

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
140 Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.
Capitol 4-3121, Ext. 2424

FOR RELEASE: Friday P.M.'s
February 13, 1959

DEMOCRATS MUST STAY LIBERAL TO WIN IN '60, SENATOR HUMPHREY SAYS

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) told the Democratic Federation of Illinois at a luncheon in Chicago today (Congress Hotel) how the Democratic Party could win in 1960: by staying the liberal party, and dedicating itself to serving people.

"Whenever and wherever we have given the Democratic Party real purpose for all the people, we have made great strides of progress," he declared.

"We've had a great year in 1958. We can have another in 1960 -- but it may require some soul searching to do it.

"We Democrats can and do win, when we're imbued with a purpose -- a purpose beyond just the glory of winning. Our purpose must always be to serve people, to be deeply concerned about the well-being of people -- all people, everywhere.

"We must have the vision to look ahead, to plan for tomorrow -- and we must have the courage, the boldness, the imagination to further our ideals by constructive and responsible action.

"As a party, we are not afraid of the future -- we welcome it. We have always had the courage to believe there is opportunity in America to make democracy more effective -- to bring closer to full realization the inspiring dreams of justice and equal economic opportunity for all.

"We are the liberal party in American political life, and we must remain the liberal party: not only to win, but to best serve America's future."

Senator Humphrey defined liberalism, in the political lexicon of 1959, as "recognizing change as the inevitable law of society, and action in response to change as the first duty of politics," as contrasted to the conservative's attitude of "resisting change except where dire necessity demands it."

"The liberal's answer to the crisis of our time is, and must continue to be, a program of action to summon all the resources and resourcefulness of free men," he declared.

"A free society can outperform totalitarianism by building its own strength, and meeting social needs without sacrificing democratic rights and liberties."

Senator Humphrey said Democrats "have accepted the mandate of victory across the nation last fall to build a program for America, geared to America's needs."

"We have the framework of such a program now evolving in the current Congress, with contributions to it coming from all geographical areas of the country, and all segments of the Democratic Party.

"It will be a liberal program, because ours is the liberal party -- and the American people have indicated a vote of confidence in liberal leadership.

"Yet, it will be constructively and sanely liberal, providing assurance to all segments of our economy that we can build soundly for future growth and development, and higher living standards at home and abroad, within free democratic institutions -- without any of the recklessness which some profess to fear.

"Quite the contrary, such a forward-looking program would be far less dangerous to our country than running the risk of shutting our eyes to the weak spots in our economy, our areas of neglect in our society that urgently need attention.

"We are determined never to neglect our economy, because we are convinced that a recession is too costly a luxury for us to afford," he declared.

"Our most urgent purpose, in order to merit the country's confidence in 1960, must be a responsible, constructive approach to building a climate for world peace -- regardless of partisan divisions between the Executive and Legislative branches of our government.

"How well we as Democrats do in 1960, in my opinion, hinges on how well we fulfill such aims between now and 1960."

April 2nd 1959
Mayor Daley - Sen Paul Douglas - ADLAI Stevenson
James R.onan State Chm
Dan Walker
Pres DFI
WINNING FOR A PURPOSE
Steve Mitchell
8000170

Excerpts from an address prepared for delivery by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) before luncheon of Democratic Federation of Illinois, Congress Hotel, Chicago, February 13, 1959.

Bill Reinken

It's good to have this opportunity to review the political

scene with fellow Democrats from the great city of Chicago and the

~~great state of Illinois, that~~ ^{- Adlai State that} has given our party such great leaders

as your own Mayor ^{Dick} ~~Bob~~ Daley, my personal friend and colleague Paul

Douglas, and, of course, above all, Adlai Stevenson.

↳ We've had a great year in 1958.

We can have another in 1960 -- but it may require some soul searching to do it. ^{not who but for what purposes!}

↳ ^{what does our Party stand for - let me tell you!} We Democrats can and do win, when we're imbued with a

purpose -- a purpose beyond just the glory of winning.

↳ Our purpose must always be to serve people, to be deeply concerned about the well-being of people -- all people, everywhere.

↳ We must have the vision to look ahead, to plan for tomorrow -- and we must have the courage, the boldness, the imagination to further

000171

our ideals by constructive and responsible action.

Noted

L As a party, we are not afraid of the future -- we welcome it. We have always had the courage to believe there is opportunity in America to make democracy more effective -- to bring closer to full realization the inspiring dreams of justice and equal economic opportunity for all.

L We are the liberal party in American political life -- and we must remain the liberal party: not only to win, but to best serve America's future.

out

L Perhaps we need to define this political label 'liberal', that seems to engender suspicion in some circles these days.

L Genuine liberalism is less a system of doctrines or programs than an attitude and an approach to the affairs of men.

out

L The 20th Century liberal, like his 18th and 19th Century forebears, believes in individual freedom and social responsibility. He believes that free men have the intellectual capacity and moral

resources to overcome the forces of injustice and tyranny.

The true liberal shares with the true conservative an abhorrence of authoritarianism, with its upside-down doctrine of the responsibility of the individual to the "master state", or "master race. Instead, he looks upon the State as an instrument or society and a servant of its members. The responsible State is held strictly to account for serving the common ends of its citizens by means which are freely chosen, and which may be freely changed.

✓ In my opinion, it is this emphasis on changes of chosen ends and means which most sharply distinguishes the liberal from the conservative in a democratic community.

✓ The dictionary defines a liberal as "favorable to change and reform tending in the direction of democracy"; a conservative as "characterized by a tendency to preserve or keep intact and unchanged".

↳ In the political lexicon of 1959, liberals recognize change as the inevitable law of society, and action in response to change as the first duty of politics. Whereas conservatives, to take them at their word, resist change except where dire necessity demands it.

↳ Regrettably, there has always been a lag between the liberal advocacy of social, economic and political reforms to meet changing conditions and new problems, and the conservative acceptance of needed reform.

↳ Yet, sooner or later, the reluctant conservatives finally catch up to where those with more liberal vision tried to focus their sights years before.

↳ In our own century, for example, the reforms initiated by Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt have been denounced by conservative critics as "radical", "socialistic", "un-American" and "unconstitutional".

Only after experience had proved not only their worth but their necessity did the conservatives grudgingly accept these changes.

While history went its leisurely pace through the 19th Century and into the early 20th, old ways which failed to provide full equality of opportunity, though costly to the progress of the country, were tolerable or at least tolerated. But after the first World War, the inability of conservative government to keep pace with the quickening tempo of change brought us to the brink of disaster.

It was only the imaginative and dynamic liberalism of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration that saved us.

This brief philosophical and historical discussion of liberalism has a purpose vital to us today.

If dynamic leadership was essential in the Twenties and Thirties, it is doubly essential today.

The explosive rate of technological discovery and development has brought vast new dangers and opportunities.

It has also opened the possibility of catastrophically

destructive war.

At the same time, a tyranny as ruthless as any in history,
and far more powerful, challenges the premises and institutions of
democracy in an unyielding and many-faceted struggle.

↳ Quite frankly, conservatism is unequal to this mighty
challenge.

↳ The liberal's answer to the crisis of our time is, and
must continue to be, a program of action to summon all the resources
and resourcefulness of free men.

This means, first of all, putting democracy's house in

order —

*and clearly, boldly stating our
objective goals.*

↳ A free society can outperform totalitarianism by building
its own strength, and meeting social needs without sacrificing
democratic rights and liberties.

↳ It means closing ranks with other free countries
democracies in common
policies and united efforts.

It means a national defense without lags and without gaps.

It means greatly increased investment of capital for free countries struggling to raise themselves by their economic bootstraps.

It means increasing the ^{rate of} growth and development of our own economy to support the very heavy demands upon it.

Finally, it means bringing to our international policies, toward friends and toward adversaries, the courage, the understanding, the strength, and the resolution to fulfill the sober responsibilities of the leadership which history has conferred upon the United States.

It won't be an easy task.

It requires knowing what our goals are, and what is required of us.

But the American people will not shrink from the task, if they know what it is.

000177

It will require imagination and planning. Yet the American people have the imagination, and they are not afraid to plan.

It will require democratic self-discipline, and perhaps sacrifice. The American people have shown they are capable of both.

All that is lacking today is dynamic, imaginative, purposeful leadership to respond to and galvanize the national will.

As the Apostle Paul said, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

That is the challenge confronting our nation today.

Only liberalism can provide the leadership that the times demand. *- yes, I mean*

Our Democratic Party can and must meet that challenge.

As Democrats, we have accepted the mandate of victory across the nation last fall to build a program for America, geared to America's needs.

✓ We have the framework of such a program now evolving in the current Congress, with contributions to it coming from all geographical areas of the country, and all segments of the Democratic Party.

✓ ^{must} It ~~will~~ be a liberal program, because ours is the liberal party -- and the American people have indicated a vote of confidence in liberal leadership.

^{and} It will be constructively and sanely liberal, providing assurance to all segments of our economy that we can build soundly for future growth and development, and higher living standards at home and abroad, ~~within free democratic institutions --~~ without any of the recklessness which some profess to fear.

Quite the contrary, such a forward-looking program would be far less dangerous to our country than running the risk of shutting our eyes to the weak spots in our economy, ^{and} ~~our~~ areas of neglect in our society that urgently need attention.

We are determined never to neglect our economy, because we are convinced that a recession is too costly ~~a luxury~~ ^{an expense} for us to afford.

↳ We need more teachers and more schools, and better teachers and better schools at every educational level -- and we are convinced Americans will be unsatisfied with less than the best of educational opportunity for our young people.

↳ We are deeply concerned over the growing toll of sickness, in cost to the individual and economic loss to the country. We are determined to wage an aggressive effort to wipe out disease through research and improve availability of adequate medical care -- an effort in which we wholeheartedly welcome the increasingly helpful cooperation of the medical profession and its many related fields of health care and service. (Pause)

↳ There is much more that needs to be done, but nothing

should take greater priority than building a climate for a just
and secure peace.

We must quietly go about our business of strengthening
our defenses, yet aggressively launch, and persistently maintain,
a bolder program of "works for peace". — *Wage Peace - Peace*
evangelism.

These need not be in conflict at all.

When robbers roam the streets, we need to have police --
but we also need hospitals, schools, parks, industry, and jobs to
maintain a well ordered society. Police alone cannot meet society's
needs.

How well we as Democrats do in 1960, in my opinion, hinges
on how well we fulfill such aims between now and 1960.

Our most urgent purpose, in order to merit the country's
confidence in 1960, must be a responsible, constructive approach to
building a climate for world peace -- ~~regardless of partisan divisions~~

~~between the Executive and Legislative branches of our government.~~

Fortunately, in the field of foreign policy, there is and must be genuine bipartisanship -- insofar as the objectives are concerned. ~~We support the objectives of the Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower Administrations.~~ Basically, those objectives are:

1. Defense against Communist aggression, wherever it occurs.
2. Expansion of the areas of freedom wherever possible.
3. Cooperation and assistance for the new developing and rising nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.
4. Support of the active participation in the United Nations, and expanded use of its many facilities and agencies.
5. And, finally, mutual defense and mutual assistance.

Our responsible bipartisan cooperation on foreign policy goes even beyond these broad objectives. In time of serious concern, we can and do maintain an essential unity of purpose, so that our country can present a united front.

Currently, two examples are NATO and West Berlin. They are all the more important today in light of Soviet threats and tactics.

We must remember that the main objective of the Kremlin is to weaken NATO, and divide the free world's allies. The Soviet cannot win either a cold war or a hot war, if the free world stands united *and goes to work.*

As Democrats, we are pledged to active participation in and leadership of the NATO alliance -- not only in terms of military policy, but politically and economically as well.

We believe in closer political cooperation and unity for all NATO partners.

NATO needs to be strengthened on the economic front by a closer economic integration of Europe and the United States.

NATO needs to expand its horizons in the field of economic assistance, to the areas of Africa and Asia, where NATO countries have historic responsibilities.

In West Berlin, it is imperative that there be complete unity of all political forces -- not only in America but in the Western Alliance.

~~The Soviet Union has its immediate objective to destroy~~
~~the freedom of West Berlin.~~

West Berlin is an island in the sea of Soviet imperialism.

West Berlin is a democratic oasis, in the desert of totalitarianism. It represents democratic strength in one of the most crucial areas of the world. It has as its Mayor a truly great and courageous democratic leader.

Is it any wonder that the Communists would like to do away with it? All the more reason we must never let this Communist threat become a reality — Broaden the area of negotiation

Now these are objectives that everyone should support.

It is to the means of fulfillment of objectives that we must give our attention.

We should make it clear to the world that we have a specific, definite program of works for peace. Let me mention a few. People, Program & Peace.

1. We should emphasize a long-term food program, as a means of aiding and helping the food deficit areas of the world. — Food for Peace

2. We should give leadership and increased emphasis to a broad world health program. Health for Peace

3. We should emphasize the importance of education, particularly vocational and technical education,

Ed. for Peace.

in the newly developing areas of the world.

Whatever happened to the President's proposal of five years ago at Baylor University to build vocational schools or to help in establishment of vocational schools in Asia, Africa, and Latin America? It was a good idea, and it should be carried out -- let's do it.

4. We should expand our programs of cultural, people to people exchange.

5. We should emphasize trade and economic development

Longman

Now, these are some of the things I mean about the emphasis that is needed in foreign policy, and the means to make it more effective.

At all times, we must remember that American military strength must be second to none. We need far less talk about rockets, missiles and other military power -- and much more

fulfillment.

We need far less talk that portrays us as a bellicose and belligerent people, and much more emphasis on our programs and policies to help people live.

Our program must be one that has as its objective better living for people everywhere!

The world is weary of war, and threats of war.

The people of this world want someone to help them on the path of helping themselves, rather than someone to frighten them.

What the world needs is hope and promise, not fear and tragedy.

That, to me, is victory's challenge to Democrats -- in 1958, 1959 -- and 1960.

February 12, 1959

COPY

WINNING FOR A PURPOSE

Excerpts from an address prepared for delivery by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) before luncheon of Democratic Federation of Illinois, Congress Hotel, Chicago, February 13, 1959.

It's good to have this opportunity to review the political scene with fellow Democrats from the great city of Chicago and the great state of Illinois, that has given our party such great leaders as your own Mayor Bob Daley, my personal friend and colleague Paul Douglas, and, of course, above all, Adlai Stevenson.

We've had a great year in 1958.

We can have another in 1960 -- but it may require some soul searching to do it.

We Democrats can and do win, when we're imbued with a purpose -- a purpose beyond just the glory of winning.

Our purpose must always be to serve people, to be deeply concerned about the well-being of people -- all people, everywhere.

We must have the vision to look ahead, to plan for tomorrow -- and we must have the courage, the boldness, the imagination to further

COPY

our ideals by constructive and responsible action.

As a party, we are not afraid of the future -- we welcome it. We have always had the courage to believe there is opportunity in America to make democracy more effective -- to bring closer to full realization the inspiring dreams of justice and equal economic opportunity for all.

We are the liberal party in American political life -- and we must remain the liberal party: not only to win, but to best serve America's future.

Perhaps we need to define this political label 'liberal', that seems to engender suspicion in some circles these days.

Genuine liberalism is less a system of doctrines or programs than an attitude and an approach to the affairs of men.

The 20th Century liberal, like his 18th and 19th Century forebears, believes in individual freedom and social responsibility. He believes that free men have the intellectual capacity and moral

COPY

resources to overcome the forces of injustice and tyranny.

The true liberal shares with the true conservative an abhorrence of authoritarianism, with its upside-down doctrine of the responsibility of the individual to the master state, or master race. Instead, he looks upon the State as an instrument or society and a servant of its members. The responsible State is held strictly to account for serving the common ends of its citizens by means which are freely chosen, and which may be freely changed.

In my opinion, it is this emphasis on changes of chosen ends and means which most sharply distinguishes the liberal from the conservative in a democratic community.

The dictionary defines a liberal as "favorable to change and reform tending in the direction of democracy"; a conservative as "characterized by a tendency to preserve or keep intact and unchanged".

COPY

In the political lexicon of 1959, liberals recognize

change as the inevitable law of society, and action in response to change as the first duty of politics. Whereas conservatives, to take them at their word, resist change except where dire necessity demands it.

Regrettably, there has always been a lag between the liberal advocacy of social, economic and political reforms to meet changing conditions and new problems, and the conservative acceptance of needed reform.

Yet, sooner or later, the reluctant conservatives finally catch up to where those with more liberal vision tried to focus their sights years before.

In our own century, for example, the reforms initiated by Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt have been denounced by conservative critics as "radical", "socialistic", "un-American" and "unconstitutional".

COPY

Only after experience had proved not only their worth but their necessity did the conservatives grudgingly accept these changes.

While history went its leisurely pace through the 19th Century and into the early 20th, old ways which failed to provide full equality of opportunity, though costly to the progress of the country, were tolerable or at least tolerated. But after the first World War, the inability of conservative government to keep pace with the quickening tempo of change brought us to the brink of disaster.

It was only the imaginative and dynamic liberalism of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration that saved us.

This brief philosophical and historical discussion of liberalism has a purpose vital to us today.

If dynamic leadership was essential in the Twenties and Thirties, it is doubly essential today.

The explosive rate of technological discovery and development has brought vast new dangers and opportunities.

It has also opened the possibility of catastrophically

COPY

destructive war.

At the same time, a tyranny as ruthless as any in history, and far more powerful, challenges the premises and institutions of democracy in an unyielding and many-faceted struggle.

Quite frankly, conservatism is unequal to this mighty challenge.

The liberal's answer to the crisis of our time is, and must continue to be, a program of action to summon all the resources and resourcefulness of free men.

This means, first of all, putting democracy's house in order.

A free society can outperform totalitarianism by building its own strength, and meeting social needs without sacrificing democratic rights and liberties.

It means closing ranks with other democracies in common policies and united efforts.

COPY

It means a national defense without lags and without gaps.

It means greatly increased investment of capital for free countries struggling to raise themselves by their economic bootstraps.

It means increasing the growth and development of our own economy to support the very heavy demands upon it.

Finally, it means bringing to our international policies, toward friends and toward adversaries, the courage, the understanding, the strength, and the resolution to fulfill the sober responsibilities of the leadership which history has conferred upon the United States.

It won't be an easy task.

It requires knowing what our goals are, and what is required of us.

But the American people will not shrink from the task, if they know what it is.

⁸ COPY

It will require imagination and planning. Yet the American people have the imagination, and they are not afraid to plan.

It will require democratic self-discipline, and perhaps sacrifice. The American people have shown they are capable of both.

All that is lacking today is dynamic, imaginative, purposeful leadership to respond to and galvanize the national will.

As the Apostle Paul said, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

That is the challenge confronting our nation today.

Only liberalism can provide the leadership that the times demand.

Our Democratic Party can and must meet that challenge.

As Democrats, we have accepted the mandate of victory across the nation last fall to build a program for America, geared to America's needs.

COPY

We have the framework of such a program now evolving in the current Congress, with contributions to it coming from all geographical areas of the country, and all segments of the Democratic Party.

It will be a liberal program, because ours is the liberal party -- and the American people have indicated a vote of confidence in liberal leadership.

Yet, it will be constructively and sanely liberal, providing assurance to all segments of our economy that we can build soundly for future growth and development, and higher living standards at home and abroad, within free democratic institutions -- without any of the recklessness which some profess to fear.

Quite the contrary, such a forward-looking program would be far less dangerous to our country than running the risk of shutting our eyes to the weak spots in our economy, our areas of neglect in our society that urgently need attention.

COPY

We are determined never to neglect our economy, because we are convinced that a recession is too costly a luxury for us to afford.

We need more teachers and more schools, and better teachers and better schools at every educational level -- and we are convinced Americans will be unsatisfied with less than the best of educational opportunity for our young people.

We are deeply concerned over the growing toll of sickness, in cost to the individual and economic loss to the country. We are determined to wage an aggressive effort to wipe out disease through research and improve availability of adequate medical care -- an effort in which we wholeheartedly welcome the increasingly helpful cooperation of the medical profession and its many related fields of health care and service.

There is much more that needs to be done, but nothing

COPY

should take greater priority than building a climate for a just and secure peace.

We must quietly go about our business of strengthening our defenses, yet aggressively launch, and persistently maintain, a bolder program of "works for peace".

These need not be in conflict at all.

When robbers roam the streets, we need to have police -- but we also need hospitals, schools, parks, industry, and jobs to maintain a well ordered society. Police alone cannot meet society's needs.

How well we as Democrats do in 1960, in my opinion, hinges on how well we fulfill such aims between now and 1960.

Our most urgent purpose, in order to merit the country's confidence in 1960, must be a responsible, constructive approach to building a climate for world peace -- regardless of partisan divisions

COPY

between the Executive and Legislative branches of our government.

Fortunately, in the field of foreign policy, there is and must be genuine bipartisanship -- insofar as the objectives are concerned. We support the objectives of the Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower Administrations. Basically, those objectives are:

1. Defense against Communist aggression, wherever it occurs.
2. Expansion of the areas of freedom wherever possible.
3. Cooperation and assistance for the new developing and rising nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.
4. Support of the active participation in the United Nations, and expanded use of its many facilities and agencies.
5. And, finally, mutual defense and mutual assistance.

COPY

Our responsible bipartisan cooperation on foreign policy goes even beyond these broad objectives. In time of serious concern, we can and do maintain an essential unity of purpose, so that our country can present a united front.

Currently, two examples are NATO and West Berlin. They are all the more important today in light of Soviet threats and tactics.

We must remember that the main objective of the Kremlin is to weaken NATO, and divide the free world's allies. The Soviet cannot win either a cold war or a hot war, if the free world stands united.

As Democrats, we are pledged to active participation in and leadership of the NATO alliance -- not only in terms of military policy, but politically and economically as well.

We believe in closer political cooperation and unity for all NATO partners.

COPY

NATO needs to be strengthened on the economic front by a closer economic integration of Europe and the United States.

NATO needs to expand its horizons in the field of economic assistance, to the areas of Africa and Asia, where NATO countries have historic responsibilities.

In West Berlin, it is imperative that there be complete unity of all political forces -- not only in America but in the Western Alliance.

The Soviet Union has its immediate objective to destroy the freedom of West Berlin.

West Berlin is an island in the sea of Soviet imperialism.

West Berlin is a democratic oasis, in the desert of totalitarianism. It represents democratic strength in one of the most crucial areas of the world. It has as its Mayor a truly great and courageous democratic leader.

COPY

Is it any wonder that the Communists would like to do away with it? All the more reason we must never let this Communist threat become a reality.

Now these are objectives that everyone should support.

It is to the means of fulfillment of objectives that we must give our attention.

We should make it clear to the world that we have a specific, definite program of works for peace. Let me mention a few.

1. We should emphasize a long-term food program, as a means of aiding and helping the food deficit areas of the world.
2. We should give leadership and increased emphasis to a broad world health program.
3. We should emphasize the importance of education, particularly vocational and technical education,

COPY

in the newly developing areas of the world.

Whatever happened to the President's proposal of five years ago at Baylor University to build vocational schools or to help in establishment of vocational schools in Asia, Africa, and Latin America? It was a good idea, and it should be carried out -- let's do it.

4. We should expand our programs of cultural, people to people exchange.
5. We should emphasize trade and economic development.

Now, these are some of the things I mean about the emphasis that is needed in foreign policy, and the means to make it more effective.

At all times, we must remember that American military strength must be second to none. We need far less talk about rockets, missiles and other military power -- and much more

COPY

fulfillment.

add to

~~///~~
We need far less talk that portrays us as a bellicose
and belligerent people, and much more emphasis on our programs
and policies to help people live.

Our program must be one that has as its objective better
living for people everywhere!

The world is weary of war, and threats of war.

The people of this world want someone to help them on
the path of helping themselves, rather than someone to frighten them.

What the world needs is hope and promise, not fear and
tragedy.

That, to me, is victory's challenge to Democrats -- in
1958, 1959 -- and 1960.

February 12, 1959



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