called the Gibraltar of the Central Mediterranean. It had an airfield and heavily organized for defense. I wanted to get this place so the enemy couldn't bother our shipping and so we could, from there, support our own attacks.

Well, never in my experience, certainly not in the African theater, was there ever a more bitterly fought battle among my advisors. I put all the members of my operational staff in front of me and listened.

The problem was this: Airborne attacks alone wouldn't do because all of Pantelleria has no area, I think, bigger than this room, and each was surrounded by a stone wall that they had picked off the field. So airborne attack was out. There wasn't a single beach. The only way you could get onto the island was through the harbor, which had an opening of about 300 yards. But we believed two things: (a) we had so much gun fire and air power that we thought we could blast our way into that particular place and take our small attack boats safely into the harbor; and (b) we thought the Italian morale was gone and we thought they wanted to surrender. Of course, we could pick up the messages that Mussolini was sending to the garrison saying if ever anyone of them surrendered they would all be executed, and all the rest of it. But our ground forces people said this kind of attack couldn't go. We had at that moment only one available division to make the attack that had been trained amphibiously.

The argument was just as bitter as it could be. But the point is that no one tried to take over the decision. The plan was considered by some so tough that they wanted to re-consider, but it stood.

Then, to make the whole thing anticlimactic, as the soldiers got into their from the big ships, white flags and white crosses on the ground on the airfields all came out; the garrison surrendered without resistance.

It was just one of those times where your worries wouldn't bother you if you could just go ahead and forget them. But the point is, the decision cannot be made by any staff group or by any voting. I never saw voting anywhere when a decision was involved, except in a committee in Congress.

Now, as to deployment and unified command, this is largely, of course, a subject in the hands of the military, but it also is something that demands state coordination, because the armies, navies, and air forces, are, after all, implementing or operating agencies that carry out political decisions. So, from the political angle there must be decided the best places for your strength, here, there, or the other.

So here again you have a problem which I think can never bypass the President; he must go into it. And, by the same token, when you begin to establish your unified commanders - a system in which I thoroughly believe - I believe that a President should do his best to know who those people are, at the very least by reputation, because they are men on whose independent judgment in times of emergency very great responsibility must be placed.

So I think in this particular matter, while a military is the predominant voice, again the President must give his approval.

All these things we are talking about, which demand coordination and argument pro and con in front of the President, require some kind of organization.

I am not going to try to point to any Administration except my own.

The Security Council was established by law, I think, by 1947. Strangely enough, it was put into law that the Vice President should be part of it. I am not so certain that this is constitutional. The Vice President is not a part of the Executive Branch of the Government, and since he is not and the President is, I would think that any President who disliked or distrusted his Vice President would be perfectly justified in throwing the fellow out of the Security Council and nothing could be done about it.

However, how much I might dislike him, I would never allow the Vice President to be absent from such meetings, if I could help it, for this simple reason. There is a great necessity for keeping the Vice President very close to the Government through all of these organisms - the Cabinet, the Security Council, legislative meetings - because we must always remember that a President could either get killed or temporarily isolated - and any

tense moment in a world situation might demand that the Vice President might have suddenly to take over. He must be kept up to date in all important matters. In my own case I made this almost a religion. After the first time I flew with the Vice President, I never allowed him in the same plane with me, and at every governmental meeting of any importance involving world affairs he had to be present.

The National Security Council then had a legal membership, as I recall, of the President, Vice President, the Secretary of Defense - I forget whether the Director of Intelligence is a member - and there were two of three others. Because of my conviction that the people who had written this law didn't really understand how broad the problem is, I enlarged the Council so that all interested parties - whenever the matter came up of raising more divisions or more ships, or anything of this kind - were present who could argue from their respective viewpoints. The Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury, therefore, were made ex officio members of the National Security Council, as was the Attorney General, when anything came up that involved legal matters. For instance, when we went to save Iran, we had to get a consortium of oil companies. Apparently, technically, we might be violating the Antitrust Act, so I had to have the Attorney General advise us how to make a plan that would not instantly be brought into court and, therefore, defeat it by its very publicity.

Another thing, because of the importance of propaganda and the United States Information Service, I brought in the head of that service. I got the best man I could find and brought him into those discussions because he was constantly trying to implement the dissemination of information or propaganda that we thought would promote our security and worry the other fellow.

In this way we had a body in which there were strong men, fighting and battling for their own particular beliefs and convictions; but they were always battling in front of each other and me. Therefore, I could make a decision at the moment or sometimes carry the problem away with me to make the decision in a day or two after I had pondered or discussed it further.

The point is that the National Security Council brings all these things together and there, on the anvil of good hard argument the truth emerges.

In order for these men themselves to be well-informed, we organized a Planning Board. Let us say the subject would be the American policy toward Southeast Asia. All right. There are a thousand different factors, as you people well know, that make it important that we know about everything we can possibly find about the area - the temper of the people, their morale, their sturdiness, their living conditions, the terrain in which they operate and live, their level of education - all these things have to be brought up. So a Planning Board (and some of you may have belonged to it) was a most useful agency.

It was a rather senior staff or what you would call the Indians; they who would get the whole program or situation laid out. And, of course, they briefed their own chiefs before these latter came in for the main meeting.

As a matter of fact, no problem ever gets to the President's desk unless it is filled with conflicting considerations. He never gets the easy ones. But that is what he is there for. People thought my golf was bad for me. I thought it was pretty good. It gave me a way to get out of appointments; and it was a good place to think about some of these matters.

Now, along with the Planning Board we found a need for another group subordinate to or as a collective assistant to the National Security Council. Again I call your attention to the absence of a general staff, as such, in the political world. When you as an Army commander or a fleet commander issue orders to your chief subordinates you know they are going to be executed. You have an information staff that keeps in contact all the time, and you have the reins in your hands all the time. This is not true in a political organization. People come in; they are very important in their own fields, and they want to do their jobs in their own way. It is pretty hard to keep them constantly coordinated among themselves, say, through Cabinet meetings or national security meetings, because these take place, say, once a week or, in times of emergency, maybe twice a week or three times a week. But to keep the details of decisions coordinated and knowing whether implementation is as good as planning, we organized what we called the Operations Coordinating Board.

The OCB had an additional function; that was to advise us on psychological warfare. I think anybody who was a part of World War II does not need to have re-emphasized to him the importance of the psychological factor. The OCB then had two different but not always separate functions. No matter what

department had a part of responsibility for implementing a decision, the OCB would ask: Is Commerce, or Agriculture, or Labor doing everything it has agreed to do? And so on. The OCB follows them up all the time, not at the top level; they go ahead and find the individuals who are really functioning in the pertinent matter and see what is going on. I think they provided for us a useful service.

The psychological function came into prominence and was given to the OCB for a very simple reason. Since it was the purpose of the OCB to make sure that there was coordination in the implementation of American policy, this meant that it was concerned also that we wouldn't confuse the French or the Germans or the Australians on what we were doing. In other words, the OCB got interested in the psychological reactions of people around the world to our own operations. This was one of the reasons that the Board was always busy coordinating these operations. I won't defend it as the ideal place to put the subject of psychological warfare, but there is where it was.

The OCB had very close connections with the Army, Navy - all the defense forces - and the others; and I think by and large it worked. I would think that some one has to have this job or there is bound to be lack of coordination. For example (and there is no criticism meant, I just want to give an example), just after I left office I noted that the Secretary of a completely nonmilitary service got up and made a statement concerning Cuba - which finally had to be denied by the White House itself. The point is, there was no one to keep in touch with that particular department and its head to make sure that he knew what the truth was and that he would know that he was about to say something in conflict with the President's policy.

I think that the staffs and the organisms that I set up during my eight years did more closely resemble the military type of organization than those in the past. But all that any commander or any responsible person can ask for, it seems to me, is to get the problem clearly stated, to get the facts on it, to have a good, intelligent, trained staff give study to it, to reach some conclusions and recommendations, and make them to him along with alternative lines of action.

These staffs have to be such that they cover the whole broad field of human experience and, therefore, in the effort to make the President's work effective and based upon the known facts and the advice of experts so far as he can get it, they must be organized - well organized indeed. And the method that seemed to me as most applicable was one that would be somewhat similar to what I had been used to. I think that any man who had not had the same background as I had might have organized somewhat differently. But I checked frequently with some of the heads of some of our big companies and I found that my organization was very little different from theirs.

I believe, therefore, that this is one good way of keeping the President as well-informed and as well-advised as any group of subordinates can keep him advised. And then, God help us, let's hope he makes at least a sound, sensible, and satisfactory decision, even if he is not a brilliant fellow.

Thank you very much indeed.

• San Francisco, California, October 6, 1962

At the very outset, let me make one point.

You know I'm a Texan by birth, a Kansan by raising. Of course, my mother and father arranged that. But I'm a Pennsylvanian and a Californian by choice; in those two states Mamie and I make our home.

I first reached this state 43 years ago - in the late summer of 1919. I had just finished a transcontinental trip with the first Army truck convoy to run from the Atlantic to the Pacific. After weeks of mud roads and desert tracks, clogged-up radiators and blown-out tires, broken springs and missing road markers, California looked good to me. It looked so good that I have been coming back ever since. And, God willing, I'll be back again with my wife in January.

In any case, as an American, I am concerned with what happens in California because what happens in this state can directly and immediately affect every aspect of American life and the position of the Republic in the world.

Incidentally, although I am addressing a Republican Dinner, I am pleased that this message is reaching

also into the homes of all of you of the California television audience.

We all know, of course, California is the fastest-moving state in the union - thanks to the energy of its people, to their faith in themselves, in the future of their state, in the providence of God. For much of this movement the mayor of this great city in which I am speaking, George Christopher, deserves no small part of the credit.

Today, in the number of students enrolled in its schools; in the number of men and women working in the modern technologies and on the latest applications of science; in the certain expansion of this state in all the indices that measure social growth - California towers above most of the sovereign nations of the earth.

So, not only as a Californian by winter residence but as an American and as one who has at times been intimately associated with problems of global scope, I come here today to speak as forthrightly as I can about a man who, I know, can carry, successfully, the heaviest possible loads of civic responsibility.

Richard Nixon is one man, so intimately and thoroughly known to me, that without hesitation I can personally vouch for his ability, his sense of duty, his sharpness of mind and his wealth in wisdom.

Through eight years, in the Cabinet Room of the White House, in the weekly sessions of the Cabinet and the National Security Council, he sat directly across the table from me - a mere few feet away. There, I came to know him as a man can never be known from headlines about him or speeches by him. My knowledge of him - first-hand, immediate, the product of my own close scrutiny - grew in times of crises and or progress toward their solution; in times of high resolve and purposeful planning; in times of decisive action and of increase in America's leadership of free nations. I lived with him through years of intense discussion and thought and soul-searching.

When we met in the Cabinet Room of the White House, around the long table in that room were gathered at every meeting men and women who, in their dedication to the public good, constituted a gathering worthy of America's highest purposes.

The matters before us were always important to the well-being of America; often of grave moment; sometimes critical in their impact on the prosperity and progress of the Republic; sometimes even fraught with the peril of war. And, parenthetically, I should remark here that those eight years were a period of advances and great prosperity for the nation - a progress now unofficially impeded by unwise policies and illogical programs sponsored by the "Far Frontier."

In every discussion, our single guide was the welfare and security of the United States. But in the application of principle, there were often expressed wide differences of opinion. Through all these meetings, I could watch Dick Nixon; absorbed in the thoughtful and sober weighing of every word and idea.

The discussion ended, I frequently asked him to present a consensus of the judgments expressed. This he did, always ignoring the trivial, the irrelevant, the imprudent; adding from his own insight and knowledge and conviction counsel that was always useful to me in making my decision.

Repeatedly he was my personal representative in affairs that ranged from meetings with small groups of visitors in Washington to momentous conferences on the national and international level.

On my behalf, for example, he launched before the Conference of Governors my administration's proposal for the most comprehensive highway program ever attempted by the Republic, in partnership with the states. For so titanic an enterprise, I could have found no better spokesman.

Another example: In addition to all his other duties, he took over at my request the Chairmanship of the President's Committee on Government contracts early in my administration. The ultimate purpose of this Committee was to end discrimination because of race, national origin or religion by employers doing business with the United States Government.

As Chairman, Dick Nixon launched an educational program of national scope. Conferences were held throughout the country. Thirteen hundred cases were handled. And the walls of discrimination were broken down in area after area, from coast to coast, from Canada to the Gulf - a unique demonstration of what can be accomplished when men of good will, in a climate of fair play, ably led, sit down to talk out controversial problems and their decent solution.

A third example: On my behalf and on behalf of every American, he traveled the continents of the earth presenting the case and cause of the Republic; never hesitant; never indecisive; never fearful; never brash;

always firm without arrogance, friendly without servility, courageous without truculence - a great American voice on the world scene.

In all that he did - through the eight years we were together - he proved himself an able leader; an outstanding executive; a public servant in the finest American tradition.

Always through those eight years, he was only a heartbeat away from the Presidency of the United States. No one knew that fact better than I. And, knowing it, I had no worry about the future of the Republic - should I be removed from life.

Because of my knowledge of the man, I applauded his decision to enter the race for Governor of California.

Of course, after fourteen years of devoted service to the people of California in the Congress of the United States and to all Americans as Vice President, he had earned a rest. Moreover, I knew that he felt a personal obligation to give his daughters and his wife far more of his time than ever could be possible in the public service.

But I feel most strongly that in this period of our history no man of Dick Nixon's intellectual capacity, conscientious stewardship, superb leadership should be permitted to stand on the side lines.

The Republic of the United States desperately needs in the public service men and women of high competence, strong character, stout courage; men and women who have proved themselves. Particularly, their leadership is needed within the States of the Union where in legislatures and executive offices they can rally the enterprise and the energy of people to do the jobs that can be done best without Washington interference and rule.

Dick Nixon is uniquely fitted for such leadership. Out of fourteen years in the nation's capital - in both legislative and executive branches - he knows well where Federal effectiveness ends and Federal waste begins; where Federal help must be had and Federal regimentation must be shunned; where and when the Federal Government can be a good servant; where and when it can become an evil master.

Several months ago, in Denmark, I observed that one of the biggest mistakes of my political career was not working harder for Dick Nixon in 1960. I urge all of you at this dinner, and I urge all Californians, not to make the same mistake this year.

Each of you, as a citizen, has in this campaign an opportunity, a challenge, an obligation to assure California great and responsible leadership. Not one of you can afford to sit back and wait to see what happens. I urge those who believe in Dick Nixon as I do, to get up, get out and get going for him through every possible hour from now until Election Day.

Dick Nixon has served his country well. I feel positive that he can serve the State of California equally well. I have full faith in the man. I endorse him one hundred percent. Regardless of where I lived in the United States I would be proud to have Richard Nixon as my Governor.

• Boise, Idaho, October 9, 1962

My political career is officially behind me. There is a certain amendment to the Constitution that solved that problem for me even if I had, myself, been disposed to pursue further the eight year tour that I had in the political arena.

But my interest in politics has merely been heightened by my experience. I believe that politics has become too important to business, to labor, to our families, to our communities, that any of us who is really concerned with the future of America, with its people, their welfare, with our security, our standing and our leadership in the world, must be interested in politics. He or she must study and must determine what it is that government can do, what things government should not do, in order that we may be the kind of people we want to be.

The reason I am a Republican is because I believe that the Republicans more nearly than any other political party espouses the kind of principles, doctrines based upon our Constitution and other founding papers, and upon good hard American common sense, that are designed to bring about the kind of world that I think

most of us want.

We want nothing of paternalism, we don't want any kind of government that tells us what we're to do, or takes care of us from the time of the cradle to the tomb. We want to live the lives of sturdy, self-dependent Americans.

All of us know, as a matter of fact, President Lincoln more than a hundred years ago told us that the function of Government is to do for people whatever they cannot do well for themselves or cannot do at all for themselves, but he did say also and in those things in which the individual or the locality can do things for themselves then Government - meaning the Federal Government - ought not to interfere and I believe if we follow that dictum of Lincoln's so long ago pronounced we can scarcely go wrong. We do not want to be kept men and women in any sense of the word.

Now, I am highly honored to be here today. It's only a shade over ten years ago that I first came here. Shortly after my nomination for the Presidency in Chicago in 1952, and as I recall it was the very first political trip I took out of my headquarters in Denver following upon that nomination. I here tried to expound my political views. The essence of those views was that all extremes are always wrong. The common sense of America does not believe that you can either go back and live in the time of Andrew Jackson or of the Plymouth Rock fathers, nor on the other hand, do we want to be experimenting with something that may be quite apt a hundred and fifty years or fifty years hence. We want to get away from extremes, whether it is in education, every kind of industry, anything you want to take, stay away from extremes and follow the route of common sense. That was the essence of my message and I believe it today and it is the reason that I am on the political trail trying to believe that the American good sense will keep us on a better trail than will some very so-called intellectuals surrounding the White House now and forming of themselves a clique of young fathers to tell us what to do. Now with your permission I want briefly to look backward over those ten years and the reason for doing so is because we are told by the New Frontiersmen that for eight long years America stood still, it did nothing, but that they with their great genius and wisdom are going to get America moving. Well, they haven't said where they are going to move.

Someone pointed out it takes a long, hard effort to climb a mountain from which to see the view of the surrounding country that will represent something of your ambitions in that line. Now you can move very laboriously, but you can move very quickly if you just fall off the cliff. Sometimes I think that is what they are really asking us to do. But let's go back to these ten years. Ten years ago there was a stalemated war in Korea when my Administration took over. It was a war that because of the political limitations placed about it could not be won. Our lines lay upon the 38 parallel where they had started, and we were losing young American boys constantly to wounds and to death. Already when I came in we had a 135,000 casualty list in this was called the Korean police action. I determined that war or either one thing was going to happen. The other side agreed to an Armistice or the war was going to be hotted up right away. They got the word and there was an Armistice. So that slaughter was stopped.

The Red Chinese said they were going to take Formosa. We had to take measures and they were effective and Formosa and Quemoy and Matsu stand even safer today than they were ten years ago.

The French were engaged in a profitless and costly war in Indo-China and when the French finally agreed that America should help them out of the mess there was an arrangement made that while far from perfect was much better than the disaster which portended. In the same way Iran almost within the hands of the Communists. You will recall that Mossadegh was about to take over the whole country. That was defeated. Trieste was a bone of contention and it looked even that war might break out between Italy and Yugoslavia which could easily have spread throughout Europe on this one city. And that was settled. The Austrian Treaty was signed. Guatemala, already in the hands of the Communists was rescued. These were the things that were facing the incoming Administration in those days. These were the things that were tackled head-on with firmness and they were solved. Enlightenment through the eight years thereafter these problems were met and they were met with firmness although with friendliness, and we at least lost no foot of ground to the Communists, nor one single individual.

Now, we are told that this is not progress. Well, if it's not progress, at the very least it was preserving things that now seem to be lost. But let's get into the domestic scene for a moment. I brought along with me just

a little summary of figures. On the domestic scene our gross national product in 1952 was \$347 billion - in 1960 it was \$504 billion - a 45% increase. The personal income of America went from \$273 billion in 1952 to \$404 billion by 1960 - a 48% increase. The average hourly wage rose from \$1.67 to \$2.29 - a 37% increase. The average family income was \$3,900 and went up to \$4,900 - a 27% increase. College enrollment went from 2 million to 3 and a half million during the same years - a 75% increase. And the increase in the cost of living during that entire eight years was held to ten percent, when in the preceding eight years it had risen by 47%. Now, my friends, if this isn't progress, if this isn't moving, it is a reasonable facsimile thereof, I assure you.

I am sick and tired of people telling the American people they did nothing for eight years, that only if they will embrace the doctrines, the pie-in-the-sky programs of the so-called New Frontier, will they really be moving. Well, it was rather moving, of course, to see what was done to the steel industry, what happened to the stock market, what happened to the morale of businessmen and the slow-down of business. All this has happened, but I guess they still call it progress. I don't know - they probably were twisting words - it's progress - but in the wrong direction. Now, I come back then to see you as an ex-politician, but so interested in what is going to be a world of my grandchildren. What are going to be their opportunities for earning, either as those of my generation and my age - how we were given the opportunities to learn and did, and how we were allowed to guide our own lives in liberty and freely. How we never heard the word regimentation. Now we are told that even the Congress is not to be trusted. I am hopeful that your two Senators and your two Congressmen going next January to Washington will be among those who will defy the Executive Department when it tries to take away the responsibilities and authorities of our elected representatives. When one department or one man says that he should have the right to raise or lower your income taxes whenever he thinks it wise, when he wants the authority to appoint the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the one Agency that our people have insisted be independent of political control in taking care of the value and the use of our money, when they asked for authority over farmers - that was the greatest steal for control over a great group of Americans that was ever asked for. When they do these things, ask for all this authority, it can mean only one thing.,

They have no trust or faith in the American people.

So, I think this election is very, very important. There are trends we see before our eyes that must be stopped. Most of this can be done by your elected representatives, your Governors, your state officials, as well as national officials, if they are dedicated to freedom and liberty and the dignity and opportunity of the individual. If they are dedicated to the theories of the New Frontier then the trend will not only be accelerated, it will really rush forward at headlong speed. So, therefore, I say we simply must elect the kind of people that will stand in the breach. So far as I can see this is only certainly in the Northern States - it is only Republicans that will do it.

So I am not a Republican merely because I think it is a nicer sounding word than Democrat, although I think it is. It's a matter of conviction to keep the Government in its proper place, demand that it creates a climate in which the farmer and the businessman and labor can all prosper, rejecting any thought that this clique of young so-called brilliant men have any magic formula by which we are to live and through which we will prosper, we must reject it and not only must we depend upon our representatives, they need your support once you put them there. You've got to make your voices heard. You've got to say "No, we won't" or "Yes, we will" and base it on the same common sense that guided this nation and gave to each of us the God-given opportunity to live as we choose.

• Denver, Colorado, October 9, 1962

To this city, I came for the first time in late June of 1916. On July first of that year a girl named Mamie and I were married. To this city, then, I owe the heartening comfort, the prized honor, the rewarding companionship that has been mine for almost half a century. Consequently, so much of my family life is wrapped up in Denver, so many of my friends work and live here; so many of my fondest memories are rooted in the streets and homes of this city that I cannot tonight become too excited about the political phrases and slogans and antics of those with whom I disagree.

But, looking back on that almost half century, I do feel impelled to make a candid and solemn profession of my convictions about the Republic. I ask myself - How best can we improve the political climate so that the well-being, the progress, the security of its people may be advanced? On our wedding day, here in Denver, forty-six years ago, the world was at war. Only the United States, among the major nations of that time, knew peace. A year later we too were at war.

In the decades since, our young men have been committed to battle in the forests of the Argonne; on Mediterranean and Atlantic and Pacific beaches; in the hedgerows of Normandy; in equatorial jungles; in the mountains of Korea; on the seas and oceans of the globe.

Our women have known sacrifice and tragedy and the fear of fateful news; mothers have mourned young sons who never returned home; widows have lived in loneliness; sisters and sweethearts have had their lives darkened by worry and often sorrow that should never be the lot of the young. And there were women too - tens of thousands of them - who gave up the quiet of home that they might serve their country.

Now recalling this record of devotion and sacrifice for it, I must speak soberly my own convictions about the Republic. I speak about an America whose genius is in its homes and neighborhoods, where the families of the land seek by their own toil to win their own dreams of happiness and betterment; to discharge their obligations; to live as worthy stewards of their heritage.

I speak about an America whose purpose as a nation is so to expand its economy, so to frame its laws, so to order its continental house that all - regardless of the accident of birth or the waywardness of circumstance - may possess an equal dignity and opportunity and reasonable hope for earned reward.

I speak about an America whose faith as a nation, under an abiding faith in God, is in the decency and the courage and the good will of its people who - sometimes painfully and slowly, always persistently and tenaciously - strive to realize within this land an age-old vision of mankind.

Our people strive for a temporal dwelling place where men, given freedom, will assume responsibility; given opportunity, will take risk in its use; given rights, will recognize obligations; given profits, will use them wisely; given a post of leadership, will be straightforward in its exercise; given power, will be humble and disciplined and forever prayerful that wisdom be added to power.

I speak about an America where the people themselves have the priceless privilege of electing freely those who are given the responsibility and authority of governing - a privilege always to be exercised with care, and after examination of all the qualities of character, knowledge and wisdom needed in those who govern.

The virtues of this America - and I have seen them displayed on countless occasions on farms, in cities, on battlefields and on the high seas - are innumerable. I cite a few:

Reliance on self; pride in work; courage in conscience; devotion to education; loyalty to country; faith in self and God.

Everyone of you has many times seen those virtues manifested within your own homes, among your own neighbors. But in naming them I am aware that to the Frontiersmen, spokesmen for a brand-new America that exists only in their own fevered imaginations - I am nothing but a backward looking, a backward-thinking, a backward-minded has-been.

Probably they (wandering aimlessly around their Far Frontier) and I will never see eye-to-eye on many things. For my part, I am tired - terribly tired - of hearing America run down by them; of hearing their brassy and boastful words and watching their bumbling actions.

Especially, I am tired of their sluggishness in real crises that may peril the nation, and their frantic haste to make votes out of manufactured crises; of their hysterical efforts to substitute, for the deliberative processes of a Congress that we elect to represent us, the pronouncements and edicts of a tiny, self-assertive clique that represents little of experience and less of wisdom.

The Washington record of these past twenty months presents a picture of political connivance instead of statesmanship; of selfish grabs for power instead of respect for our concepts of balance in government; of arrogant assertion of Washington infallibility instead of readiness to trust in the wisdom of the American people.

But the election of a Republican House of Representatives and strengthening Republican membership in the U.S. Senate will stop these trends in their tracks.

In this campaign I am not running for office. I can have no political responsibility or expectation other than those that pertain to any other citizen. But I profoundly hope to see in Washington a Congress dedicated to support the values you and I so highly prize. Such a Congress will, without fear, carry out its own Constitutional responsibilities on our behalf. And your state government is equally important. We must have governors, not to be bribed into taking the easy way, who will resist Federal encroachments on state responsibilities.

The Congress we want will work for the kind of America that was founded in a passionate belief in the dignity and freedom of man, capable of self-government; for the kind of America that we are determined my and your grandchildren and their grandchildren after them will inherit. Specifically, I want to see America cherishing and protecting its always its basic values and ideals, going forward again, even as in the years from 1953 through 1960.

In those years the White House - working in partnership with the Congress; in partnership with the states; in partnership with the communities of the land; converted the country from a feverish and war-based economy to a thriving and fruitful economy of progress and security.

In those days we Republicans - and many good Democrats stood beside us and supported us - followed a single guide; the good of all America, of all Americans.

In achieving the many goals before us - many of them in prior years often talked about but never tackled - we were always conscious of Woodrow Wilson's statement: "The highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

We got great things done. Greater can be done. But they won't be done by those who want to turn the total management of American over to Washington.

What we want is a government that has the courage to distinguish between the necessary and the merely convenient. A government that will have the integrity to pay its own bills - to keep its costs within its income. A government that will respect the independent position of our Federal Reserve Board. A government that will cease striving to regiment our farmers, and will steadily push for expanding markets for agricultural products. A government that will respect the rights and privileges of the individual, the community and the states and refuse to countenance unwarranted invasion by the Federal Government against these rights and responsibilities. A government that is firm without truculence; concerned for every citizen without paternalism. A government that establishes and follows clearly understood policies instead of going from the extreme of caution to the extreme of recklessness in the face of every crisis, real or imaginary.

I short, we want and mean to have a government of which every American can be justly proud - a leader among the nations and a guardian against every threat to our liberties and our opportunities. Therefore, I am here tonight in support of Colorado's Republican candidates.

Senior among them is an old friend, Edgar Chenoweth, Congressman for twenty years. He is the father of the Fryingspan-Arkansas project which will increase Colorado's productivity and add importantly to the state's resources.

Joined with him at all levels of the ticket are young men of great promise. Some of them are my very good friends like Peter Dominick, whom I have known since 1948. Now a Congressman, he will be a worthy co-worker in the Senate with Senator Allott for the good of your State and Nation.

These two are typical of the other Young Republicans who in an open primary were chosen to represent our party before Colorado voters - such men as William Chenoweth, Don Brotzman, Leo Sommerville - congressional candidates. Then there are John Love, our candidate for Governor, and his running mate, Gail Gilbert, candidate for Lieutenant Governor.

Your and my Party presents these men and others like them to you - men whose records, whose experience, whose potential for dedicated service makes me proud that I am politically associated with them.

Yours, on November 6, is the responsibility to your country, to your State and to yourself, to choose such men. Thus, you will assure that America, stable and unswerving in principle and ideal, will move ever forward to the greater good of all her people and to greater influence in leading the world toward the realization of man's oldest and noblest dream, universal peace with justice.

• **Hartford, Connecticut, October 15, 1962**

As all of you know, I have been roaming about the country and the world for many years. I have accumulated a lot of memories. Fortunately for me - aside from the decisions of battle and the conduct of war - mine in the main are entirely happy memories of places and people.

One of these concerns a visit I made to Hartford twelve years ago. I flew here from Columbia University in a Strato-Cruiser, the first plane I ever encountered that had a basement. The occasion was a sheep barbecue and clambake. Weather and food were excellent. Best of all was the company.

Within it were men of all sorts and conditions, of all backgrounds and walks of life, and of different political persuasions. In fact, my host was a life-long Democrat. But he was a discerning Democrat.

Twice, in later years, I met him after inaugural ceremonies - in which I happened to be a participant - and he told me each time that the previous November he had voted Republican. Naturally, I thanked him warmly and saluted his good judgment.

In any case, on that visit twelve years ago, I got in the space of a few hours - once again - a clear and sharp reminder of the source of America's progress in the example I saw of citizens' devotion to education; to our command of the sciences; to our economic productivity; to our security against external threat; to our leadership of the Free World; to widespread sharing of the rewards of human living in a land where men and women are equal in their human dignity and God-given right.

That Hartford group - composed of leaders in industry and labor unions; in communications and insurance; in teaching, in the ministry and in all the professions; representing all the faiths of America and scores of national origins - typified for me thousands upon thousands of like groups that could be gathered together in the communities of America.

Those groups, for me, are the source of American progress because of their willingness to work together, to risk together, to try new ways together; because of their capacity to set for themselves new goals and new targets; because of their eagerness to assure their children and their grandchildren a decent future; because of their acceptance of responsibility as citizens, and as stewards of a great heritage.

Now, you and I and all Americans are told by men, who claim for themselves a unique sophistication, that we are dead wrong if we think we can achieve our destiny on our own. Only Washington can do that for us, they say.

Specifically, they want a Washington where Congress is controlled by one party; where the one party gets its orders from the Executive; where the Executive gets its goals and purposes from a clique of theorists who specialize in experimental tampering and tinkering and talk.

If America had wanted one man or one party government our Founding Fathers and their successors would have so ordained.

We want self-government, representative government, and this means that we must do our part in directing the use of American power - as well as doing our part in generating it.

This is my belief - it is Republican doctrine. Of course, I have never staked out a claim for the kind of sophistication that is not dinned into our ears. But I do know something about Washington and its ways.

Left to itself, Washington can create nothing but paper work, red tape, regulations and restrictions. But a sophisticated Washington, left to itself, presents a picture of confusion, indecision, timidity - in everything except spending your money. Here there is no lack of boldness!

For example: the other day I read that - even though there are fewer people in farming - the Department of Agriculture last year added 11,975 new employees to its payroll.

Those new employees, I am sure, added nothing to our agricultural productivity; very likely, they did little to enlarge our markets for food. But you can bet your last dollar they raised up a new blizzard of paper shuffling; and the more sophisticated among them devised new ways of getting agriculture into a Washington lock-step.

Another example of sophistication: living within your income is an antiquated and outdated concept, according to the economists who now dominate Washington. Deficit spending is the sophisticated thing. In

plain English, that means:

Foist onto your children and your grandchildren your debts; mortgage the American future; don't worry about inflation - our modern printing presses can turn out all the ten cent, five cent, one cent dollars you can carry in a bushel basket. And if sophistication takes over completely, we'll need a bushel basket of dollars to buy a loaf of bread.

Because I don't want the America of my generation or of my grandchildren's generation taken over by the sophisticates, I have been out talking with the American people. My last trip was more than 6,000 miles in length with talks in seven states. Of course, I spoke as a Republican. But I tried also to speak as an American.

I have never appealed solely to Republicans. For that matter, I have never claimed that Republicans have a monopoly on common sense of patriotism or statesmanship. I would never have been elected to office had it not been for the votes of millions of Democrats and Independents.

The Republican administration of 1953-61 would never have made its record of great achievement had it not been for the support of sound and honest men in the House and Senate who were also Democrats.

But I do believe that one faction within the Democratic Party, now in control of that Party, has a monopoly on sophisticated nonsense. Against it I must speak out my belief that America today desperately needs Republican administrations within its states and communities; Republican management of the House of Representatives; increased Republican strength in the Senate of the United States.

In Connecticut the slate headed by Horace Seeley-Brown and John Alsop would get my vote, were I a resident here. Because I cannot do that direct and personal bit toward a better, stronger, more responsible and more secure America, I have stopped here today. My purpose is to ask of those who know me, who through two national elections warmly supported me, that they once again vote Republican.

• **Commonwealth Armory, Boston, Massachusetts, October 15, 1962**

Two years ago, when I accepted Tom Pappas' invitation that I come to Boston in mid-October this year, I knew you would be in the hot center of a political campaign. But I would have ventured then, two years ago, a prophecy about this election.

That, on his record, John Volpe - my first Federal Highway Administrator - will be overwhelmingly elected Governor of Massachusetts.

The vote on November 6, I am confident, will prove me right.

Now, so far as the race for the Senate is concerned, my reputation as a prophet depends on how this state answers a question or two. Such as:

Is Massachusetts determined to select the candidate who can and will do the best, the greatest job for Massachusetts, for the entire Republic, for the Free World?

Will Massachusetts send to the Senate a man who will hew only to principle; who will vote on the merits of a bill, not on its political appeal to a bloc; who will listen to the voice of conscience; who will prayerfully seek wisdom; who at all times will spurn the cheap, the deceitful, the flamboyantly partisan?

The Senatorial election will be decided by the voters of Massachusetts - in the secrecy of the polling booth - making up their minds in answer to such questions.

If their answer is in the affirmative to such questions, I predict Leverett Saltonstall will be joined in the United States Senate by George Cabot Lodge.

Nevertheless, all across the country, I read and hear that in Massachusetts one party, one candidate has boiled down the high qualifications long demanded of a candidate for the Senate of the United States into this crass, almost arrogant query. Who can get the most out of the United States Treasury for Massachusetts?

During the campaign of 1960 we heard a great deal about the image of the United States. In a torrent of words, recklessly enunciated, its image was blurred and even blackened. Now, in this campaign, if any man hopes for election by the people of Massachusetts on this one question, does he not thereby blur and even blacken the image of your state too?

My Fellow Americans, when I was a boy in Kansas, when I was a man in my country's uniform, the

image of Massachusetts was clear and bright - the home of men and women, equally great in their independence of mind and in their loyalty to the nation; equally concerned with the prosperity of their home constituency and with their responsibility to all Americans wherever they might live; however they might vote.

That was the Massachusetts of Otis and Hancock and the Adamses in Revolutionary days; of John Quincy Adams and Daniel Webster after them; of the elder Lodge and Daniel Walsh in our century. That was the Massachusetts of responsibility and integrity and leadership for all the Republic through fifteen decades and more of statesmanship.

Scores of names of Massachusetts men and women come to my mind when I think of the contribution your state made to the United States. Let me mention just one.

I call to your mind the national leadership Henry Cabot Lodge gave to my own first campaign. He knew that thereby he jeopardized his hope for reelection to the Senate. He placed his own political fortune second because by his work throughout America he felt he was helping all America - including Massachusetts.

And greatly he helped the cause of freedom, of prosperity and peace everywhere as our Ambassador to the United Nations. There in that global forum the traditional image of Massachusetts came through sharp and clear as Henry Cabot Lodge, in the finest tradition of his state, spoke out against all the forces that imperil the freedom and dignity of man. Let me ask you one question:

Since his departure from the United Nations have we heard an American voice there speak out with such clarity and force, such persuasiveness and decisiveness for American leadership?

Recently, however, in my home state, we were told by the President himself that during eight years of Republican administration our foreign policy drifted aimlessly about. On later occasions, in an amazing burst of partisanship, he said that during the past 21 months, a new and firm and forward-moving foreign policy has been developed.

This was news, indeed to all of us who have been following the news!

Personally, I have been careful in all my speeches to keep current foreign policy out of partisan debate. But when a charge is made for purely political purposes - a charge that indeed should be stated in reverse - I must seriously question the advisability of a continued silence.

After all, I am content to leave my personal record to the judgment of history.

But, for the record, I recall to your minds such names as Korea, Formosa, Quemoy and Matsu, Iran, Lebanon, Austria, Trieste and Guatemala, all the triumphs of a clear, direct and courageous foreign policy and defeat of Communist efforts. I don't call attention to the dreary foreign record of the past twenty-one months. It is too sad to talk about.

Moreover I must take strong exception to the President's extraordinary statements about Latin America, which he says, and I quote him - "Had been ignored for eight years" - the eight years, of course, when I was your President. For one, who, I am told, reads all the newspapers, listens to radio and watches TV, such a misapprehension indicates to me that: through eight years he was out of touch with the many programs instituted by us to improve the economic, social and educational status of Latin American populations. After all, I was enough concerned with Latin America to visit it; to discuss our relations with many of its leaders; to speak before its people - from Mexico to Argentina and Chile. On top of this I sent to our southern neighbors mission after mission of competent Americans to advise and counsel with these nations for the same purposes and to develop measures for inter-American cooperation.

For the time being, I merely ask you to look at the record of the years when two Americans, John Foster Dulles and your own Christian Herter, occupied in succession, the office of Secretary of State - my lieutenants in conducting the foreign affairs of the Republic.

In those eight years, we lost no inch of ground to tyranny. We witnessed no abdication of international responsibility. We accepted no compromise of pledged word or withdrawal from principle. No walls were built. No threatening foreign bases were established. One war was ended and incipient wars were blocked.

I doubt that anyone can persuade you that in the past twenty-one months there has been anything constructive in the conduct of our foreign relations to equal any part of that eight year record. For the moment, at least, I shall have no more to say on that subject.

This evening, no longer a candidate for any office, I speak only out of concern for the good of America.

Within that good is the good of Massachusetts and 49 other states. And I speak out of a lifetime of experience in Washington, as a soldier, as your President, now as a plain citizen.

Out of that experience, in each of its years, has grown a stronger and stronger admiration for the authors of our Constitution. Earnest study; mature deliberation, wise counsel, clear vision characterized them. History has vindicated their greatness and the enduring value of their work.

They established a clean-cut separation of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government. Fundamental to our system and our way of life, I firmly believe, is the maintenance of that separation.

No erosion whatsoever can be permitted, unless deliberately we decide to sever out ties with all that has been proved productive and worthy; unless deliberately we decide to stake our fortunes and the future of those who come after us on theorist-led experiments. Such erosion is not attempted, however.

Although Republicans are numerically a minority in the Congress, the cry goes out for their elimination. A one-party system seems to be the objective. But a one-party Congress inescapably is the puppet of the Executive; not representative of the people as an independent and separate branch of the Government.

What price the Constitution of the United States?

Repeatedly, the Democrats are told that there are more Democrats registered than there are Republicans. And they are urged - not as Americans weighing the issues - but only as Democrats, to mass at the polls and obliterate the Republican voice from the affairs of state and nation.

This is a curious sort of political appeal in the America of 1962; sad and even tragic in its many implications. One of them is this:

The good of all America, according to these politicians, should be the prerogative of one party; indeed of one faction within that party. The men who make this appeal are slick hands in the manufacture of slogans. Why don't they come right out and say: No Republicans or Independents wanted anywhere.

To their crude and brassy partisan demands, an effective answer can be made by Republicans and Independents and discerning Democrats who vote for George Cabot Lodge.

For him, I have the highest respect. I have known him for ten years. He has energy and enthusiasm and vigor. More importantly, he is prepared for the job he seeks.

Not intuition, not sightseeing tours, not a command of rhetoric or of political campaign tactics makes a man Senate material.

A United States Senator is a partner in the enactment of domestic law and foreign policy. Sober judgment, wide experience, hard work, dedication to good of all Americans - these make him a worthy Senator. George Cabot Lodge has them.

As Director of Information in the Department of Labor, he undertook the first comprehensive study of the relations between labor skills and unemployment.

As Chairman of the American Delegation to the International Labor Organization and as Chairman of its governing body, George Cabot Lodge led the successful fight to keep the Chinese Communists out of ILO and the equally successful fight to expel the Communist Hungarian Delegation.

As Assistant Secretary of Labor, it was his job to brief ambassadors on international labor relations before they went overseas and to study the effectiveness of our foreign aid programs throughout the world.

In all his jobs - each of them requiring tedious work as well as clear insight and sympathetic understanding of human relations - George Cabot Lodge proved himself a worthy son of Massachusetts and an American dedicated to the good of all America.

The ticket, headed by him and Governor Volpe, is of like metal. Its election will restore and perpetuate the former brightness of the image of Massachusetts in America; fortify the two-party system in America; strengthen constitutional government in America.

The central question for each of us today is this: How much, how deeply do we believe these principles? For their perpetuation what are we prepared to sacrifice? For them and for the candidates who believe in them how hard will we work - and give - and preach? Our example is - or should be - found in the sacrifice and work of the Boston patriots of 1775. If we so dedicate ourselves, if we so give of ourselves and our substance, the result will be to sustain our nation in the vision of the Founders and to help make America a sturdier and more

effective leader in progress toward peace with justice for all.

• **Manchester, New Hampshire, October 16, 1962**

The day before yesterday I celebrated my 72nd birthday. At that age, even though I am in the thick of the 1962 political campaign, concerned with the present of the Republic and its future, I think - nevertheless - I should be permitted to reminisce a little. And I have one pertinent story of the past that, so far as I can recall, I have never mentioned before publicly.

Back ten years ago last March, to my office at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe, came a letter from Arthur E. Summerfield of Michigan, urging on me the acceptance of an invitation to address the citizens of Michigan as a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency of the United States. Immediately, I wrote Mr. Summerfield a long and - I thought - a convincing letter that I could not accept the invitation because I was not a candidate for anything. Although I had read a lot in the newspapers about what the Republican Convention would do to me or for me; although I knew that many of my friends and a great many men and women whom I had never met were praising me to the skies back in the United States - nevertheless, as I explained to Mr. Summerfield, I was not a candidate to any job, and I should not go to Detroit to make a political speech.

After reading the letter over, I thought I had done a most convincing job. Then I decided to add a final touch. In longhand, I wrote a post-script, something to this effect: "Very probably, before this day is over, the voters of New Hampshire will have settled once and for all any thought of a political future for me." And they did - as you will remember, I am sure; but not as I had anticipated.

After this personal note, on this visit to New Hampshire, I must pay tribute to Senator Styles Bridges - for 40 years a friend and neighbor to all in the state, a public servant, a national leader. As your governor, he was elected by you in the days when the Federal Government under a Democratic administration was dedicated to an economy of hand-outs and pump-priming and make-work. New Hampshire, however, then as now, standing on its own feet, began to work out its own economic salvation under his leadership.

Today, you are an example to all the states of the Union in what you have achieved on your own - in the diversification of your industrial economy; in the efficiency of your local governments; in the effectiveness with which you have used the agencies of government to create a climate in which productive, competitive enterprise can flourish. Here, in New Hampshire, you have proved the best government is the government that is closest to the people, that is most representative of their common sense and thrift and wisdom, that most clearly recognizes the source of power must remain in the people. The office holder whether he be town supervisor or President of the United States merely directs the power generated by the people.

Nevertheless these days we hear too often and far too much the argument that more and more authority must be given to Washington to direct the affairs of the American people; that only the masters of theory, now in residence there, can plot out for us the direction we must take into the future. The assumption is that only the bright bureaucrats of Washington have the vision to discover the far frontier we plain people can never hope to find for ourselves. And to this extent they are right - we devotedly hope.

Of course their talk is nonsense. Here in New Hampshire you want no part of it because you know it won't work - for long. In a time of general prosperity they can indulge and carry out their flights of fancy only through deficit spending, appeals to selfish blocs, taxes that end profits and initiative and deny us the ability to lower costs and so compete in world markets.

Profits not a dirty word

- a. necessary to Federal Government
- b. necessary to renew our productive machinery
- c. continue good wages and high employment
- d. attract more capital for investment

Satisfaction of these requirements have built our nation - made it productive - powerful in war and peace. This is system Frontiersmen do not like. Prefer a system designed and operated by themselves. Pay no

attention, they say, to experience, history, logic or human nature. Just listen to them. Cotton, Bass, Pillsbury will stop this nonsense. Pay bills, stop useless spending, etc.

• **Business Council, Hot Springs, Virginia, October 20, 1962**

For some strange reason businessmen and politics have long seemed to be something like water and oil in their inability to combine. I can remember, sixty years ago, hearing merchants in my little town saying in my hearing, "Not for me - I stay away from politics." In those days my conception of politics comprehended nothing more than a vague understanding that membership on the school board or the town council was a matter of politics - so my eavesdropping was not very enlightening. But the implication of such remarks was that, though it might be respectable and customary to acknowledge membership in a political party, any personal contact with the affairs of politicians would certainly be disagreeable and possibly contaminating.

In many individuals of my generation, some of that feeling persists to this day. Though we frequently express our awesome recognition of the vast economic, political, scientific and social changes we have lived through in the past half century and recognize the resulting penetration of government into all our affairs - we still hear men of business and trade say - "No politics for me."

Such men are not always rich, nor connected with what is called "big business." Within the week, I heard an intelligent farm hand express this identical thought. Some of this attitude is undoubtedly instinctive, but some results from cold calculation. More than one business man has said to me, "I cannot afford to get into politics. In my business I sell to members of all parties."

To this I invariably retort, "You had better get into politics or you may not be selling to anyone."

In using the term "business man," I mean to include not only those who own or manage productive institutions, but advisors, consultants, scholars, and professional men and women who participate in American enterprise. Some, denying any interest in politics, are thinking merely of some active participation, such as, for example, becoming a candidate for Congress. Refusal to consider such a possibility can be a matter of personal responsibility; for example, according the risk of losing a good paying job needed to support a family. Politics, as a career, is a precarious business.

When the 19th was giving way to the 20th century, there may have been some excuse for this reluctance to take an active part in the nation's political life. Secondary and higher education was less general than now. Life and our economy were less complex. We were not yet familiar with the human and social problems growing out of mass production, or the consequences of these developments in bringing government increasingly into our daily lives. We had never heard of a graduated income tax. We had not yet become entangled in international situations that, later, involved us in three major wars and practically forced us into a position of free world leadership against communist imperialism and in promoting free world cooperation. All this comfortable, and somewhat naive, isolation from political realities is not gone; a fact we must clearly realize.

A famous Frenchman once said, "War has become far too important to entrust to the generals." Today, business, I think, should be saying: "Politics have become far too important to entrust to the politicians."

I believe that the good of our nation demands that each of us - whatever his station or calling - should inform himself as well as possible concerning the political and economic facts of his time and exercise whatever influence he can bring to bear to produce the political climate in which he wants to live. This is a personal responsibility. This is the meaning of a government by the people. Tonight, I should like to talk about a particular phase of this responsibility.

I start with this obvious truth: Politics and business are not only mixing today, but the marriage is here to stay - there is no going back to the good old days of bachelorhood. Moreover if the business-political marriage is not to share the fate of most unions of the shotgun variety - if business is interested in making the association enduring if not agreeable - it has got to discard the remnants of its instinctive "Politics is not for me."

Sometime ago, when I urged that businessmen get into politics in a big and serious way, it was assumed

that I was speaking in a partisan sense for the benefit of my own party. Consciously or subconsciously, I suppose that is partly correct, because I do want my party to consider deeply the effect of political action on our economy. Actually, I meant the statement in a broader sense. I was then, and am now, thinking of the alarming imbalance that exists between fundamental elements of our economy, in part occasioned, I am persuaded, by government - that is, by political action.

The lack of militant interest and participation in the affairs of both parties - at all government levels - by business people is, I am sure, at least partially responsible for this situation. This, in turn, results in all kinds of patchwork expedient and theoretical experimentation in a costly and fruitless effort to establish an artificial equilibrium, such as we sought in the thirties.

Now, I present a few simple facts regarding our economy merely to point up the basis of my argument that business is not sufficiently political.

During the past ten years the gross national product has increased substantially - from 347 billion in 1952 it is now reaching toward the 550 billion level. Personal income and wages have increased over 75% - but profits have had difficulty in remaining stationary.

Even if it could be shown that at the start of the decade profits were too high in relation to wages and national product, convincing proof that they are today too low is found in the fact that the investment out of profits in new capital goods has been, according to expert testimony, woefully short of the amount needed to replace obsolete with efficient plants and machines and to provide for needed expansion and future growth.

The drag in plant efficiency has been further aggravated by work rules and fringe provisions in contracts that unions have won from a sometimes frustrated management - a development that I suspect will one day be deeply deplored by working men themselves.

Incidentally, I've noted in conferences with leaders of management and labor, when both were present, that the latter group seems far more single-minded and politically-motivated than the former. There may be some significance in this observation.

In any event, businessmen have seemed to me to be diffident, if not timid, in shouting from the housetops some of the obvious facts detrimental to our economic life. All of us should be preaching the basic truth that only profits can provide full and profitably employment. Profits make jobs.

First, I call your attention to the attitude of so many people, including some of the professorial group, respecting "profits." Some seem to think the word is so wicked as practically to deserve elimination from the movies and television because of an alleged immorality of profits, as an incentive to work and progress. Demagogues tell working men that profits merely rob labor of its just share of earnings. Moreover, far too many of us inferentially admit the validity of these accusations by failing to move to the counter attack.

Let us consider first what profits mean to the Federal Government. The National Government is now handling aggregate annual expenditures hovering around the 100 billion dollar mark, a sum of almost incredible size, with the great bulk of it coming from taxes on profits and on employment income. No more lethal blow could be dealt to federal revenues than to permit profits and profitable income to diminish seriously, and for a long period. For a while the nation could depend largely on deficit spending. But we need no economist to tell us that such a practice, long continued, can have but one result - disastrous deterioration in the value of our currency, with great dislocation in the economy and in our international trade. Any return from such a situation would require radical measures, probably even the destruction of any freedom whatsoever in our economy. Government must not let this happen.

Another of the functions of profits is to keep the productive plant up to date and expanding; American production must be so efficient that in a competitive market its sales will be so voluminous and its profits so sizeable that (aside from satisfying the voracious and insatiable appetite of government for pocket money) there will be enough over for re-investing in new machinery and in needed capital goods. Barbara Ward, the well-known British commentator, has pointed out that the economic decline of the British Empire started in the twenties when it failed to maintain the rate of capital re-investment established in the pre-World War I years. Many hold that our own prolonged depression of the thirties was due to our failure to maintain the rate of capital investment established in America during the twenties. We do know that our rate of unemployment in the thirties set an all-time record that continued until World War II broke out in Europe.

Thinking on these experiences - permit me to loosely paraphrase that distinguished Harvard philosopher, George Santayana - to the effect that if we choose to ignore history, we may be condemned to re-live it. Most of us do not want to re-live the 30's.

A third function of profits is to pay an adequate dividend - or rent for money employed - so as to attract a continual flow of outside capital needed for expansion of plants, as population increases and expanding markets justify.

So, we can agree, I think, that to sustain solvency in government, to renew capital goods, to induce adequate investment for expansion - adequate profits are mandatory. They are vital to the functioning of the American economy. Even if, in the days of great monopolies and trusts, profits and dividends may have been too high in some cases, and the other elements of the economy too much neglected, the shoe is now on the other foot. Today, the enforcement of anti-trust laws is so vigorous as to assure the existence of a competition that becomes more potent whenever profits in any organization tend to rise beyond a reasonable or even minimum level.

Government, as the first and principal beneficiary of profits, would seem to have as almost its first domestic concern, that of keeping profits at reasonable levels. But rarely do we hear profits accorded such a high place in governmental discussions. Understandably, the political impulse is to think first of voters, for whom he urges high wages and full employment. These are wonderful and primary objectives, but few politicians are ready to take the political risk of arguing that only profits can assure their attainment. The politician knows that most humans would rather get a dollar now than to be assured of a steady flow of dollars at some future time through reasonable profits accumulated today. So production costs go up, profits drop and the inevitable consequences follow! The government goes into a tailspin of spending, of tinkering, and of emergency unemployment payments - all to little avail. Some recovery is experienced but usually at the cost of higher living costs, additional deterioration in the dollar's value, higher production costs, and a loss of more of our competitive market. This must end somewhere. We owe it to ourselves to see that it does not end in disaster. The imbalance in our economy must be restored before we can achieve a healthy and sound growth.

Considering only those corrective measures that involve government, the first obvious requirement is for Washington to spend less. This is a laudable, and necessary, but nevertheless a difficult thing for politicians to do. Here is not the place for me to argue with any of the speakers I've heard in the last two days, but I must record my conviction.

Every government dollar that does not go to some governmental function rigidly controlled by necessity - or fancied necessity - has some beneficiary. The list of these beneficiaries is long. That "expenditures" can and should be reduced. We do not have to accept as "one of the realities of life" that Federal expenditure must go up constantly. So, to cut any federal expenditure program disappoints someone - and starts precedence for its continuance.

While there is possibly no citizen in our nation today who cannot see where many economies can properly be made, by the same token there is scarcely a citizen who cannot see where he could lose something if his own pet program were discontinued. The net result of all these "exceptions" is more often to increase rather than cut the aggregate of governmental expenditures. Yet, reduced expenditure is the first thing that we must fight for if we are to find better economic balance.

We are supposed to be a self-governing nation. Are we doing our part - our whole best - to get these facts understood by all citizens, particularly those who stand to lose jobs if we don't have profits?

If we cut expenditures only reasonably, the next obvious step is to lower taxes, measurably. Experts have argued whether these actions should take place simultaneously or not - whether the two should be roughly equal or otherwise - whether we can cut taxes in the same legislation as we attempt reform in the tax system or, leave this latter essential objective for later treatment.

I firmly believe, for one important reason, that we should have an expenditure reduction and tax cut simultaneously, even if the magnitude of the latter is much greater than the former. Having had some experiences in Washington, I am skeptical - and I am sure most of you are too - that any cut in a governmental expenditure program will rarely, if ever, be accomplished except under some compelling reason like the obvious need for a tax cut. I could cite for you many disappointing instances to prove the point.

A modest decrease in appropriations, to accompany tax reductions, would at least prove that our cost curve is not compelled to mount, without interruption, always higher. This would create more confidence than any words, no matter how eloquently, or by whom, spoken. Why then, don't these things happen?

I am sorry to have to say it - but part of the reason is you. It is you - and all your associates all across the land who understand the basic relationship of profits to a prosperous and expanding economy - and all who believe that we must produce a more satisfactory marriage between government and a free productive enterprise than has existed under our hodge-podge of laws and regulations.

All of us, including farmers, of whom I am one - unsuccessful it is true - must delve deeper into government and political affairs. And, I'm not talking merely about a political participation limited to a more or less generous donation to the political party of your choice. I mean working at politics at all levels, from bottom up!

Though local government has already surrendered too much political power to Washington, city councils and state legislatures still wield part of the influence that government exercises over the economy. Does anyone here think that the scandals in big cities which all too often rock our nation could occur if all citizens - particularly those in industry - would participate actively in the processes of self-government. Yet these scandals add to the tax bite and cut into profits.

If presidents and chairmen of industries are too busy to attend political meetings at precinct, county, and state levels, they can assign intelligent subordinates to the task of participating in conclaves of the party of the individual's choice, who can then report to their bosses.

Why cannot industry make its influence felt in the making of party platforms, both at the national and state conventions? It is said that such platforms are merely mousetraps for the unwary, but if their economic planks become documents for nation-wide debate and argument until replaced by new ones, their significance would be vastly increased.

Why cannot industrialists charge themselves with responsibility for meeting and talking with candidates - long before these present themselves to conventions or primaries for selection as the standard bearers of their respective parties? Why should not businessmen participate in making the choice of the men believed equipped for the job? Indeed, why do not more businessmen take the direct plunge into candidacies for political positions? Doesn't it seem likely that as a leaven of intelligent, vigorous, courageous businessmen on every political slate would help bring to the fore the importance of some business sense in politics?

How often have I heard men say, "Well, in any case, my wife and I can live out our days; if we have to face economic chaos someone else will have to worry more about it than we." Now, no one truly means this! In the first place, how do you know you can run out your days in ease? History has seen many sudden and cataclysmic changes in a nation's life.

Next - we are not - cannot be - concerned only with ourselves. The purely selfish individual is rarely encountered. All of us do care about the future, proximate, and long range! Our nation - our concept of her ideals, of her capacity for human betterment, of her promise for the world - is dear to all of us. We are devoted to that concept; we will, if aroused, fight to the death for what our country means to us.

You are important leaders in America's economic life; you can save and strengthen the American system if you do not allow embarrassment, lethargy, timidity or risk to deter you. The pursuit of such purpose, I hold, is worthy of all that's best in every loyal American, and is necessary to the growth and strength of American enterprise and the perpetuation of representative government.

• Republican County Dinner, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, October 23, 1962

We meet in the aftermath of a grave message from the President of the United States. The decision he announced last night may seriously affect the lives of all Americans and the future of the Republic. In the circumstances of this moment, as described by him, the decision had to be made. It had to be resolutely enunciated by the one man who speaks for all of us in critical foreign affairs. As in all international crises, America, as a unit, must follow her constitutional leader. We must pray that he be given foresight, and wisdom,

and stout heart. We must pledge him our help in whatever way we can be of help.

So far as Cuba and Soviet Russia are concerned, in the weeks ahead we can not be partisan. But a united America need not and should not degenerate into a conformist, a silenced America. In our internal affairs, foreign crisis should not become an excuse for compliant submission by Republicans, or a shield for Democrats against our valid criticism of them. For though we support the President as he seeks to lead us through difficult foreign situations, we do not have to support him - as indeed we do not - when he speaks or acts in his capacity as head of a political party whose doctrines we are convinced are not good for our nation.

Moreover, our civic duty impels us to express our honest convictions, in this campaign, about the complexion of the next Congress; about the quality of leadership we want in state government and in our home counties and communities.

The Republic of the United States - the oldest constitutional government among the major nations of the world - has survived war and the peril of war because the American people, through their elected representatives in the Congress, have always been free to advise and counsel - even to rebuke and warn - the executive. Therein lies a fundamental strength of our system. Never has catastrophe or emergency justified the reduction of the people to a regimented herd, or of their representatives to blind acceptance of decree and pronouncement by government. Certainly, even in foreign affairs, we are free to ask and to learn how we arrived at our present state. Indeed, when the present crisis shall have passed into history - like all earlier incidents in the Cuban situation have passed - it will be entirely proper then to inspect and analyze and criticize the decisions and actions taken, if we come to believe that criticism is justified.

On the domestic scene, we have the right to examine the path before us and to point out what pitfalls and traps and entanglements we may encounter or see ahead. We have the outright obligation - despite present crisis - to conduct ourselves as citizens concerned with the policies of our government at all levels; with the exercise of our franchise and our participation in local and state and national affairs. For these reasons I am here tonight.

The coming election is of unusual importance to our country. As an Adams County Republican, I want to talk about it to you, who are my neighbors.

In Washington we see the nation's two political parties espousing widely different philosophies of government. The Democratic Party, controlled by a radical faction, is committed to the belief that what they call "pocketbook issues" are more important to Americans than freedom or self respect, than dignity or the enduring values of heart and mind. In fact, as one of their spokesmen put it here in Gettysburg a few nights ago, they think of Americans as "us little people."

We "little people," they claim, will be more prosperous if we throw off the American traits of self-reliance, self-dependence, individual ambition and striving. We should, they say, submit to political control centered in Washington and - somehow - we will be better off.

This is not government by the people that they propose; it is government by edict. Their practices and doctrines deny faith in the common sense of Americans; these experimenters propose to test on us the unproved theories concocted by a small clique of self-appointed experts. Beyond this - the centralized authority they want must engage in vast expenditure of money taken from us "little people;" and a considerable part of our money is to be spent on projects and proposals according to the whims of the Executive.

Ignored by this faction are what they consider out-dated notions. Fiscal integrity, for example. Self respect that is fostered by paying our bills. The balance set up between the executive and legislative and judicial branches of government. Indeed they seek to take unto themselves the duties and authorities of the Congress; and they want men in the Congress who will complacently agree.

Republicans, on the other hand, support ideas and concepts of self-government; representative government; elected constitutional government - ideas that are far different from those now preached and practiced in Washington. Republicans support government by - what the radical faction is pleased to call - "us little people." We may be little, but we are responsible. We know our rights and our duties as citizens, and we believe that the enterprise and common sense of Americans are far more productive of progress and prosperity and peaceful security than the untested theories of a small and self-assertive clique.

Now, in an election, sound principles and beliefs must be matched by quality and ability in the

candidates who support them. The Republican slate in Pennsylvania has outstanding quality and proved ability. Our neighbor, Harry Ridinger, will effectively represent us in the legislature. Our Congressman, George Goodling, deserves an even larger plurality for his return to Washington than he got two years ago. To these two men, personally known to all of us, I join with you in pledging our support.

And, most emphatically I want to tell you of my respect and admiration for two other candidates: William Scranton; James Van Zant. I know them. I have talked with them at length. I have examined their records.

William Scranton, a veteran of World War II, worked for me in Washington during my administration. There he learned thoroughly all the ways in which the economy of a state like Pennsylvania can be strengthened and fortified by expanded participation in the world economy. His election to the Congress was an overwhelming endorsement of his character and his leadership by those who know him best, his neighbors in his home city of Scranton - Republicans and Democrats alike.

James Van Zant, a combat soldier in two World Wars, has for two decades served in the Congress of the United States. At each election, he has been given by the voters of his district an increased majority of their support. This testimony, by his own constituency, so often repeated, is the best guarantee the state can have of his ability and dependability. He will bring to the United States Senate wide knowledge of public affairs; broad experience; and a sound American philosophy of government.

I can vouch for the integrity of these two men; for their ability and for their dedication to good government. With all the vigor and enthusiasm I have, I shall work for them from now until Election Day. Then, on November 6, God willing, I shall vote for them.

With heart - brain and brawn and with our substance all of us should join in the great effort to establish in county, state and Congress, good government, guided by men dedicated to responsible progress for all of us of every calling and station. Thus victory will be ours - to be used solely for the good of the nation.

• Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 25, 1962

We are, one and all, deeply concerned with recent events occurring off our southeastern coast. A situation has, for some months been building up in Cuba so threatening to our peace and security and to that of our friends in South America that positive action by our government became mandatory. The present crisis demands of all Americans a visible and genuine unity against those who threaten the security of the Republic. We must be prepared - on behalf of the nation - to make personal sacrifices whenever and to whatever extent is needed.

Until this urgent problem is solved to the satisfaction of our nation, every loyal American will, without hesitation, carry out and conform to any instructions, pertaining to it, proclaimed by the Commander-in-Chief.

But along with the expression of this unbreakable resolve it must also be said that no foreign crisis excuses us from our continuing and lifelong responsibility as citizens to vote our convictions about the sort of government we want in our cities, in our states and in the national capitol. In the current campaign, culminating on November 6, the voters are being offered a choice between two widely differing philosophies of government.

The Republican philosophy today, as in Lincoln's time, is based upon the dynamic concept of government of the people, by the people, for the people. It enthrones the individual - with his love of liberty and opportunity, his self-confidence and self-reliance, his initiative and his human desire to help himself and his family and country - it enthrones him as the key to social and economic progress of the people; as the key to the entire nation's growth in strength, capacity and influence. The Republican philosophy, constructive and creative and forward looking, recognizes that national problems and challenges and opportunities are a concern of all the people.

Contrast this with the philosophy espoused by the faction now in control of the Democratic party. It is a parody on Lincoln's creed that can be put this way: Government of the people, by the Washington bureaucracy, for the expansion of executive power and the entrenchment of far-frontier theorists. It patronizes the individual.

It is barren of faith in the people. It arrogates to a personally selected few, the capacity for government. It is devoid of appeal to all that is best in humans, particularly to those traits of individual character that have accounted for America's greatness.

In the conflict between these two philosophies I can not be a silent bystander. So, since early in September I have been out talking with people like yourselves across the continent urging that you take back control of your government; sustain and renew your faith in yourselves; take back from the experimenters the planning and the deciding of your country's course.

This I urge you, soberly and seriously!! After a long life in my country's service, after encountering in peace and war inescapable proof that in the common sense and the wisdom of our people lies America's strength - I am convinced of one simple and, to me - obvious truth: Our country is too great in its destiny; too intricate in its economy; too varied in its regional circumstances; too fertile in its human resources - to be turned over to the members of a clique in Washington, tinkering and tampering, in the attempt to produce, some day, somehow, an acceptable blueprint for the future of every one of our fifty states and 183 million citizens.

For 21 months the new frontiersmen have been so engaged. Their economic product has been, in spite of boastful and rosy promises: Sluggishness in the economy; continuing unemployment; deficit spending; mounting debt; and, of course, abusive ridicule (by the ream and by the hour) for all who oppose them. Their legislative product has been: the drowning of the Congress under a flood of unworkable proposals; cynical threats and pressures and lures in lieu of effective leadership to influence it; and now, incessant cries for the election of congressmen more submissive to the executive branch. Their social product has been: reduction of confidence in free and competitive enterprise; bewilderment about our domestic path and the future of the Republic.

Let me ask you one question: Are you happy or satisfied with these barren products of an administration now in office twenty-one months? Nowhere in Pennsylvania or in any state I've visited in this campaign have I encountered any such satisfaction. Nevertheless, the Democratic spokesmen in this campaign have the effrontery to blame Republicans - and even members of their own party - for their own failures and ineptness in the conduct of government.

In their claims and in their criticism, they verge on what Winston Churchill once called "terminological inexactitude." But what else should we expect of those who were so wrong in their assessment of America's strength two years ago. The gaps they talked about then proved to be just talk - campaign talk. The promises they made - whether on budgets or on international problems - they would like to forget.

Now, though they have overwhelming majorities in both houses, they can not make up their minds whether the 87th Congress was a Dr. Jekyll or a Mr. Hyde. Possibly, I should say they just can not make up their minds - except for one thing: they want more power for the executive.

In the grab for power, in the continuous effort to take away from the Congress its constitutional responsibilities, they want, for example, to put in the hands of one man the right to alter tax rates on his personal decision. They want to so reduce the independence of the Federal Reserve Board from political interference that the board - a principal guardian of the American dollar's integrity - will become a pawn in the play of power politics. They want so to interfere in the conduct of municipal affairs by the creation of a federal department that our cities will become dependencies of Washington, dancing to the tune of bureaucrats. They want our surrender to a philosophy, proclaimed by one of their economic high priests, that considers - and seems to welcome - ever increasing federal expenditures as a reality of life. Such words as thrift and frugality, no longer have meaning for them. They seem even to be convinced that deficit spending, which is nothing less than mortgaging the future, is a mark of forward movement.

Our opponents are successful in the expansion of debt, in the creation of deficits - more than six billions in their first year; an estimated eight billion or so in the current year; and the certainty of more deficits in the next two years that they will control the executive branch of government. To stop these ruinous trends, we Republicans must, in this election, gain control of the House of Representatives and the governments of many more of our states and localities. Of these, one must be Pennsylvania!

I repeat that the individual citizen, aware of his responsibility, informed about its exercise and ready to discharge it, must always be the central figure in our system. I believe, consequently, that every good citizen

owes it to himself and to his country to formulate his conclusions on vital national issues as carefully as if he were actually sitting in the Congress or in any other important position in the federal government; or in state or local governments.

In national and local affairs, there is no magic formula for reaching satisfactory decisions. But there are basic tenets, I believe, that point out the individual's path to sound decision. Permit me briefly to enumerate a few that, for me are fundamental in the Republican concepts of citizenship and government.

First, we live in a society, founded upon a deeply felt religious faith. This society is dedicated to the maintenance of economic liberty and human dignity; to the maintenance of the nation's security, and the well-being of all its citizens.

Second, the nation's progress, security and well-being require balanced strength - spiritual, economic, educational, military. To neglect any of these weakens all.

Third, a free, competitive economy is essential to the existence of genuine human liberty. And maintenance of a sound, stable currency is essential to the growth of such an economy.

Fourth, the national good must always take precedence over the advantage of group or faction. Political catering to organized selfishness is a cancer in the body politic. The Republican Party is not for blocs or special groups. It stands for families - fathers and mothers and their children. It pledges them help in time of distress - real opportunity always in all circumstances.

Fifth, balance in government between the executive and the legislative and the judicial branches of the federal government - between the federal and state and county and city government - is our chief guarantee of sustaining true self-government; of possessing efficient and effective constitutional government.

Because of these beliefs, through eight years of a Republican administration, in all problems that concerned the well-being of Americans, we strove to arouse at the grass roots, at the community level - among individuals - an awareness of national problems that could be solved by the people, working together, using government at all levels as a servant to execute their considered decisions.

One example: In 1953, there was a serious shortage in the number of modern classrooms needed in our elementary schools. None of the bureaucrats or the special pleaders knew the exact number. Some said 700 thousand classrooms - an absurdly high figure. Some of the more moderate or sensible - maybe they were just timid - said 300 thousand. But they all had just one solution - only the federal government, they claimed, could do the job.

Well, the Republicans thought otherwise. We knew the people, if they were informed and aroused, would do the job on their own, using their local resources and their state governments in partnership with Washington. So all across the nation, at the school district and community level, we asked the citizens to get together to study the problem. Then they chose men and women to represent them in similar studies at the state level. Finally from all over the country state and regional representatives met in Washington for the first White House Conference on Education in late November of 1955.

The result of this effort was the greatest wave of construction for education in the history of our country. And it was done by the people themselves, with federal leadership and help - not through some vast federal program, extravagant in cost and maddening in its red-tape entanglements. And the people proved again the value of strong and sound state and local governments; governments that refused to surrender their rights and responsibilities to federal overlords.

You, in this assembly represent the common sense and wisdom of the American people at work on the sort of government that you want and that you will have, if in this campaign you go about the election of your Republican candidates with energy and enthusiasm - as you went about the building of schools.

The entire slate of Republican candidates in the state is a distinguished one. It deserves your support, intelligently and enthusiastically given!! Of two candidates, in particular, I would like to speak briefly.

William Scranton, a veteran of World War II, worked for me in Washington during my administration. There he learned the ways in which the economy of a state like Pennsylvania can be strengthened and fortified by expanded participation in the world economy. His later election to the Congress was an overwhelming endorsement of his leadership by those who knew him best, his neighbors in his home district - Republicans, Independents and discerning Democrats alike. For him, I have the highest respect and esteem; I believe that he

will make one of the most successful and distinguished governors this great state has ever had.

James Van Zant, a combat soldier in two world wars, has for two decades served in the Congress of the United States. At each election, he has been given by the voters of his district an increased majority of their support. This testimony, by his own constituency, so often repeated, is the best guarantee the state can have of ability and dependability. He will bring to the United States Senate a wide knowledge of public affairs; a broad experience in legislation; and a sound American philosophy of government. He will serve you well.

I can vouch for the integrity of these two men; their ability; their dedication to good government, here in Pennsylvania and in Washington. With all the vigor and enthusiasm I can muster, I shall work for their victory just as I urge you so to work from now until election day. Then, on November 6, God willing, I shall vote for them, in the confident hope that your unremitting efforts will assure that a vast majority of Pennsylvanians will do likewise.

• **Louisville, Kentucky, October 27, 1962**

I come to this famous city at a time of crisis, when from one hour to another we do not know the character of the news that may reach us by radio, newspaper and television. Americans have known many crises in the past; they have met them unafraid. Once more we summon all the vigor of our minds and hearts to stand behind our constitutional Commander-in-Chief, as he seeks to lead us through whatever may betide.

As we so muster our strength we do it as a united America; determined that no divisive influence can weaken us, as dictatorships, great and small, trumpet their challenges to our safety and to the values we so deeply cherish. But as citizens, we have duties other than those of merely waiting for the eventualities of crisis. One of these duties is to study, analyze and work for the kind of government we want and for the candidates we deem best fitted to represent us in that government. In this election we are carrying out this single duty!

One hundred and fifty-two years ago, a Kentuckian took his seat in the United States Senate - Henry Clay. The following year, elected to the House of Representatives, he was chosen Speaker of the House. Thereafter, as Secretary of State and again as a Senator of the United States, through forty years, he was in the foremost ranks of American statesmen. Because of his devotion to public service; because of his promotion of Latin American independence and his life-long concern for hemispheric solidarity; because of his service in bridging differences and uniting the American people at times of national crisis, the memory of Henry Clay will live so long as the Republic endures.

Even if Kentucky had never again sent a like man to Washington, the name of this state would shine bright in the nation's history. In our time, fortunately, Kentucky has sent to the Senate two men of like patriotism; of like devotion; of like conviction that in the well-being and security of the entire Republic all Americans can best enjoy well-being and security; two men who stand stoutly for American leadership in this hemisphere and in all the world. Six years ago this month, I came to this state to speak out for these two men - the Republican candidates for the United States Senate. They were, John Sherman Cooper and Thruston Morton. You elected them!

I come back this year to voice my respect and admiration for Thruston Morton - once more a candidate - and to urge all my friends in Kentucky to return him to the United States Senate; there to continue his work with John Sherman Cooper for Kentucky; America; the Free World.

I know the man well. He served as Assistant Secretary of State through my first term in the White House. In that job he conducted for John Foster Dulles and myself our liaison work with the Congress. During those years, his was the responsibility - on our behalf - to present to the members of the House and the Senate our programs, our policies, our objectives in the foreign affairs of the United States.

During those years of Thruston Morton's work in the State Department (as through his following years in the Senate), the Legislative and Executive branches of the Federal Government worked together in warm and successful cooperation for the security of the Republic, for peace with justice in the world. One war was ended in that time. Incipient wars were prevented. Communist expansion was halted in its tracks by swift action that ranged from the South China Sea to the Caribbean. The fearful, the indecisive, the timid repeatedly criticized us

for the strong positions we took. They talked about brinksmanship. But we kept the peace.

Moreover, we strengthened America - in its economy and in its educational system; in the sciences and technologies, as well as in its military posture. And, above all, forever we sought the increase of America's spiritual strength - the foremost asset of the Republic.

In the State Department, because of his qualities of leadership, Thruston Morton was an effective agent in getting enactment of sound, progressive legislation. Later, in the Senate, he was for me always a dependable source of political support. He never let me, his state or his country down - by indecision, hesitation, doubt. Always he worked for the greatness of the Republic and for the good of all its people.

When I spoke in Kentucky six years ago on behalf of John Sherman Cooper and Thruston Morton, I told you, in that October of 1956, my hopes for America; of Republican hopes for America. I hoped - and we Republicans worked - for an America in which every man might eat his own bread in peace; raise his own family in security; and strengthen his own spirit and mind in dignity. An America with full employment at good wages. An America where the schoolroom shortage would be erased - where every child might go to a good school, and every young talent might be developed to the full. An America in which farm surpluses no longer crushed down farm prices - and the farmer. And this - incidentally - meant an America where no politician would any longer treat the farmer himself as a product to be bid for in the political market place.

I hoped - and we Republicans worked - for an America where intensive medical research would conquer our most crippling and killing diseases. An America where every family could afford and find a decent home. An America where a mighty network of highways would spread across out country - and where ocean ships would sail into the ports of the Great Lakes, bringing a fresh surge of progress and growth. An America where long and costly strikes would be rare - where older workers would be hired entirely on the basis of ability - and where local unemployment problems would be solved by special programs of financial and technical aid. An America where the greatest possible government efficiency would allow the lowest possible government costs - and hence, lower taxes. An America whose government would not be run, as it is now, by politicians who assert that the way to lower taxes is to increase expenditures. Our way - to reduce expenditures - is now called "old fashioned." But it has one important advantage - it worked - in one strike we reduced taxes by 7 1/2 billion dollars a year.

All of this meant, finally, an America fully armed - materially and spiritually - to lead the free nations of the world. In particular, in this time of crisis, I remind you that our armed forces were brought to an unparalleled peak of power and effectiveness, from World War II patterns to a mighty mechanism of missile, bomber, sea and ground strength, never before known. For that, certainly, we Republicans will be given credit by the people and history - whatever partisan politicians may say.

The America I have described, we Republicans worked throughout eight years and we were in the main successful, as the record shows. Our gross national product in 1952 was \$347 billion - in 1960 it was \$504 billion - a 45% increase. The personal income of America went from \$273 billion in 1952 to \$404 billion by 1960 - a 48% increase. The average hourly wage rose from \$1.67 to \$2.29 - a 37% increase. The average family income was \$3,900 and went up to \$4,900 - a 27% increase. College enrollment went from 2 million to 3 and a half million during the same years - a 75% increase. And the increase in the cost of living during that entire eight years was held to ten percent, when in the preceding eight years it had risen by 47%.

If that is not progress it is a reasonable facsimile thereof, I assure you. I wish the record of the present faction now controlling the Democratic Party were anywhere near so good. It has not been; not by a far frontier.

We - Republicans, Independents, discerning Democrats - must work together for a return to real progress. A Republican victory on November 6 will mean the election to office of men and women who will strive to re-create a climate in which American productive enterprise, industrial and agricultural, can thrive and expand - and so lessen the tax load all of us are called to bear. Then we will have progress once again; forward progress.

I have come back to Kentucky to thank you for the support you gave me by your votes and by your election to John Sherman Cooper and Thruston Morton to the United States Senate. To ask that once again you vote Republican; return Thruston Morton to the Senate; work for the entire Republican slate. Keep working!

• **Marion, Illinois, October 27, 1962**

A week ago yesterday, according to the newspapers, a prominent Washington resident spoke in Chicago before the Democratic precinct captains of that city. He said, "I just want to see who did it in 1960." And he added, "I hope you'll do it again." Then he flew back to Washington.

Now, as I remember it, there were some grave doubts in the minds of sober-thinking Americans about just what was done in some Chicago wards in November of 1960. But whatever happened in them, I have an idea that this year a tidal wave of votes by Republicans, Independents and thinking Democrats will nullify the efforts of those precinct captains.

About one thing in the Illinois situation, I must confess to a little confusion. A week ago, in this state, the same visitor from Washington singled out for particular denunciation several of my friends, including Les Arends and Everett Dirksen. He demanded of the voters that these two gentlemen not be sent back to Washington. Then, almost within forty-eight hours of denouncing them, he hurriedly asked them to the National Capitol for advice and counsel in a serious situation.

In these circumstances, I should say that his words of last Friday were completely cancelled out by his action of Monday. If I am wrong in this appraisal, then actions no longer speak louder than words. So, it would seem to me that Les Arends and Everett Dirksen can now point out that they have the equivalent of strong endorsement by a leading Democrat as well as the enthusiastic support of a majority of the voters who will mark their ballots on November 6.

Now, my fellow Americans, we are met in a time of international crisis. Until this crisis is clearly and cleanly resolved to the advantage and the satisfaction of the United States, we must present to all the world a united front. Every loyal American - I am confident - will, without hesitation, carry out and conform to any instructions pertaining to it, proclaimed by the Commander-in-Chief. We must - every one of us - be prepared to make personal sacrifices whenever and to whatever extent is needed.

But in our internal affairs, a foreign crisis must not become an excuse for silence or submission by us Republicans. Of course, we support the President in foreign affairs. There, he is our Constitutional Leader and our Constitutional Spokesman. But we do not have to support the dominant faction of his party or the doctrines it preaches and practices. And, through the rest of this campaign, until the polling places close on the night of November 6, we must make sure that we defeat his recent efforts to get in Washington a virtually one-Party Congress. No crisis of any sort - no acceptable theory of Government - justifies an attempt to make the Congress a rubber stamp for decree and pronouncement by the Executive. The people of America must not be reduced to the level of a regimented herd, blindly confusing total silence with genuine loyalty. Such silence is equated with loyalty only under dictatorship. And only a totalitarian dictator can enforce it.

President Woodrow Wilson, in World War I, said, "While exercising the great powers of the office I hold, I would regret, in a crisis like the one through which we are now passing, to lose the benefit of patriotic and intelligent criticism." I think Woodrow Wilson spoke out of wisdom and faith in the people. No officer of government can fail to profit, in the conduct of his office, from listening to the people and their representatives - particularly in a tense time. Indeed, when the present crisis shall have passed into history - as have all the crises I have witnessed in a long lifetime - it will be entirely proper to inspect and analyze and criticize all the decisions and actions, foreign and domestic, taken through the last twenty-one months.

Here, in Illinois, a long way from the turmoil of Washington, I predict that when that record is so inspected and analyzed, the role of Everett Dirksen as Minority Leader in the United States Senate will be recognized as truly distinguished, responsible, statesman-like. In fact, from my own experience in the White House with Congress, I cannot understand that anyone in the Executive Branch - regardless of their partisan feeling - would ask that Everett Dirksen be defeated in this election; unless they don't want - in the Senate - experience and sobriety, courage and insight, unswerving loyalty to the Constitution and to the Republic.

In these qualities, through three decades of public service, Everett Dirksen has been outstanding. In the 87th Congress he has been a vigorous fighter against reckless spending; the visionary theories; the lockstep programs for agriculture - sponsored by the Far Frontiersmen.

He has been a strong and constant voice for what the faction now controlling the Democratic Party considers out-dated notions. Fiscal integrity, for example. Self-respect that is fostered by paying our bills. The balance set up by the Constitution between the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of Government.

Everett Dirksen, in the Senate, has been the leader of those Republicans and sound Democrats who support self-government; representative government; elected constitutional government. He and they have fought spendthrift and wasteful spending. He and they have fought mortgaging the future of the Republic. He and they have fought condemning our children and grandchildren to paying the bills we in this time are running up. Relentlessly, they have attacked the sort of patchwork expedient and theoretical experimentation in economic affairs that preoccupies the theorists who are now enthroned in Washington.

Always he, Everett Dirksen, and those who stand with him, have resisted firmly every attempt to force upon us an artificial, planned economy - run from Washington. They are striving to re-create a climate in which American productive enterprise, industrial and agricultural, can thrive and expand - and so lessen the tax load all of us are called to bear.

They believe in a system of free, competitive enterprise within which Americans can reserve their individual freedoms; a climate in which they can use for the good of themselves, their families, their communities, all the opportunities of a free society; can hope that honest effort will be justly rewarded; can plan in their own way - undictated to by government - the planting of their crops, the kind of work they do, the education of their children, the care of their health, the security of their future.

Our country is too great in its destiny; too intricate in its economy; too varied in its regional circumstances; too fertile in its human resources - to be turned over to the members of a clique in Washington, tinkering and tampering, in the hope that someday, somehow, they will come up with a blueprint for our entire existence.

For twenty-one months such a clique has been at work. Their economic product has been, in spite of boastful and rosy promises: sluggishness in the economy; continuing unemployment; deficit spending; mounting debt; and, of course, abusive ridicule, by the ream and by the hour, for all who oppose them.

Let me ask you one question. Are you happy or satisfied with these profitless products of an administration now in office twenty-one months? Nowhere in Illinois or in any state I've visited in this campaign have I encountered any such satisfaction.

In our present circumstances, every good citizen owes it to himself and his country to formulate his conclusions on vital national issues as carefully as if he were actually sitting in the Congress or in any other important position in the Federal Government. Consequently, I have been out talking with my fellow-citizens. Before I get home tonight, I will have visited - in the current campaign - twenty-one states. This, by no matter of means, has been "politics as usual."

I have been striving - as best I could - to arouse at the grass roots, at the community and state level, among individuals, an awareness of national problems that can be solved only by the American people with their common sense and wisdom; working together; using government - local, state and federal - as a servant to execute their considered decisions.

You here represent such common sense and wisdom. And so I urge you: take back control of your government; sustain and renew your faith in yourselves; take back from the experimenters the planning and the deciding of your country's course.

You will have the sort of constitutional, responsible, productive government you want, if in this campaign you go about the election of Everett Dirksen and - all your Republican candidates - with energy and enthusiasm. Keep working.

• **Syracuse, New York, October 29, 1962**

I come to you tonight as one American who, with others of my age, has lived through the period of the Republic's greatest expansion in population; in industry; in education; in wealth; in position among the nations of the world. I have witnessed three wars and I know their cost in money and in blood, in personal sacrifice and

in diversion of effort from the pursuit of national purpose. I have enjoyed, far beyond personal merit, the rights and privileges, the fullness of happiness and reward that America can give its sons and daughters. Against that life-time background, I speak to you in strong confidence that - as they have in many earlier crises - Americans will respond strongly to the challenge now before them.

On October 22nd we were told by the Commander-in-Chief of new developments in the Cuban problem that made mandatory definite American reaction, so as to maintain our nation's security. Thereafter, by the millions - some in an uncertain hope; some in fear for those they loved; all in concern for the security and global repute of the nation - we awaited hour by hour developments over which we, individually, had no control.

But each of us then, consciously or unconsciously, made a definite personal decision. We recognized that we had heard a paramount call on our loyalty, confronting us with the duty to form a united front against Communist menace. In foreign crisis, no acceptable alternative to unity is possible for those who believe that America must always show to our enemies an undivided front of courage and steady purpose. Such unity I have urged on all who would listen to me ever since we were given evidence of a missile build-up off our shores; ever since we were told that the President planned to execute decisive action.

I am proud, indeed, that it was a recommendation by the Republican leaders of the Congress that first inspired the Joint Congressional Resolution, under which the President was able to act in this latest crisis, forcefully, and with the certainty of Congressional approval of his actions.

Mere readiness, by each of us, to do his or her duty in international crisis does not of itself fulfill the true measure of the obligations of citizenship.

One effect of external crisis is to emphasize the need for thorough and thoughtful exercise of the rights of citizenship as we approach our bi-ennial elections. For America's real strength is found in the distilled wisdom and common sense of her vast millions of citizens. These are now as sorely needed as ever before in our history.

Each of us in these troubled times must examine with the greatest possible care the issues confronting us and the methods by which we can enhance the moral, economic and intellectual power of our nation, all so necessary to our military security. And, we must decide upon the identity of the leaders who can best represent us in this work.

Confronted by armed threat, the first and immediate assurance of security is our military establishment. That assurance is ours today because, through eight years of a Republican Administration, Americans ceaselessly worked to transform their Armed Forces from World War II patterns into an effective modern instrument for defense. Long range ballistic rockets and missiles, Polaris submarines, and reconnaissance satellites are only a few of the products of this great transformation. The present military readiness of the nation would not exist, were it not for the work of those eight years!!

So, the Commander-in-Chief, sure of this ready military strength, fortified by the tradition of American unity in foreign crises, proclaimed our determination to protect the Nation's security against the immediate threat to it. Thereafter, the men in the Kremlin seemed to have some sober second thoughts. Hope for a peaceful outcome was renewed!

But now, despite a reported easing of tension, we have no reason to relax. Those who - last year - loudly announced their determination to bury us, have not recalled their words or abandoned their purpose. They merely promise to withdraw - in part - from one forward base of threat to our security. The easily broken promise is fundamental in Communist strategy. The partial retreat is "Communist tactics as usual." Only the scene and the subject are new: a missile base off our coast.

The conflict of ideals and ideologies, which defines what we call the cold war, will continue. It has been with us for more than a decade and a half, always carrying a latent threat to free world security, and occasionally, stretching tensions to violin string intensity, as threats identified by such names as Korea, Iran, Guatemala, Lebanon, Laos, Formosa, and, now, Cuba. Only when the Communists truly give over their threats to others; when they end their domination of once free nations by force, will we be truly able to devote all our energies and resources to the fundamental purposes of human betterment.

Strong in arms, therefore, we must continue to be; and of strong faith, too, in God, in the Republic, in

ourselves; and ever stronger in the productivity of our economy, in the education of all our people, in the mastery of our environment, in the wisdom with which we set for ourselves national goals and international objectives. In that light, the weeks and months and years ahead will be far more meaningful to the long future of the Republic than the hours and days through which we now pass.

Military strength, we have. For the long future of the Republic, however, even more important are the spiritual greatness and constantly increasing educational and economic strength. These cannot be achieved by edict or pronouncement. In these three areas where growth is demanded, present policies and practices of Washington - at least to me - are far from adequate - in some cases, even destructive.

What contribution to spiritual greatness can we expect of partisan spokesmen endlessly emphasizing that only those who control the Federal Treasury and the disbursement of its money are the authors of the good life and the creators of progress. Judged by their words and their action, they seek the individual vote by promise of creature comfort for free - spelling an end to self-reliance and standing on one's own feet. They hope for the vote of a community by give-away programs; believing that none will care about the loss of home rule. They seem confident that a majority, even in a sovereign state, can be largely influenced by the innuendo that one candidate has no access to federal funds, while his opponent has free entry through all the doors in Washington.

Such methods are an insult to our integrity. Unless halted in their ways, these people will make the pork barrel the emblem of the Republic.

In education, what hope have we for direction and sound leadership out of them after their display of ineptness that lasted from beginning to end of the last Session of the Congress? The accomplishments of an eight-year Republican Administration in elementary education - and what it had pushed for at all other levels of education - should have provided inspiration for action in this late, but not lamented, Congress. But the Executive Department could not be bothered to exercise leadership. Nothing happened.

About economic growth, the frontier spokesmen have talked more and done less than even their most severe critics would have dared to predict twenty-one months ago. Here is, indeed, a record of sorry performance that bodes ill for the future. We have heard much talk about "moving ahead" - but so far, we have stood still at best, and too frequently, have moved backward.

In spite of boastful and rosy promises, the economic product of twenty-one months of inept fumbling by the Washington Administration is sluggishness in the economy; continuing unemployment; deficit spending; mounting debt; reduction of confidence in free and competitive enterprise; confusion and drift and endless talk. The bewildered frontiersmen just haven't learned that it is American confidence in the future and not government spending against the future that makes our free enterprise system work.

Now, looking for someone to blame, they excoriate Republicans and even members of their own Party. They urge on the voters a new concept of Federal Government. They seek to take unto themselves the duties and authorities of the Congress; and they want men in the Congress who will complacently agree. Specifically, they want a Washington where Congress is controlled by one faction of one party; where that faction of the party gets its orders from the Executive; where the Executive gets its domestic goals and internal policies from a clique of theorists who specialize in experimental tampering and tinkering and talk.

After twenty-one months of watching and hearing these people in Washington, it is clear that only the Republican Party, again on the march, re-energized and rallying Independents and thinking Democrats, can get the nation once more moving forward. A genuine two-party system is what the country needs, responsive and responsible to people; not factional rule within either party; not splinter groups that weaken both parties. In the circumstances of this time, only the Republican standard provides a rallying point for all Americans - so minded - who want government with head and heart, purposeful in its plans, decisive in their achievement. Don't waste a vote in making certain of this achievement.

With these thoughts in mind, I have returned to New York where through several years I was privileged to make my home. I come to speak out my enthusiastic endorsement of Governor Nelson Rockefeller, a man with whom I have been associated closely for some years in positions of official responsibility. I can testify to his integrity, the sharpness of his mind, his energy and his moral courage.

Moreover, as a former resident of this state, somewhat acquainted with the complexity of its government

and with many of its problems; I have been deeply interested in reading about his record as governor. To me, it is a record of promises made and promises kept. A record of loyalty to the principles of fiscal integrity and administrative honesty, that are essential to the progress and growth of our free enterprise society. Financially, it is now written in black, not red, ink. His record proves that sound Republican government can meet all its social responsibilities to a growing population - in highways and housing; in education; in progressive and far-sighted treatment of the problems of the working man and woman; in help for the aged and afflicted; in equality of opportunity for all.

Standing with him for re-election is Senator Jacob Javits. His record as Representative and Senator - in the fourteen years I have known him since I first voted for him as my Congressman in 1948 - has been distinguished by his uncompromising championship of two hallmarks of our system; equal opportunity for all and the preservation and strengthening of competitive enterprise. His integrity and unselfish dedication to his State and to his Nation are unquestioned by any.

And I must speak of one other. In this City and County, which together constitute his District, I add a personal word about Congressman Walter Riehlman. Back ten years ago, in the spring of 1952, he came to France that he might help persuade me I had a duty to enter political life. Now, I would like to help persuade the electorate to continue him in the public service by the largest plurality of his career.

These are the kind of men, Nelson Rockefeller, Jack Javits, Walter Riehlman, and the kind of records that richly deserve, in my opinion, the enthusiastic endorsements of their fellow citizens. And, when men of such evident leadership and capacity head the Republican slate in New York, we have a guarantee that associated with them is a team of candidates whose election will profit both State and Nation.

I hope you will not think me presumptuous, merely because I am now a Pennsylvanian, in asking all those who twice so generously supported me in national elections - Republicans and Independents and thinking Democrats - once again to give their support to your slate of Republican candidates. They stand for good government; representative government; constitutional government; and an America strong in military and economic posture; strong in intellectual and moral values. This is the kind of America for which all of us must always work.

And permit me to say that there is nothing that could, at this moment, so effectively bring about such an America as a Republican sweep - in Governors, Senators, Congressmen and other officials - on Tuesday, November 6.

• **Herald Tribune, October 31, 1962**

For the duration of the current foreign crisis America stands as one man behind the President while he seeks to lead us through it. My own Party, I can testify, is committed to responsible bi-partisanship. We recognize only one spokesman, the Commander-in-Chief, in time of international peril. I am proud of the fact that it was a recommendation by Republican legislative leaders that led to the Joint Congressional resolution giving to the President the authority he is now using on our behalf, with the certainty of Congressional approval of his action.

But in domestic concerns, one clear-cut duty today confronts every American citizen: to vote his convictions on Tuesday, November sixth. There, in the secrecy of the polling booth, the American voter will be face to face with himself, his conscience, his measure of wisdom. The decisions he and his fellows make there will, undoubtedly, be the most important decisions made anywhere in the world that day. Every American election, of course, is weighty in its influence on our affairs. But I feel there is an urgency about the election Tuesday; in it America's future may well be charted, possibly unalterably.

Our destiny, in all the manifold expressions of human enterprise and human dreams, is most creatively sought - as it has always been - by Americans who enjoy freedom, who are spurred by a reasonable hope of fair reward, who possess confidence in leaders of unquestionable integrity, and who employ their energies to advance themselves, their communities, their states and the nation. Government must always be the servant, never the master, of the people. To allow unwarranted political intrusion into the economic, intellectual and

social affairs of America would be to stifle our glorious potential; to harass, ensnare, and set back progress in our society.

For many months, we have observed a ruinous trend in that direction. We have seen complete disregard by the controlling faction in the Democratic Party of promises made to the American people, seemingly in all earnestness, during the campaign of 1960. We were promised a balanced budget. We got a deficit of 6.3 billion last year; an estimated 8 billion or so this year; almost certainly continuing deficits in the two years left to the present Administration. We were promised that the economy would be made to move faster. We got, instead, sluggishness in the economy; continuing unemployment; deficit spending; mounting debt; reduction of confidence in free and competitive enterprise; confusion and drift and endless talk; a record of sorry performance that bodes ill for the future. We were promised prompt elimination of all problems in the international field!

In sum, we were promised greater progress and prosperity, greater security, greater reason for pride in America. Unfortunately, for the discharge of promises, there has been substituted a preoccupation with attempts to grab more power for the Executive, as for example, authority to modify taxes at one individual's decision; to finance emergency works, at whatever location directed by the Executive; to dilute the independence of the Federal Reserve Board. In such a process the power and dignity of the Congress cannot fail to be eroded, the Constitutional balance of powers upset. This trend is accompanied by an apparently blind faith in spending as a cure for all ills, economic and social. Federal debt piles up; uneasiness and lack of confidence pervade our entire economy.

The present trend in Washington can be reversed by the voters. Consequently, through this campaign, on visits to twenty-two states, I have urged my fellow Americans - Republicans, Democrats, Independents - to rely on the record and on their own common sense and wisdom rather than on slick campaign slogan in reaching their November sixth decision.

We can, on the one hand, abide by the lessons of our heritage and move forward on the path of progress, strong in our individual freedom and confident in ourselves as men and women of talent and dignity and foresight; or, we can succumb to the blandishments of those who allege that we can have perpetual ease of living through federal handouts and subsidies and deficits.

The electorate is warned and reminded by all levels of party command that electing Democrats - Congressmen, Governors, and all others - is the surest way of getting most out of the United States Treasury, because only Democrats can really deal with party brethren who operate the spigots out of which millions and billions gush from Washington. Brashness, and disregard for the intellectual integrity and understanding of Americans, are obvious in the frantic effort to obtain a Congress - already overwhelmingly Democratic - that will be even more submissive to the dictates of the Executive.

In urging the election of Republicans on Tuesday, I am fully aware that neither party is the sole repository of virtue or evil. I respect the integrity and high sense of duty of most of the Democrats with whom I have worked in government, but I have serious qualms about many of the "frontier" programs proposed by the Administration to the Congress. I recoil at the selfish "pork barrel" standards that mark today's maneuvering for votes.

On the other hand, among the basic tenets of Republicanism is a belief that the nation's security and progress require a balanced strength - spiritual, economic, intellectual, military. A free competitive economy is essential to the existence of maximum human liberty. Maintenance of a sound, stable currency is essential to the growth of a free, competitive economy. Deficit spending by the Federal Government is justified only in emergencies of the gravest kind. Its inevitable effect is to place an increasing burden upon the economy and to rob the future of its legitimate heritage.

These are only a few Republican convictions that are not accepted by the dominant faction in the Democratic Party. But the wide philosophical differences between the two major parties are represented also in their respective attitudes toward people. Republicans start with a deep-seated faith in the men and women of America; the administration Democrats prefer to make government the source of all good.

Republican philosophy today, as in Lincoln's time, is based upon a dynamic concept - government of the people, by the people, for the people. It enthrones the individual - with his love of liberty and opportunity,

his self-confidence and self-reliance, his initiative and his human desire to help himself, his family and his country. People, not government, are the key to social and economic progress - the key to the entire nation's growth in strength, capacity and influence.

By contrast, the Democratic philosophy, as espoused by the faction now controlling the party, patronizes the individual. Barren of faith in the people, it arrogates to a personally selected few the capacity of government. It is devoid of appeal to all that's best in humans, particularly those traits of character that have accounted for America's greatness. It breeds on power and ever more power, for the sake of power. In its lexicon such words as thrift, economy, frugality have no real meaning. All this is a far cry from the traditional American concept of government and public service. For a time we may endure it and even try to execute it. But a stop must be put to it or the results will be disastrous.

I hope I am not excessively partisan or prejudiced, but, after months of watching and listening and thinking, I am convinced that only a re-energized Republican Party, rallying Independents and thinking Democrats to its standard of progress with responsibility, can get America moving ahead again, in all areas, foreign and domestic. Therefore, this autumn, I have been out talking politics - the practice of citizenship - with my fellow Americans; discussing the future we ardently desire; examining the direction in which we are actually heading.

I deeply believe that if Tuesday's election gives our government a massive infusion of Republican wisdom and stability, our freedom-oriented Republic will begin to move forward once more, on all fronts, surely and confidently.

• Baltimore, Maryland, November 2, 1962

We meet this evening with a crisis in our foreign affairs - the problem of Cuba - still unresolved. For us all, one position is mandatory. Americans, without regard to their political affiliations, must stand behind the President as he seeks to lead us to a peaceful and honorable settlement. Only he, in this period, can decide for us all; speak for us all; act for us all. So doing, he must be confident that supporting him is a unified people.

Next Tuesday, in our domestic affairs, the case is different. Then we, as individual Americans, by our ballots will decide the sort of government we want and the course we believe government should follow through a two-year period. Our first loyalty is to conscience and to our convictions about what is best for our community, our State and the Republic.

To many, this off-year election may lack the dramatic tenseness of a foreign crisis. Missing, for many, is the emotional surge that grips men and women when the nation is faced by a visible enemy. Consequently, what happens in our polling places four days from now may seem to them a matter of little moment. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In my sober judgment, the way we vote on Tuesday can establish the road for the Republic - upward or downward - for a long time to come.

Our choice that day is fundamental and far-reaching between two philosophies. One is a philosophy of government, traditional among our people since the founding of the Republic. It is now most clearly enunciated and most strongly espoused by Republicans. Faith in the individual and in the power and the decisions of the people, is its hallmark. Lincoln described it as government of, by and for the people, and Lincoln meant for all the people - workers, managers, professional people, teachers - every citizen in the nation!

The other is an out-moded philosophy - one that sees power as emanating from and exercised by an exclusive clique - dominating the people and destructive of their vitality. It seems to be the guide of the faction that directs the Democratic Party - a faction which seeks constantly to extend and strengthen its control over all the Nation.

Republicans believe that the men and the women of America through many generations, have achieved for their country a greatness and a goodness among the nations; a wealth and a power and a leadership for peace with justice - unique in all times - because of dynamic and creative traits in the free and liberty-loving individual. Some of those traits, fostered by the guaranteed rights of free Americans, are: reliance in self; pride in work; devotion to education; courage in conscience; faith in God and in self. So believing, Republicans strive

to restore in the United States a climate within which men and women can help themselves and their families to a better, more prosperous, more secure life; using government as their servant.

The controlling faction of the Democratic Party displays no faith in the people - in their foresight or initiative or wisdom. It arrogates to a clique of planners the conduct of government. It operates always in the belief that by the spending of money all things can be accomplished. It is convinced that men and entire communities and even majorities in sovereign states can be corrupted by the promise of something for nothing. This faction promised in 1960, freely and profusely, that America would enjoy immense increases in prosperity, in prestige, in power. Not one promise has been fulfilled. Instead, the record is a dreary tale of standing still - except in the spending of money and in the growth of our debt. For example, we have endured sluggishness in the economy; continuing unemployment; deficit spending; a mounting cost of living; loss of confidence in our free enterprise system; confusion about our objectives.

What has happened to fiscal responsibility - the paying of our bills as we increase them? Why does the Executive Branch try, without ceasing, to filch from our representatives in Congress, the rightful powers of that body? How much longer are we to permit an "oligarchy of experience" to outrage American common sense with their "far frontier" proposals?

The situation will worsen unless the experts in theory are put in their place by Republican success at the polls, Tuesday. By their votes, Republicans - supported by Independents and thinking Democrats - can make certain we restore the Nation's dedication to basic and simple, but dynamic and fruitful tenets - such as: The nation's security and progress requires a balanced strength - spiritual, economic, intellectual, military. A free, competitive economy is essential to the existence of maximum human liberty. Maintenance of a sound, stable currency is essential to the growth of a free, competitive economy. Deficit spending by the Federal Government is justified only in emergencies of the gravest kind. Its inevitable effect is to place an increasing burden upon the economy and to rob the future of its legitimate heritage.

So strongly do I feel the necessity of Republican success on Tuesday, that during recent weeks I have been out talking with the people in 22 states of the Union - from South Carolina to Idaho, from California to New Hampshire. In each of these talks I have pointed out that Republicans stress individual enterprise as the key to greatness - doing the best job we can with our hands or our heads in our daily work; running successful businesses and industries so that profits, widely shared, will benefit many; following the counsel of conscience and of warm heart in our concern for the afflicted and the distressed; working together for the good of all and the enduring security of the Republic; passing on to our children and grandchildren a heritage of achievement.

Our opponents, on the other hand, stress the pork barrel of Federal aid and subsidy; a heritage of debt for those who follow us. On this I need not enlarge; you know their record. Consequently, I urge you and all my fellow Americans - who twice elected me to high office - once again to vote Republican. To vote otherwise, as I see it, is to vote for a Washington ruled by one faction of one party - to the hurt of the Republic and us all; America is far too great an enterprise to be subjected to such rule.

And it is not enough for the responsible individual merely to vote. In the ninety some hours left us before the polls close Tuesday, each of us should see how many neighbors we can get to vote with us. That's what I'm going to do. I hope millions will join me in trying to produce a flood of Republican votes. Both present and future will thank us.

• **Economic Club of New York, November 13, 1962**

Although I shall deal primarily, this evening, with some aspects of the American economy, I hope you will indulge me in a preliminary review of events of recent years. At times, this may seem to you little more than ambling reminiscence, a practice dear to the hearts of old soldiers. My justification is that we can hardly discuss any problem of major moment to Americans except in the context of our relations with the Soviet Union since 1945.

The Cold War affects all our living! It colors whatever we, as a nation, try to do to increase our own spiritual, economic, intellectual and military strength; or to exercise, on behalf of freedom, the leadership that

fate has thrust upon us. Moreover, a review of our own actions and reactions of the recent past give us a measure of perspective in viewing present and future problems.

We come to recognize that cold-bloodedly logical, or starkly factual, or grimly realistic, argument may not be the most effective or persuasive in our country where the people have the final voice. We must not forget emotions. Almost every subject of national interest contains within itself some emotional element and has an emotional impact on public opinion. The heart of America is often more important than the head of America in its influence on public thinking - cynical politicians to the contrary.

In this talk, I may seem to belabor the simple and the obvious. But the growth of the American economy is dependent on such simple notions as: individual confidence in the future; individual hope for reward; individual devotion to the country's security. With that prelude finished, let me refer, for a moment, to my personal situation in an earlier November; and review quickly the events of a few years thereafter.

Seventeen years ago this week, I was clearing off my desk in Germany. Within a few days, I was to leave my headquarters in Frankfurt to move to Washington. Six months earlier, we and our allies had completed the destruction of the Nazi and Fascist armies on the European continent. Three months after that triumph, America and her allies accepted the capitulation of the Japanese Empire.

But, then, in the month of November 1945, the paramount preoccupation of the American people had become the demobilization of our armed forces. "Get the boys home," was a national command upon us; so loudly voiced in every area of the country, so emotionally charged, that it became the first policy of government itself. Immense problems were involved in its speedy execution; from the global transport of millions of men and millions of tons of supplies, to the minute details of each discharge paper. This was the one big job that America wanted done. Everything else could wait. In fact, everything else did wait.

Here, in the lifetime of us all, we had dramatic and overwhelming proof that emotionalism can dictate high government policy and set national priorities through many months - sometimes to our disadvantage. Out of hindsight, some may now argue that the maintenance of American military strength - despite the emotional cry for demobilization - would have blocked Communist designs. I doubt the complete truth of this opinion - but I do believe that such strength would have made the Communists more cautious. Probably the Korean War might have been avoided. Without that war the American economy could certainly have returned more quickly and radically to the pre-depression principles and doctrines that underlie free enterprise. But the zones of Communist influence, which even in 1945 were becoming zones of Communist domination, had largely been set up by political agreements, made before the liberation of Europe. Our forces, standing in strength on the Elbe, had to be withdrawn, for example, not because we were unable to maintain them there; nor because we were afraid of conflict with the Russians; but simply because, in hot pursuit of the Nazis, they had advanced many miles beyond the frontiers of the allied zones set up for Germany by the European Advisory Commission in 1944. This incident illustrates the inseparability of various aspects of American life and policy.

A prior political decision, arrived at by negotiation around a council table, had adverse effects upon our later military situation in middle Europe; and those effects have caused us much in money and effort. However, even if an emotional wave had not swept us into a quick demobilization; even if political decisions had not set geographic limits to our military position, the Communist menace would still have been dangerous and global. The character of the threat quickly became as much economic as military. On the Communist side, a stupendous effort was begun to build heavy industry as the base for an expanding economy and military power. The effort involved a concentration of enforced labor on dictated goals. And, consequently, it moved with an initial momentum impossible in the free countries.

The first major American challenge to the Communist purpose of gaining supremacy over Europe was an economic counterattack - the Marshall Plan. As presented by General George Marshall, then Secretary of State, the plan was economically sound and obviously in our own enlightened self-interest. But its greatest appeal, I think, was to the heart of America. In it, we saw an opportunity to help the victims of war once again to stand on their own feet and to prosper. And around the Marshall Plan a united American rallied because - aside from the logic and profit of this Plan - our hearts were committed to it.

Against Communist encroachments, however, the immediate post-war years were marked, inside America, more by day-to-day improvisation and expedient than by a consensus of opinion on grand objectives

that should be pursued by the nation. A rising cost of living, strikes, depressed areas, inflation and still more inflation - these constituted our economic news in the immediate post-war period. A climate of frustration grew in the country. By that time we had been, for more than a dozen years, wandering from the free, competitive economic system within which our country had developed its resources, expanded its strength and attained the highest standard of living in history.

During the depression years, for example, we were told by important officials of government that our industrial plant had been completed; that we had achieved a mature economy without much further growth potential; that only Federal pump-priming could maintain a respectable economy; that public works, Federally financed, constituted the last frontier of American expansion. Thereafter, through World War II, our economic system was primarily devoted to the purposes of war and secondarily to a completely controlled production for civil purposes. Rigid controls were continued even after the war ended. And before the economy could return to a free and competitive way, the Korean War once more reduced it, in large measure, to production for military operations.

By 1952, the wonder is that any faith in our traditional economic system was left in the United States.

Washington had long been in the saddle; government had widely come to be accepted as the overlord of the economy. We had been living a life that, for America, was unnatural; almost bewildering. Reaction was inescapable. Citizens, by the thousands, began an organized effort to change the political philosophy of Washington, and its role in the economy. In late 1952, they were successful. National objectives then announced were a modern expression of our earlier history and traditions. Among them were: a halt to inflation. Restored confidence in our free economic system. Steady, dependable economic growth. Equality of citizenship and opportunity. A program of construction in our basic national plant. Modernization of our Armed Forces.

And, most importantly, a sense of national purpose to which the individual, his community, his state could contribute - under the leadership and with the help of the Federal Government whenever necessary - but essentially rooted in the capacity of individuals to work together for local, regional and national objectives, using government at appropriate levels as an agent or a partner. Such objectives appealed to the pride and self-respect, vision and patriotism of individual Americans. They appealed to the good will, the decency, the humanity of individual Americans. In these respects, the approach may have been emotional - it was clearly directed to the heart of America. But these objectives appealed also to the common sense, the enlightened self-interest, the expectation of reward for work well done. And, in that respect, the approach was to the head of America. At no time did the people espousing these objectives assert that all wisdom and knowledge were concentrated in Washington.

On every problem, those of us who were in Washington sought the advice of men and women around the country - specialists in particular fields; not absorbed in partisan politics; concerned with the merit of proposals - not their vote appeal. And, there was developed at the grass roots a better informed public opinion, which helped the nation to arrive at a national consensus on what should be done.

I may be, of course, a biased witness about the results achieved during the eight years following 1952. Political critics, I understand, now charge the government of that period with the high crime of producing tranquility in America. If tranquility and smugness were the same thing, they might have reason for complaint. But America was far from smug. Speaking relatively, it was tranquil. But tranquility is evidence of confidence in the country's strength to meet effectively any crisis, foreign or domestic. And indeed America did so - every time crisis erupted - domestic or foreign. Moreover, the nation increased in prosperity and opportunity at home, in influence and prestige abroad.

Now, in the light of these experience through the years I have so quickly reviewed, what conclusions can we logically form as to our present and future? We still have an economy, fundamentally strong, needing only a reasonable encouragement by government and a renewed confidence in the future, to resume its dynamic progress. Our military posture, modernized through a ten-year program, enables us to confront any enemy unafraid. The common sense and wisdom of the people, when flouted, will eventually be re-asserted in the conduct of government. Finally, America's spiritual strength, comprising a deeply-felt religious faith, love of country, dedication to the indestructible rights of individuals, and confidence in ourselves, always seems to flourish best when problems of grave import confront us.

But trends have developed recently that - I, at least - consider damaging to our prosperity and over-all national strength, if those trends are permitted long to continue. Among them are: Concentration of power in the Executive Branch with a consequent reduction in the role of Congress. Preoccupation with what are called "pocketbook" issues which in fact seem to be "something for nothing" appeals. An economic philosophy that proposes constantly increasing federal expenditures, and more federal intrusion into the economy as an inescapable reality of life - expressed in deficit spending.

In the election last week, the American electorate had - rather it seemed so in early October - a clear-cut opportunity to express their judgment about these trends. The Cuban crisis, of course, somewhat obscured the issues in the Congressional races. A natural and patriotic desire to rally about the President, undoubtedly and understandably, distracted attention from domestic matters. Nevertheless, Governors were elected in some key states, committed to no further surrender of state responsibility to Washington. And there is other evidence that the American people, in general, are opposed to the trends toward centralization of power and deficit spending. But among our people must be developed a sharper realization that the economic battle against Communism has three fronts: (a) our economic freedom at home; (b) the integrity of the dollar; (c) the need for revitalizing our economy.

First, on economic freedom, the trend toward concentration of too much power in the Federal Government has both political and economic implications. The political implications of such concentration are both unmistakable and deeply disturbing. Further diminution in the role of state and local governments, with consequent increases in the role of Washington and further transfers of authority from the Legislative to the Executive Branch within the Federal Government, can only reduce the power of the people and increase the power of government officials.

From the economic standpoint, the growth of federal and executive power can only serve to impair the functions of our competitive economy and obstruct our efforts to win the economic Cold War. The wellspring of economic progress and prosperity lies in the decentralized decision-making of a market economy. That lesson we should have learned - once and for all - between 1932 and 1952. All of us who are concerned about our economy should likewise be concerned about the tendency to establish a "guiding hand" in government to replace the "impersonal hand" of the market place. The politically expedient displaces the economically sound. The over-all result is: impairment of investor confidence; uneasiness about a philosophy that claims free people working together cannot be trusted to reach the right decisions; that only government officials can be expected to decide and act in the public interest.

Now - the integrity of the dollar. Toward the end of my political tour in Washington, it became clear that the United States policy of promoting recovery in Western Europe and Japan had been spectacularly successful. As a consequence, the dollar shortage abroad had been replaced by a dollar surplus and short term security holdings in central banks, all over the world. We began to face a severe balance of payments problem. As it mounted and deficits became cumulative, some of our large supply of gold began to flow to other countries. While admittedly some redistribution, within limits, of the gold supply among the free nations might have been desirable, the continuous outflow of gold in large amounts, accompanied by the rapid rise of the price of gold in the free London gold market in October, 1960, created a complex problem, difficult to solve. In Washington we had started over a year earlier to implement policies aimed at reducing the deficit. These policies were intensified over the latter part of 1960 especially as related to the outflow of dollars associated with foreign military expenditures and economic aid.

The present administration has continued most of these policies, in addition to developing other useful techniques, particularly in discouraging speculation in currencies. For these actions, the administration, and particularly the Treasury, deserve the commendation of the country. But it would be both premature and dangerous to conclude that the balance of payments problem is no longer with us. We must therefore continue our efforts to maintain the stability of the dollar. Failure to do so could deal the free world a crippling blow in the economic cold war. Among other things, we must lower production costs; we must remain competitive; we must continue to increase exports; we must minimize the outflow of dollars associated with military spending and assistance; we must provide adequate defenses against speculators.

And, now, a word about revitalizing our domestic economy. We should not be satisfied with growth for

growth's sake, growth that is merely statistical. Several billion dollars increase in the GNP, if it is mainly in services and not in goods, seems hardly evidence of increasing productivity. Our primary purpose should be to expand the production of things that solidly fortify our standard of living. This requires an economic climate in which both business and labor will work and invest with confidence about the future. While I am sure there are many influences to cite as drags on our economy, one undoubtedly is the structure of the income tax. This system was substantially devised in the depression and shaped further in war. It is not suited to the 1960's. In its present shape it stifles incentives, impedes investments and has weakened us economically at a time when we should be gaining strength.

I do not intent, here, to propose any specific proposal for tax reduction or improvement in the tax structure; rather I would like to outline some simple beliefs with reference to it. In the first place, any modification of our tax system should be designed to create incentives; to provide a wider purchasing power for all the people; and to encourage business expansion by providing for adequate after-tax profits. Especially it should improve the ability of industry to modernize - and keep modern - plants, machinery and techniques. Fully as important as the form of any tax modification, is the need for carrying it out within the bounds of fiscal prudence.

Consequently, any proposals which result in a substantial lowering of taxes should be accompanied by straightforward and explicit commitments to hold federal spending constant for the next two years or, far preferably, to see that such spending declines. Moreover, policies and programs respecting spending and tax adjustments must reflect reasonable appraisals as to future income and outgo, so that deficits, if they should be necessary, may be kept at acceptable levels. Sound priorities for governmental spending should be announced to the public. In all this area, one conviction and one desire are held in common by most Americans; we can and must regain our confidence, and we must so expand our economic strength that we shall win the economic war now conducted against us by international Communism.

I can sum up my own judgment on how that expansion can be best achieved in three points.

First: if we commit ourselves to the preservation of economic freedom by ending the drift of power toward Washington and stop the encroachments of executive power at the expense of the Legislative, we shall make progress.

Second: if we continue strong and effective efforts to correct the balance of payments and to maintain the strength of the dollar, we shall make further progress.

Third: if we so modify our tax system that it does not obstruct investment and initiative, we shall go farther still.

Unfortunately, such economic objectives lack the glamour of political panaceas. They must be translated into human values; into their meaning for the prosperity of the wage earner and the farmer and the merchant; into their contribution to higher living standards, to the dignity of the individual, to the well-being of the family, to the richness of the American heritage. This translation is an imperative on all who believe in the productivity of our economic system.

I suggest that, particularly, it is an imperative on you in this room whose daily concern is with our economy and our system. On the clarity of this translation and its communication to our people, made by you and like groups, depends the future of the free enterprise system. You cannot leave the field to the doctrinaires and to the bureaucrats. You cannot merely talk it up among yourselves; you are already convinced. You must be missionaries, evangelists, preaching an economic gospel. The cause is worthy of your best and enduring effort. You will be working for the power and progress of the Republic and its world leadership - both of which are based upon the constant renewal of our moral strength and the sound expansion of our nation's economy.

• Dulles Airport, November 17, 1962

It is indeed a privilege to participate in this climax to an effort begun years ago. Even before jet aircraft first appeared on the nation's commercial airlines, General Quesada had already convinced me that Washington, D.C. would require a jet airport of its own. Consequently, the Congress was asked as long ago as

January, 1957, to appropriate funds to build such a field near Washington. Selection of a site was a knotty problem; but - I personally believe - was solved to the satisfaction of the greatest number. Acquisition of the land began in January, 1959, and construction in September of that year.

The new field was named the Dulles International Airport in 1959, shortly after the death of John Foster Dulles, because it seemed a fitting way to honor the name of a man who had spent most his life serving his country in the cause of national security and world peace.

Before his service as Secretary of State from 1953 to 1959, John Foster Dulles had long been well known in Washington. He served as a Senator from New York and over his adult years consulted with and aided several Presidents of the United States. Later, he became a familiar figure at airports around the world. During his six years as Secretary of State he traveled to 60 countries and flew more than half a million miles to meet with heads of state and their representatives in an effort to find a workable formula for world peace. His untiring efforts in Washington and his extensive use of air travel abroad made it appropriate and logical that the new jet airfield for the nation's capital should, in his memory, bear his name.

In the years to come, this will be the touch-down and take-off airfield for thousands of diplomats and dignitaries visiting Washington. I hope that they will demonstrate a measure of the genius, patience, understanding and perseverance that marked the life of John Foster Dulles. By merely setting foot on an airfield bearing his name, I am sure they will gain new strength and new determination to seek new ways to solve the problems of the world. For progress toward a universal peace with justice was ever the basic motivation in the life of John Foster Dulles.

• **National Cultural Center, November 29, 1962**

Mrs. Eisenhower and I are privileged to spend this particular night in charming Augusta with such a company, and with you to witness the great exhibition of American art, performing art, that we have seen on television. To each of those artists we give our sincere thanks and expression of our great appreciation.

Mamie and I lived in Washington a long time - long before 1953. In those days it was quite rarely that any head of state or head of government came to Washington. But in the later years Washington became the political crossroads of the world. It was visited by kings and queens and presidents and prime ministers; in the future it will be so visited even more frequently. And in their train have come many others and they have learned much about America that they did not know before.

Many years ago when my wife and I were in Europe it was not too rare at all to hear our country spoken of as one of the colonies. When a European spoke of coming to America he would say, in sort of a condescending tone, "We are going out there next year to see you people." But as these visitors have seen Washington, and then have been privileged to go to see our broad lands, our great cities, our humming factories and learn more about this great country, they began to appreciate also that there was here a culture that had been growing and developing over the decades, a culture that in all its forms deserved the respect of the world.

Finally, in the later years when I was serving as the chief executive, the idea was born that in Washington there should be a center of culture; an American center of culture to which all the artists of the United States could repair and perform. It would be sort of an artistic mecca indeed, that would be open to visitors from every land. In all of the arts, then, these people would come to see, in sort of a nutshell, what America was capable of showing, not only in her factories, in her productivity, in her great strength, in her wealth, in her prosperity, her great roads and highways, but what she could show in the arts and in those things that appeal to all that is spiritual, esthetic, in the senses of man.

So I think this dinner tonight, which starts off the program for the material development of this great center, is something in which each of us can take some pride in supporting. I do hope that each of us who has heard and seen this performance this evening will take inspiration from it and try to be a part, himself and herself, in making this center a true mecca for artists - one that will give everybody who visits Washington, whether from our own country or from the far corners of the world, a true appreciation, a better appreciation of America.

• **Lotos Club, New York City, December 6, 1962**

Years ago, in the Abilene High School, I learned that a speaker should announce his topic at the outset of a talk. This I am glad to do. My topic is: Random Remarks on a Major American Industry - "Speech Making."

In Abilene, I also learned the stereotyped opening sentence - "Unaccustomed as I am to public speaking..." I wish I could truthfully say that to you this evening! In any event I can say, "I have not made a speech in more than a week...!" and over the past seventeen years or so, I must sadly report that there have been relatively few periods when I could make it.

For a long time I have felt, so far as my oratorical record was concerned, very much as a fellow-officer on the Mexican border felt about drinking, back in 1915. This man, occupying the exalted rank of captain, was an assiduous worker during duty hours, but come evening he was a frequent customer at the local bars. And, on occasion, he was said to get back to his tent not entirely able to tell the difference between a Springfield rifle and a Sibley stove.

In any case, one morning as I walked down the company street, I passed the captain, who was sitting in a camp chair in front of his tent, holding his head in his hands. He looked downright dejected and as I gave him a very correct 2nd lieutenant's salute, I stopped to talk. After the customary greetings, not too cheery on his part, he growled: "Mr. Ike, I'm nothing but a mountain goat."

Well, that was an unusual lead-off in an early morning conversation, so I ventured to inquire just what he meant. He replied with some bitterness. "All I do is leap from jag to jag." For my part, in late years, I have many times felt that all I did was leap from rostrum to rostrum!

In my own defense I must observe that during much of the time, of course, public speaking was actually a part of my job. As Chief of Staff of the army, it was expected of me that all across the country I should present to Americans the Army's needs in national security. As President of Columbia University, I learned that an important personal duty was to speak at the drop of a hat - and, particularly, at the passing of a hat. The President of the United States, naturally, must be ready at an instant's notice to address himself fluently on any topic from the largest pumpkin ever grown - just that moment presented to him - to the State of the Union and of the world. And some day, to those may be added reports on the state of the Moon and Mars!

Eventually, (with my retirement to Gettysburg), all my careers came to an end - military and academic and political. And I thought an end to them would mean an unlamented end to my career as a public speaker.

Something has gone wrong. There seems to be a prevalent notion that anyone who has completed a political assignment is always foot-loose and fancy-free - with no ambition other than to find a platform from which to make a speech. Many others seem to be convinced that such a person is always available and always anxious to be heard - too often at length. Among these are, in particular, program directors and chairmen of dinner committees. And they labor, also, under the obsession that any dinner, no matter how delectable, must have a speaker. So they turn to these past (and some who should be past) politicians to help empty the dining room for the morning's breakfast.

If my mail is any indication as to what the great numbers of ex-politicians are experiencing in this country, a stop in the drafting and editing and typing of invitations to speak would mean a sharp rise in unemployment. Certainly there are many, many thousands of Americans engaged in getting speakers from their hideouts to the podiums and lecterns of the nation. Here, indeed, is a major American industry. Its impact on the economy, as well as on the ears of Americans, is not fully realized. If I still had a Council of Economic Advisors on which I might call, I would suggest to its members a study in depth on the contribution this industry makes to the Gross National product. Of course, I would not make that suggestion to current Washington. The principal result would likely be another half billion in the budget.

Now to keep the industry booming, the program directors have several approaches. In my case one is: "General, we don't want you to say a word; in fact, we won't let you speak. All you have to do is stand up and wave." Freely translated, that means they want a minimum of twenty minutes in which the history of the

modern world is quickly reviewed; the minds of the men in the Kremlin are clearly read; two or three government programs are analyzed; and clear-cut predictions are made about the political, social, economic and scientific future.

Another sort of invitation goes like this: "General, all we want is a brief, extemporaneous talk on what you consider the most critical and fearsome crisis in the world today; completely off the cuff; completely off the record." In that case, starting at least three days before delivery, the chairman of the committee is on the telephone constantly and insistently asking that he be given forthwith the exact text of the extemporaneous talk, in order that press and radio and TV coverage may be total and worldwide.

Then there is the invitation that is accompanied by this assurance: "General, you won't have to do any work at all. We will submit a complete draft. All you have to do is change it, here and there, into your own words." For me, agreement to that sort of invitation is a sure way to lose friends. A draft of a speech, for some reason or another, arouses in me the urge to change, to delete, even to demolish and destroy. Often the original text cannot be read because of my scrawling through it, around it, across it...and I cannot read my own writing.

When the latest revision is typed up - and by then I have no idea of now much of the original draft has survived - I worry about what the original author is liable to think of my treatment of his document. There was one man, for example, who gave me a draft and - after I delivered the revised speech - came up to me and said very quietly: "General, I want to thank you for keeping the keynote of my draft."

"What was that?" I asked him.

"The opening phrase," he said - "the part that read - 'My fellow Americans.'"

I still doubt that he was really appreciative of the consideration I had shown his work.

For my part I strive merely, in making any talk, to keep out of deep trouble. I keep remembering the judgment rendered on one of my political friends who was a prolific talker. It was: "Every time he opens his mouth he puts his foot in it; and the only worse thing he does is to take it out." Of another it was often said: "He is always answering questions that no one ever asked him." In any case, Howard Cullman gave me a very pertinent hint for my effort tonight when I asked him what I should talk about! He replied, "About eight minutes."

Do you know that my watch tells me I have already spoken more than eight minutes? And now I should like to be going on a few days vacation from talking. But - I'm making a speech in New York tomorrow! You really should not miss it.

• **National Association of Manufacturers, New York City, December 7, 1962**

The continuous struggle with international communism pervades all that you and I do. Its conduct affects each of us very personally - in the taxes we pay; in the personal or corporate plans we make; in the anxiety or confidence we may feel. Its conduct affects us as responsible citizens for our republic is the central target of communist abuse and plot, thus compelling us to maintain a global net of warning systems, bases, defensive alliances, mutual aid programs.

Our military strength, after a ten-year period of modernization in weapons and formations, can successfully meet any armed test that may confront us. The deterrent weight of our posture, its effectiveness in restraining aggression against us and our friends, has been demonstrated repeatedly in recent years.

This does not mean that we, as citizens, can afford to leave national security to the politicians. When fifty billion dollars, in the name of security, is found in our national budget, it behooves us all to demand explanations of how and why such sums are spent. Too much can, in some cases, be as bad as too little.

There is the danger, also, that we may encourage a false belief that military expenditures accelerate a healthy corporate, regional, even national prosperity. This fact is now seemingly accepted by many, despite the recognized truth that military growth and spending, beyond the proper demands of security, is sterile in promoting sound, economic progress and is ultimately destructive of creative, productive enterprise.

The military-industrial complex - an unavoidable phenomenon of our situation today - must never be allowed to exercise a domination over American life. Surely we must be concerned that American industries, in particular, do not become so acutely dependent for their very existence upon defense contracts that they fail to

protest expenditures that in their judgment, exceed the needs of the nation.

Our intellectual strength, manifested principally in the widest and deepest possible education of our young people, in a nation-wide network of educational institutions and research laboratories and in an increasing command over our environment, is as essential to the nation's strength and vitality, and therefore to security, as is military power. Our intellectual vigor is questioned only by those whose livelihood is to bewail and denounce. In the sciences and technologies, our interest is panoramic; and we seek comprehensive advance along their entire front. Consequently, at times and in narrow and limited fields, we may lag behind those who by state decree can mass national resources to the achievement of a single and spectacular goal. But our over-all strength is evident to all, including those of alien philosophies.

Here our concern should be that we may come to confuse the numerical and quantitative with the effective and qualitative; buildings with teaching; and budgets with scholarship. We must not seek to establish universal programs and curricula at the cost of destroying the inspiration and creativity of the individual instructor and the worthy ambition of the able student.

Our spiritual and moral strength - physically manifested in our churches, synagogues and temples, rooted deep in millions of prayerful and God-fearing homes - is immeasurable, unknowable, certainly beyond calculation by machine or slide rule. But the evidence of this strength is written large in our history. And today we can be confident that it, comprising love of country, dedication to the indestructible rights of individuals and confidence in ourselves, will always be ours when problems of grave importance confront us.

The final element needed in the construction of the platform on which American security, prosperity and leadership are sustained, is economic strength. It has some important strains put upon it not of its own making. Politically and militarily, we are bound together with numbers of other nations in specific pacts, so that through unified policy and actions in critical areas we may collectively generate maximum power for our common security. Where these pacts involve less developed nations, we help to strengthen their defensive capabilities through military assistance and support. With other nations outside the Iron Curtain we seek friendly relations. In many cases we give to them substantial aid in order that they may better use their own resources in raising standards of living and in increasing the dedication of their peoples to freedom and so diminish their vulnerability to communist penetration.

Thus, directly and indirectly, we help to confront communist imperialism with a great array of independent nations, that, both in spirit and in growing economic capacity, are capable of taking an appropriate part in the winning of the cold war. By reason of America's size, wealth and unfaltering devotion to freedom and to the dignity and rights of man, we are the recognized leader in this incessant global struggle. For the same reasons, there have fallen to us responsibilities and burdens that, added to those of a domestic character, put unusual strains on our capacity to bear.

The health and strength of this nation - its moral, economic and military vitality - are naturally important to us as citizens; they are equally important to every nation in the world that looks to us for aid and leadership. We provide the principal base from which go out the material things so badly needed by less fortunate peoples, who value independence and freedom. Nothing today, is more important to the entire free world, including ourselves, than that America - its economy, including its currency and its financial policy - shall always remain sound, indestructible, and true to its own ideals and concepts of freedom.

And America will be as sound, as indestructible, and as dedicated as are the understanding, courage, determination and wisdom of her people. For it cannot be too often repeated that in any nation enjoying self-government all power is generated by and resides in the people. Their elected representatives, merely for the period of their terms of office, direct that power - they do not create it. But the political power we place in the hands of those representatives - to be used in our service, not in our domination - must always be regarded as a trust. To misuse it - or to distort its purpose is a grievous crime against those to whom it belongs - the people.

Since, manifestly, we want to be prosperous, friendly with all other free nations, and power resides in us, we ask ourselves what we, as a people, should be doing to build up and sustain the national strength needed to achieve real progress toward these ends.

Before examining certain developments in the domestic economic scene, I think we should first remind ourselves that our economy does not operate completely independent of those other nations, especially those of

our friends and allies. Even now we have representatives negotiating with those of the European Common Market to devise means and methods by which the two economies can operate better and to mutual advantage.

More than this, since all their work will be conducted against the back drop of communist hostility, a fundamental purpose of the governments involved must be to strengthen the aggregate capacity of the free world to defeat communist economic aggression. We - and our negotiators - must not view Western Europe, Japan or any other nation as our economic enemy over whom we seek an immediate and selfish advantage. The overall aim must be to so coordinate all free world economic activity that the whole will prosper because of the cooperation of its parts. This work will necessarily go on for many years; the important thing is that it be started now, intelligently and vigorously. So, I am delighted that the head of our own delegation is Christian Herter, an American of wisdom, courage and dedication.

In this context let us turn our attention inward - to ourselves and to the things we see developing among us that seem meaningful to our future strength, influence and security. As we glance backward we cannot fail to be struck by the obvious fact that America has reached her present high position among the family of nations in a climate of freedom and human liberty. We believe that our great progress on all fronts has resulted from the self-reliance, the self-dependence, the initiative and energy of a free people. They have been entitled to and have received fair reward for useful work; they have been free to use their savings for any legal purpose in satisfying their own desires. These incentives, with the spur of free competition and the economic decisions made by the impersonal judgment of a free market - along with the personal characteristics of Americans - have been far more responsible for our climb to eminence than has the wealth of our national resources.

This system and these qualities of Americans are something to cherish, to strengthen, and to sustain; government - at all levels - has no greater responsibility and opportunity than this. Hence I think we should view with some anxiety what is actually happening.

The plain truth is that citizens, communities and states, and even organizations and industries, are looking too much to Washington for the solution to their problems, especially those of an economic character. Some of this cannot be helped; but because so much is inescapable - the need to oppose its unnecessary growth is vital to our mode of life.

We should take careful note of false prophets who urge us to change the goals of a free enterprise for those that place emphasis on creature comfort, on escape from risk, on relief from toil and from individual responsibility. Such doctrines could, in time, corrupt the self-reliance, the pride in work, the imaginative stewardship that have been the hall-mark of the American character. We see evidence that some erosion is developing. Though citizens are partially responsible for this - indeed in the indirect sense largely responsible - yet power-hungry politicians in Washington have for some years done more than encourage these trends - they have enacted laws that make almost inevitable a growing dependence upon governmental largess, administered, of course, by a centrally directed army of bureaucrats.

Possession of power too often creates a thirst for more; greater control over all the affairs of the nation can become a deliberately adopted objective. I believe that this constantly increasing acceptance of - and submission to - the influence of the Federal Government over so many phases of our lives and activities is the most serious threat to our American system.

Permit me to read to you a statement by an eminent American (it bears directly on this subject): "As a matter of fact and law, the governing rights of the states are all of those which have not been surrendered to the national Government by the Constitution or its Amendments.

"Wisely or unwisely, people know that under the Eighteenth Amendment Congress has been given the right to legislate on this particular subject, but this is not the case in the matter of a great number of other vital problems of government, such as the conduct of public utilities, of banks, of insurance, of agriculture, of education, of social welfare and of a dozen other important features. In these, Washington must not be encouraged to interfere.

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by 'master minds,' in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last ten years. Were it possible to find 'master minds' so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interest or private prejudices, men almost God-like in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an

even hand, such a government might be to the interest of the country, but there are none such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history.”

How quaint this 1930 statement now sounds. Possibly you may be surprised to learn that it was uttered by Franklin Roosevelt, some three years before he became President. A deep conviction - studiously expressed, was apparently reversed by reason of the change in station by the author. But the policies and practices of government in the Thirties have been once more embraced and carried even further in centralizing power in Washington, and now one branch of government, the Executive, seems intent on drawing to itself the constitutional duties of the Congress; evidenced by implementing recommendations in specific cases.

One inevitable result of such policies and practices is a vast growth in Federal costs and deficit spending. Indeed it has become almost naive to cry out against debts and deficits; these are details that some self-ordained sophisticates either ignore or embrace - scorning any thought that at the end of the “hand-out rainbow” is ruin. A continuation of such practice could result in irreparable damage to the international monetary system.

Now who is going into the breach to stem this onslaught on our institutions, our duties and rights as citizens, our solvency as a nation, our constitution. Of course the simple answer is, “The People.” Are they not all-powerful, politically, in America? Yet how can we generate a unified public, determination to turn away from this downward path and travel again the road that once led so surely to progress and prosperity?

What about the farmers? Can you expect them to cut themselves off from the governmental dollars they receive when political policies of the past have denied them the opportunity to compete freely for markets? What about the great universities? How many of them could survive on a healthy, productive basis if they had their federal subsidies and contracts suddenly choked off? How about the hospitals and slum rehabilitations, college dormitories, all depending on federal grants? Indeed how about you men here? How many of you that have prime and sub-contracts with the government could go to Washington and confidently say that you can get by nicely without continuation of federal spending?

This kind of situation must give us pause! The opportunities, the happiness, the continuing welfare of all our millions, depend upon our faithful adherence to the tenets of freedom and the support of our American, constitutional, system. No cloying effect of subsidy must ever be allowed to dull our awareness of this historical lesson. Only if great numbers of us are ready to sacrifice something now to insure a healthier, stronger, free economy - with all its certain benefits to us, and to the future, and to the free world - can correction come about.

I can think of no better mission for the members of the National Association of Manufacturers than to teach and practice these truths throughout the land. Presumably you are thinking more of your children and grandchildren than you are of yourselves. As business leaders how can you face your wife and children each night - how can you face your employees each morning, how can you annually face your stockholders unless you are working to protect the interests of all - including those of coming generations. The future must not be barren of the intangible values that enoble the economic efforts of all America.

To protect those vital interests and values, you must concern yourselves with the rights, duties and responsibilities of citizens in a self-governing society. You can do this only if you participate actively in politics. This presents a problem to most - it takes courage to defy governmental individuals. Such individuals have many ways of making life temporarily uncomfortable for the citizen who believes in constitutional processes. But were Washington and his soldiers comfortable at Valley Forge?

The problem is intensified in difficulty by reason of the unknown duration of the communist threat to free world security - a threat that, placing heavy burdens on the nation, makes it easy to surrender our own duties to government. Our country is so rich that upon occasions and for periods of some duration, we can afford federal spending sprees and profligate practices. But we have to face and fight communism for as long as it maintains its belligerent attitude - which will be as long as communism endures. We must gird ourselves for the long pull; we must carry great burdens, for decades, without faltering in our purpose, or weakening our productive capacity and financial power.

All this means that we must have sturdy, sane decisions, steady policies that will clearly differentiate between the essential and the merely desirable; policies that remain valid and stable whether facing crisis, real or fancied, or the blandishment of a hostile power. Wisdom, judgment and decision are always needed among

us - and in Washington. Let us pray that they will be with us in all the years ahead.

• **UCLA Charter Day, April 4, 1963** [from Vertical File, DDE Speeches, 1961-69]

I am delighted to have the privilege of participating in this Charter Day Ceremony at UCLA, and am highly complimented by the award, from the distinguished statewide University of California, of its honorary doctorate.

Standing on this still relatively young campus I look out upon its vast complex of buildings, completed or under construction, and sense in a very concrete way, the dedication of the people of California to maximum educational opportunity for the youth of this State. Because of this dedication California is today one of the most productive agricultural, scientific, and industrial forces in the United States and in the world. Moreover, with this conviction of the importance of education it is only natural that California should look to the future with confidence in its continued economic and cultural growth.

With good reason, growth is, these days, much on the minds of Californians. This has become the most populous state in the nation, a development that is probably greeted with mixed emotions, for as a myriad of problems is inevitably created by rapid population increase, so also can be identified a whole range of opportunities what will result from the intelligent solution of these problems. The increasing need for trained and educated minds becomes both obvious and urgent. For it is through knowledge and disciplined and clear thinking that complex problems are solved and great opportunities developed.

During eight years in the White House, I had the responsibility of guiding this nation through a segment of the complex and revolutionary postwar world. That experience taught me - if nothing else - that the great issues of our times, both here as well as elsewhere in the world, are not amenable to quick and impulsive attack. With special emphasis this applies to our international relationships. Such problems are best solved by the application of reason, patience, study and understanding, and moral courage. America, openly menaced by a hostile ideology must give earnest attention to her need for security from potential attack - a security that depends upon the adequacy of our moral, intellectual, economic, and military strength. But this attention must conform to fact, logic, and human judgment - it must not be responsive either to hysterical fear or to unjustifiable complacency.

I believe that if we are to avoid fighting our way to oblivion, or in the name of security, overspending for armaments to the point of bankruptcy, we must, with others, think and reason a way to a practical and honorable modus vivendi. The conduct of negotiations to this eventual result is, of course, the responsibility of governments. But governments - at least free governments - cannot negotiate effectively unless they can be assured of the support of their populations. People - all peoples - must become more enlightened, more understanding of themselves and of each other or they will risk a catastrophe beside which all of the past will be less than child's play. Education, therefore, is mandatory; in a very real sense America's first line of defense runs through her university campuses. Likewise, they are the shock troops in the battle for peaceful solutions of the world's troubles.

Here is one compelling reason why the quality and character of our educational institutions have become more important than ever before. It is in these institutions that motivated and gifted minds must be honed to the degree of sharpness and competence that will fit them, as they are later tempered and tested by experience, for the posts of leadership they will be called upon to fill. They will be the ones to help this world find a path to progress and to lead it away from the routes that could bring humanity to stagnation and civilization to disaster.

At home, the difficulties created by the increasing urbanization of our society become ever more pressing. Important ones are air and water pollution - public transportation - human delinquency - and architectural sprawl and squalor. All are ultimately responsive to the application of reason and intelligence. Surely we must work to prevent our cities from becoming brutalizing forces, and it is to our colleges and universities that we must look for the trained minds and the knowledge to help us get on with the task.

Our economic future and our productive capacity are intimately geared to the vitality of college and

university classrooms and laboratories. They generate much of the knowledge that leads to new products, new industries and new jobs for an expanding population. They become daily more useful to business management; indeed, they provide a principal source of leadership in our nation's productive life.

The state of California and its colleges and universities have effectively responded to these responsibilities. The accumulation here of Nobel Prize winners and members of the National Academy of Sciences attests to the contributions that California and its universities make to the nation's intellectual, economic, and military future.

But well we know that man also recognizes values other than the material and utilitarian. The vigor of his intellectual achievement and vitality of his biological being must be leavened by the richness of his emotional component. The creation of beauty, whether by the poet, the sculptor, the painter, the musician or the playwright, and the capacity to respond to this beauty, are essential elements of a complete society. It is evidence of national maturity that an even larger number of our people are demonstrating a growing preoccupation with the arts and all that they have to give us.

But one word of warning seems appropriate: because it is a law of life that nothing stands still, a growing maturity must not be confused with, or allowed to degenerate into, decadence.

The ideals, aspiration, and institutions of our nation, the sturdiness and initiative of the people that have brought us to a position of world leadership - all these must be respected, sustained and daily revitalized. This suggests the need for constant self-examination by the teacher, the student, the university, and by every citizen. Aside from the concepts of personal liberty, even-handed justice and human dignity and rights, America was established as a self-governing people. No matter what else may preoccupy any individual or any institution, a fundamental concern must be to make this form of government truly and continuously effective.

The American system, we must remember, is still an experiment; it is even today being tested. Each of us must comprehend his proper relationship to government, his duty to it, and his authority over it. Unless he does so he has forfeited his right to and his opportunity for self-government; he allows others to govern him.

Educators rightly place high value on, and fiercely defend, academic freedom. But this freedom is only one of a group that includes also political, economic, religious and personal freedoms. They are mutually interdependent - if any fails, the others will eventually be destroyed. They are the most precious possessions of a free citizen.

Colleges are necessarily concerned with producing excellence in many fields; to do so they indulge in specialization. This work is mandatory to progress, but in my view there is one mission even more important.

Speaking of Universities, Dr. Deane Malott, President of Cornell, recently remarked: "There is too little time for comparative government, for world history, for Western civilization, for adequate facility in foreign language, for human relations, and for all of the cultural exposures, which provide assurance and poise, judgment, and the selection of the best in life." In that expression "The best in life" Dr. Malott must have had in mind, among other things, the priceless values of human dignity and freedom.

We might well ponder a quotation from the late Judge Brandeis: "Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

And listen to some of Lincoln's admonitions as paraphrased by Dr. Boetcker. They are applicable today - and specific in describing the understanding we need: "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

If we love freedom - if we want to live as free men and women - we must never forget that its price, every day, is always the same, eternal vigilance! To teach the essentials of this vigilance, everywhere and all the time, is true Americanism; if neglected all else will be lost.

I have no doubt that, as California continues to grow and her influence increases, her educational

institutions will concern themselves not merely with the excellence of the students preparation for professional life, but will inculcate in him an understanding of the duties, rights and responsibilities of the citizen as such. So long as her public and private educational systems devote themselves to the development of great scholars and good citizens - this largest of our states is certain always to be a bulwark of human freedom, a model of successful democracy in the world, a leader in the ceaseless search for an enduring peace, with justice.

• **Cornell University, May 17, 1963**

For a number of reasons I am delighted to be here today. From the days of my own student career in New York State, in a slightly different kind of school, I made the acquaintance of a fellow football player who was from Cornell. He and I had all sorts of plans to meet each other from time to time. The times never materialized, but from that time on I never lost my desire to see this great institution.

The second reason is that I was invited to come and visit with you as a personal guest by my fellow townsman in Abilene, Kansas, President Malott.

And the third reason is this: Because of my undying interest for the young people of the United States, and indeed of the world. I spent my life in a career that perforce put me with young people - young enlisted people, young officers and draftees - trying to work out with them doctrines, policies, plans and programs that would forward and further the objectives of the United States of America, in war or in peace. Now, as I address myself to you young people, I must confess that my first feeling is one of envy. The rate at which you learn today, the specialization that is brought to you, the character of the education that is laid before you, the kind of selective process through which you have gone in order to get here, all make me wish that I could shuck off 50 or 55 years and be fortunate enough to be one of this party.

I wonder if you ever stop to think of just where you are today in this world. By this I mean, just where you are today, and I'm talking now more in a philosophical sense than geographical, of course. Are you just on the crest or the upsurge of a great tidal wave of advancement of all kinds in the material, natural and social sciences? Are we going on in this way and are we going to continue at the rate we are now experiencing? Or are we going to reach a plateau on which the world may live for some few years before another great revolution in thinking and upsurge of learning and discovery carries us on to new heights? Did you ever stop to think that from the time of the early Pharaohs until the time of Napoleon the most rapid means of land transportation was the horse and at sea the sailing ship? Now in the span of a century and a half we have gone from, you might say, the Pharaohs into the jet age. And the jet age is only a few years old; indeed, the air age only 60 years of age, makes it possible for us to reach Europe in two hours. Very soon, largely at about the rate of twice the speed of sound, we'll be leaving one day for a conference in London and come back here for lunch. This is the kind of thing that has been happening and I don't have to belabor the subject. To the one subject of transportation you can add communications and electronics and the atomic and nuclear discoveries of our science.

Now the question that bothers me a little - no, I don't mean bothers me - I mean, intrigues me a bit, is this: Are we just beginning an era that will be a great big upheaval carrying us on for another century or two, or are we starting something that is going to be the common experience of human kind for many generations? I don't know and I don't think anybody else knows. But just think of this: the slowness by which things happened before the time of the Industrial Revolution began. I think that gunpowder was first used in the European battle of Crecy in 1346. Now this is disputed by some scholars but it is generally accepted. But as late as 1870 there were German lancers in the Franco-Prussian War. The time that it took these things to develop now is telescoped to the point where the airplane has gone from a few feet off the sand at Kitty Hawk to flying 40-50,000 feet and even higher to give us a trip to London in two hours. As these things happen they tend to take us away from our anchors. Our anchors sort of drag because - now I mean anchors of self-understanding - and I think that in order to get a stabilizer, a sort of governor for accidents, it is well to go back and study some of our own history. And rather than our military or economical history, I mean our moral or spiritual history.

Our forefathers asserted that they were going to tell the world that a decent respect for the opinions of mankind impelled them to separate themselves from England. They cited some things and among the rights that

they said their Creator, the Creator you remember with a capital C, had endowed man with were life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. All of this is very meaningful, it means that we are living under a system that encourages each of you to become extremely expert in your own selected line of endeavor. And liberty means human dignity, it means human freedom. Freedom to speak, talk, think as you please, to earn as you please, to work at what you please and to keep, after taxes, the earnings that you have achieved for the use of your family and your community. I would like to impress upon you, if I could, that these advances in the experimental, and material and other sciences, wonderful as they are, must never overwhelm or overcome your strength of dedication and devotion to the principles upon which this nation was founded. To do that you must be concerned with your capacity and your capabilities as a citizen as well as you are with your experiences in medicine, engineering, architecture, law, whatever. If you don't, you are neglecting, to a degree at least, the right you were given by this great constitution of self-government. If you don't help to govern yourself intelligently with the aid of all the learning and understanding you have developed through your school, and through experience, then you are not governing yourself; you are letting someone else govern you. And if we would allow this process to go too far it would indeed be unfortunate.

I don't expect it to go too far because I believe that people like yourselves, in great institutions throughout this nation, are a little smarter, not only in the disciplines of learning but you are a little bit more aware than we were in my generation, of our responsibilities to ourselves, our families and our nation. This we must never forget, that we have been for 175 years the world's greatest example of freedom, self-government and human liberty and human dignity. We have our defects; we recognize them and we certainly hope to strive to eradicate those that stand up like sore thumbs among us. But things went very slowly in the early scientific world; men such as Euclid, Archimedes, Marconi and Galilei, are almost benchmarks of particular and special discoveries, but the whole was indeed a slow thing. Now in the same way, Rome lasted first under the kings and under the republic and under emperors for a long, long time. Time rushes on. Can we expect ourselves to last as long as Rome? If we are going to believe that we are not hurrying forward to oblivion as a free, self-governing, proud people we must keep just as much dedication in our hearts for the eternal values as respect we now give to the changing values in all of these scientific and other advances.

Personally, I believe you'll do it. I am not a pessimist, but I do say this: We will not do it unless each of you thinks of this as more important than just his particular specialty. Each of us must be a good citizen. And if each of us is a good citizen you will live through an era of American history that will far overshadow any advances we've yet made internally or as a leader in the age-old pursuit of a just and eternal peace. I cannot tell you how much my prayers are with you and I cannot tell you how high my confidence is that you will do it. But I do believe you must continue to remind yourselves always of this great obligation that you owe to yourselves, your children and all the generations that will come after you, if America is going to be for the whole world the shining example of decency, justice, fairness and liberty. Thank you very much.

• **Pilgrims Dinner, New York City, May 22, 1963** [complete copy in 1962-63 Signature File, box 23]

After the introduction we have heard I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Ambassador, that I should have come with a written speech. As my mind, my whole heart is so involved in the recognition of the need for and a devotion to the concept of strong, friendly, intelligent and understanding relationships between our two nations, that for me to talk without this text risks the fact that there will probably be no beginning, no end - I shall wander like a meandering stream to a flat plain and the only hope you will have of going to bed early is for the President here to exercise his executive power and do something about the matter. Because, you see, there is probably - and in my mind certainly - no American who is so fully obligated, so deeply in debt to a single concept as I am to the reality of British-American friendship.

I went to Europe in early '42 as the commander of the American forces that were there beginning to assemble. As of yet we had no plan except the plan for going across the Channel, which was not executed until two years later, but shortly thereafter our two governments agreed upon the plan that was called Torch, the invasion of North Africa, and to my utter amazement I, the newcomer, the recruit in this was - the recruit among

the commanders, that is - was made the over-all chief.

There came to my mind yesterday, when I got that assignment, the observation that used to be made by an instructor of mine in the Staff School, and he used to say, "Now, there is one prayer which should never be neglected by any man who might one day be a field commander in a great theater and that prayer is this: "O Lord, if I must have this responsibility, please let me fight against allies."

The history of military coalitions has not been a happy one and, as I quoted to a similar meeting in London last summer, there was a conversation between two young officers who had been studying the campaigns of the past and one of them was struck by the brilliance of Napoleon and by the great victories he won. The other fellow said, "Yes. I felt that way a long time, but then I suddenly was struck one day with this fact - he never fought except against allies."

There were many difficulties, differences in staff methods, differences in conceptions of command, structures of organization, and so on, that had to be overcome if we were going to operate together, but our two great war leaders, the political leaders of our two respective countries, understood one thing: these two nations were held together not by treaty, not by any kind of agreement or even by a common danger that they faced in Hitler's hordes, they were bound together by a common appreciation of the greatest values that free men possess. These are liberty, human dignity, human rights, a government dedicated to its own people as their servant and not as their master. Holding such convictions as these, it was not too difficult to bring about the unity that we needed.

The British had for many years been dedicated and committed to a system of triple command - the ground commander, the air commander and the naval commander in any theater. We believed thoroughly in the system of single command. Whether the man be ground, air or sea was a matter of indifference. The British accepted this, but they knew so many things that we didn't know.

They knew about intelligence, which we had neglected sadly before we got into World War II. We had to adopt their methods - in fact, we had to adopt the products of their greater and better intelligence system.

Gradually we came closer together - and this thing happened not only in the official work day by day that engaged us, but in little personal, sometimes inconsequential matters.

I went over to Europe as a very busy soldier with many things to do - troops arriving and systems and warehouses and everything to be set up - all of the intricacies of infrastructure, if you know what that word means, to be mastered, and so I was rather impatient one evening when I was invited to dinner. This was a military dinner but it was quite high-ranking. Our Ambassador, John Winant, was there. So I sat down without much ado and I started smoking and the next morning I was visited by my Ambassador. Now, he was a very diffident man, but he did want to get over - and he did get over to me, very delicately, that you never smoked before the toast to the King - it was then - should be drunk.

"Well," I said, "this is very bad, Mr. Ambassador, for me, but it does let me out of one thing and that is out of dinners." This was shocking to him, but I had come over there imbued with the idea that I was there to fight and I didn't have much time to frivol away anyway and so I was rather abrupt and rather blunt and I said, "No dinners."

Not long after that my friend, Dickie Mountbatten, who later commanded in another theater, in Southeast Asia, he insisted I come to dinner. I said, "No," but he said, "Now, you come on. This will be a nice dinner and you won't be bothered." So I went, finally, with some misgiving. I sat down and found the soup course was already there and we promptly drank that and he jumped up and he said, "Gentlemen, the President of the United States." We drank that. "Gentlemen, the King."

"Now, Ike, smoke."

I may report that possibly because of that custom - which I think is an admirable one - I finally stopped smoking. This was fourteen years ago and I might remark on the side that my doctors say that if I never smoke again I will still have a good average.

Now, my friends, these were serious times. There could be nothing of a rift allowed to come up and the leaders of the British Empire of that time recognized this, realized this and practiced it.

I was still a long way from my political leaders and I was daily - sometimes two or three times daily - exposed to the opinions and convictions of the British and this brought about, for a little time, some fear on the

part of the American chiefs of staff that I would fall too much a prey to the influence of the British. On the other side, the British were constantly warning me that I was dealing with a lot of American troops and they thought I might be stubborn on that side. Well, I told them that I thought both sides were fearful about me and maybe I was doing all right. At least, I believe that because of the forbearance, the understanding and the loyalty to these basic principles of which I speak on the part of the British in the European theater and of our own nation back here on this side, there was welded the finest kind of allied team that could be produced. It was efficient, it was huge, it embraced all of the Services and so far as I can recall, certainly in the last year and a half of operations, any differences that were encountered were simply those of judgment, never of heart or never the result of personal prejudice or selfishness on the part of anybody. I owed all this, I owed the success of that Headquarters and of that command to the British acceptance of the things that we thought important and our acceptance of the things that they thought to be important. It was a force that was overjoyed at the success of its friends on either side.

And as the war went on, finally we had the French. They came back after we had entered France and finally there were ten or eleven of their divisions, armed by the Allies, that fought by our side, and this raises a question in my mind.

If there should be a jealousy, Mr. Ambassador, that we see in the world about the closeness of the British/American relationship, it occurs to me to say to them, "We are free people and you are free to join." If they want to join in this kind of close union, I am all for it because if that epidemic of joining will go further and embrace the whole world, finally we will have this peace, if we all should adopt this peace.

Now, finally it became my lot to be the political head of this nation and as such you can imagine the numberless times that I had to work with my old British confreres, associates, and warm personal friends. I have known four Prime Ministers of Britain and with one of them my association was not very close - Lord Atlee - now Lord Atlee - but with the other three both my war and peace associations have been very close and though there have been differences among us, differences of judgment, I have never seen any slightest sign of resentment or of personal irritation because one side or the other could not yield what they thought was a basic principle and whether it was in the crisis of Suez or when we were trying so desperately to find some way of helping the French in Indo-China - wherever the struggle - in Iran, or any other place - occurred, even if we didn't sometimes agree as to methods, always there was the closest possible association - telephone calls, radiograms, letters, messengers, meetings - and nothing was of a greater satisfaction to me throughout those years because, as the Ambassador so eloquently stated, the greatest objective of American and British friendship, indeed of societies - the Pilgrims' Society and the English-Speaking Union - is to further this kind of understanding, this kind of readiness to work together, well realizing that opinions and convictions on any subject can never be identical, but working together in leadership to bring the whole world to recognize today that only in peace, only in negotiated peace that will forever assure us of our possession of these priceless qualities of human dignity, freedom and rights, can we fulfill our mission or such societies as this fulfill theirs.

I can't tell you how proud I am to have this gold medal of the Society and I learned only this evening from our speaker that there was only one other man that ever received it. I am even prouder, because my long association with Sir Winston was one of the things that I remember best of all the things that happened to me in a very - sometimes I think very long and varied career. He is one of the world's great men, one of the world's noble men, and, like you all, I wish for him many, many long more years of happiness and some kind of fruitful action.

It would be impossible for me to tell you some of the incidents which have fortified me in this conviction I have of the tremendous importance of this friendship, but I told your President that I thought I would tell one story about the Royal Family because the story was told me first by the late King and then by Queen Elizabeth, now the Queen Mother, and then by their daughter and then finally her sister, so that I can be sure, I think, that they will authenticate it if any of you want to ask them.

This is a story - it is a little long but I think it is very interesting. General Clark and I were early in 1942 in Britain and one thing we wanted to do one Sunday afternoon was to see Windsor Castle and a man named Lord Wigram was Constable, or the Keeper of the Palace, and the Royal Family called him "Wiggie," and they had given permission for him to take the two of us around the grounds and through the Chapel and all the rest of

it. Well, they had promised that they would stay in their apartments so that their presence would not stop the progress of this tour, but they forgot and we came up over a hill and something happened that I didn't know at the time but a few weeks later when I called to pay my respects to His Majesty he asked me if I had ever seen Windsor and I said yes and I told him about this visit one afternoon. Well, he went off into quite gales of laughter and told me - he said, "Well, I must tell you - did you ever come over the hill and is General Clark a very tall, dark man?"

I said, "That's the man."

"Well," he said, "we forgot that we had promised to stay out of the way and we knew that when Wiggie saw us there your tour was ended, so the two girls and ourselves were there and," he said, "we didn't know what to do so the first thing we did was jumped under the table." This sounded rather odd. "But then," he said, "we found out that we were just under the horizon from which he could see us, so now we crawled over the wall and there, well concealed, we walked back in column to where we belonged and the visit went all right."

Well, I thought this was a very ridiculous thing and I said, "Your Majesty, if all of America could hear that story and understand it and believe it, I tell you never again could Big Bill Thompson be elected Mayor of Chicago running against the King of England."

The King loved that story and he visited us sometimes in the field, or he would have us in in the afternoon for a good run over the world scene, and so on, and whenever the Americans, or any new officer, were present, he always made the point to say, "I have had the great honor of having been defeated for the Mayoralty of Chicago by Big Bill Thompson. Did you know that?"

Thank you very much.

• **Radio Free Europe Luncheon, May 23, 1963**

First a personal observation. I've known one of our speakers, General Rodney Smith, for some time but every time I hear his name it takes me back a half century. One of my football coaches 51 years ago was Rodney Smith. And he was tough. It's a little bit more than coincidence I think, because his namesake seems to be the same kind of person.

I should like to call your attention to an obvious truth. The security of America, her influence in the world, her leadership, is not to be measured merely, or even mainly, by her strength in bombs, missiles, satellites, guns, tanks, airplanes, or any other kind of hardware or numbers of men under arms. The strength of any nation in these fields is a product of three factors.

First of all her moral strength, her patriotism, her dedication to the form of her government and the nation of which that citizen is a part.

And next is economic strength. The productivity of a nation that can do all of these things that help to boost morale, and particularly in its ability to carry, over the long pull, the great load of armaments that this nation is compelled to carry as long as the Soviet threat is so blatantly dinning in our ears throughout the world.

Now, about moral strength. First of all I think we should remember our own founding documents - how we were assured that by our Creator we were endowed with certain unalienable rights and among these were life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Possessing these rights, men had to be free. And I think the basic concept of our government is individual liberty implemented through a system of self government. Governments may do many things for us. Sometimes they represent us accurately; but not always do they represent mass thinking correctly and accurately. But certainly any nation that is merely doing what its political leaders, or indeed, its business leaders, tell it to do, is not reflecting that kind of moral, mass strength that is needed to keep the United States of America free, strong and a leader for peace and justice throughout the world.

The development of strength for a contest has a relative measure as well as an absolute. In other words, as we raise our own morale, let's, by all means, try to weaken that of the potential enemy. One of the functions of Radio Free Europe is to help weaken the morale of the Soviet and Communist nations to counteract the poison that these people absorb through mismanaged news and through distortions of truth. I have from the very

beginning of Radio Free Europe been associated in different types of relationships with it - first I think when I was Chief of Staff of the Army. I believe in this organization and its work. I believe what it has done, and above all things, I think of this: when we, as private people, help to support it we are taking some part in this great contest, this global contest, between an atheistic Communism and our own form of religiously inspired political government. I believe that when we participate in this movement, we help support and strengthen our own morale; and certainly through the efforts of RFE we accomplish a weakening of Communist morale. Evidence of this truth has been given to you by General Smith just now. So I believe that in every activity in which we, as a nation, are called to participate in the broad scope of global struggles the private citizen has a very definite part to play.

I recognize, as do all of you, that all the foreign relations of the nation are placed by the Constitution in the hands of the President of the United States. But by no means does this prevent or bar any of us to do what we can in supporting the ideals of our nation and the purposes for which it was founded. We are free citizens and whenever we may, by any form of activity, strengthen our relationships with other like-minded peoples, whenever one of us can give to a friend from anywhere in the free world that will strengthen his dedication to these ideals and principles, we are helping our own nation. And when we can help enlighten the people who are compelled to live in regimentation under a Communist dictatorship we are doing still more for our nation and for the form of life here developed and which we so greatly value.

RFE is part of, and a very important part of, the kind of tool that we need. It has been working all these long years, and I for one was delighted to hear from General Smith about the reactions of four dictators in satellite nations. I shall never forget an incident when I was talking with a Soviet confreres in an international conference. I asked him why the Communists were afraid to carry out the promises made in some of the wartime conferences to give free elections to the Eastern nations. He had been explaining all of the attractions of Communism and the Communist form of government, but when I asked him why he was then so afraid of free elections, allowing these people to decide for themselves, he said, "Well, they've lived so long under capitalist imperialism and under the tyrannies of a capitalist form of government, it takes time to educate them so they can vote intelligently and properly" - meaning in favor of Communism.

Now I think that one of the big things RFE is doing is to prevent the capture of all of those minds and that freedom of decision by the Communists. And as long as we can keep alive their hope that one day their aspirations will be realized, we are doing a truly valuable thing.

I congratulate each individual and each company that is helping in this one program and maybe in many more. And there are many more things to do. Of course there are. Things that prove that we are a proud, free, self-governing nation, capable as citizens of making our own decisions and living under the kind of institutions that have meant so much to each of us. All of these things raise our morale as long as we muster and keep the moral courage to make certain that no influence, internal or external, will ever take us away from that kind of thinking and that kind of action.

So, I salute RFE for what it is doing. My hope that it will grow. I'm delighted to hear about these better facilities because, personally, I want to drive Communism from the earth - I would hope, in my lifetime; but at least I'd like to see starts all along the line.

Thank you very much.

• Iron and Steel Institute Dinner, New York City, May 23, 1963

It is with a sense of high personal distinction that I receive the award, established by this institute in memory of the life, services and accomplishments of the late Benjamin Franklin Fairless. Because I share with the members of this distinguished institution a deep admiration, respect and affection for Ben Fairless - sentiments which led the institute to perpetuate his name in this fashion - I am signally complimented by my selection to be the first recipient of the honor.

Manifestly the governing officials of this organization were not moved to create this memorial to Ben Fairless merely because he was a highly successful businessman; or because he rose from unpromising

beginnings to head the business enterprise that for many years has been the world's largest producer of steel; or even because he became the acknowledged leader and spokesman of the steel industry and often of the entire business community in public forums and in the counsels of government. These things he did, and in so doing, he earned the gratitude and acclaim of his associates.

Nevertheless, if these told the full story of his remarkable career, I cannot believe that the Iron and Steel Institute would have felt impelled thus to memorialize his name. Rather, I conclude, it was because in all the positions he filled, in all the responsibilities he carried, in all the authorities he exercised, he proved himself a man of exemplary character, rock-like integrity, indestructible courage and down-to-earth wisdom.

It was his moral stature rather than his material accomplishments that we revere today. Though, considering his meteoric rise to eminence, he could readily have been forgiven instances of arrogance, he was forever humble; though a lesser man could have fallen prey to self-centered ambition, Ben Fairless never failed to think first of others - not merely of his company - of which he was so proud - but always of the nation.

What was right was the question he sought always to answer; what was merely expedient or temporarily gainful he ignored in his search for the surer guide to the public good. Once, visiting me in the White House, he brought up the subject of a task that I had decided - against some considerable political opposition - to keep temporarily on the books. He said, "The decision you have made and published is disappointing to many; for example, it will cost my own company many millions of dollars. My purpose in coming here is to tell you that I believe you have done right, and I will support your decision to the limit of my ability."

This was one of my earliest meetings with him, and, heartwarming as his words were to me and as appreciative as I was of his thoughtfulness in coming with such a message, my instant and dominant reaction was that in him I had met an unusual and admirable individual. Though the occasion seemed to call mainly for an expression of my gratification, there flashed, instead, across my mind the thought, "What you have just said evidences your caliber as a business statesman and your patriotism as an American citizen."

In this audience are individuals who could recite many more instances of such self-revealing statements than I possibly could. But this one alone was proof to me that I was dealing with a man of character. From that moment onward I never once hesitated to call upon him for any service or word of counsel that I thought might be useful; never did he let me down. And in every contact my recognition of his integrity, abilities, and selflessness became all the keener.

As a leader it was not in him to indulge in the flamboyant or the pseudo-dramatic or in self-glorification. Instead of desk-pounding or similar theatrics, he used the soft voice, patiently to assure among his assistants their full understanding of the instructions he had to give. By his own testimony he trusted far more in thorough study and serious conference with his advisors, subordinates and associates rather than in preconception or flash impulse as he arrived at important decisions.

It was, then, through character and moral strength that he impressed himself, unforgettably, upon others; therein was a greatness that far transcended his ability, drive, endurance and experience, exceptional as these were. Today if we should attempt to express our admiration and affection for Ben Fairless merely in eulogy, then I think we would show ourselves to be scarcely aware of the true lessons that his life holds for us. But for us who knew him, almost inescapably there comes to our minds the wish that we might be able to bring to the solution of our problems, each day, the same qualities of spirit that he so clearly displayed in his own.

Moreover, as we made such an attempt I suspect we would reach the conclusion that the problem most concerning us at this moment - and should concern the nation - is the seemingly widespread deterioration in our moral fiber. We seem to be losing our capacity to bear our own responsibilities unflinchingly - that is - to stand solidly for what we know in our hearts to be right, decent and fair, and important to the nation's future.

Of course, there are many other and possibly more specific issues to face. We are, for example, critical of high taxes; but we don't like to see taxes revised in such fashion as to relieve others one cent more than it does us of part of the tax burden.

The vast majority believes that governmental expenditures are too high; but we insist upon excluding from any program of reduction all those that seem to profit us individually.

We deplore deficit spending in time of prosperity as a policy of government, believing that it is not only unnecessary but, eventually, ruinous. In addition, deficits incurred in these conditions can scarcely conform to

our concept of justice in that it deliberately presents to coming generations the bills for things we get for ourselves today. It scarcely increases our self-respect if we supinely accept a policy urging us to "owe-as-we-go!"

We criticize costly and clumsy governmental farm programs; we oppose unfair regulations applying to expense accounts; we urge the application of logic and reason to projected international contests into outer space. We question the wisdom of certain details in Medicare programs and we grow irritated when some world-touring Congressman spends our tax money in music halls and night clubs - immune from any disciplinary action by the government. We are horror-stricken by mounting crime waves - especially the sometimes almost inexplicable delinquencies of our youth - not only in the gangs of our city streets, but too often in some of our institutions of higher learning.

All of these are serious matters, and they call urgently for practical solutions. All of us should be involved in the task. But, important as they are, they do not define the root of our true problem. They are indeed symptomatic, but they are primarily effects rather than causes of the basic difficulty. That difficulty is the weakening of our sense of duty - or moral obligation - to ourselves, to our children, to what is right!

We seem to be losing too much of our readiness to move against the tide, too much to the sturdy independence that should reject any unfair governmental advantage for ourselves as quickly and emphatically as we reject another for our contemporaries. Through fear of governmental threat we too often fail to assert our rights or to move on the free course assured by our Constitution! Through love of ease, or sheer lethargy, we shut our eyes to the weaknesses within us - sins of omission and commission. We lose our capacity to be righteously indignant. We fail to do what we know to be our duty - not deliberately, but rather through a subconscious desire to avoid extra effort and sacrifice or to escape criticism and ridicule for supporting unpopular ideas. Worse, by word and example we impart these habits to our children, apparently and blindly hoping that a new generation will display a courage that we do not ourselves possess in facing forthrightly the problems that baffle us, both those of a weakened spirit and those that are outgrowths of our neglect.

Possibly then the true potential of this evening's meeting will be measured by the degree in which we, in renewed inspiration achieved through reflection on the lives of such leaders as Ben Fairless, will experience real rejuvenation of our readiness to face head on, both the basic and the symptomatic diseases of our time. Opportunities to do so are numberless. In the home, in the schools, in the business conference, on public platforms, at luncheon clubs, and in associations, including those of political parties, we can make our influence felt. And that influence will rise like a flood if we refuse to allow embarrassment to still our tongues, or the hope of immediate gain deter us from efforts designed to improve the long term good of family and nation.

The process of self-examination is difficult, sometimes secretly embarrassing. But permit me to hint at some of the questions that frequently bother me as I ponder these matters. Although the personal examples we set for our children within our own homes may have little to do with juvenile delinquency - in our eyes they are always paragons of virtue - how much time and effort are we ready to spend to eradicate it? How much should our city taxes be raised to produce a police force adequate to make our streets safe for the peaceful pedestrian? How much more are we ready to pay to increase the efficiency of educational systems - both juvenile and adult - aimed at elimination of causes of this scourge? How are we to set about the enlightenment of a population when we see so many special groups eagerly embracing the cloying effects of governmental subsidy at the expense of others, and the loss of their own self-reliance.

Unfortunately, such groups are many. Indeed few of us can show a clean record in this matter. In problems of many kinds from tariffs to taxes; from slum clearance to farm surpluses and subsidies; from power development to pollution of our streams; we far too often seek special federal help rather than refusing it except only as it applies across the board - to 180 million Americans. Correction for this and similar ills calls not just for money - they will succumb only to determined efforts reaching the intensity of a crusade.

Possibly the most important question each of us can ask himself is, "How can I help to keep alive, healthy and effective, the concept and practice of self-government, given to us by the framers of our Constitution in 1787?" To answer this one we must first ask ourselves some preliminary questions. First, do I actually participate in self-government? Most of us vote, some give money to political campaigns - but do I, as a citizen, do all I can to further the measures in which I believe, in opposing proposals to which I violently

object? If not, am I effectively participating in self-government?

Do I still thrill to the words of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death"? Or Nathan Hale saying, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country." Or Ben Fairless who once said - "The most important thing is to do what is right for the nation as we understand it." But if we are ready to admit the worth, and timeless inspiration, to be found in contemplation of these examples - rather than to dismiss them as rubbish to be discarded by the overly sophisticated - then there is much that each can do!

An obvious one is to participate actively as a member of the political party of our choice; delve deeply into our fund of common sense, our knowledge of our own history, and the development of the American economy; study the words and deeds of Washington, Franklin, Lincoln and Jefferson - and out of all of this develop an individual and simple political philosophy.

Why do I not refuse to listen to the political aspirant that promises a special favor to me, but, instead, join and support the party whose platforms, programs and actions for national progress seem best to coincide with my own beliefs. And work, every day, for that party? Why not participate in private associations and organizations whose missions and efforts are calculated to promote better understanding of America and better fulfillment of the obligations of self-government? Indeed, should not our hearts, our hands, and our pocketbooks be dedicated to promoting what is right for America?

Tonight as we salute the memory of a distinguished American, I trust we shall often recall and deeply contemplate the principles by which he lived. A free-born American, proud of his heritage, he was a leader who commanded our respect because he preferred the hard right to the easy wrong; who would not sell his birthright of freedom for any material gain, no matter how great; who did his duty as he saw it and counted not the cost.

So long as we struggle along that same path, and particularly if we work as hard as Ben Fairless did to further his concepts of good of country, individual liberty and moral integrity - then indeed we need not fear the threats we sense about us, but shall, instead, do our respective parts in assuring for America a bright and glorious future.

• **Commencement Address, Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio, May 26, 1963**

The significance of a college or university commencement is the annual renewal it provides - and the wide world - in fresh energy, new knowledge, keen insight, spirited idealism. This season, by the hundreds of thousands, young Americans - women and men - are departing their campuses with dreams of productive, constructive, creative lives throughout the land. To the long future of the Republic theirs is a mightier and vaster contribution than wealth in gold or power in machines or material strength on the world scene. Out of their works, inspired by noble purpose, all these things shall be added to America; and, of vastly greater significance, if they fulfill our hopes, they will add to our way new greatness in soul and in heart.

The pace of America's growth, since the first graduation at Harvard College more than three hundred years ago, has been measured by the steady increase in number of those who entered into the nation's life, armed and fortified in the disciplines of higher learning.

Through all the years, of course, innumerable individuals - out of their own genius and commitment, and without the benefit of higher education - have achieved for their fellows great breakthroughs in all the realms of human life; in politics; in science; in commerce. Instantly, we call to mind George Washington and Benjamin Franklin and Abraham Lincoln, Fulton of the steamboat, Edison of the light, Ford of the automobile. To recall their names and deeds should be for us, who have been given so much advantage, a spur and a goad to our spirit to be a little like them who - on their own - overcame so much disadvantage. For the irresistible march of America has been primarily powered by the thousands who, to their natural talents, added the knowledge and the skills and the visions of thorough academic education.

Today a nation, approaching 190 million in population, committed to a leadership role in a world of 3 billion, cannot depend on the chance genius. Each of its young people must be given the opportunity to demonstrate genius. Your commencement and a thousand like it this month and next constitute the nation's recognition of this fact. The consequent tidal flood of talent, each year pouring into all the areas of national life

is a guarantor of a new acceleration of a progress beyond accurate prediction. In our past - in the past of all humankind - we have no parallel to this flood, in its immensity in numbers, its competence in every educational discipline, its breadth and depth of understanding.

And there is this uniqueness about it: this tidal wave is not the product of political design or the by-product of political statecraft. Rather, in its origins and in its swelling sweep, it is the expression of the American purpose that to each individual shall be given freedom and opportunity to learn and to inquire and to search. It is the manifestation of the American belief that to each individual, under God, belongs the responsibility and the reward of so using his talents and his time and his energy that he may live - to the limit of his capacity - the fullest and best life.

Unique too, is this swelling flood in that - not destined to serve the ends of dictated government policy - each individual within it is free to shirk entirely the challenges before him or to travel the easy road of mediocrity. But he is privileged also, to strive greatly, daringly, exhaustingly, that his imprint for good may become an enduring evidence that he has used his talents, his education and his freedom well and profitably.

You, at this moment of your lives and your fellows in all like commencements, are the heirs to scores of centuries of human enterprise and sacrifice; of exploration on earth and in space; of adventure in ideas and in deeds; of history's recorded thinking and accomplishments. If you are to add nobly to this record there will be on you an insistent responsibility to cast out of your heritage prejudice, hate, ignorance; an equally insistent responsibility to conserve and expand all that is good and useful. Above all things you must be firm in your faith in the supreme worth of the individual; for this is the foundation stone of free government. It defines the difference between us and those who deny any belief in God and who see the individual only as a tool to serve the ends of dictators. What you think and speak and how you act will stand, finally, as the measure of your value to your nation and humankind, far more than will the amount of the world's material goods you may accumulate. As leaders of the people you will mold, shape and build the nation's 21st century. No burden could be heavier; no opportunity more bright.

As a conscientious citizen of this great nation, there is one truth that must ever stand as a guidepost for all your dreams. It is this: in self-governing America, power belongs to and is generated by the people, not by any clique, individual or government agency. That power will grow and be ever used for good only as the people grow in knowledge, understanding, in dedication to the concepts of human liberty, rights and dignity, and in faith in themselves, in American ideals, and in their God!

Two hundred years ago, in 1763, to those prepared for leadership, the call was to revolution: that old ties and old ways be abandoned, however dear they might be; that a new system of government be constituted; that a new goal in human purpose be enunciated.

One century ago, in the year 1863, to those of like preparation for leadership the call was to preservation: that a divided nation, torn by war, be re-united in peace; that the revolutionary principles of the earlier century be fully realized; that the government be truly of and by and for all the people.

In this year of 1963, the call to you is two-fold - restoration and reformation. Insofar as we may have lost any of the fervor that moved the founding fathers as they established for us freedom and self-government, and opportunity, this fervor of dedication must be restored. Let us never forget those immortal words "that all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." Likewise required is constant renewal of devotion to the conviction that a basic duty of government is to protect the individual in his God-given right to work, to earn, and to husband his resources for the benefit not only of himself and his family, but for his community, his nation and humanity. If, through the cloying effect of governmental subsidy we have lost any measure of self-reliance, independence of spirit, and love of liberty, then, restoration of all these is part of your task.

The need for reformation rises out of the new and complex problems that confront us daily, requiring new and even revolutionary solutions; many of them rising out of a mushrooming citizenry, concentrating as never before in densely peopled areas, living in a fiercely divided world. In reaching appropriate answers to these problems the words of the true leader must be so clearly spoken, so courageously supported that all citizens may still live as fully free individuals. Their voices and wishes must be accurately represented in the government, and their equality of opportunity assured. Reformation means abandonment of what has grown

obsolete, ineffective, and wasteful. It means changes in attitudes and practices and mechanisms to meet changes in the economy, in the social fabric and in political relations within the country and within the world. And to direct this change into proper directions the secure rudder is always found in dedication to the basic principles of self-government.

Beyond this, in a world where the force of nationalism and the conflicts of ideologies and the passion for power will not soon diminish, the United States must be neither slow nor hesitant nor weak in advancing and supporting measures that will inspire all men, without hurt to the aspirations, pride and rights of any other nation, to achieve a stable peace with justice and freedom. Progress toward this goal will, among other things, be furthered by expansion of our alliances with other free nations for mutual security and mutual profit. It will be accelerated by liberation of the United Nations from subservience to pressures of arrogant dictators and by its elevation to a genuinely world-representative body, able to do - as well as to talk and dispute. These responsibilities, falling upon national leaders, must by the very nature of successful self-government be shared by every citizen.

Those who wrote our Constitution designed a government that would be a servant, responsive to the people, managed by the people. Their foresight was equal to their faith in the people. And through decades of growth and change their work - after the Bill of Rights - required few amendments. But the founding fathers could not foresee that, in the space of three lifetimes, the Republic would extend from the Atlantic three thousand miles out into the Pacific, or overleaping an independent neighbor would reach into the Arctic; or that an economy of small farms and large plantations, whose cities existed mainly as ports of entry and exit, would be transformed into massive concentrations of people forming communities without regard to county or state lines. They could not know that in less than two centuries the immensity of domestic and international affairs would tend to create in us a feeling of individual helplessness and even lead us into an unthinking abandonment of personal and local responsibility to a few men in government, giving to them a frightening power for good or evil; and almost certain to invite error or abuse.

Through all these developments government more and more escapes the control of the people. Though in townships and villages, school districts and towns, citizens still make decisions for themselves, the room for decision daily shrinks because each must be made in the context of responsibility and power lost to a distant bureaucracy. Framers of the Constitution could not foresee the exact causes that might bring about such a trend but they knew that the potential danger existed. Only an inspired and educated citizenry will provide the power to keep American from following the path of earlier civilizations in which the love of country, the dedication of service to society weakened through the love of ease and the worship of affluence.

Against the possibility that ordinary and customary processes of self-government might weaken or be found ineffective, or later laws and interpretations of original constitutional intent might conflict with the mass convictions of Americans, the Founders provided a final and decisive means of reformation and restoration by the people themselves. Through their state legislatures and without regard to the federal government, the people can demand and participate in constitutional conventions in which they can, through their own action, adopt such amendments as will reverse any trends they see as fatal to true representative government. I do not here refer to any amendment presently proposed, or under consideration by the several states. Moreover, constitutional amendment is not to be lightly undertaken. But if you and your generation fortified by a superb education, with access to the knowledge and wisdom of the ages, and imbued with the spirit of our founders, decide that reformation of a radical kind becomes due - then I say, let nothing stop you! Study, examine, survey, think, consider, decide and then - by all means - act!

No discovery in science or in space for which you may be responsible, no art that you may create, no fortune that you may amass can ever faintly approach in importance what you do to America's political heritage. Remembering this, may you be a generation that a half century hence can proudly say: We maintained and furthered the American experiment born in 1776 and confirmed in 1789; we made certain that in our time freedom's flag would be more firmly nailed to the masthead of self-government - in short, we helped the nation to march on - in faithful dedication to her own ideals - to fulfillment of her destiny.

God speed you - except for the inescapable obstacle imposed by fifty years' difference in our ages, I'd be proud to follow where you will lead.

• **American Booksellers Association, June 10, 1963**

1. American Booksellers - Allen Dulles
2. Brief statements; questions. Been asked to discuss first volume of memoirs coming out this fall, called "Mandate for Change."
3. Events of some important to all of us; seen from vantage point of presidency.
4. 33 men preceded me in office; few left complete personal memoirs; something of a duty.
5. Scope limited to the eight years of the presidency. First volume starts 1943, but nothing before inauguration not bearing directly upon entry into politics. Volume ends with decision to run again.
6. Story is personal. Experiences of others largely omitted.
7. Mention few things this book will do. To present my own reasoning and views on the various issues. Errors described but I do not put on sackcloth and ashes or beat my breast.
8. Hope reader to finish the book with a clearer idea of the presidency itself; complexity of the job. Many functions - chief executive officer of the government; commander-in-chief of the armed forces; conductor of foreign relations; individual who appoints all important officers; as leader of a political party; and ceremonial head of state.
9. Possibly the reader will get a broader view of some personalities. One who was appreciated only in his last days or after his death was my great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. Because such a great portion of my time was involved in foreign relations and the relationships between Foster Dulles and me, text refers to him more than to most others.
10. The reader will likely find considerable background material on events of those years. This material can often be found more fully elsewhere.
11. Certain things reader should not expect. Some preliminary readers wanted me to be more critical of personalities. Name-calling criticism seems intriguing to some. Have never done it. Even though my Dutch temper may have flared on occasion, I see no reason why should not strive for objective view.
12. Not a partisan document, expresses my convictions on such subjects as I deemed vital to the United States, subjects such as responsible government, sound fiscal policies, and minimum governmental interference in our daily life. These correspond with politics of Republican Party. But those who are looking for a bookful of catch phrases which might be used in the 1964 campaign will have to look elsewhere. I have tried to avoid showing how right I always was and how wrong my political opponents.
13. Book will not involve a detailed discussion of technical subjects such as military programming, missile development. In such instances, less detail than that which I had to use in coming to many important decisions. The reason is that if this book is not read, it will not be useful. To lay every argument out in detail would be boring for readers.
14. Second effort at a book of memoirs. The first one was Crusade in Europe. I have tried to follow the same tone in "Mandate for Change" as I did in first one. This one broader.
15. By no means do I expect "Mandate for Change" to be a definitive history of the time. But I do hope that it will constitute a useful addition to the over-all store of written knowledge of the times.

• **Effective Citizens Organization annual meeting, Washington, DC, June 12, 1963**

It is indeed a very great honor that has been awarded me by the Effective Citizens Organization, and I am particularly pleased to receive it from the hands of an old friend, one that I've admired and respected for years. Incidentally, he spoke of a prediction he made concerning me some years back. He omitted one remark that he later made. He said, "Welcome to the membership of those who now follow the ptomaine trail." In that particular exercise he had had much more earlier experience than I had.

I should like to start by saying, first, that I concur with and applaud the sentiments expressed by Mr.

Farley just now to this audience. Likewise, I am delighted and gratified by the report we had from Mr. Barr on what this organization is producing and the work they are accomplishing.

I should like to talk to you for a moment - possibly in generalities - on what I think about certain fundamentals. I think the most priceless heritage recognized by all that we have been handed from our founding fathers through succeeding generations is the right of self-government. And I wonder how often we stop to think what self-government means, what it entails. It includes and comprehends all those concepts of human dignity, individual liberties and all of the rights specified in our Constitution and as recited just a moment ago by Mr. Farley.

But self-government means just a little bit more than that, I think. If self-government is going to work, then we have to practice it. Let us assume anyone in this audience has not voted or has not done his best to further the ideals and concepts of government that he believes should prevail. Then I submit that man or that individual is not part of self-government. He's letting somebody else govern him, and if you make this practice too general - and it is far too general today when we have only what sometimes I call a pitiable percentage of our electorate coming to the polls - if this practice becomes too general, then government finally gets into the hands of a very few people and we have in fact an oligarchy.

What, then, are we going to do about it? I submit there is only one thing. You must, whether you choose to remain a private citizen at home, to go into politics itself, or to be a professional man, whatever you want to do - you still have the bound duty to express yourself through our system, our practical system of self-government, so that your voice may be heard and so that you may have your influence in making certain that those precepts and tenets of political doctrine can be observed in Washington and in the Governors' Mansions and in the county councils so far as you possibly can.

This is the essence of self-government. And I think if it's neglected, taken for granted, like the man who finds he's taken his wife too long for granted, he just may lose her, and I believe that we, if we take self-government too much for granted, can lose it.

If we do this we keep, as Jefferson told us we should, government close to the people. We respect the power of our city councils and of our boards of commissioners in the counties, of our legislatures, and we give to Washington - with apologies to all of my congressional friends here present - but we accord to them and give to them only those residual duties that were specified or not reserved to the states and the people by the Constitution of America.

So we then have the problem, how are we going to do our best? I don't believe that anyone is doing his duty as a citizen merely because he registers at the proper date and goes down and makes some marks according to the symbol that heads a particular column on the ballot - unless he's on my column.

I believe that we have got to study; self-government demands intelligent consideration of all the problems that present themselves to a people. You've got to study, and when you contact any individual who for one reason or another, either through lack of education or lack of opportunity, has not studied, you have to help him.

You are business leaders. Why, then, can you not be leaders in the kind of government that has made this Nation what it is today? We know what happened to the Athenian city states. In Athens we had a democracy. It was lost, largely because of the fault of the people to call themselves citizens. The example was even more pronounced in the Roman democracy which, giving way to the Emperor, did so because of the citizen's neglect of his own duty both internally and in the problems of self-defense. We must never do this, and I see no way in which this constant rejuvenation of respect for self-government can be brought about except as the people are the national leaders; in the intellectual world, the business world, the labor world, wherever it is, the people must bring about a study of the programs, issues and problems of the day, using their own God-given intelligence to make their decisions.

I am happy to have had a faint part in the development of this Effective Citizens Organization, because I believe by putting our brains and our strength and our dedication together we help to inspire each other, each to do a little bit more than he has been doing. And let me give you an example of what happens when you don't.

I have a great friend, a very brilliant young man who was elected Governor in my state. And I heard the story secondhand from him something to this effect: he thought, because of the economic problems that were

besetting the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania he should get a number of businessmen, men of proved ability, to attack this problem. The cabinet of the state is much larger than the federal cabinet - and why this is I don't know - but anyway he had to go over quite a list of people. He made and finally selected a list of twenty businessmen that he wanted to invite into his cabinet. He began to look up the political records of the whole gang, which I think with the exception of two, were terrible. Some had not even registered; some had not voted for a number of elections. There was no way that he could find to justify appointing any of these particular people because they'd shown they didn't have any interest in government. We've had too many people who, because they differ with details within that particular party, say, "I will sit on my hands." What an abdication of responsibility and your God-given rights! I have never understood how anyone can say that if he's got any concern whatsoever for the United States of America.

I've heard it said, "Well, we've nominated two men. They're both bad choices. What do I do?" You had a part in selecting one of those men. You must have a part, then, in helping to elect a man of your choice.

I cannot stress too much how deeply I believe in this system of government which is still revolutionary and still under test. Despotic government is as old as sin. This new form was brought to us only 175 years ago. This is still a revolutionary idea. The one practiced by the Communists today is as old as history. We've got to make our government successful. This doesn't mean yesterday or tomorrow. This means today. And make it successful so it can march healthily down the years, giving to our grandchildren and all their grandchildren the right that we have had to take part in our own government, the most precious political privilege that any person, any individual or any nation can have.

• **Republican Citizens Committee Citizens Workshop, Hershey, Pennsylvania, June 13, 1963**

I would like to read you an excerpt from a letter. "The Republican is the only form of government which is not eternally at open or secret war with the rights of mankind." The letter was written to Mr. William Hunter in the year 1790 by Thomas Jefferson.

Now our mission, as I see it, is to preserve and strengthen Republican Government - though the adjective may be spelled with a small or capital "r". On this I stand and I hope I shall not be interpreted otherwise anytime for as Lord Balfour once said, "I am more or less happy when being praised, not very comfortable when I'm being abused, but I have moments of uneasiness when being explained."

As a permanent haven for citizen participation, the Republican Citizens Committee is one of the most potentially fruitful innovations in American politics in many years. Its prospects as an instrument for better government seem limitless. I see this workshop as having its roots in the colonial town meeting where citizens participated enthusiastically in the affairs of their government with each making his small contribution to the deliberations which eventually decided the course of action. I hope this town meeting is the forerunner of many, many more across the country by different citizens groups - all of which will make their contribution toward the growth of Republicanism.

Among our initial objectives are these: To offer assistance and cooperation to the regular Republican organization - and, when invited supplement the regular campaigning efforts in behalf of specific candidates.

Next, to lead in forming a nationwide network of state and local Republican citizen organizations which, in turn, will mobilize front line troops for the political battles ahead. Citizens' organizations hope to make it attractive and relatively easy for political volunteers to take as active a role in political affairs as they can whether or not they are party professionals. Basing our hopes on the experience of long established local volunteer organizations in Los Angeles and elsewhere, we think it practicable that through closely coordinated and extended operations to establish a string of recruitment agencies for the Republican Party. The Party's regular state and local organizations in most cases would unquestionably welcome massive infusion of fresh brains and muscle. These can be provided by citizens who choose to move on to the regular party organizations, after becoming attuned to Republican goals by experience in the citizens groups.

Another citizen organization objective - a most urgent one - is to create widespread respect for Republican positions, programs and aspirations. To meet this need, citizen groups are forming and expanding

units of specialists to cope with one of the Republican Party's most critical and exasperating deficiencies - that of communicating with others. The Citizens Committee could more than justify its existence by improving Republican communications.

Consider this: Notwithstanding election returns and the ratio of officeholders, ours is, in conviction, the majority party. There can be no question that a majority of Americans share our belief in such basic Republican doctrines as responsible progress, sane fiscal policies and a good life through individual opportunity and initiative. This is vastly different from the Democratic Party doctrine of reliance on government above all else. Why we Republicans have not succeeded in these recent years in translating our majority beliefs into majority votes is a multipronged dilemma. And the business of communications - spreading the truth in understandable terms, presenting it as a vote-getting package - is at the heart of that dilemma. This, then, we must solve.

Next - Some eyebrow raising was to be expected from party oldtimers who, for one reason or another, are allergic to citizen movements. It would have been surprising indeed if the organization had achieved its first birthday without having at least a few belittling snorts directed its way by individuals who, for some strange reason, adjudge the words "idealist" and "amateur" to be politically disparaging.

I believe that at this point in history, when cynicism, mistrust of the people, and contrived political imagery are seemingly becoming the vogue in the nation's capital - our body politic could stand a hefty dose of idealism. And as for political "amateurs" - they bring verve, sparkle and fresh ideas which perk up a political party the way a well-advertised medicine does tired blood.

Another thing, many of today's finest public officials and party organization leaders were yesterday's "political amateurs." Possibly "idealists" and "amateurs" oftentimes cause headaches and short tempers, merely by getting underfoot. But a political party without a steady supply of them is likely to become not only inbred but will likely decay.

If you will permit a personal note - I am partial to so-called "amateurs." Dedicated non-professionals - mostly young men and women whose only previous political interest was to vote on election day - were to a considerable extent responsible for my decision in 1952 to enter the political arena. So by admiring and encouraging the amateurs and idealists in politics one does not thereby reflect unfavorably on the professionals. Many distinguished veterans in politics are also idealists. After all, the formula for successful service to the nation calls for a meld of idealism and practicality.

I have profound respect for the art-science of politics - and for most politicians with whom I have been associated. On the whole, they are sincere, conscientious public servants. Yet now, as we approach the 21st century, politicians and non-politicians alike must awaken to the realization that, like it or not, government is becoming ever-more important in our lives. In turn, that makes it increasingly imperative for citizens to stand guard aggressively, if need be, over their freedoms - and delineate with unmistakable clarity the line of principle beyond which governments may not step.

Politics is becoming far too important in our individual and corporate lives to be monopolized by politicians. I am told that a tough, old political boss of Jersey City took pride in revealing the secret of how he managed for years to dominate his community, his county, and the New Jersey Democratic Party. In essence, he would put it this way: "My organization never lets up...we keep at it twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, fifty-two weeks a year...'good people,' he said, "start their movements every now and then...but they never stick at it. They always quit..." Though his purposes were selfish - often blatantly so - yet his organizational and operational methods were so efficient that he maintained his hold over an enlightened citizenry for three decades.

Many of the nation's most populous cities are even now as tightly boss-controlled as ever. While the political apparatus in most instances has a modernized facade to conform with the times, the main secret of success is identical to the letter to that of the old Jersey City boss. And as is too well known, the clue to Democratic Party victories for years has been the incredible majorities delivered on call by those city bosses.

There is in these experiences a lesson that the Republican citizens organizations, functioning for good purposes in scores of communities, should learn well. Let it be known here and now that this "movement" of what machine political bosses refer to derisively as "good people" does not have the word "quit" in its lexicon. This permanent Republican Citizens organization is here to stay - and to serve. The foresight, dedication and

spirit of those who conceived, formed and are advancing this novel political enterprise will have the confidence of all who share our deep belief in fundamental principles and purposes of Republicanism.

Incidentally, it took boldness and a sure sense of competent optimism for the National Citizens organization to start right off with a full 5-year operating schedule. Now, on the eve of the first birthday, it is heartening to see that the original 5-year agenda already had been extended. Plans are being projected for increasingly productive activities extending through the foreseeable future. There are an array of essential chores that all citizen groups and every Republican must face boldly. To me, the most pleasant one of all is expounding, clarifying and advocating, with all my heart, fundamentals of Republican beliefs, keyed to an abiding faith in the American people.

Another crucial task is to point up repeatedly and endlessly the very real and significant differences between the Republican concept and that of the Democratic Party's current leadership. Still another duty before us - one that I do not relish, but will deal with because it is as important as any other - requires that we call the roll, clear and loud, on the opposition's record - the sorry record that stands naked to behold, when the cunningly manipulated veneer of imagery is peeled off. For the sake of its future, the American electorate should become re-introduced to now-no-longer disguised incidents of the recent past. It should become fully aware of the political connivance that is a way of political life for those who apparently seek power at any cost - and having won it - reach out for more and more. The roll-call - a long record of glowing promises and anemic deliveries - would include such campaign catch-phrases as "missile gap" - "stroke of the pen", "strong presidency", "get the country moving again", and so on - and on. What man or woman in America, if fully acquainted with the cold facts, could fail to feel ashamed of the deliberate effort to elevate that kind of political connivance to a level of full acceptability? Thousands and tens of thousands of Democrats and Independents share our concern over what has been going on. I believe that they are disturbed by the non-action and headlong retreat on matters of national survival and domestic well-being on which were promised firm, unequivocal decision and action.

Now - we Republicans are no paragons. We have many shortcomings, far too many! But without pretense, we strive to improve. And I cannot imagine any Republican official of standing, proclaiming the reverse of a standard Democratic slogan of the 1960 campaign. That claim - that "the worst Democrat is better than the best Republican" - was to my knowledge first heard at the Western Conference of Democrat leaders in Albuquerque, New Mexico, in February 1960.

This would seem difficult even for the most ardent Democrat to believe. But listen to this story brought to me about one of the most avid endorsers of this ridiculous assertion. He was a Democratic member of the Congress, a committee chairman with extensive powers and prerogatives. In his campaign for re-election he claimed brazenly that his seniority in Washington was "money in the bank" for his home state. Subsequently, when it became evident that this politician was being hard-pressed in the campaign and help was badly needed, he ran speedily to Washington for assistance. In double-quick time, the Defense Department, of all places - with the Federal Treasury footing the bill - undertook a political rescue operation. In the politically-distraught Senator's state was an Air Force base which had been declared unnecessary and was being shut down. In this time of trouble the campaigning Senator announced he would demonstrate his influence with the administration. He was invited to a conference. Immediately after it, the candidate for re-election announced, and the administration confirmed, that the Defense Department was reversing itself and was re-opening the useless Air Base. Thus the Senator proved that his political seniority was "like money in the bank," and it had the desired impact. The Senator, one of the better than the "best" Republican, was reelected. Shortly thereafter the base was closed.

I cite this example from the campaign last year because it symbolizes an intrinsic difference between the two parties. We Republicans have concentrated our attention on principles and programs and service to the nation. Our opponents appear to devote their energies to the cold and calculating realities of partisan politics - and their eyes are ever-glued to the end product, power. To Republicans, "the rights of men" is a living doctrine. To our opponents it is a campaign catch-phrase, a political gimmick to be cunningly exploited as part of the great mosaic which presents a public but deceitful image known, far and wide, as concern for the common man - protector of the poor - champion of the people. The facts are altogether different from the

image.

Republican ideology today, as in Lincoln's time, is based upon the dynamic concept of government by the people, as well as of and for them. It enthrones the individual - with his love of liberty and opportunity; his self-confidence and self-reliance, his initiative and his human desire to help himself and his family and his country - as the key to social and economic progress of the nation; in the practice of this faith the entire nation has grown in strength, in capacity, and in influence.

On the other hand, the philosophy of those presently controlling the Democratic Party is based essentially on the contention that the answer to most of the Nation's problems is more Government, more executive power, and ever-more spending of public funds. Such an ideology sees the individual in terms of a vote - and something to be patronized. It is barren of faith in the people. It arrogates to a personally selected few the capacity for government. It is devoid of appeal to all that is best in human nature, particularly to those traits of individual character that have accounted for America's progress.

There is still another significant clash of concepts between the two Parties. We proudly espouse the simple, but dynamic virtues of America and its people. To us, "patriotism" is a word that throbs with great meaning. But to those who set the tone for the Opposition party, such cherished American virtues as "Reliance in Self", "Pride in Work", "Devotion to Education", "Faith in Self and God", are seemingly considered plain, low-brow corn, and not to be taken seriously. I would like to point out to them that if our forefathers had not taken "corn" seriously, we would not be here today.

And now, let us look at a few of the pertinent facts in the credo of Republicanism that need to be emphasized and re-emphasized. Our fundamental concept of the dignity of the individual and of Government as the protector of his freedom is, even today, the world's newest political philosophy - a fresh, invigorating philosophy based on faith in an enlightened people. By contrast, the concept of the omnipotent, omniscient state, presently advertised as sophisticated political philosophy, is as old and as ugly as sin. The contention that man's destiny must be centrally controlled is as old as human history. It existed for centuries before the dawn of freedom.

It cannot be repeated too often that our freedoms are inseparable. Economic freedom, personal freedom, political freedom - these are all parts of a single unit. The loss of any would mean, then, the loss of all. To preserve our freedoms, to grow ever stronger in their defense, we Republicans face a great challenge - and an ever greater opportunity. Unity is essential to our success. As for me, if any proposal or program tends to divide those who support Republican principles, then I will have no part of it. But I will support to the limit of my ability that which fortifies our unity.

It is our responsibility as citizens to help preserve and strengthen the fabrics of American freedom - to insure our Nation's progress - to establish individual responsibility as a keystone in our very way of life, personal and Governmental - to assure equal opportunity for all regardless of any inconsequential consideration.

Again, I salute those whose dedication to the public good and whose foresight brought about this organization. It is not unlikely that a few years hence political science will trace the coming resurgence of Republicanism - the return to power of Republican ideals implemented by Republican officials - to the founding of this Republican Citizens Committee.

And now, as I close, I would like to read once more the words of Thomas Jefferson: "The Republican is the only form of Government which is not eternally at open or secret war with the rights of mankind."

• Battle Anniversary Commemorative Service, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, June 30, 1963

The name of this Pennsylvania town is better known, throughout the western world, than are those of many great cities; even though each may be a hundred times the size of Gettysburg. Pamphlets, books, lectures and plays in endless succession have told and still tell of the drama of conflict here enacted a hundred years ago. We, the beneficiaries of ceaseless historical research, possess an array of factual detail about Lee's and Meade's armies - their numerical strength, the character of their weapons, the reasons that brought them to this particular spot, the losses each suffered. We feel almost a personal acquaintance with the commanders

themselves and we comprehend the significance of the battle to the whole course of a war that had begun two years earlier and was to continue almost two more. We can even understand how men who, of common origins and language, could yet be so divided by passionate and selfless devotion to diametrically opposing beliefs regarding the basic structure of our nation, that a fratricidal war had to be fought out, to the exhaustion of one side.

The battle, often described as the turning point of the war, was the greatest - in terms of numbers engaged, the losses incurred and its military and political significance - ever fought in the Western Hemisphere. Likewise it stands as a supreme example of the courage, endurance, determination and loyalty that animated all the forces of the North and of the South during the four year long tragedy of civil war.

But beyond and above all fact and statistic that can be accumulated, it still remained for one man - not a soldier or a historian - but the President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, to tell us in a few immortal words the true meaning of the battle fought here on July 1st, 2nd, and 3rd, 1863. He said in sentences, which none dares to try to emulate and none can misunderstand, that Gettysburg was fought to insure that self-government might not disappear from the earth. The outcome of the battle and the President's address four months later marked the beginning of a great upsurge of renewed Northern confidence that the Union would be preserved.

President Lincoln did not imply that, on this bloodiest of American battlefields, the dangers and risks to the concepts of freedom and free government were forever eliminated. Far from it! All the sacrifices of the dead, all the suffering and travail of the living who fought in these fields and woods to support and foster self-government, could never insure it in perpetuity. Risks to its continuity, though of a different kind, are as real in 1963 as they were a century ago. Consequently, Lincoln's words should be read, pondered and pondered still again, by every American, for they apply today as profoundly as they did on that November day, when they were first spoken.

Much of the world lives under dictatorships - largely Communist dictatorships that outspokenly declare their intention of destroying the concept of individual liberty and the right of people to govern themselves. The threats they pose are recognized; the free world may not for a moment disregard their seriousness, or with an unfaltering strength of spirit fail to provide, to the last shoelace, the material defenses necessary to sustain freedom wherever threatened.

But other threats to liberty are not so easily recognized as those loudly proclaimed by foreign cliques, hostile to our way of life. Lincoln, speaking from a platform only a few hundred yards from this one, did not direct his words toward the nation's war-time opponents - not to the leaders of the states that were, as he saw it, trying to destroy the great American experiment in representative government. He was appealing to his fellow-citizens - the soldiers and citizenry of the North - to be, under God, strong in their faith in freedom and vigorous and selfless in their actions to support that faith. His message, then should ring loud and clear in our ears this day and always. For destruction of self-government, as he implied, need not result from the strength of known, outside enemies; it could come about through weaknesses in ourselves.

A later American statesman, Supreme Court Justice Brandeis voiced his convictions on this subject in these words: "Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

As we recall, once again, the inspiration that flows to us from every phrase of Lincoln's interpretation of Gettysburg, are we courageous enough to ask ourselves some searching questions on this matter of self-government and strong enough in character to guide our actions by the answers we thus reach? For my part, I feel a certain uneasiness when I think of some of the answers I would have to make to questions like these:

Does self-government, for me, mean sturdy self-reliance - depending upon myself for all those things, tangible and intangible, that I am able, without governmental interference, to provide myself and my family? Or - would I rather take from a paternalistic government every possible immediate advantage it can give, even if I do not really need it?

Do I tend to be backward in supporting the Red Cross and the Community Chest in the hope that either

the government or my neighbors will make up the deficit caused by my failure to meet cheerfully one of the obligations of freedom? Do I understand that for every responsibility I hope to shift to government I lose something of my individual rights and opportunities and self-reliance?

Do I identify in my own mind the issues and problems now concerning the nation, and try to inform myself concerning them as far as may be possible, so as to form my own conclusions concerning them? Or would I, ignoring the need for personal searching and study, rather live in ignorance, and give my support according to my prejudices and my hope of some gain won at the expense of my fellows?

Am I content merely to vote - assuming that I find it convenient to do so in view of other engagements - or do I strive, so far as I am able, to discuss these vital matters with my fellow citizens, with the purpose of measuring my conclusions against those of others and, so doing, achieve among us a local consensus as to doctrine and candidates, a practice that is at the very roots of a Democratic form of government?

Do I realize that if enough Americans fail to practice self-government seriously, the whole concept will eventually be lost and government will be that of a clique of even of an individual?

In the days of my youth there was an old saying, "The mind, like steel, stays bright through use." The same applies to self-government. Its constant practice keeps it healthy, strong and vigorous. None of us would ever, consciously, place a selling price on his right to participate in self-government. But, bemused by glittering governmental pledge to relieve us of sometimes burdensome responsibilities for self, family and community, and bewitched by enticing offers of unneeded subsidy, we need constantly to re-dedicate ourselves to liberty, duty and democracy - never forgetting self-respect.

Possibly few of us could make any honor roll through our answers to the questions I have posed to myself; but certainly, we can strive, each of us, always to improve the average of our grades. And both you and I would become far more earnest and effective champions of freedom if we would study and contemplate again Lincoln's words as, on November 19, 1863, he delivered to the world one of the noblest messages ever spoken by mortal man; ending with the indispensable formula he gave for an ever greater America - "Government by the people, of the people, for the people."

In their dedication to freedom thousands upon thousands of our countrymen have given their lives; millions have stepped forward to offer a similar sacrifice. Thus they gave us freedom and self-government to preserve, cherish, use, and pass on to the future. If our minds are truly responsive to the eloquence of Lincoln, our hearts will be filled with love of freedom and country, and our wills dedicated to the furtherance of the great ideals of liberty, equality of opportunity and human dignity, for which American stands. Thus we, in our time, shall win the battle for freedom!

• True Meaning of Civil War, September 5, 1963

I would urge in all our commemorations of the Civil War centennial, that we look on this great struggle not merely as a set of military operations, but as a period in our history in which the times called for extraordinary degrees of patriotism and heroism on the part of the men and women of both the north and the south. In this context we may derive inspiration from their deeds to renew our dedication to the task which yet confronts us - the furtherance, together with other free nations of the world, of the freedom and dignity of man and the building of a just and lasting peace.

The years 1961 to 1965 will mark the one-hundredth anniversary of the American Civil War. That war was America's most tragic experience. But like most truly great tragedies, it carries with it an enduring lesson and a profound inspiration. It was a demonstration of heroism and sacrifice by men and women of both sides who valued principle above life itself and whose devotion to duty is a part of our nation's noblest tradition.

Both sections of our now magnificently reunited country sent into their armies men who became soldiers as good as any who ever fought under any flag. Military history records nothing finer than the courage and spirit displayed at such battles as Chickamauga, Antietan, Kenesaw Mountain, and Gettysburg. That America could produce men so valiant and so enduring is a matter for deep and abiding pride.

The same spirit on the part of the people at home supported and strengthened those soldiers through four

years of great trial. That a nation which contained hardly more than thirty million people, north and south together, could sustain six hundred thousand deaths without faltering is a lasting testimonial to something unconquerable in the American spirit. And that a transcending sense of unity and larger common purpose could, in the end, cause the men and women who had suffered so greatly to close ranks once the contest ended and to go on together to build a greater, freer, and happier America must be a source of inspiration as long as our country may last.

• Centennial of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1963

We mark today the centennial of an immortal address. We stand where Abraham Lincoln stood as, a century ago, he gave to the world words as moving in their solemn cadence as they are timeless in their meaning. Little wonder it is that, as here we sense his deep dedication to freedom, our own dedication takes added strength.

Lincoln had faith that the ancient drums of Gettysburg, throbbing mutual defiance from the battle lines of the blue and the gray, would one day beat in unison, to summon a people, happily united in peace, to fulfill, generation by generation, a noble destiny. His faith has been justified - but the unfinished work of which he spoke in 1863 is still unfinished; because of human frailty, it always will be.

Where we see the serenity with which time has invested this hallowed ground, Lincoln saw the scarred earth and felt the press of personal grief. Yet he lifted his eyes to the future, the future that is our present. He foresaw a new birth of freedom, a freedom and equality for all which, under God, would restore the purpose and meaning of America, defining a goal that challenges each of us to attain his full stature of citizenship.

We read Lincoln's sentiments, we ponder his words - the beauty of the sentiments he expressed enralls us; the majesty of his words holds us spellbound - but we have not paid to his message its just tribute until we - ourselves - live it. For well he knew that to live for country is a duty, as demanding as is the readiness to die for it. So long as this truth remains our guiding light, self-government in this nation will never die.

True to democracy's basic principle that all are created equal and endowed by the Creator with priceless human rights, the good citizen now, as always before, is called upon to defend the rights of others as he does his own; to subordinate self to the country's good; to refuse to take the easy way today that may invite national disaster tomorrow; to accept the truth that the work still to be done awaits his doing.

On this day of commemoration, Lincoln still asks of each of us, as clearly as he did of those who heard his words a century ago, to give that increased devotion to the cause for which soldiers in all our wars have given the last full measure of devotion. Our answer, the only worthy one we can render to the memory of the great emancipator, is ever to defend, protect and pass on unblemished, to coming generations the heritage - the trust - that Abraham Lincoln, and all the ghostly legions of patriots of the past, with unflinching faith in their God, have bequeathed to us - a nation free, with liberty, dignity, and justice for all.

• Dinner with Ike Program, Cobo Hall, Detroit, Michigan, January 29, 1964

Our able speakers of this evening, my friends, are the kind of dedicated Republicans who, during most of the century past, have guided this nation soundly and safely in times of peace and peril. Over the years, as today, they and we, as Republicans, have had a common tie - not greed for power, not political victory for its own sake, but allegiance to unchanging principles and purposes, including these: a nation kept strong - spiritually, morally, economically and militarily - through adherence to principle, founded in religious faith; a nation kept solvent through unswerving integrity and common sense in fiscal affairs; an honest government, desiring not ever-increasing power but only to serve, and ever truthful with the people; a government eager to assist those among us unable to make their way but encouraging all, who can, to stand on their own two feet and care for themselves.

Such Republican tenets have stood the test of time. Our record has been a bright one for America. But

the acceptability of our Party to the public is not, in recent times, nearly as bright. Our need today, then, is not for new principles; it is to re-enlist the cooperation of the American public in applying our principles to major issues, which today are vastly more intricate than in simpler times.

These issues are easy to identify. Examples are: unemployment, including the creation of new jobs and manpower retraining; civil rights; agriculture; education; health and welfare; fiscal affairs; foreign relations (including our policy toward Cuba); national security and space exploration. But to resolve these issues in a way that harmonizes with the Party's principles is a challenge to us all.

Clear it is, then, that we Republicans have a pressing need for an all-out, nation-wide action program of political education. It is time that we go directly to the people with the Nation's major problems so that these may be better understood across the Nation and so that our citizens may more wisely decide.

I suggest specifically that we establish and operate a system of Party-to-People panels to conduct forums, public discussions and round-tables, all across the country. We might call this plan, "United Statesmanship." The principal task of each panel would be to arouse interest and to teach - and I remind you that those who teach well will never cease also to learn. Thus, through Party-to-People forums we shall establish a two-way political avenue of understanding and cooperation.

I suggest that members of each panel should include not only our own Party's experts but also leaders in other fields. After full discussion, these panel members should invite and respond candidly to questions from the audience. I hope we could have such meetings in each major region of our country. They could not fail to generate widespread interest and a chain reaction of increasingly active and informed political discussion. These regional convocations, initially organized by the Party's National Chairman, could set the patters for subsidiary forums. Under appropriate Party officials these could be conducted in every state and every county - indeed, in every precinct, in every block, in every rural area.

At the same time I think we would need to open at Party Headquarters in Washington what could perhaps be called a "Suggestion Center for a Better America." To this center every citizen would be invited to contribute his views on the most pressing issues of the day. It would be most important that the early results of these efforts be assembled in time to reach our 1964 Platform Committee well in advance of the Convention, so they could be directly reflected in a Republican People's Platform. Thereafter, the entire system should continue to operate at full speed, right down to election day. By vigorously promoting such a program, I believe we Republicans can develop an expression of the mainstream thinking of an informed people. We will know their real concerns. We will know their real aspirations as never before. Thus our Party's proposals can be better tailored to the Nation's true needs.

Such, then, is one way - in my judgment, a most effective way - in which our Grand Old Party - our sturdy and militant G.O.P - can go to our countrymen. This is also one way we can bring our countrymen to us. Simultaneously we must prepare ourselves, and we prepare our Party, for the responsibility of taking over a government devoted to progress, to solvency, to common sense - a government inspired and revitalized by a new, Republican, citizen-oriented initiative.

My friends, our mightiest weapon is truth!! Let us use it.

• **Junior Statesmen of America, Palm Springs, California, May 9, 1964** [in "Speeches Made by DDE" folder, box 6]

I cannot tell you how delighted I am to be here for these few minutes, and to witness what you are doing and to hear some of your deliberations. The bringing up of the new generation - a growing generation that is going to take over our affairs all too quickly - is a very serious responsibility and honor.

To see you taking up the questions that I see listed in your documents, giving them study through your various committees, taking up selected ones to vote on and discuss on the floor - all of this, I think speaks well for the future of our institutions that we have raised up under the institution of self-government. Self-government is something I feel we should quite - that all of us should think about very seriously. When we read in our papers that only sixty-one or sixty-two percent of our population as voters have even taken the trouble to

register and vote in a National election, this seems to me that we are growing quite indifferent to the priceless privileges that are ours in this business of governing ourselves. At the very least, or at the very most, sixty percent of us is governing all of us, and only a majority of that sixty percent. So finally, in a very practical sense, something a little more than thirty percent of the qualified voters of the United States are governing all of us.

If this trend grows worse, we will be approaching an oligarchy, and don't think you have to worry then about your small advisory council here, your legislative council; it will be finally such a small group that is governing us, that indeed, self-government, the entire institution of self-government, can be lost.

I think it is good that you take many of these questions that so far are somewhat beyond your experience. Let us say, in foreign policy. I notice one question about the non-recognition of Red China, and I can't tell you how much I agree with you there. But it is nevertheless a question in which few of you have any opportunity to be truly experienced.

To go back into the history of our diplomatic relations with others, that is the whole history we have with Red China - what their attitudes have been and what are the crimes the people have been guilty of - these are things that are very, very serious.

Now, because government today has become so important in our lives, it is more than ever essential that each of us learn not only about the specific subjects like non-recognition of China, but actually the way - let's just say by following here - by experience you are certainly learning something about Robert's Rules of Order, and you are more than that, learning about the issues that are so important to the United States now and bound to be in the years and decades still coming ahead.

Any child today, any of you here, some of you must have very young brothers and sisters. Did you ever stop when that child is born, that they are getting as their first present a sixteen hundred dollar debt from the Federal government? That's exactly the first part of the legacy they have and they are going to pay interest on it until that debt is discharged. So each person is in effect from the day, the minute, they are born - they're putting in something like say, sixty-four dollars a year, or something like that, just for paying interest, not for reducing the debt.

That is what we - my generation has given to you people. And it's what you, if you don't reform and do better than we have, are going to be doing even worse to the generations of another fifty years or sixty years behind me.

These are very important questions. So what you are doing in looking at the questions, beginning to form your opinions about them, and then practicing the methods of bringing government into them in a proper way, I believe that you are preparing yourselves more for a good future than you are merely when you are going into everything from mathematics to the art courses.

You are in the highest - the highest ambition anyone can have is to be an effective, honest, useful citizen of the United States.

No matter what may be the wealth of any individual; money that he may have earned or has come to him by inheritance to him; no matter what, the dignity of the offices to which he may be entrusted by the public, this still is the greatest ambition of anyone - better than a great mathematician, a great doctor, a great lawyer. You, yourself, can be an effective, good citizen of the United States.

Most of our politics, of course, are implemented - our political beliefs are implemented - through two parties. I happen to be of the rather minority, but I think it's still the best. I did not come either to bury or to praise. I just wanted to point out this - a political party is not something that you inherit, or political beliefs are not something you inherit.

A political party is formed to support beliefs that are commonly held by the members of that party. These beliefs, these convictions, principles we call them, are far more important than any other individual. Far and above giving early belief to any particular individual, I would say let's find out what we believe. What do I, from my studies, from my teachings right here, what do I as an individual believe? How do those beliefs accord with those ideas spoken and exposed to the public by anyone running for public office, be it country commissioner, or President of the United States, or your Congressman, or your Senator, or your Governor, or whatever.

The party must be formed around these beliefs. And this is the way we should also select the people that we want. I believe in this way we are a truly self-governing people, and if we can get - through the efforts and through the high, even evangelical work of such people as you devoted people, can get - that other 40% thinking, studying and voting that way, then we can be sure that the priceless privilege of self-government is never going to be lost from the United States, and this, I should think is related consistent to the help and inspiration we shall be getting from such people as you. And I, for one, am very proud that you have asked me.

When I first came up my girl friend JoAnn and I were just going to sit out there by the door and listen. But it seemed to have started a little commotion, so I heard the discussion from the rostrum rather than from the back benches.

In any event, I'm very proud that you asked me. I am delighted with what you are doing, and I would like to see such bodies as are gathered here today to be repeated in every state in the Union. Indeed, I would like to see them in every county, every ward, every precinct, of our whole country. So that we could, from the time of thirteen years or on, start studying so you can be an intelligent voter from the day you get your first certificate that authorizes you to go into that voting booth and make your decision as to what the American government can be, and what it should be. Thank you a lot.

• **George C. Marshall Research Library, May 23, 1964**

It is a high privilege for me, once again, to pay a simple tribute to General George C. Marshall. This time I do so in terms of my personal contacts with him. A few of his characteristics are uppermost in my memory and it is on these I shall dwell. They include his consideration for others; his clear, direct and logical approach to any major military problem; his complete, single-minded dedication and loyalty to his country and government, and his selflessness and objectivity in making decisions and in courageously discharging his vitally important duties.

From World War I onward I had often heard of George Marshall. By older officers he was always described as a brilliant soldier, by many as a genius. But, until World War II was a week old, I had met him only twice - and then but momentarily.

My direct association with him began on December 14, 1941, on a Sunday morning in the old "Munitions Building" in Washington, D.C. He placed me in charge of military planning, later adding other operations. On that Sunday morning a great deal of our conversation dealt with the situation in the Pacific. General Marshall brought me up-to-date with events and then said that he would look to me for assistance in planning help for that beleaguered area.

Just before dismissing me, he gave me some brief instructions that I have never forgotten. I can repeat his words almost verbatim. "Eisenhower," he said, "the department is filled with able men who analyze their problems well but feel compelled always to bring them to me for final solution. I must have assistants who will solve their own problems and tell me later what they have done." He looked at me with an eye that seemed awfully cold, and so, as I left the room, I resolved then and there to do my work to the best of my ability and report to the general only in calamitous situations, or when he personally sent for me.

This habit I cultivated to the point that one day - finding myself in a crisis situation - I issued an order that occasioned for me some days of acute unhappiness. Indeed, I suspected - with obvious reason - that I might be ignominiously dismissed from the presence of the Chief of Staff, if not from the army. The facts were these: we badly needed to send a division of troops to Australia, and it happened that in one of our ports and ready to depart was the British ship, the Queen Mary. Having permission to use her, I directed the loading of 15,000 men on her and started her across the Atlantic and around the Cape of Good Hope, without escort. Because of her speed I was not particularly worried until we intercepted a cable sent by an Italian official in Brazil to his government in Rome. It read as follows: "The Queen Mary just refueled here, and with about 15,000 soldiers aboard left this port today steaming southeast across the Atlantic."

At once I had visions of all the German submarines in the South Atlantic trying to concentrate around the Cape of Good Hope area, possibly intercepting the great ship and filling her full of torpedoes. For the next

few days I slept little. But finally I had the welcome news that the Queen Mary had arrived safely in Australia.

I felt so good that I took the time off to go voluntarily to the General's office to tell what I had done - and of the great suspense in which my principal assistants and I had been living. I said that I had not told him this before because I saw no use for his bearing the same burden of worry that I had been carrying, but now that all was well I thought he might like to know what had happened.

He smiled and said, "Eisenhower, I received that intercept at the same time that you did. I was merely hoping that you might not see it and so I said nothing to you until I knew the outcome." Rarely have I seen such generous consideration for a subordinate so beautifully exemplified.

One incident has a bearing upon his conception of performance of duty without fear or favor. I was in his office once when he picked up the telephone to answer a call that an aide said came from a senator - the chairman of an important committee. As I watched the General's face it became flushed, he was obviously more than a little annoyed. Within moments he impatiently broke in to say, "Senator, if you are interested in that man's advancement, or that of any other, the best thing you can do is to avoid mentioning his name to me. Good-bye!" Then he turned to me to say: "I may make a thousand mistakes in this war but none will be the result of political meddling! I take orders from the Secretary of War and the President; I would not stay here if I had to respond to such outside pressures. Moreover I don't like people who are seeking promotion." To a possible senatorial displeasure he gave not a single thought.

In early conferences of the American Chiefs of Staff and later, of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, he quickly established himself as the dominant figure. His vision was so clear, his grasp of complex issues so instinctive and precise, and his convictions so strong, that he was almost invariably the recognized leader in discussions and in resultant decisions. In all Allied meetings in which I was present with him this continued throughout the war; his complete absorption in the task at hand was apparent to all.

In another meeting I saw convincing proof of his utter selflessness. When the President and the American Chiefs of Staff were traveling to the Cairo and Tehran conferences in November of 1943, they stopped overnight at allied headquarters in the African theater of war. Speculation was then rife as to the identity of the individual to be named to head the cross-channel operation scheduled for the next spring, named Overlord. Washington headlines, I was told, were fairly agog about the matter; some misguided persons even alleging that General Marshall and I were engaged in a bitter vendetta, each falsely accused of seeking the prize of command.

On the evening of the President's arrival in Carthage, General Marshall and Admiral King, quartered with me in my cottage, had a long conversation into which Admiral King brought this subject. He had been given to understand in Washington, he said, that General Marshall was to go to London and I to the post of Chief of Staff. According to the Admiral it was assumed the President, believing that Marshall would like to be in the field and that he had clearly earned the right to make his own choice of positions, had ordered the necessary shift in assignments. Admiral King, however, was convinced that the nation needed General Marshall in Washington and said he was going to use what influence he had with the President to keep the Chief of Staff there. He made a prolonged presentation of his arguments and then, finally, invited my comments. I merely replied I would try to do my duty wherever my superiors decided I should serve.

General Marshall smiled and remarked - "I don't see why any of us is worrying about this - the President will have to decide on his own, and all of us will obey." He went on to say: "The President has asked for my preference but I've refused to express any." I was struck by his complete objectivity; and not once in later years did he ever give me a hint as to his personal choice of the two positions.

Incidentally there was a sequel to the story that should dispel any fanciful idea that there might have existed any rivalry between General Marshall and me for the Overlord command. At the end of the Cairo conference the President decided to keep General Marshall in his vital post. The telegram informing Stalin that I would go to London was written out in long hand by General Marshall and signed by the President. The original text was then sent to me by General Marshall with this note. It read: "Dear Eisenhower. I thought you might like to have this as a memento. It was written very hurriedly by me as the final meeting broke up yesterday, the President signing it immediately. G.C.M." The telegram was not nearly as important to me as was the kindly thoughtfulness so clearly evidenced by a busy superior who wanted a subordinate to have a souvenir certain to

be highly valued.

In December of 1945 I was directed to take General Marshall's place as Chief of Staff of the Army. One thing he said as I came to report to him has persisted in my memory. He expressed a great feeling of relief at laying down the duties of active service; his enthusiasm for the rest, recreation and happiness of the life he saw stretching out before him and his family was, to say the least, unusual for him. I was not only happy for him - I wished that I could have done the same.

But the sequel to this incident was far from pleasant. Hardly had he been settled in the family home at Leesburg when he came into my office and announced: "The President is sending me to China; I'll be needing some help from the Army; will you see that my requests are considered?" Of course I replied, "Anyone you want." But I could not help from asking whether he was not to have some rest and vacation. "It seems," he said, "that the matter is one of some urgency." Not a word of complaint against fate or superiors - he just set about quietly to do his duty. But this time I knew where his heart lay; and I knew he felt keen disappointment, even though he would never voice it.

Finally, sometime before he entered the hospital on his last illness, I stood with him as there was presented to the government, in his honor, a portrait of this unusual man. He was one of the three or four men whom, in positions of great responsibility I have rated - in my own mind - as the most distinguished in character, ability and leadership. At that simple ceremony I found myself wishing that he could have understood how much he had meant to America; how much his fellow citizens appreciated the vision that impelled him, in the late thirties and early forties, to labor so hard to prepare the nation for the probability of its entry into the war and against pacifistic tendencies that almost defeated the draft law; I thought of his moral courage, calmness, and wisdom - after the war began - in directing the mobilization and world-wide deployment of great armies and air forces - of the selflessness he displayed in forsaking all his own cherished plans as he undertook new, strange and onerous duties in the afternoon of his life - these and a myriad other things, I prayed that he might fully understand. But his modesty would have rejected any effort or others to tell him.

But now the documents telling of his life and accomplishments are being collected, edited and made ready for historical use. They will tell to future generations what those of us who were privileged to serve with him have long known - here was truly a great man!

• National Forum on Presidential Inability and Succession, May 25, 1964

The subject that your Chairman has just been calling to your attention is one that has interested people in Government for many, many years. And you have heard it discussed this morning from the standpoint of very able lawyers. And I have heard it discussed by politicians and others. I'm going to discuss it from the standpoint of a patient.

I have a personal approach to this whole problem because three times, while in the Presidency, unforeseen circumstances reminded me that I might be one of these people found with a disability to carry on my duties. The problem, of course, is usually posed in two phases. One, that of succession; and the other, the determination of disability.

Respecting the first, I mention only one thing that I understand it is now the consensus of this body - and one in which I most firmly agree. Upon the succession of a Vice President to the Presidency there should be immediately nominated by the President another Vice President and that individual, upon the approval of both Houses of the Congress would become the next Vice President.

I want to talk for a moment about some of the, by-product, or fall-out, benefits of such an arrangement. It not only settles the question of succession very successfully, but it assures that there will be brought into the Presidency, in the case of necessity, an individual who has had full opportunity to know all about all of the critical problems then facing the country.

It was not always thus, because we have had in the past instances where a President and his Vice President did not see eye to eye on many problems. But in recent years, when it has become more and more the practice in political conventions for the Presidential nominee to indicate his preference for Vice President,

mutual antagonism has gradually subsided and, indeed, there has, as there was in my case, been a rapport that was helpful.

By law the Vice President is a member of the National Security Council. I believe there is no possibility of making good decisions in the foreign field except as crises are foreseen before they hit you. And, unless situations are thoroughly and exhaustively studied through every kind of discipline, every kind of specialty that the Government could bring to bear, and the final debates conducted in front of the President so that he can be fully apprised of facts and potentialities and so he himself can make the decision - either at that moment or after his own study in his own bedroom or, indeed, on the golf course - the decision will likely be little more than guess work.

The Vice President is, by the very nature of his job, present at all of these debates and discussions. They deal with critical problems from every standpoint - economic, political, moral, military - whatever is brought out, he has heard. He is prepared to act as President, whenever necessary, certainly in the foreign field. He is a member of the Cabinet - at least he was in my case and kept so - he was present at all of the meetings between the Executive and the Legislative leaders, whether partisan or bipartisan. He is, in other words prepared, exactly like a good understudy in an opera or in a great show would be prepared, to take over the star's job.

Now, this is an opportunity that is enjoyed by almost no one else. Everybody else has a time consuming job of his own. He can't be giving all of his attention to finding out what's going on in other offices. And this goes for Members of the Cabinet, as well as for anyone on the Hill.

So, what I'm getting at here is that by keeping a Vice President you have a man who has been selected to keep prepared to carry out the job of President. He is almost certain to be in accord with the President in outlook, because he has been selected, or nominated, by the President. Then the second man, who now takes over, nominates another and trains him, teaches him, works with him, in that same way. This, to my mind, is a great benefit to the system now proposed, a benefit to the nation, and one which we should consider seriously before we would reject the scheme that had been proposed.

Now, we get into the business of disability. First of all, I will relate to you several personal experiences. One morning at 2 o'clock I had a pain, and the doctors came. They gave me something in the arm and the next thing I knew I was in an oxygen tent. But from that moment on, I never felt the slightest pain, the slightest difficulty. I was rather amused. I thought this was something that happened to other people - not to me. And I wondered why.

Now, it is perfectly true that the doctors kept me practically incommunicado for almost a week before they let any of my staff come in and see me with particular problems. But I remember that when Sherman Adams came in to see me at the end of the week, he came in and he had some tough ones. The doctors did keep the newspapers away from me. Later they told me this was so that I wouldn't be reading about my own illnesses and what they were saying to the press. Some of these things were acutely embarrassing, I assure you.

Now, what I'm getting at is that within one week thereafter I began picking up the load, and within a matter certainly of three or four weeks was carrying to the full the essential burdens of the office, although I still was in the hospital.

In the operation of a year later, I felt nothing of a disability after I came out of the operation except as an acute pain. It hurt. And I think that took my mind enough off the problems of the nation. And again it should have been said that I was temporarily unable properly to carry out the duties of the Presidency.

Then the next time, a year later, I had another one. And this time was a spasm, they called it, of the brain - if any. And I had, for something like 24 hours, an absolute loss of memory of words. I didn't feel anything. I walked around and did as I pleased. But I couldn't, if I wanted to, see anybody because I couldn't possibly remember their name. This passed in a very short time.

Now, though in each of these three instances there was some gap that could have been significant - in which I was a disabled individual from the standpoint of carrying out the emergency duties pertaining to the office - I was fortunate that no crisis arose. So there was no real need for the Vice President taking any action except in routine or ceremonial affairs.

Now, disability needn't necessarily be physical. In this day and time, when a decision might have to be made in a matter of minutes - let us assume that a President is flying across the ocean and his telephonic

communication with the West is far less than satisfactory, he is then “disabled” from performing his duties at that particular time. Therefore, there has to be some easy quick way to determine whether the individual carrying on the duties of the office is able to do so.

I think there could be a number of situations that you could imagine, just from temporary isolation, where communications could fail and a situation like this would demand action. Because of this, I personally believe the only individual who can make the decision that a President is disabled and cannot for the moment carry out his duties is the Vice President of the United States. I think he could not be excused if he should fail to accept that responsibility, act upon it, according to his best judgment, because by the nature of his duties he is the only individual who can make the decision and do it in time.

Now, I agree with your Chairman, who has said that necessary changes should not be recommended in detail. I just believe that the principle of the Vice President being in charge, being charged with the responsibility of taking over, is much greater than any difficulty that might arise later over some little quarrel between the two or some difference of opinion as to whether or not it had really been necessary. The United States cannot afford to go ahead in these days without someone that they know can make a decision, capable of doing it, and is there to do it. So I think that the relationship between these two people should be very close and that they should understand each other very well.

The Constitution says, I believe, that when the disability has been removed, then the President take back his job. Now, let’s assume there is a quarrel about this, that the President, being a little bit wacky, thinks he can take back the job but that the Vice President and, let us say, the majority of his Cabinet thinks that he is not capable under these circumstances - and I think the chance is remote that they would occur - regardless of the method determined by the Congress by which this question would be resolved, it is no longer an emergency. Someone is still there operating as Acting President, and with everything going on as before. Therefore, there can be plenty of time to resolve the matter, whatever ritual that the Congress may decide. Unquestionably such a plan would include some kind of expert medical and probably psychiatric advice.

So, again it would be necessary that these people trust each other, these two people. And, of course, since the Cabinet would presumably be quite friendly with the President - since he was a little bit responsible for their appointment in the first place - you could expect full justice to the President and certainly the Vice President would want no more.

Now, I tell you these things because during these periods of disability, I pondered it often: What would we do? How can we do it so that it’s done well? I think that now we have come to the conclusion that there is no longer as great a risk of global war, without warning, as we one time thought there might be. But, in any event, I think there should be always someone at the helm that knows he has the right, the duty and responsibility of making a decision.

In solving the problem through means of Constitutional amendment, and supporting Congressional law, there should be no belief that we can foresee every single possibility, every single conceivable situation. There must be, along with law, the belief that the principals engaged are men of honor, men of integrity, men whose concern is the welfare of their own country and not of their own personal ambitions. We must make that assumption.

And I believe, trusting in that and with the kind of law that would stand behind the Vice President who would be protected thus from the charge that he had operated rashly or without authority, I believe that we can solve this thing, not next year or in two or three years, but now. I do not believe that it’s quite as intricate as we make it. But it does mean, as I say, that we do believe that all of us, of all parties and of all levels of Government, have as our first thought and concern, the United States of America. And, if we do that, I think all of the other problems kind of recede in their immediacy, their urgency and in their, you might say, crisis-type of complexion and they become resolvable by people of good will - that is, good Americans. Thank you.

• **Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, May 26, 1964** [in Speeches by DDE folder, box 6]

I find it gratifying to meet with you gentlemen here at Freedoms Foundation. We are trying to do an

important job for this nation - something that has needed to be done for a long time - trying to continue the spirit of George Washington so that the meaning of Valley Forge, as a vital example of the struggle for freedom, is made clear to everyone.

I think that every true American should come to Valley Forge at least once in his life-time and see the place where the Father of our Country kept this nation from dying. The United States was born at Valley Forge, which makes it one of the most important places in our nation. One comes here for inspiration. I feel sure no one who ever walked on these hallowed grounds will ever forget that experience, because what happened under Washington in 1777-78 was a sublime act of profound faith. It is possibly the greatest act of faith the world has seen in nineteen centuries. Here Washington lost over 3,000 men - one-third of his army, through starvation and freezing - and had a great number of desertions, but at the end of that bitter winter he had a body of resolute patriots who fought through to the finish and made freedom synonymous with the name of our country.

As I look back on history I believe that Valley Forge is more important to the understanding of human freedom and the history of our country than even such great places as Chateau Thierry, Corregidor or Korea. None of these places and none of the leaders who fought there was as significant as Washington at Valley Forge. What other man could have withstood the ordeals with which he was faced, striving to make us a nation? One of the efforts of Freedoms Foundation is to encourage every American to come to Valley Forge and to understand how this country was created.

You may recall the axiom "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance." Freedoms Foundation is merely trying to make America vigilant. To be vigilant you must be alert, and if you are going to stay alert, you have to be informed. There has to be an understanding of our Republic's aspirations and responsibilities. Our Foundation has discovered over its years of experience that not enough Americans know the character and true value of our heritage, or what it would mean for us to lose the global war between spiritually-based liberty and atheistic-Communist dictatorship. We know of course that there is trouble between our leaders and Khrushchev, but when we get down to the real meaning of the struggle, it is one for the hearts and minds of men. Are we doing our part?

A lot of you served in one or more wars. During my wartime experience I had the habit whenever possible to be in the front areas talking to soldiers. I discovered that the question most frequently asked of me, and the most difficult for me to answer, was "Why am I fighting?"

Soldiers would say to me "Why am I here?" "Why have I been rooted out of my family while back home there is a bunch of fellows on strike? Why are we sleeping in the mud, picking up dead and wounded comrades? Why are we hungry, sometimes without sleep? Why are we putting our lives on the line?"

These most important questions I tried to answer but these answers should have been given before that time of life and death crisis. We have millions of people in the United States who have never found it necessary to put their lives on the line to save our nation, and all it stands for. We have millions of people today who really don't know about the difference between the Hitler idea and the American ideal.

When at the close of hostilities, my command responsibility ended, I had the strongest desire to come home and find a comfortable place in some rural college. There I wanted to talk to young people about America. I still have that desire but I never got the chance. Other things interfered - Columbia University, NATO, and then the Presidency. All my ideas about living in a quiet, rural college where I would have the chance to talk about America went out the window. Now I am trying to do this work in Freedoms Foundation, something that I could not do while in active service.

In my opinion, Freedoms Foundation is one of the truly important organizations in our country. Because America must do more than win battles on the battlefield. We must keep the economic, spiritual and political ideals of our country where everybody can see them, appreciate them, strengthen them. We must teach our young to revere the example of George Washington, particularly Washington at Valley Forge, his winter of greatest test and trial.

One quotation of Washington that is most meaningful and should be our guideline today was said at Valley Forge. He said "Impress on the mind of every man, from the first to the lowest, the importance of the cause and what it is we are contending for."

I cannot emphasize too much that our freedoms are a single bundle, comprising mutually interdependent

economic, political and spiritual factors. If any one of these is destroyed then the whole fabric of our society disintegrates. That is why we want to put our hearts into the understanding of the operations of this nation and give total support to the Credo which symbolizes the meaning of our country.

There is no more important task than working with our young, as Freedoms Foundation is doing through the Awards Program and other processes. We must complete the Freedom Center for we need the residence halls for all the people coming here. While we do not have any interest in bricks and mortar as such, they are absolutely essential in carrying out our work. To each one of you I want to say that we hope you will deeply interest yourselves and participate in this work. In my view, it is one of the vitally important tasks in our nation's life today.

• Governor's Conference, Cleveland, Ohio, June 8, 1964

As, in periods of contemplation I reflect over my own lifetime of experiences and those of others, I have grown ever more convinced that the human family rises or falls according to fidelity to a few religious, political and ethical principles, which have persisted, and been reaffirmed, in almost every epoch of history. Stated very simply, they include: faith in the Almighty; respect for your neighbor; men are created equal; the individual is the most important element in a free society; freedom and justice are inseparable; responsibility accompanies privilege; liberty is man's most valuable possession; and character is the measure of his worth.

Sure progress toward an ever more satisfying life depends, I believe, upon how well men - and nations, too - can discipline themselves to adhere to such unchanging truths. Since time unending, it has been these fundamentals of faith and conduct that have kept alive the hopes of the world's multitudes that some day there might be achieved a worldwide reign of peace, of justice, of individual liberty, of satisfaction of human need.

Merely to state this timeless yearning of mankind is to summon to our minds visions of work and effort and partial defeat - and then still more work and still more effort. To reach the summit of our hopes it is the human lot, regardless of disappointments and fatigue, to disdain the plateaus of ease and the downward slopes of complacency, for we have learned from ages past that these, in spite of their enticing foreground, dead-end, inevitably, in despair and anguish.

Yet, to many among us in these times, the plateaus and slopes seem to have an irresistible appeal. Viewed in this perspective, the developing posture of our country cannot comfort any thoughtful person, in or out of government.

In pondering the reasons for this modern trend, my mind goes back to almost two centuries ago, when a youthful colonist, destined for immortality, took up his pen to define his concept of the inalienable rights of free men. In the golden words of Thomas Jefferson, these rights included "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness." It is clear, I believe, that he was one who did not equate happiness with affluence, self-indulgence, or idleness; but we wonder, whether in some modern misinterpretation of this revered phrase - known to every generation of Americans from childhood - is to be found the origin of some of our anxieties today.

Had Jefferson foreseen any possibility that "Pursuit of Happiness" might one day be read as justifying selfish and empty purposes, I suspect he would have, at the very least, added a footnote of explanation, if not of caution, for our current benefit.

A famous Frenchman once said, "Liberty is the opportunity for self-discipline." How right he was - for certain it is that self-discipline, national and personal, is indispensable to the long-term survival of freedom. But discipline is not necessarily compatible with the short-range pursuit of happiness. Indeed, in some circumstances, self-discipline requires self-denial and fortitude and a willingness to forgo the heart's immediate desire.

But if in the long view Jefferson's "Pursuit of Happiness" is to be construed - as he intended - to mean self-control today that there may be stability and progress tomorrow, then the phrase stands as a noble expression of a national aim. If we let it mean self-indulgence today, at the expense of tomorrow, then the term could well lead us astray.

Now, to me, self-indulgence includes failure to fulfill the recognized responsibilities of citizenship. It is

the worst form of laziness and leads, inevitably, to centralization of power. That power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely, is wisdom distilled from ages of tragic human experience.

It was in that wisdom that the forefathers built a system to perpetuate the capability of the citizen to govern himself - a system in which the exercise of power would be so dispersed and so counterbalanced that no one person and no one group could dominate others. The system requires that each citizen, to the utmost of his ability, be an individual of responsibility, and of sturdy self-reliance. The delicately balanced structure which our forbears so painstakingly contrived was intended to insure us against ourselves - that, in this land, liberty would survive. And survive it has, for two centuries, an achievement that is at the core of our heritage.

But I repeat my opinion that in the current century we have begun noticeably to breach the barricades, erected with such care nine score years ago in Philadelphia, against the propensity within us to destroy liberty. The divergence, deliberate or not, from the guidelines laid down by the founding fathers has grown apace and the end is not in sight.

Twelve years ago I put aside the nation's uniform, worn for forty years, in a pledge to help restore political balance to a system that, in my personal view, was becoming definitely tilted toward one philosophy and one grouping in our society, both leading toward an all-pervasive federal intrusion into our lives. For eight years thereafter in the presidency, a constant purpose and a constant striving were to fulfill that pledge.

I would like here to recite a few of the directions into which our efforts were channeled during those years, not as self-justification (and, of course, there were defeats as well as successes), but to provide a backdrop for a specific proposal I made seven years ago to a body similar to this, and for others I shall suggest today.

Beginning in 1953, the then new administration sought, for example, to re-instill a national respect for the Congress of the United States as an equal partner in the Tripartite Federal Structure. In this there was measurable success.

But balance is essential not only among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government, it is equally necessary for satisfactory relations between the several echelons of government.

Our eight year program to shore up the structure of liberty included many things - discouragement of direct appeals to Washington by lesser officials than governors; efforts to restore farming to farmers; better protection of the rights of individual workers; establishment of workable partnerships in power development; and reaching into such things as elimination of various forms of governmental competition with private enterprise, development of cooperative programs to improve health and education, and a myriad of others.

As part of the entire effort we worked to harness federal spending to demonstrated need, and so help protect the value of the citizen's savings. This effort, though far from the results I had envisioned, resulted promptly in a budgetary surplus, permitting a then unmatched tax reduction with larger revenue sources to the states.

All these measures comprised a package of apparently unrelated items; but all were threaded on one theme - the common sense re-direction of citizen interest to his own responsibilities; to his own locality's affairs, his own state's affairs, and limitation of the Federal Government to its intended role. The specific proposal of seven years ago, to which I adverted earlier and which relates directly to this meeting, was initiated in an address before a conference of your predecessors in the Capital of Colonial Virginia at Williamsburg.

Time and time again over the earlier years of my administration I had met with state governors, singly and in groups. Invariably we agreed on the theory of returning more power, more responsibility, more tax revenues to the states. In practice, however, difficulties - sometimes apparently insuperable - always presented themselves. Finally at Williamsburg I suggested that the Governor's Conference and the Federal Administration together create a joint committee, charged with three responsibilities: first, to identify specific functions for the states to assume and finance that were then performed or financed wholly or in part by the Federal Government; second, to recommend federal and state revenue adjustments so that the states could assume such functions; and, third, to pinpoint functions and responsibilities likely to require future state or federal attention and to recommend the level of state effort, or federal effort, or both, needed for effective action. These proposals constituted a concrete and earnest attempt to revert tax revenues to the states to enable them to take back responsibilities previously syphoned off to Washington.

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee developed recommendations for reform in numerous fields, but the critical test of the whole undertaking came in a plan to transfer to the states, in return for a portion of the Federal Telephone Tax, the Federal Vocational Education and Waste Treatment Facilities Programs. This, I was convinced, was exactly the sort of program that States' Rights proponents had long called for. For the moment I was fired with hope. To my regret, however, there was little meaningful state support.

One reason was illustrated by this incident: A group of governors visited me to say, "Mr. President, don't eliminate from the federal tax the money you want us to receive. Should you do so, we doubt that our legislatures would give us the authority to collect an equal amount. Let the federal government collect the money and then give it to us as a grant." As a result of this attitude, the Congress, feeling no pressure, failed to act. That failure I deplore still. Perhaps - just perhaps - a step forward here would have inclined the Nation away from its continuing drift toward aggregating ever more power and ever more influence in Washington, D.C.

Parenthetically, I remind you that some 20 of the United States Senators today - one fifth of the Senate membership - were previously State Governors. By contrast I know of no governor today who reached his office by way of the United States Senate. Perhaps, then, I should have opened these remarks with the salutation: "Greetings, future Senators!" But, gentlemen, if one of these offices has to be a stepping stone to the other, I would personally prefer to see the order reversed.

But let us now dwell too long on opportunities lost to enhance the dignity and power of the states, or in decrying the pyramiding of federal authority. With your indulgence, I suggest that new attempts be made, and I offer some possibilities.

First, our best protection against bigger government in Washington is better government in the states. I would hope that in each state, where improvements have fallen behind, a major effort could be launched to maximize efficiency and to streamline the governmental structure. For, as all America knows, and as you know best of all, state governments have expanded enormously, many in topsy fashion, since the turn of the century. One state now has 360 state boards, commissions and agencies. Doubtless others represented here are equally encumbered. A nation-wide, state-by-state, energetically advocated program to prune and update state administrative activities would save considerable state revenue, win widespread citizen approbation, and do much to slow the march on Washington.

Intimately related, of course - perhaps, in some instances, a prerequisite - is constitutional revision. I am told of one state with 217,000 words in its constitution, with 407 amendments. The index alone for another constitution takes 60 pages. It was only three years ago that one state repealed a constitutional clause voiding land grants given by the King of England after October 14, 1775. Clearly, past solutions for past problems, imbedded in state constitutions, should be allowed no longer to impair the ability of state governments to meet their present needs.

Other possible improvements - often pondered, I am sure, by each governor present - include re-evaluation of the functions of our 7,000 state legislators. In most instances state responsibilities in these times require more of legislators than 30 to 90 day sessions; staff assistance of greater competence and numbers is sure desirable; and the compensation of legislators needs to be increased above today's medial salary of approximately \$4,000 a year. At least two states, I understand, still pay their representatives \$5 a day; another, the equivalent of \$3 a day, which works out, younger friends remind me, to something less than babysitters get for an evening's work.

Far too short terms for some governors and prohibitions against more than one term should likewise be studied.

But there is far more to be done than mere improvement of the mechanisms of state government. Think of some of the glaring problems that clearly fall within the purview of state responsibility. Strong moral and political leadership is called for if we are to do better in diminishing the erosive influence of juvenile delinquency, of crime, of lack of educational and recreational opportunities, and the annual slaughter by motor vehicles on our highways.

To find better solutions than so far we have, the Federal Government can assist in many ways. But in all these things responsibility resides definitely in the states, and leadership in their governors. The better the states

do their jobs, the better the chance that the Federal Government will cooperate properly and effectively with them, and stop seeking to dominate such programs. Just as political power resides in the people and is generated from bottom upward - so should political correction of local domestic problems be initiated normally at the grass roots.

Moving to a different but related field, I remind this body that, collectively, the states possess a national power of monumental significance. I refer to the constitutional provision, till now unused, that amendments to our basic charter may be proposed by a convention that must be convened by Congress on application of two-thirds of the state legislatures. The resulting amendments, when ratified by state conventions or legislatures in three-fourths of the states, become an integral part of the Constitution of the United States.

The point I wish to highlight is this: contrary to the popular impression, the collective will of the people of this country can, in important areas, make itself effective through the states themselves, acting in concert. There is no need for endless waiting on Congressional action; there is no need for groveling before any part of the Federal Government.

Consider the so-called "item veto," which presidents, one after another, have urged upon Congress for years on end. Almost four-fifths of the state governors hold this power today respecting appropriations bills. And to my southern friends present I offer this reminder - the item veto was first developed in the Confederate Constitution of 1861, and it first flowered in the southern states.

On the national level, the refusal of Congress to grant this power to the President has resulted in blatant abuses. Yet those states already granting their governors this authority could, by themselves, using Constitutional procedures, endow the President of the United States with the same authority, and all America would be the better. There would be an end to the costly "pork barrels," so beloved by self-serving politicians - and end, also, to one of the many devices which centralize power in Washington.

Another Constitutional amendment might, with some wisdom, provide, on the one hand, that (except in an emergency declared by Congress) the President must submit to Congress federal budgets which balance at least biennially. On the other hand, it should provide that Congress can increase items in the President's budgetary recommendations only by a two-thirds vote.

Obviously an amendment of this kind would have to come through state initiative, for the power to spend irresponsibly and to charge the bills to the unborn through deficit financing is a mighty political weapon. Such an amendment would work miracles for responsibility on the federal level, and would bring to a sudden halt much of the federal trespassing on state preserves. You are aware, of course, that several of our states have limits upon their legislatures to prevent increases in appropriations recommendations, so the concept I have mentioned is not new to the American system.

Such proposals I mention, however, not so much in a spirit of advocacy, but rather as examples whereby the states, acting together, can enforce their will on the national stage. Amendment to our Constitution is, of course, not to be lightly undertaken. But I am sure that out of your collective knowledge and experience you may well conceive of other proposals worthy of earnest study, particularly if their purpose is to keep government responsible, and keep it closer to the people. I repeat - this Constitutional amending process has never been used. But once used, those in Washington power centers would never again feel at ease in their restless work to extend the federal reach or use tax money to attract votes.

Gentlemen, many among you are personal friends of mine of many years standing. Some of you have already moved courageously, and coincidentally with burgeoning need, to remedy flaws in state government. I know that every one of you is dedicated to advancing the well-being of the people of your respective areas, and have a zeal no less burning than mine to do everything in your power to strengthen freedom.

Even more, perhaps, than you can appreciate, upon you and the forcefulness of your leadership and the efficiency of your state administrations - upon the initiatives which you may take - rests in major degree the arresting of power concentration in this nation. Thus, in your hands may rest the restoration of the self-discipline and the restraint so essential, now and in the future, to the preservation of individual liberty and the freedom of America.

No cause could be more important; most earnestly do I hope you will adopt it as your own, and most sincerely do I wish you success in its accomplishment.

• Taras Shevchenko Monument, Washington, DC, June 27, 1964

On September 13, 1960, when I signed into law a measure to authorize the erection of this statue, it was my expectation that you would arrange a ceremony of dedication commensurate with the greatness of Taras Shevchenko. That day is here and you have come by the thousands from all over the United States; you have come from Canada, from Latin America and Europe, and from as far away as Australia, to honor the memory of a poet who expressed so eloquently man's undying determination to fight for freedom and his unquenchable faith in ultimate victory.

This outpouring of lovers of freedom to salute a Ukrainian hero far exceeds my expectation. But its meaning does not exceed my hope. For my hope is that your magnificent march from the shadow of the Washington Monument to the foot of the statue of Shevchenko will here kindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words and actions of men; a never-ending movement dedicated to the independence and freedom of peoples of all captive nations of the entire world.

During my boyhood more than three score years ago it was confidently predicted that within the lifetime of my generation the principles of our free society would become known to all people everywhere and would be universally accepted around the world. That dream has faded.

Within the past few decades, the concepts of liberty and human dignity have been scorned and rejected by powerful men who control great areas of our planet. The revolutionary doctrines of our free society are far from universal application in the earth. Rather, we have seen the counterattacks of fascism and communism substitute for them the totalitarian state, the suppression of personal freedom, the denial of national independence, and even the destruction of free inquiry and discussion.

Tyranny and oppression today are not different from tyranny and oppression in the days of Taras Shevchenko. Now as then, tyranny means the concentration of all power in an elite body, in a government bureau, in a single man. It means that the ultimate decisions affecting every aspect of life rest not with the people themselves, but with tyrants.

Shevchenko experienced this kind of governmental usurpation of decisions he believed he should have the right to make for himself. And he was a champion of freedom not solely for himself. When he spoke out for Ukrainian independence from Russian colonial rule, he endangered his own liberty. When he joined a society whose aim was to establish a republican form of government in countries of Eastern Europe, he was jailed - even denied the right to use pencil and paper to record his thoughts about freedom. Today that same pattern of life exists in the Soviet Union and in all captive nations. Wherever communism rules there is forceful control of thought, of expression, and indeed of every phrase of human existence that the State may choose to dominate.

The touchstone of any free society is limited government, which does only those things which the people need and which they cannot do for themselves at all, or cannot do as well. Our nation was created as this kind of society, in a devout belief that where men are free, where they have the right to think, to worship, to act as they may choose - subject only to the provision that they transgress not on the equal rights of others - there will be rapid human progress. We believe also that when this kind of freedom is guaranteed universally, there will be peace among all nations.

Though the world today stands divided between tyranny and freedom we can hope and have faith that it will not always so remain.

Of all who inhabit the globe, only a relatively few in each of the captive nations - only a handful even in Russia itself - form the evil conspiracies that dominate their fellow men by force or by fraud. Because man instinctively rebels against regimentation - he hungers for freedom, for well-being and for peace - even though he may not, in some regions, always comprehend the full meaning of these words. Yet the will of a few men thwarts the will of hundreds of millions and freedom stands aghast that this is so. But let us not forget the ageless truth, "This, too, shall pass." And until it does, we can be sure that this nation will, with its valued allies, sustain the strength - spiritual, economic and military - to foil any ill-advised attempt by dictators to seize any area where the love of freedom lives and blazes.

In the nations of East and Central Europe, in the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., and in Russia itself - where the poetry of Shevchenko is well known - there are millions of individual human beings who earnestly want the right of self-determination and self-government. His statue, standing here in the heart of the nation's capital, near the embassies where representatives of nearly all the countries of the world can see it, is a shining symbol of his love of liberty. It speaks to these millions of oppressed. It gives them constant encouragement to struggle forever against communist tyranny, until, one day final victory is achieved, as it most surely will be.

Most of you here today are of Ukranian descent or origin. All of us - if we go back one generation, or two, or ten, find family roots in some other nation, some other continent. But today, we stand together as Americans, bound by our common devotion to a system of self government - a system that makes it possible for us to be different, and yet united; independent, yet interdependent; diverse, and yet inseparable.

To be successful in bringing peace with freedom and justice to the world, we must increase our joint efforts to make peoples around the world more aware that only in freedom can be found the right road to human progress, happiness and fulfillment. Shevchenko lived and taught this truth.

In unveiling this memorial to the great nineteenth century Ukranian poet we encourage today's poets in Ukraine, in Eastern Europe, and around the world to embody in their poetry mankind's demands for freedom for self-expression, for national independence, and for liberty for all mankind. We know that were he alive today, he would still be in the forefront of that great struggle.

And now I recall the words of one of America's greatest sons, Abraham Lincoln. Speaking just 100 years ago he said: "It is not merely for today, but for all time to come, that we should perpetuate for our children's children that great and free government, which we have enjoyed all our lives." In the same spirit, it is not merely for today, but for all time to come that we today present to the world this statue of Taras Shevchenko, bard of Ukraine and freedom fighter, to perpetuate man's faith in the ultimate victory of freedom.

With incessant work, and with God's help, there will emerge, one day, a new era, an era of universal peace with freedom, and justice for all mankind.

• **Statement for Republican National Convention Program, July 1964**

It is a privilege to extend warm greetings and felicitations to all participants in the 48th Republican National Convention.

As we meet for the important work of the Convention the needs of the nation transcend all other considerations. As Americans we are challenged to look ahead, not to a political victory for its own sake, but to a victory which will proclaim anew the promise and the humanitarian purpose of the United States toward its own and toward free people everywhere.

Neither our deepening difficulties abroad nor painful social and economic strains at home will lessen as long as the words and actions of national leaders seem to cast doubt on the principles which emerged from our revolt against tyranny two centuries ago. Our dedication is to those principles, and it is only as we apply them to the problems of today can we defeat those who try to lead our people through a wilderness of sterile planning and politically alluring panaceas, and into short-sighted ventures abroad, that solve nothing and lead to ever greater disappointment.

Over the years the Republicans have guided the nation safely through times of peace and danger. We have been able to do this because we have been bound together in allegiance to unchanging American concepts, the most basic of which is that of free individuals, well informed and using their own good judgment, are capable of achieving anything they set out to do when they are allowed and encouraged to do their best.

In calling for rededication to American principles I urge my fellow Republicans to carry their message to our countrymen as the united Party of the future; enriched by the lessons of history; armed with the tools of experience, and pledging common-sense government devoted to preserving the freedom and the well-being of every citizen in the land.

• Republican National Convention Speech, July 14, 1964

I am here this evening, first of all, as a citizen of the United States, with primary allegiance to my country; but second, I am here, with great pride, as a Republican.

I am dedicated to the purposes of this party; I am jealous of its good name; I am grateful to those among us who represent us all by their discharge of political responsibility.

Because of these feelings, I hold this simple conviction: For the good of America, Republicans must be restored in great numbers to controlling positions at all governmental levels, including the highest - the Presidency of the United States.

My purpose this evening is very personal - to give you the reasons for my deep dedication to Republicanism - as I understand Republicanism. To do so, I shall cite a few incidents in our party's history, and then take a glance at its opportunities for service today and in the future.

This means that, only for a moment, I must ask you to bank the fires of fiercely competitive intraparty politics and contemplate with me the whole of this great party of ours - the reasons for its birth, its record of valuable service, and the bright promise of its future. Please understand that just as soon as I finish, you are at liberty to resume the fray!

Our party, let us never forget, was born out of protest against the supreme indignity to mankind - slavery - the story of which is found on the darkest pages of America's history, both North and South. It persisted as a social cancer even in this land of liberty, until Abraham Lincoln eliminated it a century ago, supported by our party, which he led. This Republican Party, then, was conceived to battle injustice. It was born committed against degradation of people. So it is more than mere coincidence that we Republicans have, as an article of political belief, faith in the individual. Nor is it coincidence that our party, so born, has never ceased to champion the rights and privileges of every citizen, regardless of race or station. It is not our claim, therefore - and may it never be - that we or any others have the right or duty to control the individual in the legitimate conduct of his daily life. Rather, we have ever sought to create an atmosphere of liberty and to sustain its substance. Consistent with this effort, we have maintained that in all those things that the citizen can better do for himself than can his government, the government ought not to interfere.

From the time that Lincoln signed the Land Grant Act in 1862 to recent weeks when Republicans in Congress, to their great credit, voted far more overwhelmingly than did our opponents to pass the Civil Rights Bill, our party's programs have reflected concern for the individual citizen, whoever he may be - wherever he may be - whatever he may be. Though often cast in the role of the opposition in recent years, and compelled to battle a never ending stream of unwise proposals, the party's stature has been earned through its dedication to positive purposes.

For a half century after Lincoln's inauguration our country lived under almost continuous Republican leadership. And it prospered mightily. Transcontinental systems of railways, roads and waterways - great manufacturing plants, schools and bustling communities - sprang forth as if by magic; all the product of a free people, vigorously and freely competing among themselves. Protected by laws against an unwarranted concentration of industrial or financial power, our citizenry proudly and happily pushed forward to new levels of achievement and prosperity.

The next half century, beginning shortly before World War I and marked later by the Great Depression, World War II and the Korean Conflict, ushered in a season of troubles. In the last thirty-two years, our political opponents have controlled the executive branch of the Federal Government for twenty-four, and the Congress for twenty-eight. During this period our money was recklessly devalued, with great hardship visited upon much of our citizenry. The expansion of federal influence was made permanent policy, even though its miserable lack of success in the economic arena persisted until the violent demands of war obscured the unhappy failure. The centralizing process even went so far as to include an attempt, by summary executive power, to seize the steel industry.

Some of these acts and laws were necessary - others not - but the sinister trend toward paternalism, which now again grows apace, was interrupted only by the eight-year determination of a Republican

administration in the 1950's. That administration stood for integrity in government. It stood for fiscal responsibility, including disciplined management of public spending. It supported our private competitive enterprise system. It insisted that all public responsibilities be carried out, wherever possible, by local and state governments; by the federal government only when necessary.

Our party stood also for a sound foreign policy, within which every critical development would be carefully judged and consistent action forthrightly taken. Recognizing that in this troubled and threatened world, security forces unmatched in efficiency and strength are necessary to sustain the peace, our party provided them. At the same time it insisted upon avoiding the peaks and valleys in military activity that spell, always, waste and extravagance.

It was an administration which set its face directly for the people and their well-being and directly against any increase in the concentration of power in Washington. We rejected those steps which, over the long run, would make the citizen a ward of government; instead our Republican position was that the ambitions, incentives and aspirations of free men are the mainspring of progress.

In these years the party achieved, I submit, a record of strength for America abroad - a record of responsible, common sense government at home. But the raucous cry of demagoguery has never ceased. Beginning in the 1930's and continuing to today, our countrymen have been subjected to a sustained barrage of political misrepresentation.

Let me offer a few examples. First, for thirty years opposing political leaders have claimed that ours is the party of privilege. This is utter nonsense. Our concern for every citizen, whatever his status, shines forth from every tenet of Republican doctrine. The truth is, it is Republicans who think of, and really try to serve, the "littlest" of all citizens - the children of America, and even the grandchildren of today's unborn babe. By our insistence upon paying now for what we demand from government today, instead of charging our bills to posterity, we are seeing to it that those who follow us will not one day be working out their lives, paying off gigantic debts run up through our own selfishness and profligacy.

This concern for the future is in keeping with Republican conviction and American tradition. America is here, not just for a day or a century! In the Constitution we read, as the purpose of our inspired founders, "To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." Any political party that counsels us to ignore the needs of tomorrow, so that, on deficit spending, we may live today in comfort and ease, is false to America's true meaning and to her destiny. Our policy of sound conduct of fiscal affairs is simply proof of our concern for all Americans, both now and in the future.

When Republicans stand for a sound dollar - meaning one that will buy tomorrow roughly as much as today - demagogues cry out that we care less for people than money. Yet, who can be hurt more by spiraling costs than the wage earner? The worker will, one day, have to live on his hard earned pension, insurance policy, or savings account. He has no defense against the silent, but most insatiable, thief of all - inflation. It is for the sake of that worker - white collar, blue collar or no collar - that we fight to prevent erosion of our currency.

Again, when public opinion polls indicate that Democrats can keep America at peace more surely than Republicans can, certainly nothing but public misinformation or blind partisanship is reflected. The causes of America's wars of this century cannot fairly be laid to any political party or individual. But when we remember that all three of them - World War I, World War II and the Korean War - were started during Democratic administrations, and that none in this century started during Republican administrations, it is hard to believe that an informed and impartial public should conclude Republicans are less able to keep the peace than Democrats.

The most persistent charge against us is that Republicans have ignored the great human problems that have been occasioned - or at least intensified - by modern mass production. While Republicans have insisted that these problems should not become the football of Washington bureaucrats, we have approached them sympathetically and at the grassroots - so that the solutions for emerging difficulties would be tailored best to the conditions pertaining to specific needs. Thus, such participation of the federal government as is necessary should reflect the wisdom and desires of those closest to the problem.

It was in this framework of conviction and action that a Republican administration in the 1950's extended social security coverage to 10 million more people. It is why Republicans increased social security

payments to meet the increased living costs caused by earlier inflation. For the same reasons we initiated programs to meet the conditions in chronically depressed areas - programs designed to help people help themselves. Also it is why we took steps by law to insure the ability of able young men and women to obtain university training, today so badly needed by the nation.

In all such work the Republican aim has been not merely to meet the immediate and inescapable material needs of the citizen, but so to act as to do no damage to his pride, dignity, self-reliance and confidence. This is the kind of help in which Republicans believe, the kind they evidenced when, under the leadership of a Republican administration, the first breakthrough in eighty years was made in obtaining civil rights legislation. Except for that success in 1957, and except for Republican leadership in the current congress, it is scarcely likely that the comprehensive bill of 1964 could have become law. With the passage of this law I believe that every Republican should now take upon himself a moral commitment: to do his utmost to see that it is implemented not merely by the power of legally constituted enforcement agencies, but by the hearts of a determined and free people.

These few examples warn us that the spreading of the truth about our party, and about the philosophy that has guided us from Lincoln's day to this moment, is for us a basic mission and duty. To do this we must maximize our own strength. We must learn that when any Republican concerns himself too much in condemning this or that faction of decent people in the party, he is hurting himself and the party. Strength is found in unity, under a consensus broad enough to accommodate the honest thinking of all who subscribe to our basic doctrines.

Of course, individually and as a party, we must never shut our eyes to problems that adversely affect numbers of our people and that they are unable themselves to solve. These include certain phases of health programs, education, care of the aged, civil rights, slums and impoverished areas. In attacking them, however, we refuse to clothe the federal government with exclusive power to handle such matters. To achieve a balance between local and federal participation is difficult - so difficult that it is in these efforts we find differences - sometimes deep differences among us.

But these differences do not go to the root of Republicanism and our basic doctrines. Rather they concern matters of degree of effort, procedures and other matters. Other divisions, far less valid, are created among us by geography. Frankly, I doubt that I belong to any of these sectioned party groupings. But I do hope no one will read me out of the party because I was born in the southwest, raised in the mid-west, now live in the east, spend the fall in the deep south, and winter in the far west.

Clearly, we should set some clear limits on the extent to which each Republican should go in trying to prove himself a better, wiser, and sounder Republican than any of his fellows. Cannot we also agree wholeheartedly that radicalism of any kind, whether of the right or the left is bad not simply for our party but also for America?

I believe with all my heart that the kind of party ours must be, is one that rejects as unfit and unwholesome all who are purveyors of hatred and intolerance, who are prone to the use of violence, who malign the character of fellow Americans, and who baselessly charge decent Americans with treasonable acts or intentions. We should reject as well those who misguidedly, through extremist economic nostrums and wishful thinking in foreign affairs, would weaken or deliberately destroy this Republic.

Let me repeat one critical point: the divisions I mention within commonsense Republicanism do not evolve from differences over basic ideals and principles. They involve the lesser questions, and far too often, in the heat of debates, we exaggerate their importance. Possibly we should take a good hard look at ourselves. If such differences should ever become so deep and permanent that, even after our platform is agreed and our nominees are selected, we are unable to unite in good will for victory, then our quarreling groups could hardly coexist in the same party.

I do not accept, not for a single moment, the need for any such ridiculous outcome. For a minority party it would be tragic and, in addition, stupid. We can - and we should - compete vigorously and honorably among ourselves. But never can we afford to permit ourselves to be led astray by meaningless slogans, labels, preconceived notions and prejudice; and we shall not be, if we cleave to the straight path of principle and common sense. The disappointed should strive to improve our Party - not destroy it.

My friends, we are Republicans. If there is any finer word in the entire field of partisan politics I have not heard it. So let us particularly scorn the divisive efforts of those outside our family, including sensation-seeking columnists and commentators, who couldn't care less about the good of our party.

Now, in saying this, I do not mean that we can turn our attention only inward. For three decades we have been the minority party. Victory cannot be won by Republicans alone, no matter how tightly we are joined together. But a great chasm of public prejudice and lack of information separates us from millions of independents and those Democrats who, being thoughtful, are disenchanted. We simply must find better ways for bringing the truth to the public.

Here, I have a word about an obligation that rests with special force upon the Republican Party. Since 1932 we have been protesting vigorously against the drift of political power to Washington, a drift that places far too much influence in the hands of federal government for controlling our lives and our entire economic structure.

One effective way to counteract this trend is to insist upon better government in communities and in the several states. There are many ways of an organizational or legal character in which this improvement can come about. Here I refer only to a single type of method - a moral and, therefore, an individual one.

There are many problems which are peculiarly local in character but are so serious and widespread as to occasion a national concern, thus increasing the demands "that something must be done." Among these are crimes in our city streets and public parks, juvenile delinquency, slaughter on our highways, attacks upon law enforcement officers, drop outs from our schools, and disorders arising out of the effort to integrate our institutions of learning.

Good local governments will attack these problems by legal methods. They can impose punishment more in keeping with the crimes committed, especially in the case of repeaters. They can expand police protection, build more and better schools, and provide better lighting on our streets and parks. But beyond the cures that can be effected by local government lies the attitude of the average citizen, his degree of concern, his readiness to recognize and attack the problem himself, and to encourage the people that operate his government to perform their duty without favor. It is not enough to limit ourselves merely to writing letters to the editor or refusing to walk our streets after dark. In the home, in the school and the church is a great field where the aggregate influence of dedicated concern among the local citizenry can be applied with revolutionary impact on all these evils.

We can demand that our judges dispense justice without fear or favor, ignoring special pleas from any of us even where friends or family are involved. We can encourage and offer assistance to the policeman and his family when he is injured in the line of duty. Let us not be guilty of maudlin sympathy for the criminal who, roaming the streets with the switchblade knife and illegal firearm, seeking a helpless prey, suddenly becomes, upon apprehension, a poor, underprivileged person who counts upon the compassion of our society and the laxness or weakness of too many courts to forgive his offense.

Meeting in such conventions as this we attempt to do our duty as we see it; and we donate to the campaigns of the nominees we have selected. I submit it is equally necessary that with our substance and our political support we help our governors, our mayors and the organizations operating under them to keep the peace and maintain order. In this entire field I would hope that the Republican Party will assume its proper place in the forefront of the forces fighting for decency, safety and progress in all the localities that make up this fair land.

So, in sum, the question before us comes down to this: How intense is our determination to live and act Republican throughout our lives? Just how determined are we to elect Republicans to office in order to reapply fiscal soundness to federal affairs and strengthen local and state responsibilities and authority? How important is it, really, for us to restore an atmosphere in which the initiative of the individual and the vigor of competitive enterprise can again have the greatest possible influence throughout the land? If the answer be that these are truly our fundamental goals, then let us renew our strength from the fountain of unity, not drown ourselves in a whirlpool of factional strife and divisive ambitions. And let us not stain our image by consorting with radicals of any kind.

This, in sketchy outline, is my treasured picture of the Republican Party. It is the kind of party in which

I, for one, and I would hope the vast majority of Americans, could serve with lasting pride. I count on it - and with confidence.

My friends, for me the shadows lengthen. But my loyalty to the historic mission of my party, to its great record and to its promise for the future, is as strong and bright as ever. My confidence will never dim so long as all of us stand together for human dignity and for the sound and steady progress of this wonderful land; for so long as we stand as the strong, wise and sturdy leader of freedom in the world.

May the Almighty look with favor on your purpose and on your work. And now, good night and Godspeed.

• **Railroad Museum (Arena Lunch), Green Bay, Wisconsin, September 1964**

So far as I can recall, Neil McElroy never introduced me at a political meeting when I was a candidate for public office. But now that I have heard him, I missed out in 1952 and 1956. Undoubtedly the tickets on which my name appeared in those years would have gained many, many thousands more votes had Neil McElroy been able to tell an audience what he thought of me.

Of course, he was not entirely overlooked - far from it. During my years in the White House, his service within the administration proved his sense of responsibility as an American; his willingness to devote himself in the public service despite the heavy cost to pocketbook and leisure and even peace of mind.

For example, through the late '40's and early '50's we had been hearing that the primary and secondary school system of the United States had gotten into such a deplorable shape that only the Federal Government, by vast expenditure of money and equally vast intrusions into local affairs, could remedy an insufferable condition.

To find out the truth, we organized across the entire country, starting with the local school districts, a citizen study of our educational needs and problems and resources. From neighborhood meetings, we moved into districts and state and regional meetings and then into a White House Conference on Education at which the thinking of all our people was crystallized into a program of action.

The result was a re-dedication of America to the best possible education for its children; a wave of school construction unparalleled; a demonstration that an aroused people can on their own - using Government as a servant whenever needed - accomplish any worthy and worthwhile objective.

A leader in this grand enterprise of arousing the American people to study and to work was Neil McElroy.

Later, as Secretary of Defense, he mustered an army of scientific genius to the achievement of American leadership and security in space. The result of his leadership is our present position above the earth's atmosphere. Our most successful means of exploring space and of maintaining our security - the Atlas and the Titan - date back to his days in the Pentagon.

I have spoken at this length about Neil McElroy, not because of a natural gratitude for his glowing words about me, nor because I think him unique, but because I believe he is typical of the energy and the responsibility, the self-reliance and the independence, the patriotism and the faith that animates the American community in this and in the other forty-nine states of the Union.

All the money the Federal Government can raise in taxes or print in paper; all the pressure and power the Federal Government can exert for any purpose are vain and futile - if these qualities should disappear among our people.

Now, if I were to spend all my time back in Gettysburg, merely reading newspapers and magazines, watching television and listening to radio, I might very well get the idea that those qualities are fast disappearing. (As a matter of fact, there seem to be many who believe that they are obsolete because unnecessary; that the Federal Government should be our principal reliance in all things human).

Fortunately, in that small town of seven thousand or so, I see at least during the tourist season a cross-section of all America, come there solely because it is a shrine of those very qualities.

Fortunately, too, I get around the country a good bit, to states like Wisconsin, to cities like Green Bay,

where the sights I see, the talk I hear, the work going on is heartening evidence that the overwhelming majority of our people can still start things on their own; stay with them through all the difficulties and delays; and bring them to a successful completion.

Take, as an example, the National Railroad Museum and the British Steam Locomotive, we dedicated today. First of all, let me say, I have a very personal interest, dating back more years than I like to think of, in railroading.

As many of you know, for years my principal ambition was some day to find myself a locomotive engineer, announcing my approach to every crossing with a whistle blast which echoed across the countryside, acknowledging with a dignified salute from the cab the welcome that awaited me - and my train - at every station.

That dream was never realized. But something that, even in my most imaginative moments back in Kansas, never entered my head, did come true. Far off in England my name, cast in metal, was placed on a locomotive. And now, almost twenty years later, that locomotive is moved to an American Museum. Here - possibly through hundreds of years - visitors will see it.

Three or four, maybe ten centuries from now, they will inspect it. They may think it as ancient as the dinosaur and just as clumsy and slow a contraption for the movement of freight and people. We, on the other hand - at least those of us who can remember when everything in a small town was geared to the arrival of the milk train, the mail train, the express train - some years ago would have thought this locomotive the very last word in power and speed.

Two things, however, this locomotive will recall until it rusts away. First, the years when Americans, united with their allies, defeated and overthrew global tyrannies supported by military machines that, in their might and succession of victorious onslaughts, seemed invincible.

Second, the period when man mastered the energy of steam and, here in our own homeland, then scantily populated outside a few cities and in vast areas devoid of even the rudest structure, ran the rails over rivers, across deserts, through mountains, linking the Atlantic to the Pacific, the Gulf to the Great Lakes, ending the isolation of farm and town and the divisions of sectionalism.

So the locomotive, just added to the Museum, and its companion exhibits commemorate two grand triumphs of free men: the first, over tyranny; the second, over nature.

And, beyond that, the Museum itself is a monument to the American way of doing things. Enterprises of this sort in cities the size of Green Bay are the product of an idea, a dream, a vision born in the mind of a few men; communicated to their neighbors and associates; unswervingly pursued despite the objections of doubters and the red tape entanglements woven by those who knew it could not be done; realized in patience and in perseverance and an unshakable faith that no worthy goal is beyond achievement so long as free men give it their minds and hearts.

For me this morning's tour of the Museum has been a nostalgic return to those younger years of my life when the Iron Horse, the steam locomotive, was the mightiest engine of land transport ever devised by man.

But the tour, furthermore, was a revelation to me of how in a small city initiative and enterprise and the will to get things done transforms a dream into visible reality. So, for two reasons, I am happy that I could be with you today, a relatively early visitor to a shrine of history that will excite and inspire many generations yet unborn.

My congratulations go to all in Green Bay on this Museum, to all everywhere who have helped bring it about. I wish it limitless success.

In a concluding word, addressed strictly to Green Bay - I shall be watching the Packers in the weeks to come, despite some political distractions between now and November. However, I must not wish them limitless success. You see next week I must be in Chicago, the week after in New York and possibly later on in other cities where too strong an interest in the Packers' success might chill my reception.

• Wilbur Renk Campaign, Green Bay, Wisconsin, September 18, 1964

The last time I appeared in Green Bay during a political campaign was just a few weeks less than twelve years ago. And it's good to be back, making here my first appearance in this campaign before a Republican group.

Welcoming me this morning was one familiar face from '52 - John Byrnes. That year he asked me to say a word on his behalf. I asked him to make a few speeches on my behalf. I was sure he could do me more good in Green Bay than I could do him. That is still true, I am confident.

Unfortunately, in an election year, when I appear before a group of my fellow Republicans, at least a few of them usually expect of me wise and experienced counsel about the conduct of the campaign. Instead of giving you advice on that sort of thing, however, I have to make a confession.

These days, I don't seem able to arrange even my personal schedule. For example, through most of this summer, I had planned to spend the first two weeks of this month near Minocqua where I could fish and relax and in the evenings solve - to my own satisfaction - every problem that confronts us this season. My well-laid plans turned out to be wishful thinking. Back in August, the two weeks of vacation disappeared from my schedule.

This year's visit has been reduced to a few hours and two speeches. Now all I can hope is that next year will be quite different in all aspects - including the political - from 1964 and I shall get my two weeks of Wisconsin fishing. But, right now, in Wisconsin I should not open my mouth on planning a campaign of any kind.

There are some things, of course, on which I can talk. For instance, I am something of an authority on stream and lake fishing in this state from Minocqua and Tomahawk to Land of Lakes and the Brule River. My wife, brothers and I over a good many years have enjoyed this State's hospitality. Since the war, I must have been a resident of the state at least two months. In New York, the Democrats would consider that ample residential qualification for their United States Senate candidate.

Furthermore, I know a little about farming in Wisconsin. Back in 1950, I flew here from the East for one of those two weeks fishing engagements that seemed certain of realization until we discovered that the Rhinelander airport was closed and our gas was running low. For a few minutes, it looked like an end to all fishing trips. That area, as you know, has more trees and lakes than flat open spaces.

But our pilot, Al Ueltchi, one of Pan American's finest, got enough altitude to inspect the entire area and located one cow pasture of about ten acres that looked like a possibility as a landing field. To make sure, he flew down toward it and, at a height of not more than a few hundred feet, circled it a half dozen times. It didn't look very good to me. On three sides were woods. On the fourth side, a barbed wire fence and a narrow dirt road was all that separated us from still more woods. Then we went in.

I got my two weeks of fishing, no thanks to my planning the arrival or my choice of landing fields. But, ladies and gentlemen, there is one farm field in Wisconsin that I know far better than even its owner. I have examined every wrinkle and dip in the terrain, every stump, practically every pebble and blade of grass.

For this meeting, I am better prepared than I was for that landing. Two weeks ago yesterday one of the foremost musky authorities in Wisconsin, now eighty-six years of age and still able to put in four days of hard casting at a stretch, wrote me a letter. I want to read you part of it. He wrote: "I have known Wilbur and the Renk family ever since he was a little boy...Wilbur is just about as fine a young American as one can find and you need have no hesitation whatever in giving him unqualified support. As you know, he is clean cut, keenly alert, vibrant with energy and earnest desire to go, go, go - forward...His years on the University Board of Regents in close association with some of our most able men matured him...Everything I know about Wilbur is one hundred percent honorable, decent, and something we can all be justly proud of. He is a top-notch American. We are happy that he decided to go into politics and that he has the courage to speak out his beliefs - and the truth...At eighty-six years of age it has fallen to my lot to appraise many young men - including my officers overseas in World War I - but I do not recall one who merited rating above Wilbur Renk." So wrote me two weeks ago Joseph W. Jackson.

Now, a fisherman is usually a poor judge of the size of fish - particularly of the one he lost. But, I think an eighty-six year old fisherman is usually a good judge of men and their qualities. In this instance, I am in complete agreement with Joseph Jackson's estimate of Wilbur Renk.

Here in Wisconsin you have as your candidate for United States Senate a man thoroughly experienced as a farmer - a successful enough farmer that I think I should ask his advice how I can make some money out of cattle.

Thoroughly experienced in higher education for, through his adult years, he has been intimately associated as an alumnus and as an official leader in the advancement of one of America's greatest universities.

Thoroughly experienced in sound industrial expansion and the creation of jobs for, through many years, he has been intimately associated with the development of Wisconsin from a heavily agricultural and recreational state into a pace-setting region, fast exploiting all its potential for industrial leadership in the nuclear age.

Few men, known to me, can bring to the United States Senate so valuable experience and background at a time when American agriculture, American industry, American education desperately need on Capitol Hill men of wisdom and experience.

More than that, Wilbur Renk is an authentic Republican who puts the good of his Party and the betterment of his country above personal like and dislike, above factional dispute and regional difference. That he was a pioneer Chairman of the Citizens for Eisenhower twelve years ago, of course, does not lessen him in my esteem; after all I am human. But more importantly, he recognizes in all campaigns and particularly in this one the need for unity within the Republican Party. He is a loyal Republican.

Joined with him are Warren Knowles, whose years in the legislature and two terms as Lieutenant Governor certainly qualify him for the Governorship. And Jack Olsen, whose record as Lieutenant Governor warrants his re-election. These three men head your state-wide ticket. They and their fellow candidates merit your unstinted support for they are the exponents in Wisconsin in the year 1964 of the Republican philosophy of Government.

A concluding word on my own role in this campaign. I plan to work for and to vote for Senator Barry Goldwater because he won the nomination of my Party openly and forthrightly and overwhelmingly. I should be a poor American, indeed, were I so poor a Republican that I would desert the ranks because other candidates for the nomination were rejected.

I hope that everyone of you, in the same spirit, will do every bit you can to help the Republican cause between now and November third; and on that day, voting yourselves, persuade every friend of good government you know to vote Republican too.

• Chicago, Illinois, September 24, 1964

I come before you this evening in this great city and state as a Republican; a Republican who is loyal to his party because of the ideals and principles it has stood for during the century of its existence; a Republican ready to abide by his party's decision in its county, state and national conventions.

True to the basic tenets of the Republican Party we, as a nation, should be in our foreign affairs always strong and firm with those who oppose us - but always fair; conciliatory and encouraging to those who hesitate and falter; patient and understanding with those who are our friends and allies.

At home, the cornerstone of our party is the individual - his liberty, his rights, his capacity - these concern us always. According to Republican tenets, government - local and state and national- should be ready to do for us all that is necessary for our good that we ourselves cannot well accomplish for ourselves. But, never weakening our self-reliance or our initiative, always avoiding a heedless extravagance that makes debt the inheritance we pass on to those who follow us, and always determined that the integrity of the dollar will be maintained so that those, now in the afternoon of their lives, can be confident their savings, their pensions, their insurance, will not vanish because of a government spending binge, with a resultant inflation.

Because of my faith in our great party and my conviction that the political leadership it provides is badly needed today across the nation, I earnestly support it and its nominees for public service headed by Senator Goldwater, our candidate for the Presidency.

Now, if the vertical pronoun too often is heard in what I say this evening, I have a valid excuse. In the

campaign to elect Chuck Percy governor of Illinois, I am personally involved.

Through all the years of my presidency, second only to the call of my immediate duties as President of the United States, I had a constant political concern. That concern was to search out among younger men and women those of proved ability, of evident talent and of inspiring presence who shared my belief in the Republican Party. My search was rewarding. By the hundreds, I found men and women within our party who, to my mind, represented the best in the American present, the finest in the American heritage, the surest in the American future. I persuaded some of them to give up the larger pay, the shorter hours, the easier problems of private life for the toils and troubles of public service. Today, they serve their communities, their Congressional districts and states through the entire range of public office. I am here now to do everything I can to persuade you that another Republican governor should be added to the list.

More than six years ago, I began a campaign to convince Church Percy that the Republican Party, the state of Illinois, the United States of America, needed him. All three, I told him repeatedly, could profit from his leadership, his vision and energy; his unshakeable loyalty to American principles; his abiding faith in the American people and in their capacity still further to realize the American dream.

One part of my personal campaign has been crowned with success. Chuck Percy is the leader of a united Republican Party in Abraham Lincoln's home state. And I am here in Illinois, as a Republican, to assure all those who have believed my words in the past, that Chuck Percy can be a great governor, will be a great governor - if those who want honest, respectable, purposeful, enlightened government bestir themselves and work for him. This is the kind of government for which the Republican Party stands - the kind it practices.

The Governorship of Illinois is no little job to be awarded a man merely because he has spent all his life in politics; or because he is the favorite son of a political machine; or because he claims his hand can reach deeper into the federal treasury than any other. If those were the criteria for election as governor, Chuck Percy could not be elected. And I, certainly, would not be speaking on his behalf. And you would not be here tonight.

You recognize that, in this time, harsh and hard problems confront a man who is determined to be a great governor. Let me cite just one in the form of a question. How can we best maintain the independence, the vigor, the personality so to speak, of a sovereign state?

These days swarms of politicians, the chieftains of political machines, the worshippers of bureaucratic programs cry out for more dependence on Washington. They cry out for more abandonment of self-rule. They cry out for more strait-jacketing of our affairs by an authority that often makes no distinction between Alaska and Alabama, between Illinois and Idaho.

What is the answer to this question? My answer is this: Elect as governors of our states men who will not be stooges for Washington. Elect to all local offices individuals who believe in and practice the basic tenets of the Constitution of the United States.

Chuck Percy is no stooge. Out of my knowledge of him and his ways, I have no slightest doubt that he will bring to the governor's office genuine independence from the domination of political machines and cliques. He will assure fiscal responsibility, for he has an outstanding executive ability that has won him fame throughout the free world. He will be a genuine leader, inspiring support; not a boss, imposing rubber stamp obedience. He is a humanitarian as well as a businessman - he will assure within this state the equality of all before the law, and equal rights and opportunity for each citizen of Illinois. By sound management and by the elimination of politically-motivated waste and inefficiencies he will be able to focus, to concentrate the resources of Illinois, natural and fiscal and human, on the high challenges of state government.

Among the challenges that cry out for greatness in any man who is selected to lead one of our great states are these: Improvement of education so that young people will get the kind of schooling needed in the modern world, designed so to fit them for creative life that in their lives they may be worthy and effective Americans.

Another is moral leadership against the tides of lawlessness, accompanied by the courage to press for more effective law enforcement. Our streets and homes and business places must be made safe from the invasions of organized crime and senseless delinquency.

A third is action to foster a surge of economic growth. Illinois should be a leader of the nation in the creation of new jobs; in the expansion of our economic horizons; in the return to a sound and dependable and

growing prosperity. This state - no state - should be haunted by the threat of constant erosion in the value of the dollar. This state - no state - should be stuck with a crazy patchwork of dole and handout as a permanent federal program.

To challenges such as these, a candidate for high public office must bring a sense of urgency - the direct opposite of the dilatory and haphazard tactics of those who are more wrapped up in looking for votes than in getting a job done well and thoroughly.

A sense of urgency when a challenge confronts him is the essence of Chuck Percy. But a sense of urgency in a man must be balanced by a sense of values; a respect for decency and justice; wisdom to take the ideal for his guide, as he works for possible and practical goals. Chuck Percy is so balanced. This I know from long hours of deliberation with him.

He was one of those with whom I discussed, back in 1958, the need in America for a statement of goals, something more than politically contrived national objectives to arouse the best efforts of free men and women. We were not talking about a blueprint for a so-called Great Society. We knew that the greatest society of all time had begun in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution; that it had been defended in blood, extended in enterprise, strengthened in the responsible exercise of individual freedom, through all the generations since its first beginning.

We saw, however, that this greatest society as a way of life was endangered by increasing dependence on the central government as the source of all good, the guardian against all evil. We wanted to arouse once again in all Americans a fiery pride in national achievement that would be the reflection of individual achievement. We wanted to set before the American people great goals that were at once realistic and yet so high they would inspire every citizen to do his part in advancing the American levels of moral, intellectual and material strength.

Out of these discussions came my proposal in a State of the Union message for the establishment of a Commission on National Goals. Through almost two years the Commission and its staff, representing every facet of working and thinking America, studied the American potential. Scholars in universities, executives in industry, leaders in labor and agriculture, clergymen and soldiers and plain citizens pooled their knowledge and genius and vision in a far-ranging study of what Americans could do for America and themselves.

Because Chuck Percy so thoroughly interpreted our high hopes and purposes in this study, I arranged his appointment as chairman of the Republican Committee on Programs and Progress. Its duty was to translate into Republican action the goals discussed by the National Commission. His superb discharge of that duty, the brilliance of his committee's report, made most logical his appointment as chairman of our 1960 platform committee. Because of this background, your candidate for governor of Illinois will bring to that office a vision of great goals to be realized by Illinois - and all America; a commanding knowledge of today's problems and sound approaches to their solution.

One final word: In other places I have and I shall again, speak our my support of the Republican Party and all its candidates from the national to the local level. But I have come here principally because of my respect, admiration and friendship for Chuck Percy. Chuck Percy, loyal to Republican principles, devoted to Republican unity, will work for Republican beliefs and all Republican candidates. He needs to have elected with him his fellow state candidates and a legislature that will carry out his program.

He informs me that prominent in his program is more state support for education, effective anti-crime legislation, and enforceable election reform laws. To get his program across I commend to you the 118 responsible Republicans running at large for the legislature. I am proud that my brother Earl Eisenhower is one of them.

Under Chuck Percy's leadership, the pivotal state of Illinois - the land of Lincoln - can achieve new heights of greatness. And here he is: Chuck Percy.

• **York, Pennsylvania, October 5, 1964** (excerpt)

I'm here, my friends, as a Republican - a Republican who is loyal to his party, who is respectful of the

decisions made by the Republican Party, whether they are in the precinct, county, state or national conventions. And I do not only respect their decisions, I go along with them because I, as an individual, had my chance, by my vote, to express my preference whether or not I was defeated or was successful. My feeling of dedication to the party of Lincoln and the principles for which it stands are unchanged, so I shall vote for my candidates, the Republican candidates that are presented on our ticket this Fall from Senator Goldwater on down to the last precinct committeeman.

• **Oklahoma City, October 10, 1964**

Twelve years ago - in 1952 - I came to Oklahoma speaking on behalf of the Republican candidate for the Presidency. Some of my advisers thought the time spent in this state could be more profitably spent elsewhere. "Democrats," they pointed out to me, "far outnumber Republicans in Oklahoma. And they won't change." That's what some of my advisers said. Well, they were wrong; back in 1952. Oklahoma went Republican that year. Oklahoma went Republican in 1956. Oklahoma went Republican in 1960. And Oklahoma elected a Republican Governor in 1962. Evidently there have been enough discerning Democrats and informed independents, joining with Republicans, to make this genuinely a two-party state.

I am proud that I spoke in Oklahoma during each of those four campaigns and I am happy that I can be here this year, asking that you vote Republican again - for Barry Goldwater; for Bud Wilkinson; for Page Belcher and his fellow candidates on the Congressional ticket.

This visit is no sudden decision, made in the closing weeks of the campaign. Back in early June more than four months ago, Bud Wilkinson invited me to speak here. I then wrote a note: "This I would like to do around October 22-23-24." And here I am.

Entirely aside from politics, I have one common bond with Bud Wilkinson. Years ago, I was a football coach - at St. Mary's in Texas, at Fort Meade in Maryland. My record of gridiron success hardly compares with Bud Wilkinson's, of course. But the parallel in our careers might raise a question such as this: If an average-sort of football coach can get to the White House, why should not an outstanding football coach go to the United States Senate? The answer is: Certainly, Bud Wilkinson should - for many reasons; some of them directly connected with his performance as football coach.

Let me take a few of the latter first. Public office is public leadership, requiring of him who holds it in a free system of representative government, faith that the individual, properly aroused and motivated, will do far more than he has to do that an objective may be won. Bud Wilkinson has such faith in immense quantity and has seen it vindicated scores of times - by scores Oklahoma's opponents would like to forget.

Public leadership in America requires courage in decision and decisiveness in action so that programs, soundly devised, will not fall apart in the timid hesitancy of political trimming or wither away in the heat of small political deals. Such courage and decisiveness Bud Wilkinson has so often demonstrated that we can be sure his will be a fearless voice in the Senate demanding that the public good, never be subordinated to partisan schemes or pressure groups' maneuvering.

Public leadership in America requires confidence that teamwork - in neighborhoods and communities, in states and regions - is a far more effective road to success in any worthy human enterprise than strait-jacketed regimentation or bureaucratic blueprints. Bud Wilkinson is a national exemplar of confidence in teamwork; of ability in achieving teamwork; or performance surging out of teamwork.

Finally, public leadership in America requires national stature and national recognition so that the office-holder's thinking, his speaking, his doing may attract more than merely local attention; may have, indeed, national attention, influence, respect. Bud Wilkinson already has such stature and recognition. When he speaks in the Senate, his words will be heard and read across the land; overlooked neither by the communications media nor by the people of America.

These are some of the reasons that moved me to urge on Bud Wilkinson many months ago his entry into public and political affairs. These reasons are now fortified by his commitment, his dedication to honesty in government - Federal, State and Local; common sense in Government; freedom from too much Government,

especially bureaucratic Government in Washington.

About these three subjects, I should like to speak briefly. These are most general subjects, to be sure. And our opponents may brush off what I have to say, with the charge, "Platitudes! Nothing but platitudes!" That does not bother me too much. There are some who have said the same thing about the Gettysburg Address, about Party Platforms, about the Pledge to the Flag, even about the Declaration of Independence. While my talk this evening makes no pretense of kinship with those great documents, except only as it declares abiding respect for them, I care not a fig for the partisan critics.

To Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration, is attributed this statement: "The Whole of Government is the Art of Honesty." The cynics may brush off that statement, too, with the tag, "Platitude." But out of my half century in the service of our nation I would say Thomas Jefferson compressed into those nine words a truth about Government that lesser men could not so sharply define in a lengthy campaign of speeches or a year's production of press releases.

Ours to be sure, is a Government of laws; not of men. But the laws must be written, interpreted, enforced, expounded by men; above all exemplified by men who hold governmental office. When men fail in the art - the practice - of honesty the law sinks under a scum of hypocrisy - and contagious lawlessness infects the communities of the country.

Honesty in Government begins with honesty in the voter. When he believes in his heart that a candidate is right, that a party's philosophy fosters the greatest good of the greatest number, and then votes otherwise - he cannot complain of a lack of honesty in Government. He has already been dishonest with himself and the country. His pretext may be that "What was good enough for grandpappy is good enough for me," or "My vote won't change anything; why bother?" or "If my old auntie finds out, she'll cut me out of her will." No matter what the pretext may be, by voting against his conscience, he has cast his ballot against honesty in Government. So my first plea is that we vote our own informed convictions.

By so voting, I am confident we shall help restore common sense to Government for the overwhelming majority of Americans has no faith in political panaceas and cure-all programs, concentrating and more authority in Washington. More power in the Washington bureaucracy or in the White House will help solve no crisis, foreign or domestic. More common sense will, however; and more time spent on the proper business of the Federal Government; more attention given to what jobs must be done, and less to what new jobs can be taken over. The plain fact is that too much power over the lives of us all is already concentrated in Washington.

We need a return to the spirit of Constitutional government. The Founding Fathers, out of their knowledge and study of human institutions, devised for this nation a unique Constitution of divided and diffused authority so that America might be assured a freedom seldom for long enjoyed by any nation, freedom from too much Government, concentrated in one place and in a few hands.

We Republicans do not want to turn back the clock of history. We want in Washington men and women who can read the time on that clock. And the time has come, we believe, to recognize that already many responsibilities have been concentrated in Washington over and above those that properly belong there. Not all can be discharged well and some of them inescapably are discharged poorly - at extravagant cost and in heedless waste. The fault is partially our own. But the bills - in millstone debt, in a strait-jacket society, in national disillusionment - will be paid by another generation, unless we realize that concentrating responsibilities and power in Washington does not add an iota to the common sense, the integrity, the wisdom of Washington.

These are the compelling reasons that lead me to urge you to vote Republican. Republicans will speak out and work for freedom from too much centralized government; will help break down bureaucratic immunity from the popular will; will help restore in Washington the Constitutional checks and balances of government and respect for the two-party system. Rejecting imposed conformity to Washington schemes for our lives, we shall then tap once again our unique strength as a nation, that springs from unity within diversity. In such unity we shall rally the individual, the community, the state, the region, into a grand muster of enterprise and effort for the Republic's prosperity, security, peace.

We then shall be again a nation of great-hearted individuals, each of them in his infinite worth, using his talents to convert the endless opportunity that is every American's birthright into the reward of honest labor.

We shall be again a nation of dynamic communities, each of them striving to be in its homes and streets and parks, in its schools and hospitals, in all its places of work and rest and prayer, a community worthy of human hopes and dreams for a decent life.

We shall be again a nation of sovereign states, each conscious of its individuality and of its distinctive heritage and determined to preserve them, setting for itself its own goals of achievement and reaching them in the ways and with the means best fitted to its character.

We shall be again a nation - strong and confident - that needs not halt in anxious examination of its course because of a change in Moscow, a tumult in the Congo, a hysterical speech in Saigon or Havana.

Finally we shall be a nation supporting eagerly and earnestly a Federal government that, recognizing and fostering this kind of unity, will enhance our own security and lead us all toward the greatest of human goals, universal peace with justice.

• Columbus, Ohio, October 15, 1964

Yesterday was my 74th birthday. And on this, the first day of my 75th year, I am making a political speech. Twenty years ago, today, the possibility of such an appearance for such a purpose could never have entered my head. On that note, permit me a minute of reminiscence.

Twenty years ago, on October 15, 1944, I was spending the evening at First Army Headquarters near Liege, and close to the German frontier. A few miles ahead of us Hitler's panzers and infantry and artillery fought, attempting to hold Aachen against our assault. Behind us stretched liberated France and Belgium, the U-Boat haunted voyages over the Atlantic, the painful marches across North Africa, into Sicily, up Italy, out of Normandy. The only subject of conversation that night, I am sure, was the immediate job in front of us; and thereafter, the crossing of the Rhine, the encirclement of the enemy armies, the final and complete victory over Hitler.

Had anyone, however, raised the question: "What will we all be doing twenty years from now?" my instant response would have been: "If alive, I shall be in a rocking chair on a sunny porch, or in front of a warm fireplace." I would have been a poor prophet of my own future; as poor as some pollsters have been at times about election results.

But I am happy that I am making a political speech here today, asking that Ohio vote Republican, all the way, in every contest on the ballot. This mission I prefer to rocking chair confinement anywhere, for three reasons. First, because of my dedication to the American two-party system. Within that system, I believe the Republican Party - in its philosophy and practice - works most effectively toward government by and for the people.

Second, I prefer this platform to a rocking chair because of the two men who are your candidates, Bob Taft and Ollie Bolton. These two men, on their record as public servants and private citizens, reflect republican commitment to common sense in government. They won't be stampeded by hair-brained schemes and magic solutions to hard problems. They reflect Republican commitment to integrity in government. They won't sell out principle because of a twisted arm or a cloak-room deal. They reflect Republican commitment in government dedicated to a secure and productive future. They won't sacrifice the enduring public good for the transitory applause of a pressure bloc.

Third, I'd rather be here than in a rocking chair because - as a Republican - it's good to visit a truly Republican state. Ohio went Republican in 1952. Ohio went Republican in 1956. Ohio - to the shocked amazement of our opponents - went Republican in 1960. I urge that you again give them the shock treatment in 1964. It will do them good to learn that they don't have the country in a bag - not so long as Ohio continues immune to the techniques of promise-peddling and panic-mongering. And it will do the nation great good to learn that Ohio has once again voted for a Republican president - for Barry Goldwater, and that Ohio has returned to the Congress - including your own Sam Devine - an overwhelmingly Republican delegation.

Parenthetically, I would make one suggestion. This is it. Between now and election day, should any of you encounter a poll-taker, please speak out your convictions loud and clear. I, although an incorrigible

optimist, don't like this business of being wiped out of existence before a single ballot is counted. Nor do you, I am sure.

Beyond the three personal reasons I have given you why I prefer this place to a quiet rocking chair, there is another. Liege in Belgium on October 15, 1944, and Columbus in Ohio on October 15, 1964, are directly and inescapably connected. Then, America fought with arms to regain for ourselves a lost security; to restore for our allies a lost independence; to vindicate in battle our right to freedom from every tyranny. And we won, although at the time of our entry into the war the extent of Nazi success, his control of land and sea, and the physical odds in almost every statistic were against us. Now, twenty years later, Republicans fight with ballots so to arrange our public affairs and so to man our government that we may devote ourselves to the grand purposes of the Republic.

Let me name three of these purposes. These three to my mind tower in importance high above the multitudinous and fragmentary objectives so constantly announced - and so often conveniently forgotten - by our opponents. They are, first - we Americans, at home, seek to be secure against a massive onslaught which could destroy us in an hour of terror. To this end, we demand careful and wise use of our national resources - fiscal, natural, human - so that we may not be guilty of irresolute excursions in extravagant spending, in aimless fighting, in improvised substitutes for sound policy.

Second - abroad we want to advance and strengthen our global partnerships, purposefully, with our friends, mustering our resources, pooling our talents, making our plans in amity and confidence.

Third - we believe that, in all places, at all times, the Republic of the United States, armed in strength - economic and military and moral strength - should demonstrate the ideals, the virtues - and the rewards - of a free society.

Given a reasonable security and inspired leadership at home, with community, state and federal governments performing well their respective duties; given a restoration of genuine partnership and mutual understanding abroad, we shall more surely go about the business of amplifying and extending the American dream in the field of human rights, in the field of human welfare, in the field of human dignity.

Beyond all legalisms and partisan panaceas, beyond all capabilities and proper functions of government, we insist that the rights and welfare and dignity of our citizens are best assured by schools and colleges and universities; hospitals and care for the ailing; highways for safety and speed; urban transport unclogged by jam and bottle-neck; safe streets for our use; attractive houses for comfortable and decent living; museums for our heritage and laboratories for our future; parks and forests, clean streams and clear lakes for our play; churches and synagogues and temples for our worship.

More, much more, of these we should have quickly. Not enough of them will we ever have until such national affairs become once again the concern of all citizens; with government at all levels cooperating in common-sense and imaginative guidance. All this will never come to be in an administration that seems preoccupied more with bold headlines and popularity polls than with the solidarity of our national position and purposes.

Look, for a moment at the harsh problems of our national security - on which we are now spending more than fifty thousand million dollars a year. Too many in authority seem to be depending for security and world stability solely on the whirl and lightning answers of computers. Even under the best management, the kind we had when Charley Wilson, Neil McElroy and Tom Gates headed our defense establishment, the search for absolute and unilateral armed security can eventually end only in national bankruptcy or the establishment of a garrison state.

Therein lies one weighty reason why in this campaign we Republicans strive again to man our government - that the nation's business will be efficiently managed in a climate of vision and common-sense. We mistrust those who, seeking more authority, use each national problem as a fifth ace in a game of partisan politics. That is why we want Ohio Republicans in the House of Representatives - and Bob Taft in the United States Senate.

One final point. Possibly we Republicans are too slow or too quiet in labeling for what it is the propaganda of those who want no part of a Republican administration. Back in 1960, for instance, the ears of the country were deafened in clamor about the dire state of our security, the fallen state of our world leadership,

the tragic state of our people. We heard endlessly about the missile gap, our shredded prestige abroad, the millions going to bed every night desperately hungry. To panic the voter was the purpose. My administration, as president, was the target, of course. And I was a little reluctant to use the one word that completely described the charges of 1960: tommy rot! Pure tommy rot.

In 1964, the same type charge is still being levied - changing the present to the future tense. Now we are told a Republican administration will abuse and misuse the missiles that a Republican administration developed. We are told a Republican administration will arouse deadly fear and even enmity within the international partnerships a Republican administration either started or greatly fortified. We are told a Republican administration will pauperize millions, taking from them the security a Republican administration assured them.

For these charges - and all like them in 1964 - there is still only one accurate label: tommy rot! Let us so brand such charges whenever we encounter them; and then vigorously present our own case and the merits of our candidates. Let us speak out clearly on what we oppose - and on what we propose.

For example, we will always oppose, save in emergency, increase in the public debt. Why? For a reason as sound as it is simple. Because we do not want to live on government credit-card spending, with the bills to be paid in the sacrifices of our grandchildren.

Again, we will always oppose the concentration of more power in the Washington bureaucracy, just as in the earlier day we Republicans took the lead in opposing economic monopoly. Why? Again for a reason as sound as it is simple. Too much power corrupts even the best of men. And, according to repeated press accounts, we already have had corruption enough, in men not so good.

In short, we will oppose all schemes and contrivances that weaken the individual in his self-respect, in his sense of responsibility, in his pride in American citizenship, in his ability to earn for himself and his family a decent living in a well-paying job. Why? Because the good of the individual - protected in all his rights, in his use of responsible freedom, in his God-given dignity - is the proper purpose of all government - federal and local.

Therefore, we Republicans stand four-square for all common sense programs that increase for every citizen his opportunity to live in a climate of freedom and progress; enabling him more surely to pursue happiness in all honorable ways he may choose. To that end, we Republicans initiated the first Medicare programs. We spread social security coverage, giving more than ten million individuals - never before protected - the security benefits that were their due. We successfully fought for a sound and stable currency so that older citizens - living on pensions, savings and insurance policies - might have dollars to spend that would not become dollarettes through inflation. We worked for - and achieved - a then unparalleled peace time prosperity so that Americans might have good jobs at good pay, enabling them to build good homes, good communities - a good and great America.

We Republicans are pledged to sound and progressive government, searching out modern solutions for modern problems. We Republicans believe, with Lincoln, that the individual is the most important factor in free government. In his strength is our security. His welfare is our concern. His advancement is our ambition. Therein is the course of our visions of human progress - visions that inspire us to live, work and vote Republican.

May every success crown your efforts in Ohio; the efforts of all Republicans throughout the nation.

• Life Insurance Association, New York City, December 9, 1964

During the past 75 years, incumbents of the White House have made special statements endorsing life insurance. I was no exception. So, though it may be an authorial crime, I begin by quoting myself:

“One of the clearest evidences of the faith of our people in the free institutions and the future of America is the fact that many millions of our citizens have life insurance policies. Their ownership of life insurance is more than a great multi-billion dollar bulwark of family protection. It is also a kind of thrift which provides productive capital. This capital, invested in farms, factories, homes, transportation, utilities and other

resources, helps to give this nation the economic power needed to buttress freedom in the world.”

Today I congratulate the 120 million United States policyholders on the wise provisions they have made for personal and family security. My preference would be to talk directly to them about some basic objectives and principles that I believe should continue, in this field, to guide our people. This being impractical, you, as top executives of life insurance companies, might find it possible to communicate with your policyholders on these and related subjects - and I dare hope - with some benefit to both you and them.

Over the years your work in encouraging and accumulating savings has done much to promote the financial strength and security of our nation and to provide the capital necessary to our material progress. This is a priority objective of every right-thinking citizen, for an investment of about \$20,000 is required, on the average, to provide the equipment for every individual job in our technological society.

Savings represent the hard work and frugality of a lot of people. To accumulate and transform them into an effective financial basis for advanced living standards through increased output per worker in the economy, life insurance provides one of our most important mechanisms. This is a people's capitalism at work.

Because these are private savings, it is not only right but necessary, under the umbrella of wise protective laws, to keep decisions affecting economic policies and actions in the hands of private industry and productive individuals. This is the burden of my talk today.

In far too many ways we are heading away from reliance on the citizen's common sense, personal responsibility, and freedom of action toward federal domination over almost every phase of our economy. This may give to some an immediate sense of material well-being and personal security. But it is dangerous to our future - because it flouts our basic rights, weakens our moral fiber, restricts individual decision and, in the long run, destroys the incentives that have been responsible for our unmatched productivity.

An over-powerful government can rob a whole people, just as surely as a pick-pocket can steal from an individual. But the scale is broader, the stakes are greater, and the loss is far more tragic. For what is stolen by paternalistic government is that precious compound of initiative, independence, and self-respect that distinguishes a man from an automaton, a person from a number, productive and competitive enterprise from a regimented people. Too much government planes off peaks of excellence, hones down differences, dries up competition and leaves a drab and unhappy community where once dwelt thrift, zeal to excel and ambition for human betterment.

I believe we should set our faces firmly against federal programs that erode away citizen, local and state self-reliance. For example, we must not tolerate mounting federal domination of the nation's power and water resources, or its increasing involvement in urban, agricultural and housing problems. Why should the federal government assert and assume a priority interest in the problems of the youth and the aged, the ill and the poor, and the temporarily unemployed? Should it not heed Lincoln's counsel, and intervene in those matters only when individuals and lower echelons of government cannot properly care for them? Are we, in our communities and states, to be reduced to helpless bystanders? Do we trust a Washington bureaucrat more than we do ourselves to solve problems that rest on our own doorsteps? Or, are we just too lazy to act; too blind to see; or too ignorant to understand?

The trend toward centralization can be stopped only by a better government at home. This is a task that is surely ours and our fellow citizens. I would hope that all of you would enlist in the cause - and for the duration.

Now, at all levels, government must of course have a heart as well as a head. Its assistance, when needed, must go freely to individuals or localities that cannot help themselves. But this must be done, as far as possible, locally - only when necessary, by Washington. Thereby, the local need can be more accurately met with least injury to responsible citizenship, and programs will be orientated to the citizen and not to political expediency.

A specific area of unnecessary government intervention is found in its competition with private enterprise. Much of this occurred during - and was executed by - World War II. Since that time some headway has been made in discontinuing and curtailing commercial and industrial activities of governmental agencies, but too many remain in operation.

One of the important intrusions is in the field of finance, in which you are vitally concerned. In many

directions the government unjustifiably lends our tax money in direct competition with private financial institutions. For example, the basic, and necessary, objectives of the Rural Electrification Administration have long since been realized. But the federal government, borrowing long term money at 4% or more, even today, continues to lend it by law to the R.E.A. at half the cost - not to electrify farms, but to provide power for industries and towns. These small tax-financed plants have production costs much higher than large tax-paying private enterprises. Here is inefficient socialized enterprise directly in competition with highly efficient private enterprise.

A few years ago, when I faced a great R.E.A. convention to tell the audience that with the original need met they should refuse to accept 2% loans from the federal government, I failed to get even minimum support. Worse, the next day, a prominent political opponent urged the same audience that if any man tried to take away their 2% money they should drive that man out with beer bottles. He was heartily applauded! This is a single instance of a practice, authorized by law, that illustrates how ready some politicians are to vote away public money for ulterior motives.

Another primary objective is fiscal responsibility in the federal government. When spending the other fellow's money, we have fine self starters - but are short on brakes! Gross expenditures of federally administered funds stand at about \$150 billion this year; and our debt limit was, in this year, increased temporarily to \$324 billion. There seems no end in sight for these annual deficits - yet for the present we are living in the greatest prosperity we have ever known.

Two questions force themselves upon us. "Who is finally to pay the piper?" And, "What will happen to us in a period of even modest recession?"

I believe that a public awareness of the need for responsibility in the management of our nation's finances - and in creating a climate more favorable to the operation of a truly free and competitive enterprise - would bring about massive support for obtaining common sense answers to these questions. Certainly in times of prosperity something should be paid, annually, on the national debt.

Swollen expenditures are more damaging than merely forcing our voteless children to support spendthrift parents; living on credit tends to debase our currency and leads to inflation.

Yet anyone who openly opposes deficit spending is charged by the "sophisticated" theorists of being more "interested in money than in people." This accusation - stated more accurately - ought to read, "Anyone who deliberately advocates deficit financing in a period of high prosperity is attempting to justify federal burglary of your hard-earned savings." For what, I ask, is more inhumane to more people than deliberately, through inflationary policies, taking away the value of the savings on which they must live in the future? The dollar you earned and saved 25 years ago is now worth only 45 cents. This loss is a cruel injustice to people who worked hard all their lives; who were frugal and self-reliant in accumulating savings, insurance, and pensions for their old age. The value of their retirement dollars has been cut to less than half of what it was when they began earning them.

No business has a greater stake in the soundness of the dollar than has the life insurance business. You - of all people - realize that if the citizenry, as a whole, should come to believe that they or their families would eventually and always receive benefits from policies in dollars worth only a portion of these they paid in - then surely life insurance would lose its attraction for most Americans. And this applies not only to dramatic cases of inflation, such as, at different times, ruined Japan, Italy, Greece and Germany, but to the creeping inflation which gradually, but just as surely, eats away at the value of the dollar. The only thing to do with inflation is to treat it as the evil it is.

As I contemplate the whole sweep of American history and try to project it into the future, I believe the outlook is bright if we have the wisdom and the courage to apply ourselves in accordance with sound principles and methods. There will always be problems - but life would be worth little and our moral sinews would wither if there were not some problems to correct and new ones to solve. Happily the development of the nation and its free way of life will always be unfinished business; no generation will ever be denied the satisfaction of working for progress, so long as freedom lives in America.

As one illustration - automation now increasing at a logarithmic rate, can be a blessing to the individual, to our economy, and to our national strength. The accumulation and investment of capital should not be

deterred by any fear that construction of new plants and development of new equipment for further automation will be accompanied by a decrease in opportunities for profitable employment. Temporary dislocations will occur. But the answer to any dislocation is more education and training to provide greater flexibility in the nation's work force. Moreover, the entire process leads to higher incomes and a higher standard of living, creating new demands and new jobs.

Indeed automation is only one more step in the continuing industrial revolution which produces ever greater unit productivity and more leisure time for all. Moreover leisure is not a meritorious goal if it provides only more spare time for favorite sports and pastimes. We need to participate more fully in community affairs, to broaden our education, and, particularly, to gain a deeper understanding of our country and responsibilities and opportunities in the world. In short, each of us needs to become a better, more active citizen.

If the challenging demands of our growing population are to be satisfied at improved levels of living, enormous increases in the supplies of skilled manpower, mechanical energy, raw materials, and capital equipment must be found. The number of marriages, which will be reflected in the rate of household formations, is likely to be much larger in the next few years and very much larger in the late 1960's and 1970's. The number of young people reaching their late teens and early twenties will continue to exert pressures for more and more goods and services. These demands can be met only if we build the productive facilities required. This emphasizes the importance of personal savings, such as those achieved through life insurance, to furnish the necessary capital.

In a relative sense we will always have depressed areas and individuals who do not share as they should in our national well-being - those not well equipped for change. Such problems are intensely human and our society must meet them squarely. But they cannot be solved merely by adding more bureaucrats to the federal payroll to "tell the people what to do." Necessary individual and area adjustments cannot be brought about by suppressing the symptoms with federal subsidies and doles.

As a single example, the problem of poverty, wherever it exists, can be cured only by going to its roots, by helping people and the communities to develop new opportunities for themselves. Doles have never made a people self-supporting; they can only carry them through emergencies. Education, training and guidance are the ingredients for success and this means, from the rest of us, understanding, effort and dedication - not merely dollars.

Now, I must mention a few of the basic principles from which are derived the objectives I have noted:

Abiding faith in the individual: The essential unit in our democracy is the individual, not any group or class. Preserving our democracy depends ultimately on respect for the individual's rights, initiative, judgment and opportunities.

Limited powers of government: The leaders of a democracy are not the source of power, they merely direct it. Power derives from the people, and they should jealously retain all powers and responsibilities not specifically delegated to the government.

Freedom and equality of opportunity: These are the rights of each American whatever his ethnic, social, or economic background. They truly represent the priceless privileges of the United States citizenship.

National unity, born of a common devotion to the essentials of our system: We must defeat any and all forces which might divide our nation by class, region, racial ancestry or economic interest.

Application of these principles to national issues is not easy. But we should attack our national problems at their roots, refusing to try to bury them under federal dollars. And we must be sure that any proposed governmental action will not cause decay of freedom's values and will not replace individual and local responsibility with federal paternalism.

What I have been saying is really nothing more than a plea for each of us to take more deeply to heart the rights, privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. The proudest boast one of us can voice is "I am an American." Should it not be, then, the deepest purpose of each to strive, with all that is in him, to be the kind of American that will make his fellow-citizens proud of him.

I repeat that I feel honored by this opportunity to speak, indirectly, to the millions of policyholders who are increasing each day in number and so becoming more and more synonymous with the public itself.

Indeed they are the public, and I wish all of you well in their service.

• **Tribute to Sir Winston Churchill, London, England, January 30, 1965**

Upon the mighty Thames, a great avenue of history, move at this moment to their final resting place the mortal remains of Sir Winston Churchill. He was a great maker of history, but his work done, the record closed, we can almost hear him, with the poet, say: "Sunset and evening star, and one clear call for me! Twilight and evening bell and after that the dark! And may there be no sadness of farewell, when I embark."

As I, like all other free men, pause to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us, I have no charter to speak for my countrymen - only for myself. But, if in memory, we journey back two decades to the time when America and Britain stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I can presume - with propriety, I think - to act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and their British comrades during three years of war in this sector of the earth.

To those men Winston Churchill was Britain - he was the embodiment of British defiance to threat, her courage in adversity, her calmness in danger, her moderation in success. Among the Allies his name was spoken with respect, admiration, and affection. Although they loved to chuckle at his foibles, they knew he was a staunch friend. They felt his inspirational leadership. They counted him a fighter in their ranks.

The loyalty that the fighting forces of many nations here serving gave to him during that war was no less strong, no less freely given, than he had, in such full measure, from his own countrymen.

An American, I was one of those Allies. During those dramatic months, I was privileged to meet, to talk, to plan, and to work with him for common goals.

Out of that association an abiding - and to me precious - friendship was forged; it withstood the trials and frictions inescapable among men of strong convictions, living in an atmosphere of war.

The war ended, our friendship flowered in the later and more subtle tests imposed by international politics. Then, each of us, holding high official posts in his own nation, strove together so to concert the strength of our two peoples that liberty might be preserved among men and the security of the free world wholly sustained.

Through a career during which personal victories alternated with defeats, glittering praise with bitter criticism, intense public activity with periods of semiretirement, Winston Churchill lived out his four score and ten years.

With no thought of the length of the time he might be permitted on earth, he was concerned only with the quality of the service he could render to his nation and to humanity. Though he had no fear of death, he coveted always the opportunity to continue that service.

At this moment, as our hearts stand at attention, we say our affectionate, though sad, goodbye to the leader to whom the entire body of free men owes so much.

In the coming years, many in countless words will strive to interpret the motives, describe the accomplishments, and extol the virtues of Winston Churchill - soldier, statesman, and citizen that two great countries were proud to claim as their own. Among all the things so written or spoken, there will ring out through all the centuries one incontestable refrain: Here was a champion of freedom.

May God grant that we - and the generations who will remember him - heed the lessons he taught us: in his deeds, in his words, in his life.

May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity; no man is denied opportunity for fulfillment. And now, to you Sir Winston, - my old friend - farewell!

• **Grinnell College, May 13, 1965**

In the course of a fairly long life, I have been called many names; some of them reflected neither respect nor affection - and certainly were not meant to be flattering. This is the first time, however, I have been called "Politician in Residence." Many here may question my right to that label, measured either in years of practice

of politics or in number of elections contested.

So, I am taking it for granted that Grinnell College has pinned this title on me on the assumption that one who has been in and around Washington a good part of his adult life, should know something about politics. But I'll go farther than that. In my opinion, every American should know a great deal about the subject.

As I understand the procedure before us, I am to make a general presentation of my views on the individual citizen's role in the political life of community and nation. Thereafter, at closer quarters, I am to attempt to answer your specific questions.

No discussion of politics could be useful unless all of us had a common and clear understanding of the kind of government we are talking about. To start, I should stress a fundamental belief of mine as to the spirit in which the revolutionary patriots approached their task of founding a nation. They were totally convinced that political principles were of no enduring worth unless they had their source in moral values.

In the Declaration of 1776 - the birth certificate of our nation - we find this pronouncement: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit (not the guarantee) of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are founded among men."

In these words is the keystone of the national political arch they erected; indeed in this passage they implicitly said that our governmental system is the political expression of a religious faith. And they asserted further that governments derived "their just powers from the consent of the governed." This then is the kind - a new kind - of government they visualized. In that light, politics - the practical application of political principle to all our affairs from the community to the global level - is far too important to be left to professional politicians. It should be the business of every American. Out of my own experience - warning you that age does not necessarily endow a man with wisdom - I shall speak briefly on the political responsibilities of an American citizen - after a bit of personal reminiscence.

In recent months, I have spent some little time reviewing the earlier years of my own life, from my first memories around 1895 - seventy years ago - to the period of World War I. Inevitably, as I have indulged in this kind of hindsight exercise, I have frequently berated myself for errors of commission and omission. Fortunately, I could indulge in some self-congratulation on one decision to which I stuck firmly. That was to get a college education; no matter how long it might take; no matter how difficult its pursuit might be; no matter how many temptations might arise to stop school and to start earning money.

Of course, in the making and in the keeping of that decision, I was the product of a home where education was cherished as the chief temporal good. Elsewhere - in many homes - the earning capacity of children was given priority over intellectual development. The sixth grade was often the terminal point in formal schooling, while entrance to high school was a privilege ignored by the majority of young Americans. The mortality rate among those who did enter was extremely high. In my own class, sixty-seven strong in its freshman year, the drop-outs outnumbered those who graduated in 1909, thirty-six to thirty-one. In most American communities today such figures would be considered outrageous.

Looking back, in memory, to those who for one reason or another failed to win a high school diploma, I am happy to note that its lack in no wise seems to have doomed them either to second-class citizenship or to unproductive and unrewarding lives. On the contrary, in their working years, many were often as constructive in their citizenship and successful in their works as those who continued longer in the educational process.

To be sure, many say that those times were free from internal and external crises, and were a sort of golden age when human problems were few and Americans were sheltered from anxiety. This would be a misconception. Around the turn of the century, for example, the country was torn by those who defended Washington policy and those who demanded our immediate withdrawal from the Far East and from the Caribbean. They contended that our presence in lands alien to us was tyrannical imperialism. (In this respect it appears that we seem to be re-living history.)

Agrarian and labor unrest was heatedly expressed in words and deeds that often frightened the easily disturbed, convincing them that the collapse of the country was inescapable and imminent. Indeed, discontent with the status quo is as old as humanity. The muck-rakers, as they were called in my boyhood, filled the newspapers and magazines of the time with exposure of, or at least charges of, tragic injustices, cruel

mistreatment of workers, corruption in high places.

Certainly we were far from being a smug, self-satisfied nation in those days. And I think most Americans did work steadily to further the realization in daily life of the purposes enunciated for the Republic in the Constitution: "To form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity..."

Has they not so worked - even as did their forebears through generations before them - the Republic today would not be engaged merely in unfinished business, correcting imperfections in a progressive and prosperous and free society. Instead, we would be wracked by widespread class war and social feud - or would be the subjects of a totalitarian bossdom.

In the hearts of those people - the pioneers - was first a fervor, a passion for freedom, an insistence on self-reliance as a dynamic virtue, an intense faith that - under the Constitution and God - men of good will could find for themselves in this land life more rewarding than in any other society on earth. They were not a people to be weakened by misfortune or by obstacles in the path of progress.

Second, though few of them were scholars, they were interested in government. They did not shrug off politics as a profession, somewhat unclean. They had brains, and they used them in applying to the hard problems before them the political principles of American life that had worked successfully in earlier and like situations.

But, though we are rightly proud of the political structure our forebears devised for us, it is still true that a constantly increasing level of formal education is necessary to the effective functioning of self-government. For one thing, as population goes up, the complexities of government and of society increase.

Now, one advantage possessed by the citizen of these simpler days was this. Even sixty years ago the individual citizen seemed less lost in the mass of numbers than today, when he is one of 192 million Americans. So, I am not astonished when these days I frequently get letters from young people putting to me questions like this: "What can I - one individual - do to further the American cause, to strengthen the Republic and to help achieve its goals?" Undoubtedly, many of you have put the same question to yourselves, with the same eagerness and a like frustration.

Because an answer depends so much on personal circumstances, I dare not attempt advice except in most general terms. I presume, of course, you who pose this questions are determined to be more than passive drifters with the current of the times; that you want to be active citizens, fully appreciative of the great and growing importance of government in our lives. I am sure you want to play as meaningful a role as possible in the affairs of community and country.

So, I would first say, your paramount obligation is such preparation of yourself for the discharge of citizenship responsibilities that you may play your part in furthering the nation's purposes. This means that you should be equipped intellectually to encourage and to lead those about you toward wisdom and decency and patriotism in performing the duties of citizenship.

To this end, and beyond the normal school and college requirements, I think you should studiously examine the mission and high purposes of the Republic as they have been declared in the principal documents of our history; as they have been demonstrated, in war and peace, since the first colonization of the continent, by men and women of vision and dedication, regardless of their political affiliation; and as they are, these days, manifested, sometimes obscurely and at other times dramatically, by those who work to preserve fullness of opportunity, justice for every individual, prosperity and progress for every community, secure strength and forthright leadership for the nation on the world scene.

Boiled down, this is to say: learn all you can about your country in all its aspects, its past and present, and its potential for the future. As Santayana said, "Those who cannot remember history are condemned to relive it." Such study and preparation, I know, may seem a dull and tedious job, lacking the glamour and the excitement of a street demonstration, or a picket line. But it is not only necessary - it can become dramatic if we take the time to look briefly at the character of the basic challenges of today.

For several reasons they are more difficult than those of yesteryear. First, almost instant communications can overnight make of any friction abroad an intercontinental dispute. Second, a sharply divided world can transform each into an ideological quarrel. Third, every crisis of international moment may

bear within itself the germ of nuclear war, and a possible end to all human problems, by way of human extinction.

In such circumstances as these, we can scarcely expect to have a reserve cushion of time for thoughtful scrutiny or many-sided analysis in a period of crisis. Remembering that a senseless enemy could trigger an assault aimed at annihilation, we realize that only advance preparation can help us to act sanely and effectively. Such advance preparation requires, from government and private citizen alike, study, reflection, and contemplation of the lessons of history - so that in crisis there may be promptly and effectively rallied all the country's strength - material, intellectual, spiritual. To such preparation by America and her citizens, I see no acceptable alternative. We cannot trust the nation's fate to impulsive or unstudied decision.

Neither in crisis nor in everyday life can the great goals of a nation be easily achieved. Patrick Henry electrified his listeners with the cry, "Give me liberty or give me death." But before victory at Yorktown was reached Valley Forge and seven years of conflict had to be endured; before the Union was established, the near-chaos of the Confederation had to be experienced; before the integrity of the Union could be forever assured, our bloodiest war had to be suffered.

Hard work, intelligently planned, is far more important than what we like to call "a stroke of genius." I now speak of another point that I very much want to bring to your attention.

Before the majority of you, in all probability, lies an active life of half a century or more. In that long passage, unforeseeable crises and problems and challenges, both personal and national, will certainly arise in every season of every year. To meet them courageously, to defeat whatever may threaten our system and way of life, vigorously and successfully to foster whatever may expand them, will require of you far more than emotional loyalty or instinctive response - important though those qualities are.

All around you at this moment are problems that arouse in you an ardent wish that you might participate directly and actively in their solution. Your idealism and enthusiasm for justice seem to require of you some personal and public proof of their existence within you. This is entirely natural and laudable. And I, for one, would never attempt to quench or even to dampen the ardor of youth. But I would point out to you that in the long years ahead, countless calls will be made upon you for a deep and sympathetic understanding, a thorough knowledge and a generous wisdom of what America is and what it should be.

Not to be able to answer those calls capably, when they arise, will be more tragic for you as individuals and for your country, than to miss a present chance to demonstrate publicly your instinctive reactions. By no means, in so speaking, do I advocate a do-nothing attitude about current public affairs. I only urge that now you ready yourselves to help solve the nation's inevitable and sometimes dismaying problems of your time.

Another point: I hope that you will never permit an honest difference of opinion or judgment, rooted in a good conscience, to become in your mind a wall between you and other Americans. Among humans, it is far too easy to condemn as dishonest or stupid or even criminal those who differ with us, forgetting that they too may be, in their motives and their purposes, as honorable as we.

A century ago there were two men, now honored for their greatness of character and spirit by all Americans, who were then bitterly opposed to each other. One was named Abraham Lincoln; the other, Robert E. Lee. Before the onset of war, both believed in peaceful resolution of civil conflict, both opposed the evil of slavery, both cherished the unity of the nation. Nevertheless, they came to be arrayed against each other in a war neither wanted. In what happened to these two men - and to millions of others in the same day - alike in honesty, integrity and patriotism, should be a warning to all of us never to become so wrapped up in justification of our own positions that we see in fellow Americans outright enemies of the good and the decent.

Next, I would urge on you active participation in governmental affairs within the two-party system. For years I have been firmly convinced that young Americans on reaching the age when they may be required to serve and to sacrifice for the country - possibly even to die for it - should be permitted a voice in its management. Only a few states have seen fit to give the franchise to all who are subject to military draft.

But those who cannot vote, because of age requirements, are not lacking important opportunities to perform some of the duties of citizenship. They can help in arousing others to use their privilege and right to elect far-sighted and conscientious officers of government; they can help do the countless jobs within a party organization done best by those who are ready to work long hours with enthusiasm and fervor. Parenthetically -

and as my only commercial - I might say that, even though some of you cannot vote, the Republican Party will welcome you into its ranks as the sort of volunteers who will, by your ardor, put new life and new spirit into all of us.

A few moments ago I stressed the phrase “within the two-party system.” I realize, of course, that for some there may be in splinter parties and tiny groups the attraction, so to speak, of being big frogs in small puddles. I do not criticize these groups. I would remind you, however, that the two-party system, ponderous though it may be at times, has proved to be the most effective instrument for control of government by the people. To work cheerfully, diligently and intelligently for the party policies and leaders you may espouse, is one of the marks of the good, effective citizen.

Now, a final thought: shortly, all of you will be going out into the world into lives that we hope will be full and rewarding, but lives that will be often marked by pain and worry and a multitude of pressures not yet known to you. In these college years, I’d hope you would form the habit of making certain that every day should have its share of fun - of decent enjoyment. Life cannot be lived to the full unless it contains its element of joy. I knew a lady who endured, before her end, the pains and suffering of cancer, for fourteen years. Yet in all the time I knew her I never saw a frown upon her face - never anything except a smile for her visitors and family. Though in a wheel-chair she was the light and life of every gathering.

This is living to the full; and though I pray that none of you have ever to suffer the agonies that she did, I submit that her great qualities - character, courage, consideration for others, and a sense of humor - will make life worth living - will make of it a joyful experience. Through their development, you will find strength for - and satisfaction in - the cheerful discharge of every public and personal responsibility that may confront you.

You of Grinnell, and of her sister institutions, will disperse (sooner or later) into every nook and cranny of our country. There you will assume posts of positive leadership in all fields of useful endeavor. Because of your enlightened and dedicated service as a citizen, America will become more secure, more prosperous, and more effective in the fulfillment of her great destiny of promoting, under God, universal peace with justice and in leading all peoples to higher levels of human betterment.

• **National Industrial Conference Board, May 20, 1965**

Four months ago Roger Blough asked me here to discuss this evening a topic that I’m sure is brand new to all of you - “Competition by the Federal Government with Business.” The subject he suggested is, of course, only a part of a much broader one. At one and the same time, Federal competition is a cause - and a result - of the unchecked, octopus-like growth of government, both in size and function. No one contests the obvious truth that as the nation has grown government has had to expand. But it is a dubious thesis that population growth alone can justify the vast Federal expansion of recent decades.

It is said that Jefferson, our first Secretary of State, ran the headquarters of the State Department with only two clerks. I am sure this great apostle of simplicity and frugality in government would, if he could return to us for a moment, shake his head in bewilderment when told that the strength of the domestic section of the State Department and related activities is now 10,878. We also note that the legislative branch now has more than 25,000 employees; the Defense Department more than a million civilians; and the Attorney General heads a force of 32,000.

As to increases in the number of Federal functions we know that as the nation has passed from an agricultural to a highly industrialized society many offices, unforeseen by the founding fathers, have been created by the Federal government. Examples are the large anti-trust section in the Justice Department and the army of “independent” agencies which regulate a vast spectrum of business and economic affairs. Just how necessary all of these controls are, is difficult to determine; but in size they extend from the Federal Radiation Council, with a staff of five, to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 33,500 employees and the Veterans Administration with 171,500.

By way of comparison in over-all size, just within the past 34 years the civilian employee strength of the Federal government has grown from 600,000 to 2,500,000 or by 400%, while the population has grown by

60%. These data carry the suggestion that the Federal bureaucracy is six times as procreative as is the public at large! Could this be another Parkinson's Law?

In spite of the restrictions on Federal powers imposed by the 10th Constitutional Amendment the government has displayed great ingenuity in contriving new ways to invade the provinces of states and localities. Much of this insistent outreach carries no clear mandate of necessity, but popular opposition to the trend is dulled by the cloying effect of subsidy and the belief that someone else will have to pay the bills thus incurred.

But the most perturbing point is that these changes still go on and always in the same direction. The assumption by the Federal government of power - ranging from an almost iron-clad control over agriculture, to the use, several years ago, of threats of retaliation in order to dictate prices - is filled with dire potential for the future of the nation.

Some have even hinted that our federated form of government, with its powers delicately checked and balanced - a system which over the years has proved superbly fitted to the nation's needs and progress - is now outmoded. I cannot agree to this for a moment, but to those who do so believe I say this: "Why, then, do we not call a new Constitutional Convention. That is the way to make such fundamental changes as the people deem necessary."

We do seem to be developing a national schizophrenia. On the one hand we pretend to venerate the wisdom of the Founding Fathers; on the other, we stretch some clauses of the Constitution beyond all common sense, to do things its authors could never have imagined. Had they foreseen this development I personally believe they would have provided against it even more forcibly than they did. Ours is still supposed to be a government of dispersed and limited powers, but more examples of the things on which the Federal government now legislates, include Federal supports for farm commodities, support of local schools, compulsory participation in health insurance, qualifications of voters, and minimum wages. Incidentally, if the Federal government can dictate a minimum wage, why not a maximum? And, if both, why cannot the Federal government tell us where to work, at what hours and at what pay?

I have offered this short recital of government growth in size and function only as a sketchy background for a more specific discussion of Federal competition with business.

On receiving Roger's invitation to talk on this subject I remarked to a friend that his letter obviously contemplated a "head-nodding situation" - the kind in which the speaker knows what the audience believes. He then gets up, talks about it, and everybody nods, each impressed not by the speaker's eloquence, but his wisdom in seeing things their way.

But to challenge head nodding, head on, I propose that after we examine some commonly-held convictions, we hurry on to the truly significant question, "Just what can we do, and what should we do, about these trends and portents?" When we come to this question I suspect that rather than nodding over bland generalizations, we will find reasons for some unhappiness, not a little of it rightly directed toward ourselves.

As a starting point: needless government competition with private enterprise is wholly bad - bad for business, bad for government, bad for the country, and, in its deepest sense, bad for every citizen. Among other things: it constricts business opportunities and individual initiative; it forces the taxpayer to underwrite competition against himself; it showers favors on some at the expense of others; it diminishes tax revenues at all levels of government; it intrudes government into areas where it has no right to be; it is inefficient; and it makes governing cost more than it should.

Therefore, though we recognize the need of some governmental regulation of a number of businesses - transportation systems - communications - hydroelectric power - stock exchanges, and so on - we oppose governmental ownership and operation of these same activities.

The distinction between proper and improper governmental involvement is not always easy to determine. Indeed, the problem of accurately delineating private and public sectors of economic endeavor has always been near the center of our domestic political wars. Some here may recall that I carry a certain amount of scar tissue from encounters of this kind during my White House days.

In 1953, shortly after assuming the Presidency, I found the government in an outlandish aggregation of business-type activities. As examples:

We were manufacturing rum, spectacles, false teeth and sleeping bags. We were refining a poor grade of tin ore. There was scarcely any type of business, major or minor, in which we did not participate. We found the government in rail, air and marine transport, as well as in trucking and warehousing.

We engaged in the generation and sale of electric power, in making loans to business and industry, and in the writing of insurance policies covering such things as crops, housing, mortgages and bank deposits.

A Congressional survey disclosed that the executive branch had become the largest lender - largest borrower - largest landlord - largest tenant - largest holder of grazing and timberland - largest owner of grain - largest warehouse operator - largest shipowner - and the largest truck fleet operator in the United States.

So, in 1953 the Administration tackled the problem. First we issued a series of policy statements and bulletins to the heads of all executive departments and agencies. The policy was simple. The Federal government would not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if the product or service could be procured on a fair basis from private enterprise through ordinary channels.

Speedily we found we were always on a path that was thorny and always uphill. In government, I remind you - if reminder is needed - it is one thing to declare a purpose; it is quite another to achieve it.

Just the cataloguing of the government's business operations and services turned out to be a monumental task. Then the evaluation of these activities to determine which ones could best be undertaken privately was even more troublesome. Every step of the way created argument within and outside the administration.

I learned that only a Congressman whose district is dispossessed of a Federal installation can out-bellow a bureaucrat dispossessed of a parasitic function. Indeed the purple oratory that can erupt over these matters verges, occasionally, on the unbelievable. I once confronted a large Rural Electrification Administration convention to say bluntly that the R.E.A. subsidized interest rates should be abolished. The law authorized Federal loans to that organization at 2%. The cost of this money to the Treasury was more than 4%, and I pointed out that with 95% of the rural homes electrified and the organization already producing and distributing power for purposes other than farming this subsidy was no longer justified either by need or fiscal common sense. The next day a leading Senator told the same audience that they should use beer bottles to drive out of their areas anyone who dared to challenge this vested privilege. My applause was a polite recognition of the office I held - his, a standing ovation!

Despite such political flak we did make progress here and there, but four years ago last January my able Budget Director, Maurice Stans, rendered a summarized report of the entire venture. It disclosed that by the end of my eight years in office there were still about 24,000 commercial-industry activities being carried on, mostly by civilian agencies of government. Generally, these were inconsequential, in many instances merely janitorial services. But major cases of competition were still numerous.

In spite of this disappointing picture, we had not conducted an eight-year exercise in futility. We curtailed or discontinued such activities as general and livestock farms, production of bakery items, gasoline service stations, and the operation of local trucking or draying services. We eliminated a tin refinery, and got out of the rubber business. In the defense area there was a general, but far from complete, house cleaning.

So, while I cannot engender in my soul any feeling of vast satisfaction over the administration's accomplishments, we did make a start. It was, indeed, an historic reversal within the executive branch, but its greatest value was to lay a foundation and establish precedents that could, hopefully, serve the nation well in future years.

But today the problem is still with us, as is clear from your Conference Board's first study in the series entitled, "Government in Business," a copy of which was thoughtfully furnished me. Doubtless all of you have received it, so I shall not dwell on it here. But one conclusion deserves emphasis.

The study says: "As publicly financed enterprises impinge upon activities for which private funds had earlier provided the required capital and related resources, they not only tend to restrict further risk taking enterprise in these fields but they also lend to the erosion of the tax base, thereby placing an even heavier burden upon the remaining private ventures."

The report shows: that one in four of our present labor force is directly or indirectly employed by government; that one in six of the nation's employed is on government payrolls; that we have a continuing

upsurge in Federal agricultural expenditures though there are fifty per cent fewer farms and agricultural population has sharply dropped in the past quarter century; and that there has been a tenfold increase in Federal loans and guaranteed or insured loans in the last two decades.

These data were assembled before the "New Frontier" was well explored and before the "Great Society" had shown its zeal to establish instant paradise. Consequently your own data on governmental growth became understatements, even before they could be put into print.

Even more important than all this, we are further eroding self-reliance, the will to venture and risk, and other human qualities that have made this a nation of opportunity and dynamic growth. So we ask ourselves, "Is this, then, a process never ending?" Is the private sector destined year after year to shrivel until non-governmental effort can no longer be worth the candle?

It is obvious that the time for the business community to grapple with government competition is now, today! If we in this country empower the central government to become the paternalistic "Great White Father" it has charted its course to be - if private enterprise is to acquiesce in unjustified Federal intrusion into historically private, local and state affairs, either through fear of retaliation or through avidity for the immediate Federal dollar as opposed to healthy long-term progress in freedom - then the whole concept of maintaining a free and competitive enterprise as we have known it begins to weaken and wither.

Here permit me one highly personal observation: Despite our current self-indulging, deficit-engendering economic thrust, I for one find little satisfaction in a political program premised on citizen futility, pressure group cupidity, state and local irresponsibility, and Federal infallibility.

Are we ready to start a revolt against practices that we believe are insidiously dangerous to our form of government and to our economy? If so, I submit that we cannot content ourselves with mere talk with other like-minded people or deal only in generalities. Though we can inflame ourselves by dwelling upon the inefficiency and costly clumsiness of government in business we cannot stir up public enthusiasm by any attempt merely to "kill Santa Claus."

We must get down to work! We first need, I think, fair and frank analysis and experts in every field where we believe there is unjustified competition by government. We must plainly show to the taxpayer the cost of each such governmental business facility. We must widely show how political action, centralized power, subsidized business and the public purse are used for the profit of pressure groups and for the benefit of politicians, while the taxpayers foot the bill. We must convince every recipient of subsidy - except the indigent, of course - that he is not "getting something for nothing."

Here it would appear, is a great field of opportunity for your Conference Board - joined perhaps by other fine organizations such as the Business Council - to organize, lead and coordinate the processes of educating the public and inspiring each of us to do his utmost. This could indeed be a great service to the United States of America.

But this is not enough, even though it is an essential factor in achieving the next objective I propose. Our government, whose intervention into business we decry, is exactly what you and I, and other citizens of the nation, make it; no better, no worse. It is our representatives in the Federal government who are responsible for every political act in Washington.

The obvious cure for the ills we see is to get representatives at all levels whom we respect and trust. You each have one vote. But you have more. You have influence - in your respective fields you are recognized as leaders. But far too many Americans have been slothful in exercising the qualities of leadership that are theirs by position, education and ability.

Unless every one of us exercises, to the utmost, his capacities and opportunities to support those fundamentals of government in which he deeply believes, we shall deserve what will most surely befall the American system that we cherish and venerate.

I believe that each such leader should, in his own field, or locality, get busy in helping to choose candidates for every elective office to be filled. Too often we by-pass this important duty and, after the smoke has cleared away, content ourselves in donating - either grudgingly or generously - to candidates others have chosen.

This I submit is a grievous failure of duty to ourselves and to our country. Why don't we urge and help

people to stand for office whose political-economic philosophy we respect? Why don't we then support such men in the primaries - and in all the ways a good leader uses to bring about a desired effect among humans?

Not always will we get our first choices; but the individual selected to represent us can be questioned as to his economic convictions - so that if we detect harsh disagreements we can strive to persuade him and tell him frankly that he can count on our enthusiastic help if he stands on the side of self-reliance, full opportunity and the minimizing of governmental paternalism.

There are many millions in this nation still devoted to the simple truths and principles of self-government that Americans have been taught for generations. These millions can be mobilized to support their convictions - but only if the relationship between their own future and the application of these principles to the nation's economy are clearly explained - and only if dedicated leadership inspires them to enthusiastic effort.

The government in Washington belongs to you. Every American citizen is not only a part owner, but, as a voter, he is a participant in it. In today's society that Government's decisions and programs affect every American life. If those decisions and actions do not conform to what you believe in, then it's the fault of natural leaders (including all in this room) who have, through indifference or laziness, failed to convince the majority of Americans that the brightness of their future depends upon their support of the free competitive American system.

That system was designed and structured laboriously and thoughtfully by men whose names fill the early pages of every American child's history book. We have only to support its basic principles zealously in order to eliminate needless Federal intervention in business. So doing we too - as a generation if not individually - will be remembered, gratefully, in America's future history books.

And, my friends, in this great task I wish to everyone of you, a heartfelt "Godspeed."

• Salute to Ray Bliss, Cleveland, Ohio, June 9, 1965

Thank you, Governor Rhodes. And good evening, my friends here in Cleveland and throughout Ohio. I should like to say to all the dinners that have been held this evening that if the enthusiasm and zest that has characterized this dinner of 3000 people in Cleveland this evening gives any indication of what's happening elsewhere, Republicanism in Ohio is on the march.

What I have come to say here in Ohio is uttered far less as a partisan than as a deeply concerned citizen. With every one of you I am convinced that we greatly need, not one, but two strong political parties in the United States - both firm in principle and purpose, both aggressive, both powerful in numbers and influence. It is through their determined competition that you and I and our children can best be assured of good government, locally and federally. Make no mistake, whether in America or anywhere else, lopsided political control is a deadly threat to free people.

Two vigorously contending political parties are our great weapon against unwisdom on high, abuse of the public trust, and even tyranny, whether of a benevolent or police state variety.

So tonight it is in that context, not simply as a Republican, that I share with you a few observations about an extraordinary political leader. We of the Republican Party have borrowed Chairman Bliss from Ohio in a political season that is somewhat less than auspicious. This distinguished son of the Buckeye State has taken direction of the National Party on the heels of a crushing, nation-wide political defeat. In the face of one-party domination in the Nation's capital and despite his awareness of sharply differing convictions in his Party's ranks. At such a time and in such circumstances only a man of uncommon ability and resolution would shoulder the heavy burdens of the Party's chairmanship. At such a time, I would add, the Party can do with no less than an uncommon leader.

I am sure that all Republicans will support Ray Bliss as he seeks to fulfill his pledge of reorganizing, reunifying and re-energizing the Party from the bottom to the top. He asks and needs the aid of each of us in a program of revitalization to preserve until the Party's resurgent force can implant prudence and responsibility in the handling of state and national issues of concern to every citizen.

My friends, we are indeed fortunate to have such a man at this hour. He has forgotten more about

practical politics than most politicians ever learn. For a third of a century a precinct chairman, a member of a county executive committee, and a delegate to state conventions. For a quarter of a century, member of a county board of elections. For two decades, chairman of a county central committee. For more than a decade, member of the Republican National Committee. For sixteen years, Republican State Chairman. Delegate to the last four national conventions. And now, National Chairman of the Republican Party.

Fellow Americans, that is political professionalism unexcelled in either party and unmatched during most of our nation's history. And this to me is what it means.

First, a rapid resurgence of Republican strength in all areas of the country. And as a partisan, I rejoice in that. Second, it means an early return to healthy political competition between our two major political parties. For this all who love freedom should give a cheer.

So tonight and in your behalf, I welcome to national leadership and I salute this tireless, dedicated man on whose abilities so much depends. Some years ago Ray Bliss wrote that a party chairman needs the patience of Job, the wisdom of Solomon, and the hide of a rhinoceros. Well, only Ray himself can vouch for the thickness and toughness of his hide, but I can and do now present to you with great personal pride a man who has that patience, a man who in politics has that wisdom, formerly chairman of Ohio, and now the Republican National Chairman, my good friend Ray C. Bliss.

• Denison, Texas, September 1, 1965

It would be futile, and completely redundant, for me to say that I am proud that the City in which I was born has seen fit to name this magnificent auditorium after me. But I can say this: there is no honor any American can receive that is greater than the respect of any group of his fellow Americans expressed in terms of educational activity and purpose.

I had a great ambition when I left the scene of battle in Europe in 1945. I hoped I could go to a rural community and there, possibly in a junior college or small college, mingle and live with young people - because I lived with young people in the Army. Of course, in those days we didn't have the advantage of having young beautiful girls, but they were young people. Now I am happy to be not only because of the significance of the occasion itself, but just because it gives me the opportunity to visit with you - you people of high school age.

I do this all the time. My most recent visitors were people representing the Youth Councils where many cities bring in youth juries to assist juvenile courts to award proper and decent and effective punishment for those among us who have refused to conform with the laws of the city and of the community. These youngsters were full of enthusiasm. They showed the results of their work and, frankly, in listening to it, I would hope that even in this city you could join with your mayor and your city council and through your school authorities - organize a youth council. Wherever they have been organized, juvenile delinquency has either been unknown or it has been very radically reduced.

In this, of course, we are talking about curing a disease. I'd rather talk about its prevention.

Most people tell you that you are the generation which will soon be taking charge of our affairs. My friends, don't forget how important you are this very minute. The mass opinion of people whether they are teenagers, twenty-five-agers or in the full flood of maturity - is important. You people, at comparable ages of those with whom I was in high school, are more sophisticated, better informed, more widely versed in the affairs of the nation and of the world than we ever were.

I have been one of those since the days of the War who have said, and believed, that any citizen who is old enough to be drafted by his country is old enough to vote.

I believe that the young opinion should be brought into our councils and our system of self-government, on the proper basis, so as that opinion reaches the level of understanding that I think the average senior in a high school has reached, it will have its effect in our system of self-government.

Now the thing that bothers me more than anything else about today's development is the seeming deterioration in our respect, first, for moral law, and, second, for the legal law, the statutes on our books.

Because of this seeming deterioration which has been going on, it seems to me, since World War I and

more rapidly since World War II, we have riots. But I don't think each of these riots is to be examined in a vacuum. I believe they are a result of this deterioration in our respect for moral law all across the continent, and this means not merely a minority. I mean each of us.

We have had only last year in a great university disgraceful riots, merely because of some fancy purpose to enforce what they call free speech - when they later changed to very filthy speech. We had an incident in Philadelphia a couple of years ago where in a fine home a young and well-educated girl and her friends in for an evening of entertainment, which ended in their tearing up the entire house, which is a veritable castle, I believe at a damage of an estimated \$25,000.

This is the kind of thing that we should pause and examine if we are patriotic Americans. Read the first part of your Declaration of Independence where it says that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights and it says that these rights are given to us by our Creator and because of our respect for the law of nature and of nature's God. If we will read those texts time and again - and I am quite sure the Supreme Court is not going to find unconstitutional the Declaration of Independence - I think we should take those very short paragraphs at the beginning of that immortal Declaration and study it and think about it here.

If we are to be of equal rights, I cannot trample upon your rights.

In other words, we envision at once an orderly society, and we do it because our Creator has given us these rights. Indeed we have here, I think imaginative teachers, veritable sermons, where we can as students and teachers, examine: What did these people mean, and, what did they expect to create, and, what did they expect a United States of the year 1965 to be?

I cannot tell you how deeply is my faith in you people. I was told by your mayor this morning there has never been a riot, there has never been any unfavorable or lawless demonstration in this City. I congratulate you. I hope the standards that have borne you up as you have established a record of good conduct will always be with you.

Let us turn to those ennobling virtues of sacrifice and patriotism and selflessness. Let us guide our lives by these things.

Your teachers will give all there is to learn at the present moment of science, and of the proper construction of your sentences, all the grammar and rhetoric and languages. Fine. And you are so much further than we were in our similar state that it's almost pitiful to compare.

But I do say: Lose not one iota of your respect for moral law. Think, "I am a decent, proud, patriotic American." I can think of no higher honor that can finally come to an American than, as he or she is rocking away on the back porch of final days, to be able to say, "I have desperately and always and energetically and intelligently tried to be a good American."

Now, some of you are going to college - I hope a vast majority of you. Some of you will quit high school when you have graduated. Whether or not you do, I have one specific recommendation to you. You insist that you have at least one year of American History preferable along with a bit of Modern World History; that you have also the elements of Economics; and finally a year of what we used to call Civics - or if you want to, call it Political Economy - the way government works, because if you take these courses, you will take real interest in this system of self-government. You will never say, "I'll sit on my hands; I won't vote," or "I'm going to play golf today and not register."

My friends, the system upon which America is based is self-government, and anyone who does not register and vote, and vote intelligently, is not a part of self-government. They're asking someone else to govern us, and if this grown to be a major habit in the United States, then indeed there is some clique in far-off Washington that will be governing us, and that is no longer self-government. The very perpetuation of the kind of United States we want, the kind that has made us so great a nation, has been nurtured by those qualities of self-reliance and self-dependence and proud belief that we can take care of ourselves, and we must depend upon these same qualities to keep the United States great.

I can only pray that you will never lose from your hearts and minds this kind of conviction and belief and determination, so that the United States of our grandchildren's time will be even freer, greater, more powerful and a better leader of the Free World toward that final goal - universal peace with justice.

I am so proud that you people have gathered to give me the opportunity to speak to you for a moment that I cannot tell you in words the true depth of my pride. But I do say, "Good luck to each of you, God bless you, and goodbye."

• **Unveiling of Magna Charta, English Speaking Union, Atlanta, Georgia, October 31, 1965**

Most of you know that I have had in my past a certain political career. It is always dangerous to give any political figure, present or past, the microphone, and then give him a big audience. Some years ago there was a law in one state that when any man was to be hanged for a crime, he had the privilege of taking five minutes to say anything he wanted to in the world. And this man that confessed to this great crime was given this five minutes and so informed of his privilege. He said, "I have nothing to say whatsoever." And a voice in the audience said, "Mr. Sheriff, if the man does not want his five minutes, won't he yield it to me, I'm running for Congress."

I want to take a few minutes, if that much is allowed to me, to tell you something of that is in my heart about forging greater links of friendship between the peoples of all of the English-speaking nations. I would like to take your minds back twenty years. During wartime the peoples, the governments, the men of the fighting services of our two nations achieved, it seems to me, a level of cooperation and understanding among themselves that has never, possibly, been equaled among two proud, self-sufficient nations. I see no reason why that relationship, which then reached such heights, should not be continued, and why advantage should not be taken of it. All the people of the world want peace, and they have a dim understanding, at least, that while mutual understanding of each other will not necessarily produce peace, without it there can be none.

The English-speaking people, common heirs to a judicial system - born on that day of June the 15th, 1215, when King John was forced to admit that even a King was subject to law - that system is today the common heritage of our two peoples; and this means that each of us is free to do his part in making certain that this kind of relationship with other peoples shall exist and flourish. We have a unique opportunity, as heirs of a common legal system, as heirs of a common language (or almost that), and of many traditions and histories that have come down to us through all the years - we have the chance to give to all the world a model of this kind of understanding between peoples, that in the long run even politicians will have to heed, and therefore cannot, by their blundering, impede the growth of this kind of relationship between nations.

There is in the mind of no individual really jingoistic ideas that America is better than Britain or Britain better than Canada, or Australia better than any of us. We respect each other, and by doing so and by practicing this self-respect and respect for the other I think is our great opportunity to provide for all the United Nations - or indeed all the nations of the world - a model of what can develop in the way of peaceful existence, of greater prosperity or greater progress for all humankind in this kind of contact of one people with another.

I think of all of the things to which we are common heirs, we would say Magna Carta is number one. I do not believe anyone can pass by it today, see it, and feel in his heart or her heart what it means without feeling a great reverence, a great thankfulness. Some, I've learned, have said, "Well, this is not the real original Magna Carta." That's true, I believe it was modified somewhat - and probably the historians here can correct me - about 1216 and 1217 and 1225 and 1297. But I'd remind all the Americans here that our Constitution had ten amendments before it was even adopted.

So what we are revering, what we are saluting today, is the great concept that the Barons had when they said to King John, "You too are subject to the rules of law." And when all the world understands this lesson and practices it, then indeed peace will prevail throughout the world.

April 17, 1966 People and Principles (extracts)

...for America tomorrow, next year, a generation hence.
The individual is of supreme importance.

The spirit of our people is the strength of our nation.
America does not prosper unless all Americans prosper.
Government must have a heart as well as a head.
Courage in principle, cooperation in practice make freedom positive.
The purpose of government is to serve, never to dominate.
To stay free we must stay strong.
Under God, we espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all peoples.

• Sylvanus Thayer Speech, May 15, 1966

As a son of West Point, steeped in its traditions, I am profoundly conscious of my debt to Sylvanus Thayer, the man who fathered it. Keenly aware of this obligation I am at once reluctant, yet eager, to speak publicly about it. Reluctant, because my deep esteem for him, approaching veneration, involves those inner sentiments of heart and mind that only a poet could express. Eager, because in the life of Colonel Thayer I see heartening inspiration for all who seek so to learn and to think, to venture and to build that - generations after they are gone - their impress for good may never be lost.

Part of the Thayer heritage to our nation is material and physical: the United States Military Academy at West Point; the Port of Boston; the School of Engineering at Dartmouth; the Academy and Library at Braintree. They are monuments to his vision and zeal, his perseverance and unflagging will. We are citizens of a nation more strong and dynamic because he lived.

Clearly Sylvanus Thayer belongs to the entire nation, yet the United States Army fiercely clings to its priority claim upon his name and record. For as its officer corps has derived character and standards from Colonel Thayer of West Point, so does today's entire Army reflect this spirit of its officers. Whether at home stations or standing alert, or even fighting, around the outer ramparts of freedom, the Army looks upon him as its patron saint.

His was a restless soul, constantly seeking betterment for the society in which he lived.

A century and a half ago this season, the then young Sylvanus Thayer, a soldier deeply depressed by our national blunders in the War of 1812, was searching Paris for masters of new skills, dynamic theories, creative ideas. He was sustained by an unflinching faith that Americans, armed in knowledge, fortified by integrity of character and animated by love of country, could restore the nation's prestige and amplify its future. He believed - as young men will - that he could do something about his country's ills. And - as the young men of every time fortunately are - he was ambitious to play a worthy role in his country's future, transmitting lessons of enduring value.

What lesson - the idolatrous worshipper of today's latest scientific spectacular may ask - can a man of so primitive a time pass onto us or to our successors, who surely will be lords of the universe?

True enough, since Thayer's Paris years, the image of the world has been transformed, for good or for ill, almost beyond human capacity to appreciate. No nostalgia for simpler times can blind us to the manifold and enduring values that are ours. Deeply-seated hungers have been relieved, sometimes even sated. Great good has been accomplished, but not all change has been to human profit.

As dynastic empires, arrogant in their tyranny, have disappeared, new despotisms over men's bodies and minds have replaced them. As the ancient penalty that man must learn his bread in painful drudgery has, in many regions, been lifted, new strains of fear and anxiety have been imposed upon him.

As plagues of famine and disease have been lessened for most and banished for many, making the Biblical span of life's years a reality, the corruption of pessimism about life's purpose and reward becomes epidemic.

Winning the pursuit of comfort and ease and even mastering much of the formerly impossible we may be losing, in affluence, mastery over self, individually and nationally. For we know that self-government is still in the testing stage - indeed it will always be under attack by the selfish, the arrogant, the greedy. But in the lives of such as Thayer we find the courage to conquer doubt and despair; to renew our faith that we can fulfill

our destiny as a nation of free men, helping to lead all peoples and races to a life of dignity, opportunity and liberty.

The imperishable lesson for all of us is that man's character, probity, decency of purpose and love of liberty in an orderly society, must still be the priceless ingredients in the heritage of every American generation. This is the truth that has heartened men from primitive times to this age of planetary probes. It is forever arousing the weary and the frustrated to renewed effort - inspiring those who still march and fight to yet more valiant thrusts. It is the code exemplified by the life of Sylvanus Thayer.

It is tempting, but impractical, to review here the main events of Sylvanus Thayer's long and many-sided life or to venture an assessment of his contributions to military victory in America's wars; to engineering triumphs in peace; to his transformation of our educational concepts. We merely wish to bow for a moment to the spirit of the man, the everlasting that will outlive all things of brick and mortar, metal and marble. For this memorial symbolizes much more than past record or present fact; it will be meaningful to generations yet unborn. It takes its rightful place with those of other men who, likewise honored by this Hall of Fame, have contributed greatly to America's physical, moral and intellectual heritage.

Duty, Honor, Country, the code of the West Point of Sylvanus Thayer. Three simple words, but their application is universal. These enduring ideals can move Americans, whatever their age or walk of life, now, or in centuries hence, to strive for great goals, to endure tragic trial, to serve in devotion that others may gladly and grandly follow them.

So doing, they will be faithful to the spirit of Sylvanus Thayer.

• Exeter Academy, June 12, 1966

In spite of my abiding affection for young students, if one of my age should find himself privileged to spend an evening visiting with the Exeter student body, I doubt that he would feel fully at home. You must certainly find it difficult to visualize yourselves as wrinkled oldsters, enduring, one day, the physical limitations imposed by age. At the same time, when I so much as glance into your modern textbooks I encounter terms routinely used that are, for me, no less than bewildering.

Between eighteen and seventy-five are vast differences in preoccupations, interests, diversions, experiences, perspective and outlook. However, I do not believe that these obvious differences necessarily make illogical our one-sided conversation of this morning. For as you now peer dimly forward into the six decades that will bring you to my age, I can look back an equal distance to my own school days with hindsight and a bit of actual experience. So doing, perhaps I can speak, with some confidence, on the importance of your present. This is my subject; for it is now - during these preparatory and maturing years - that you are shaping the pattern of your entire future.

Suppose we liken the career of an individual to a house - a lifetime home built of his own deeds, words, mistakes and accomplishments, growing continuously through the years until the day comes when the final piece is fixed firmly in place, and the occupant lies down at last to rest. If the house is to be strong, rather than weak, beautiful instead of mean, useful instead of worthless, its foundation must be sturdy and solid. You will recall the Biblical parable of two houses, one built upon sand, the other upon durable rock. When the winds and floods struck them both, the one was demolished and swept away - the other, on rock, withstood every shock of wind and wave.

The core of the foundation you are building is "character." The word defies exact definition, but if your house of life is to be one to bring you enduring satisfaction it must rest upon sound and proved qualities. Those qualities. Those qualities are the stones of your foundation.

Let us think then of some of these elements - a few of the pieces you will need for your foundation of rock. First, consider integrity, because to utter this word is to convince any normal mind of the necessity for its inclusion in every life's foundation. It requires no advertising from the builder - no ostentatious polishing to keep it shining. Your own inner concern for it will insure its permanence and its bright visibility.

Ambition is another necessary stone, and one to be selected with special thought and care. Ambition has

been likened to salt in the food, "Too little and the food lacks savour and appeal; too much, and the whole dish becomes inedible." But consider ambition in terms of scope: "Does it concern only myself, or, is it directed equally to family, community and the society of which I am a part?" Do you want to be merely a publicized star of the game - or do you want most to do your part in helping the team to play its best? In this sense, ambition is truly valuable, whereas if it comprehends only one's selfish goals in fame or money, your house may, from some angles appear beautiful - but from others, and certainly to the builder, it will eventually become cramped, ugly and unworthy.

Next, a capacity for hard work. Anyone who hopes to attain his life's purposes by chiseling, by slippery dealing or by personal charm will find at the end only defeat and self pity. Work suggests duty, which has been called, properly, a sublime word. It is no exaggeration to say that whoever loves his work, and tries to do his duty, is a happy and constructive man.

Loyalty is another stone we need. Without it one can have no deep friendships, and if the house of life is too devoid of friends it will be a sorry structure indeed. We give it to superiors and to subordinates, to high ideals, to family and community. Loyalty to the nation is patriotism; a proud word to any true American. Loyalty can withstand defeat, disaster and privation - and what is more difficult - success and affluence. It asks only to be useful and, in return, a like loyalty.

Common sense. I have heard this term defined as the "wisdom of the unlettered." With this I do not agree. True, many under-educated possess it, but it is also a quality that can be acquired. Common sense is the enemy of hysteria and frantic action. It is the ability to place facts in perspective and, even in crisis, make a calm appraisal of their over-all meaning. Here the good teacher or leader can render you a special and extra-curricular service, for to seek outside help for this purpose is in itself an expression of common sense.

Next, I suggest several closely related stones - conscience, decency, self-respect. In talking of these I do not mean to take over your chaplain's duty. I shall not try to preach a sermon. Instead, I merely point out the essentiality of these qualities to a fruitful life.

Conscience is the judge of your inner self. It is conscience that tells you to do right, even when unobserved, and it is conscience that gives you a feeling of guilt and cheapness when you do otherwise.

A sense of decency comprehends respect for the basic rules that the civilizing process has developed for relations among humans. In mankind's long trek from beginning darkness toward the light, there have emerged well-nigh universal customs and practices, hallmarks of our culture. Some of these are obedience to law, good manners, and healthy and wholesome relations among individuals, groups and the sexes. Probably even more important than any of these is respect for the family, the basic unit of civilized life. To do anything to damage the strength and sanctity of the family, or sully one's family name, is to weaken the whole structure under which is maintained an orderly society and the individual's liberty and protection. Indeed should an entire nation forget this fundamental truth the eventual result could scarcely be less than anarchy and loss of freedom.

The importance of self-respect is vital. It is loyalty to self - to all things that conscience and decency prescribe for you. With it never can everything be lost; without it never can a full life be achieved. If a few decades from now, you should be called upon privately, or from such a distinguished platform as this, to face your own son and advise him about his future, I am sure you would express the conviction that conscience, a sense of decency, self-respect and devotion to family are among the most important qualities he will need always.

Finally, moral courage. This is the readiness to stand up for what you believe to be right, after determining what is right through study, reflection and common sense. It includes self-reliance and self-confidence but it never becomes arrogance, egotism or self-righteousness. It is a hall-mark of the true leader.

Should we add up the qualities I have mentioned and include others, such as mercy, initiative, generosity, and above all, a sense of humor, we come again to "character," without which no life can be a true success.

Now, no sound foundation can be built by accident, only through knowledge can you recognize and begin selecting and shaping the stones you need. In the same way it helps to guide construction of your entire house of life, so that it may become satisfying to you and admired by others. Knowledge is acquired by formal education and by observation, absorption, and trial and error.

Education has been described as the exposure of young and inquiring minds to great minds. It is this - it is likewise a maturing process. It a growth of spirit as well as of mind. It accumulates information, compels thinking, and develops understanding. Through it, faulty ideas and concepts can be corrected, bad thinking and habits can be changed - those stones badly selected initially for life's foundation can be reshaped, repaired or replaced.

This is easy to say, less easy to do. Distractions of all kinds are ever present. In a few student bodies - even some faculties - across the land evil influences completely alien to the teachings and lofty traditions of such institutions as Exeter, try to corrupt the thinking of the whole. I am not here referring to any new or honest movement for improvement. I am speaking only of those who violate accepted standards.

Exponents of these cults want to distort values and create discord; they urge you to seek the pleasant looking, but treacherous, sand on which to build your house. Such warped souls suffer from an inferiority complex, seeking through sheer exhibitionism to attract attention to themselves. Whenever these foolish adventurers, with persuasive manner and surface brilliance, seem to be luring you away from the task of building your house soundly, I would suggest you talk the matter over with a trusted teacher.

Further, refresh your memory with the words and works of those inspired men who wrote our Nation's Declaration and Constitution. They were pioneers in establishing freedom in an orderly society, they gave us self-government and human dignity in this great land. Doing so they made you the heirs to rich opportunities for free choice, splendid education and self-fulfillment.

Now I rush along because I know how eager you are to get started on your vacation - or to meet your date at the close of this ceremony. Indeed, I hope you will apologize to her if I have kept you too long.

This school has an enviable reputation throughout the nation, even abroad, for helping its students in developing character, knowledge and understanding. Your pride in it, your loyalty to it, your memories of it, will do much to help you choose, always, the hard right instead of the easy wrong.

I congratulate you on past accomplishments, and express my best wishes for your future. I assure you that through life's unending storms - born of human frailty, rapid technical change, unforeseen events, great discoveries and even disaster - may at times force you to change or repair some part of your house's super-structure, as long as it is based soundly on character, fortified by education, you will never be compelled to face discouragement or doubt as to the worth and firmness of the whole.

More than this you will be enriching the heritage you have received from your forebears, and will pass it on, stronger than ever, to your own children and theirs. Thus you will earn and hold the proudest title of all, that of "Good Citizen of the United States of America."

Now - thank you and God bless you all.

• Shipley School for Girls, June 15, 1967

1. Traditional role of commencement speaker:
 - a. World situation & problems. Crossroads; followed by
 - b. Advice, prophecy, exhortation.
 - c. Too smart to advise; unqualified to prophecy; hope too humble to exhort.
2. From vantage point of age can make several observations.
 - a. Speed of change - transport - electronic communications - computers.
 - b. 60 years separating us you will witness far greater and more startling changes than I.
 - c. Necessary to adjust mentally to change.
 - d. Not rudderless - sound basis is character.
3. Formal Education: Lifetime
 - a. Basis is character, mental & moral integrity, & sense of responsibility & justice
 - b. Profit, understanding, citizenship, training succeeding generation; personal satisfaction.
4. Conclusion
 - a. A fine world. The only worthwhile task is to make it better.

b. Task for people of character who like to work; calls for knowledge of world-others-yourself.

c. And finally one quick observation & one profound hope - for girls only. Ankles are neat, knees are too often knobby. Girls with straight, stringy hair look so terribly sad. I hope they soon go back to their curling irons.