

Remarks by Hubert H. Humphrey at the United Nations Committee dinner Saturday, July 15, Minnesota Club, St. Paul, Minn.

While I am not authorized to speak for the entire Minnesota delegation to the national Democratic convention, I know ^{that I can say we} ~~that all of us~~ have profited from this splendid meeting. As a member of the United Nations advisory committee and one who has been active in the speakers bureau, ~~xx~~ and, also, as a delegate to the convention, I believe that I am correct in stating that the Minnesota ^{an} United Nations committee has enthusiastic supporter~~x~~ in every member of this delegation.

For the record I think it should be stated that the recent state convention of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor party unanimously ~~is~~ resolved in favor of the national League of Women Voters resolution on foreign policy, ^{that resolution pledged} ~~pledging~~ that the United States ~~will~~ take the initiative in leading other nations to agreement on international policies and ^{ed} ~~pledging~~ that the United States ~~will~~ become a member of a permanent international organization and ~~will~~ agree to the joint use of military force to suppress future attempts at military aggression by any nation, ^{It pledged} ~~and pledging~~ that the United States ~~will~~ cooperate now with other countries in solutions of political, social, and economic problems that are pressing, such as political policy in liberated or Axis countries, relief and reconstruction, stabilization of currencies, air commerce, postwar shipping, and pledging that the United States ~~will~~ maintain a tariff policy that will promote, not obstruct, international trade.

This resolution was not taken lightly but was given serious consideration. The members of our party not only view the problem of establishing a just and enduring peace as one of international organization with adequate force and law but also firmly believe~~x~~ that any program for the establishment of peace and

security must take into consideration the political, social, and economic problems which, if let to themselves, result in sordid nationalism, aggression, and war.

Again for the record, I think it should be noted that the respective county conventions of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party have adopted resolutions indorsing the program of the United Nations and commending the efforts of the Minnesota United Nations committee.

I point to these formal expressions so that you as members of this committee may know where we stand. ~~and say publicly~~ We are not afraid of a positive and definite statement on foreign policy. We are not asking our party to adopt "wimpy" words" or "rubber words," ^{either} ~~either~~ on a state or national basis. ~~We are not afraid~~
~~of the responsibility of leadership. We are not afraid~~

It has become commonplace to point to the tragedy of 1920 and to say, solemnly, it shall not happen again. ~~I wish~~ But I just wonder, if we don't repeat that statement mechanically, without realizing its full meaning. Because, ladies and gentlemen, I am afraid that it may happen again and that it may happen for exactly the same reasons.

~~What is it~~ What really did happen in 1920? In that fateful year the ~~million~~ people of the United States ~~were~~ were cheated, I say cheated, because ~~an overwhelming~~ an overwhelming preponderance of the American people wanted their country to join the league. And what happened?

The Republican convention that met in Chicago in 1920 included two ^{seemingly} ~~iron~~ irreconcilable elements. There was the pro-league element, which included such ~~Kellogg, Elihu Root~~ men as Frank B. Kellogg and Elihu Root, who drafted the ~~pro~~ platform. And there was the bitter, anti-league element, which was headed by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, and ~~included~~ included Hirman Johnson, and George Harvey, who subsequently disgraced ~~America~~ the United States as ambassador to England.

~~That convention met in an atmosphere of~~



the Balls, the Austins, and the Burtons on the other.

And the Republican candidate of 1920 was like the platform. He could ~~ask both~~ face both ways at once. He was pro-league, he was anti-league. For example, in a speech at Des Moines on October 7, 1920, Harding stated flatly: "It is not interpretation, but rejection that I am seeking," a statement which can hardly have a double-meaning, but it was immediately modified by a promise to consult with the best minds of the country after the election "to the end that we shall have an association of nations for the promotion of peace."

What was the effect of this upon the pro-league Republicans, the Willkie Republicans of 1920. The effect was precisely as the old-guard managers of the GOP intended it to be. Individual Republicans were angered, but not sufficient to cause a change in policy. In fact in October ¹⁹²⁰ some 31 prominent Republicans issued a public statement which they concluded by saying, "We, therefore, believe that we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation to promote ~~the~~ peace by supporting Mr. Harding for election to the presidency." Among the signers of this ~~the~~ public statement were Herbert Hoover, Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Henry L. Stimson, Ray Lyman Wilbur, and a number of college and university presidents.

Fortunately one leader did foresee clearly that the pro-league Republicans had lost all control of Republican policy. Dr. H.N. MacCracken, president of Vassar college, stated at the ~~in~~ time, "Although I have been asked to sign ~~this~~ the statement of Elihu Root in behalf of Senator Harding's candidacy, I cannot do so, for the reason that the names of those signing it will not in my opinion have any influence on Senator Harding's foreign policy after the election. It seems to me that the same group of Republican senators will control Republican policy who have controlled it in the past and that nothing is to be expected from them in the way of international cooperation."

I ask the gentlemen of this committee, in the spirit of President MacCracken, what do you expect from Mr. Taft, Mr. Vandenburg, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Nye,

4

Mr. Bricker, Mr. Hamilton Fish, and Mr. Knutson in 1944.

Be honest with yourself, just who do you believe is in control of the Republican party? I think you might even answer this question by consulting Mr. Willkie. Or you might even ask Mr. Hoover, because in the fall of 1920 in Indianapolis, Indiana, Mr. Hoover in a little-remembered speech said, "The important thing is that the Republican party has pledged itself by its platform, by ~~its~~ the action of the majority of the senate, by the repeated statements of Senator Harding that they undertake to put into living being the principle of an organized association of nation for the preservation of peace. The carrying out of that promise is the test of the sincerity, integrity, and statesmanship of the Republican Party."

Ask yourself in 1944, in view of this record and in view of these pious pronouncements, do you think you can trust the platform or the pronouncements of the candidate of the Republican party.

With this ~~his~~ brief review of political history let us become contemporary. Only a few days ago the Republican convention nominated Mr. Dewey as their candidate. What has been Mr. Dewey's record with respect to international affairs. In 1940 he bewailed the fact that our country had recognized Soviet Russia. In 1941 he said lend-lease would bring an end to free government in the United States. In his Wisconsin campaign of 1940 his philosophy was "to keep away from Europe," and since 1942 I think it is fair and just to say that no man in the past 20 years who has ~~as~~ aspired to the office of the Presidency ~~x~~ has said so little about the important and crucial issues of our time as Mr. Dewey.

It is not only the candidate and his record which I would like to call to your attention. But as President MacCracken pointed out, it is the men who control the party organization that is important. Since his nomination, Mr. Dewey has appointed Harrison Spangler, an isolationist, as general counsel to the national committee, and the Chicago Tribune's man, Werner W. Schroeder, as vice chairman of the national committee.

5

The convention itself was maneuvered and handled by, not the liberal forces of the Republican party, but Mr. Pew of Pennsylvania, ~~but~~ Mr. Hoover, *Mr. Landon*, Mr. Taft, Mr. Vandenburg, and Mr. Martin. ~~Exhibit is that the Minnesota Republican delegation~~ The Republican convention of 1944 had no time for Mr. Willkie or his proposals. He was there neither in person nor in spirit.

Are we to entrust the high purposes and objectives of the United Nations committee to a political organization and candidate whose internationalism ~~want~~ had developed by 1943 no further than an Anglo-American *alliance* ~~alliance?~~ Consider this in comparison with the record of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who ~~in 1920~~ record for international organization goes back as far as his vigorous campaign for the League of Nations in the campaign of 1920.

If my remarks seem partisan, let me assure you that I am not here in a spirit of petty political partisanship. The issues of foreign policy which this committee has so courageously dedicated itself is one that superseded all considerations of party. What ~~i~~ we don't want is another election like that of 1920 in which the candidate can say the day after election, "The League is dead."

I do not want to see another Committee of 31 prominent American citizens, as there are in this room, who are misled by ~~the double-talk~~ and the pious pronouncements of an ambiguous platform and ~~a~~ the double-talk of a 1944 Harding.

¶ Ladies and gentlemen, ~~if~~ let's come right down to the state of Minnesota and see if the picture is any different. On July 7 at the Marcy school in the second ward of the City of Minneapolis there was a Republican meeting ~~attended by~~ addressed by Governor Thyne, Congressman Gale, and a number of other Republican candidates for office.

At that meeting they passed out a sheet of songs to each person as he came into the room. Included in the songs is the following, which I would like to read to you:

(To the Tune of the Flying Trapeze)

OH-O-O

They fly thru the air with the greatest of ease;
To Egypt, to Iran, where ever there's breeze;
Their flying is world wide the aliens to please
While the home folks go hungry and freeze.

OH-O-O

They fly thru the air with the greatest of ease
To Italy, to Malta, and all the known seas;
They whirl the world over with never a sneeze
While the home folks are stung by the bees.

OH-O-O

They spend all our dough with the greatest of ease,
While ~~the~~ trying their best the whole world to appease.
Their outlook is global, their friends the Chinese
While the home folks are getting more fleas.

And the most tragic thing about this is not that it is poor verse, or not that it was ~~not~~ passed out at the meeting, and not that it was sung by great gusto, but the tragic thing is that not a single one of the speakers, including Governor Thye and Congressman Gale, spoke a word of disapproval. In fact, the ~~xxxxxx~~ song I have ^{cited} ~~submitted~~ they were willing to accept as their theme-song.

Now let us examine this verse. In spite of all the pronouncemtns on the part of the Minnesota delegation headed by Governor Thye for a strong foreign policy plank, the Minnesota Republican Party publishes and distributes this type of literature. ^{part}

They ~~exist~~ ^{publicly declare} for international cooperation, and they pass out isolationist literature. Let's look at the first verse, "their flying is worldwide, the aliens to ~~please~~ please," What do the Republicans mean by this? I thought we were fighting a ~~world-wide war against fascism~~ world-wide war in order that we might have the opportunity to build upon the principles of the United Nations.

~~It is interesting to note~~

Ladies and gentlemen of this committee, as a Democrat and a member of the United Nations committee, I am interested in finding out what the position of the Minnesota United Nations committee is ~~is~~ going to be not only with respect to platform but with respect to candidates. We are no longer fighting straw men.

The 1 Committee of 31 in ~~194~~ 1920 included almost a half-dozen members of the ~~new~~ executive committee of the League to Enforce Peace, ~~These~~ which ~~in its~~ ~~day~~ was the United Nations committee of 1920. ~~Are we to have~~ Are we to have another Committee of 31 in 1944 which will mislead the voters in this campaign?

I for one want to know tonight what ^{will} the official policy of this committee with respect to such men as August Andrewsen of the first district, of Mr. Knutson of the sixth congressional district, and the other ~~is~~ isolationist members of the Minnesota ~~is~~ congressional delegation. I want to know, in all fairness tonight, since this committee believes ~~is~~ with me that foreign policy is the basic issue before the American ^{people} ~~committee~~, where do you stand with regard to Mr. Dewey and Mr. Roosevelt?

I ask this question because Mr. Roosevelt more than any other person symbolizes the aims and the aspirations of the United Nations. It was Mr. Roosevelt along with Prime Minister Churchill who prepared the declaration of the United Nations on January 1, 1942. It was Mr. Roosevelt who had had major responsibilities for such historic meetings as the Moscow conference, the Teheran conference, and the Cairo conference, all of which are milestones in the development of the United Nations.

It is Mr. Roosevelt and his secretary of state who have been instrumental in ~~such memoranda~~ the calling of such historic meetings as the United Nations food conference, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation conference, and the current international monetary conference.

I believe this record speaks for itself, and I believe in all sincerity that men who publicly state that the development of an international organization for the establishment of a just and enduring peace is the paramount issue of our time

should and must support Preident Roos^evelt.

This meeting, like the similar meeting with the Republican delegation, was called because ~~xx~~ of the interest of the United Nations committee in a sound and straihtforward platform on international cooperation. You already have the contradictory and ambiguous platform of the Republican party. If the Democratic party comes out in a simple, clear, and unequivocal platform for the principles of the United Nations, is the United Nations committee ready to support the Democratic Party.?

SECRET

Remarks by Hubert H. Humphrey at the United Nations Committee dinner Saturday, July 16, Minnesota Club, St. Paul, Minn.

While I am not authorized to speak for the ~~entire~~ Minnesota delegation to the National Democratic Convention, I know that I can say we have profited from this splendid meeting. As a member of the United Nations advisory committee and one who has been active in the speakers bureau, and, also, as a delegate to the convention, I believe that I am correct in stating that the Minnesota United Nations committee has an enthusiastic supporter in every member of this delegation.

For the record, I think it should be stated that the recent state convention of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor party unanimously resolved in favor of the national League of Women Voters resolution on foreign policy. That resolution pledged that the United States take the initiative in leading other nations to agreement on international policies and pledged that the United States become a member of a permanent international organization and agree to the joint use of military force to suppress future attempts at military aggression by any nation. It pledged that the United States cooperate now with other countries in solutions of political, social, and economic problems that are pressing, such as political policy in liberated or Axis countries, relief and reconstruction, stabilization of currencies, air commerce, postwar shipping, and pledging that the United States maintain a tariff policy that will promote, not obstruct, international trade.

This resolution was not taken lightly but was given serious consideration. The members of our party not only view the problem of establishing a just and enduring peace as one of international organization with adequate force and law, but also firmly believe that any program for the establishment of peace and security must take into consideration the political, social, and economic problems which, if let to themselves, result in sordid nationalism, aggression, and war.

Again for the record, I think it should be noted that the respective county conventions of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party have adopted resolutions indorsing the program of the United Nations and commending the efforts of the Minnesota United Nations Committee.

I point to these formal expressions so that you as members of this committee may know where we stand. We are not afraid of a positive and definite statement on foreign policy. We are not asking our party to adopt "weasel words" or "rubber words", either on a state or national basis.

It has become commonplace to point to the tragedy of 1920 and to say, solemnly, it shall not happen again. But I just wonder, if we don't repeat that statement mechanically, without realizing its full meaning. Because, ladies and gentlemen, I am afraid that it may happen again and that it may happen for exactly the same reasons.

What really did happen in 1920? In that fateful year the people of the United States were cheated, I say cheated, because an overwhelming preponderance of the American people wanted their country to join the league. And what happened?

The Republican convention that met in Chicago in 1920 included two seemingly irreconcilable elements. There was the pro-league element, which included such men as Frank B. Kellogg and Elihu Root, who drafted the platform. And there was the bitter, anti-league element, which was headed by ~~XXXXX~~ Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, and included Hirman Johnson, and George Harvey, who subsequently disgraced the United States as ambassador to England.

The action of the Republican convention of 1920 was not based upon any understanding of the world situation. It was not motivated by a desire to deal constructively with the issues of the day. It met in an atmosphere of sordid and bitter partisanship, venting an uncontrollable wrath upon that man in the White House, Woodrow Wilson.

The spirit that pervaded that convention was the spirit of "unity" -- and "unity", at any price, even if that price was the death of the League of Nations and another World War. The Republican convention of 1920 did achieve unity, unity in the form of Warren G. Harding. X

Reflect for a moment ~~on what~~ ^{as to the nature of} the Republican party of 1920 ~~was~~. It was all things to all men. Here is their platform proposal on League issue: "the Republican party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon justice and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by development of law and the decision of impartial courts," but at the same time, the platform also said, "the covenant signed by the president in Paris, contains stipulations not only intolerable for an independent people but certain to produce the injustice, hostility, and controversy among nations which it proposed to prevent. The platform also contained high praise for the men who had directed the fight against the league and at the same time for the disappointed advocates of the league contained a promise of hope for the future. The result was the ideal of the platform maker, a platform on a controversial issue upon which all good stand, the pro-leaguers and the anti-leaguers alike."

1944
Is there any difference between this and what the Republican party has done in its contradictory platform of 1944? Just as the platform of 1920 provided ample space for the Johnsons and the Lodges on the one hand, and the Roots, the Hughes and the Tafts on the other, so the platform of 1944 has been designed to make ample space for the Chicago Tribune, the Vandenburgs, the Ham Fishes, the Knutsons and the Andresens on the one hand, and the Balls, the Austins and the Burtons on the other.

1920
Doubt
Talk
And the Republican candidate of 1920 was like the platform. He could face both ways at once. He was pro-league, he was anti-league. For example, in a speech at Des Moines on October 7, 1920, Harding stated ~~in~~ flatly: "It is not interpretation, but rejection that I am seeking," a statement which can hardly have a double-meaning, but it was immediately modified by a promise to consult with the best minds of the country after the election "to the end that we shall have an association of nations for the promotion of peace."

Committee
of 31
What was the effect of this upon the pro-league Republicans, the Willkie Republicans of 1920. The effect was precisely as the old-guard managers of the GOP intended it to be. Individual Republicans were angered, but not sufficiently to cause a change in policy. In fact, in October 1920, some 31 prominent Republicans issued a public statement which they concluded by saying, "We, therefore, believe that we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation to promote peace by supporting Mr. Harding for election to the presidency." Among the signers of this public statement were Herbert Hoover, Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Henry L. Stimson, Ray Lyman Wilbur, and a number of college and university presidents.

Fortunately, one leader did foresee clearly that the pro-league Republicans had lost all control of Republican policy. Dr. H.N. MacCracken, president of Vassar College, stated at the time, "Although I have been asked to sign the statement of Elihu Root in behalf of Senator Harding's candidacy, I cannot do so, for the reason that the names of those signing it will not in my opinion have any influence on Senator Harding's foreign policy after the election. It seems to me that the same group of Republican senators will control Republican policy who have controlled it in the past and that nothing is to be expected from them in the way of international cooperation."

Question
Today
I ask the gentlemen of this committee, in the spirit of President MacCracken, what do you expect from Mr. Taft, Mr. Vandenburg, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Nye, Mr. Bricker, Mr. Hamilton Fish, and Mr. Knutson in 1944.

Be honest with yourself, just who do you believe is in control of the Republican party? I think you might even answer this question by consulting Mr. Willkie. Or you might even ask Mr. Hoover, because in the fall of 1920 in Indianapolis, Indiana, Mr. Hoover in a little-remembered speech said, "The important thing is that the Republican party has pledged itself by its platform, by the action of the majority of the senate, by the repeated statements of Senator Harding that they undertake to put into living being the principle of an organized association of nations for the preservation of peace. The carrying out of that promise is the test of the sincerity, integrity, and statesmanship of the Republican Party."

Ask yourself in 1944, in view of this record and in view of these pious pronouncements, do you think you can trust the platform of the pronouncements of the candidate of the Republican party.

With this brief review of political history let us become contemporary.

Only a few days ago the Republican convention nominated Mr. Dewey as their candidate. What has been Mr. Dewey's record with respect to international affairs. In 1940 he bewailed the fact that our country had recognized Soviet Russia. In 1941 he said lend-lease would bring an end to free government in the United States. In his Wisconsin campaign of 1940 his philosophy was "to keep away from Europe," and since 1942 I think it is fair and just to say that no man in the past 20 years who has aspired to the office of the Presidency has said so little about the important and crucial issues of our time as Mr. Dewey.

It is not only the candidate and his record which I would like to call to your attention. But as President MacCracken pointed out, it is the men who control the party organization that is important. Since his nomination, Mr. Dewey has appointed Harrison Spangler, an isolationist, as general counsel to the national committee, and the Chicago Tribune's man, Werner W. Schroeder, as vice chairman of the national committee.

The convention itself was maneuvered and handled by, not the liberal forces of the Republican party, but Mr. Pew of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Landon, Mr. Taft, Mr. Vandenburg, and Mr. Martin. The Republican convention of 1944 had no time for Mr. Willkie or his proposals. He was there neither in person nor in spirit.

Are we to entrust the high purposes and objectives of the United Nations committee to a political organization and candidate whose internationalism had developed by 1943 no further than an Anglo-American Alliance? Consider this in comparison with the record of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose record for inter-

and even before,

national organization goes back as far as his ~~NIKE~~ vigorous campaign for the League of Nations in the campaign of 1920.

no more partisan ship

If my remarks seem partisan, let me assure you that I am not here in a spirit of petty political partisanship. The issue of foreign policy to which this committee has so courageously dedicated itself is one that supersedes all considerations of party. What we don't want is another election like that of 1920 in which the candidate can say the day after election, "The league is dead." *The United Nations is dead!*

no more committee 931

I do not want to see another Committee of 31 prominent American citizens, as there are in this room, who are misled by the pious pronouncements of an ambiguous platform and the double-talk of a 1944 Harding.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's come right down to the state of Minnesota and see if the picture is any different. On July 7 at the Marcy school in the second ward of the City of Minneapolis there was a Republican meeting addressed by Governor Thye, Congressman Gale, and a number of other Republican candidates for office.

At that meeting they passed out a sheet of songs to each person as he came into the room. Included in the songs is the following, which I would like to read to you:

(To the Tune of the Flying Trapeze)

OH-O-O

They fly thru the air with the greatest of ease;
to Egypt, to Iran, wherever there's breeze;
Their flying is world wide the aliens to please
While the home folks go hungry and freeze.

OH-O-O

They fly thru the air with the greatest of ease
to Italy, to Malta, and all the known seas;
They whirl the world over with never a sneeze
While the home folks are stung by the bees.

OH-O-O

They spend all our dough with the greatest of ease,
While trying their best the whole world to appease.
Their outlook is global, their friends the Chinese
While the home folks are getting more fleas.

and the most tragic thing about this is not that it is poor verse, or not that it was passed out at the meeting, and not that it was sung by great gusto, but the tragic thing is that not a single one of the speakers, including Governor Thye and Congressman Gale, spoke a word of disapproval. In fact, the song I have cited, they were willing to accept as their theme-song.

examining the verse

Now, let us examine this verse. In spite of all the pronouncements on the part of the Minnesota delegation to the Republican Convention headed by Governor Thye for a strong foreign policy plank, the Minnesota Republican Party publishes and distributes this type of literature.

They publicly declare for international cooperation, and yet they pass out isolationist literature. Let's look at the first verse, "their flying is worldwide, the aliens to please," What do the Republicans mean by this? I thought we were fighting^a/world-wide war in order that we might have the opportunity to build upon the principles of the United Nations.

Ladies and ~~MINNESOTA~~ gentlemen of this committee, as a Democrat and a member of the United Nations committee, I am interested in finding out what the position of the Minnesota United Nations committee is going to be not only with respect to platform but with respect to candidates. We are no longer ~~XXX~~ fighting straw men. *on theoretical issues. we face stern reality.*

The Committee of 31 in 1920 included almost a half-dozen members of the executive committee of the League to Enforce Peace, which was the United Nations committee of 1920. Are we to have another Committee of 31 in 1944 which will mislead the voters in this campaign?

I for one want to know tonight what will be the official policy of this committee with respect to such men as August Andresen of the first district, of Mr. Knutson of the sixth congressional district, and the other isolationist members of the Minnesota congressional delegation. I want to know, in all fairness tonight, since this committee believes with me that foreign policy is the basic issue before the American people, where do you stand with regard to Mr. Dewey and Mr. Roosevelt?

Concise
I ask this question because Mr. Roosevelt more than any other person symbolizes the aims and the aspirations of the United Nations. It was Mr. Roosevelt along with Prime Minister Churchill who prepared the declaration of the United Nations on January 1, 1942. It was Mr. Roosevelt who had had major responsibilities for such historic meetings as the Moscow conference, the Teheran conference, and the Cairo conference, all of which are milestones in the development of the United Nations.

It is Mr. Roosevelt and his Secretary of State who have been instrumental in the calling of such historic meetings as the United Nations food conference, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation conference, and the current international monetary conference.

I believe this record speaks for itself, and I believe in all sincerity that men who publicly state that the development of an international organization for establishment of a just and enduring peace is the paramount issue of our time should and must support President Roosevelt.

This meeting, like the similar meeting with the Republican delegation,

7
was called because of the interest of the United Nations Committee in a sound and straightforward platform on international cooperation. You already have the contradictory and ambiguous platform of the Republican party. If the Democratic party comes out in a simple, clear, and unequivocal platform for the principles of the United Nations, is the United Nations committee ready to support the Democratic Party?

Copies to

Manuel Lemer

Lois Beard - VP

Guy Alexander

Mike Malloran

Jack Mackay - AP

weekends send

material c/o

Governor's office

Press - ~~man~~ Lois Beard



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org