

TUESDAY PM's
June 4, 1968OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT
JUNE 4, 1968

Last Saturday, at the University of Arkansas, I addressed myself to the problems of bigness in our society . . . problems of individual people surrounded by institutions of growing and encroaching size.

Today, I wish to follow this with an examination of a problem in the wider world which, in the long run, may have more to do with our survival as individuals -- and the evolution and nature of our American institutions -- than anything happening here at home.

It is also a problem which, in the broader sense, directly involves you, as future guardians of our national security.

I mean the problem of international development -- development which is, in the words of Pope Paul, the new name for peace.

For our true security depends as much on the conditions of life within other nations as it does on our own ability to produce men and weapons able to protect this nation.

As an American I take pride in the well-being and relative affluence we have been able to create for an increasing number of our citizens. But I also take shame at the hunger, poverty, and deprivation which surrounds this prosperous island of the Western world.

I have seen, in Central Java, hundreds of thousands of people lining the roadside to cheer the sight of the American flag -- and, among them, no more than a dozen pairs of shoes.

I have seen, in Africa and Latin America, towns and villages where a majority of the children will not live to voting age.

The terrible fact is this: There are more than a billion people in the world today in countries where the average annual income, per person, is less than 100 dollars. Hundreds of millions live on less than fifty dollars a year.

On the other hand, here in the United States the average man, woman and child had at his disposal something like 27 hundred dollars to spend or save in 1967. And we are all too aware, even at this income level, of the poverty which remains in this country.

It would be oversimplification to say that the massive problems we face in our cities, and in our human rights and welfare areas, stem alone from gaps between the "haves" and the "have-nots."

But evidence shows us that poverty -- and side variation in opportunity for employment, for education, and for sharing the benefits of modern technology -- does bring tension to our society.

I am convinced, too, that a good deal of the unrest in the American family is to a large degree due to a revolution of rising expectations among people -- previously confined to both physical and psychological ghettos -- who, through mass communication, are able to fully see and hear what they are missing in the growing, prospering "other America."

And, if that is true -- and I believe it is -- surely the same will increasingly be true in the wider human family.

People all over the world are "in touch." The transistor radio and communications satellite will make this even more so in the immediate future.

The man in Korea, or Guatemala, or Zambia knows what modern society can mean to his family. He knows what you and I have. He knows about our wealth. He knows about the vast resources at our command, and at the command of the other fortunate nations.

What does he think? How long can he be expected to cheer our flag?

In late 1964 Adlai Stevenson sent me a private letter in which he expressed the fear that this growing disparity between rich and poor "has failed to obtain the public recognition necessary to deal with it effectively."

"Means," he wrote, "must be promptly found to convince public opinion (in the rich nations), despite its growing cynicism and weariness, that the world which will result from the aggravation of this development gap will be an extremely dangerous one for their children to live in."

Then he put the challenge in clear and specific focus:

"A failure of development to proceed with sufficient speed in underdeveloped countries -- and what is 'sufficient' will differ in each one -- will inevitably result, despite whatever force may be exerted from outside, in the seizure of power by more and more extreme regimes in more and more countries.

"Even where these regimes are not Communist and in alliance with the Chinese, as some of them probably will be, they will be increasingly ready to attack white 'bastions' in Asia and Africa.

"Eventually, if the disease is not checked, a general North-South confrontation, more uncontrollable and bloody than the East-West confrontation, may eventually emerge.

"In concrete, practical terms this means that governments, legislatures, and peoples of developed nations must be persuaded, despite their alleged role of Santa Claus, that larger bilateral and multilateral economic aid and technical assistance programs, as well as arrangements for trade and investment favorable to the underdeveloped countries, are in hard cold fact as much in the interest of North as of South, and that the alternative is disaster.

Events of the past three and one-half years have given us no evidence that Adlai Stevenson's assessment was wrong.

In fact, there is a great deal of evidence -- clear and present evidence in Southeast Asia and the Middle East -- that festering conditions of poverty and social unrest in even the most remote region can draw the major powers into conflict and confrontation.

Yet, we saw in our newspapers only last week that the Congress had withheld funds for both the Asian Development Bank and for IDA -- the soft-loan window of the World Bank.

That action was only symptomatic of a growing and, I believe, short-sighted callousness toward the plight of the poor nations.

This is, in the short term, no more or less than withholding necessary and available medicine from a patient whose health depends on it.

It is, in the long term, no more or less than playing roulette with our own ultimate security.

But does the individual American citizen really feel callous about all this?

I cannot believe he does.

This is, after all, the America of the Marshall Plan and of Point Four. It is the America of immigrants, and the sons of immigrants, who came here burning with the belief that all men should have the ways and means to lift themselves. It is the America of young men and women ready to sacrifice for others on dusty Southern roads and in deep slum neighborhoods.

I believe much of the trouble here is the feeling by the individual citizen that he no longer truly relates to any of the problems, or solutions, which come pounding in at him day-after-day on his television set.

There is another gap here -- the gap between the instinct of the citizen thinking out his hopes and concerns within his living room, and the vote finally cast on his behalf by his Congressman.

And here, perhaps, is the place to talk about "participatory democracy" on an international scale.

If we are ever going to be able to mobilize public opinion for the necessary governmental actions to narrow the gap between international rich and poor, then we must begin now to mobilize the individual citizen to direct, personal action he can undertake on his own level.

If honored by the people with the gift of the Presidency, I propose to do everything within my power to encourage and nourish this personal participation.

I propose to offer a new system of national service for our young people -- a system which offers overseas outlets far beyond the present numerical openings in the Peace Corps and in private voluntary agencies.

I propose to explore new tax and other incentives for our universities, private corporations and labor unions to engage their resources and people in grass-roots health, education, agricultural -- and manpower training -- projects in the poor nations.

I propose new opportunities for people in their 40's, 50's, 60's and even 70's to provide their organizational and technical skills to countries desperately in need of those skills.

I propose to open new opportunities for student and teacher exchange on a scale many times larger than those available today.

I propose, in short, to give every opportunity possible to every American citizen for helping in the largest task that faces this planet in the remainder of this century: The carrying of peaceful social revolution to all who seek it.

* * *

Will these new opportunities for personal commitment, of themselves, close the gap between rich and poor? They will not.

But they will help create a climate in this country in which it will be possible once again for this nation's elected leaders to undertake the governmental commitments they believe necessary to doing so.

And here, let me once again outline in the specific those governmental initiatives I believe to be necessary.

-- First and foremost, a reordering of our national priorities and allocation of resources away from ever-wider military and armaments programs toward programs for peaceful development. As a first step, I believe we must -- in concert with our NATO allies -- seek a mutual thinout of men and armaments in Central Europe, through negotiation with the Soviet Union and the Eastern European nations.

-- Second, an unequivocal commitment on the part of the United States to a policy of relaxation of tensions throughout the world. This should include a policy of active, peaceful "bridge-building" -- through trade, tourism, and personal contact -- not only toward the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but also toward mainland China.

-- Third, leadership toward family planning in the developing nations on a scale many times larger than now being considered.

-- Fourth, new emphasis in our development programs to food production and the building of rural economies.

-- Fifth, world-wide commodity agreements which stabilize prices enough so that raw-materials-producing nations may have at least an even chance of earning their own way.

-- Sixth, leadership toward international agreements and guarantees which will sharply increase the flow of private investment to the developing countries.

-- Seventh, a new emphasis on multilateralism in aid programs, with maintenance of only limited bilateral aid programs, and greater reliance on the World Bank, the United Nations, and African, Asian and Latin American institutions for investment and development.

-- Eighth, active encouragement of economic and political regionalism so that other nations may enjoy the benefits of large units of people, resources and markets such as the United States and European Community now possess.

-- Ninth, new priority to modernization of an international monetary system which must be able to provide the capital needed to finance the developing as well as the developed.

-- Tenth, the steady removal of barriers to trade among the prosperous nations, and the establishment of a global preference system for the goods of the underdeveloped.

* * *

Do we have the resources to mount such a program?

Some of these things will surely require an additional investment of financial resources.

Yet, if we project the growth of the American economy at the rate of the past several years, per capita disposal income in the United States -- in 1967 prices -- will exceed 6 thousand dollars by the year 2000.

That means an average annual family income of over 20 thousand dollars.

Again, I emphasize that these are stated conservatively in terms of 1967 prices.

Our Gross National Product will double every 15 of 16 years.

At the same time, projections from present trends in the developing countries show that, by the year 2000, there will be three billion people with incomes of less than 200 dollars a year.

Facing this growing gap, the real question then is not whether or not we shall have the financial resources. It is clear that we shall, and so shall others in the Western world.

The real question is one of our spiritual and moral resources.

The question is: Will the individual American citizen care enough to act personally and to influence the efforts of his government to meet this challenge?

Or will he fall back into the comfort of The Newest Place for Off-Season Vacations to await the deluge that must then surely come?

I have no doubt that if we, as a people, fail to muster these spiritual and moral resources that we shall find ourselves within a very few years surrounded by an increasingly-hostile and troubled world -- either withdrawn within ourselves as a garrison state . . . or desperately extended in a series of worldwide firefighting expeditions . . . or both.

And here I am talking directly about the course of the future lives of the young men here today.

Yet I equally have no doubt that if we, as a people, do rise once more to what we can be, we can help build a far safer and more peaceful world environment than we know today.

And that America may be seen throughout the world and by us, as Carl Sandburg saw her:

"I see America, not in the setting sun of a black night of despair ahead of us. I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun fresh from the burning, creative hand of God. I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision."

#

REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT

JUNE 4, 1968

(Supt)
1 Admiral Engel
3 Gov. Dempsey
4 Sec. Boyd
2 Admiral Smith
(Commandant)
Sen Ribicoff
Cong St. Onge

*Members
Graduating
class of
1968*

*Parents
&
friends*

Last Saturday, at the University of Arkansas,
I addressed myself to the problems of bigness in our
society ... problems of individual people surrounded
by institutions of growing and encroaching size.

Today, I wish to follow this with an examination
of a problem in the wider world which, in the long run,
may have more to do with our survival as individuals --
and the evolution and nature of our American institutions --
than anything happening here at home.

It is also a problem which, in the broader sense, directly involves you, as future guardians of our national security.

I mean the problem of international development -- development which is, in the words of Pope Paul¹², the new name for peace.

For our true security depends as much on the conditions of life within other nations as it does on our own ability to produce men and weapons able to protect this nation.

As an American I take pride in the well-being and relative affluence we have been able to create for an increasing number of our citizens. But I also take shame at the hunger, poverty and deprivation which surrounds this prosperous island of the Western world.

L I have seen, in Central Java, hundreds of thousands of people lining the roadside to cheer the sight of the American flag -- and, among them, no more than a dozen pairs of shoes.

L I have seen, in Africa and Latin America, towns and villages where a majority of the children will not live to voting age.

∟ The terrible fact is this: There are more than a billion people in the world today in countries where the average annual income, per person, is less than 100 dollars. Hundreds of millions live on less than fifty dollars a year.

∟ On the other hand, here in the United States the average man, woman and child had at his disposal something like 27 hundred dollars ^{each} to spend or save in 1967. ∟ And we are all too aware, even at this income level, of the poverty which remains in this country.

∟ It would be oversimplification to say that the massive problems we face in our cities, and in our human rights and welfare areas, stem alone from gaps between the "haves" and the "have-nots."

But evidence shows us that poverty -- and wide variation in opportunity for employment, ~~for~~ education, and ~~for~~ sharing the benefits of modern technology -- does bring tension to our society.

I am convinced, too, that a good deal of the unrest in the American family is to a large degree due to a revolution of rising expectations among people -- previously confined to both physical and ^{who ~~now~~} psychological ghettos -- /through mass communication, are able to fully see and hear what they are missing in the growing, prospering "other America."

And, if that is true -- and I believe it is -- surely the same will increasingly be true in the wider human family.

People all over the world are "in touch." The transistor radio and communications satellite will make this even more so in the immediate future.

The man in Korea, or Guatemala, or Zambia *now*

knows what modern society can mean to his family.

↳ He knows what you and I have. ↳ He knows about our wealth. He knows about the vast resources at our ^{the} command, and at the command of other fortunate nations.

↳ What does he think? How long can he be expected to cheer our flag?

In late 1964 Adlai Stevenson sent me a private letter in which he expressed the fear that this growing disparity between rich and poor "has failed to obtain the public recognition necessary to deal with it effectively."

↳ "Means," he wrote, "must be promptly found to convince public opinion (~~in the rich nations~~), despite its growing cynicism and weariness, that the world which will result from the aggravation of this development gap will be an extremely dangerous one for ~~their~~ children to live in."

Then he put the challenge in clear and specific focus:

"A failure of development to proceed with sufficient speed in underdeveloped countries -- and what is 'sufficient' will differ in each one -- will inevitably result, despite whatever force may be exerted from outside, in the seizure of power by more and more extreme regimes in more and more countries.

"Even where these regimes are not Communist and in alliance with the Chinese, as some of them probably will be, they will be increasingly ready to attack white 'bastions' in Asia and Africa.

"Eventually, if the disease is not checked, a general North-South confrontation, more uncontrollable and bloody than the East-West confrontation, may eventually emerge.

"In concrete, practical terms this means that governments, legislatures and peoples of developed nations must be persuaded, despite their alleged role of Santa Claus, that larger ~~(bilateral and multilateral)~~ economic aid and technical assistance programs, as well as arrangements for trade and investment favorable to the underdeveloped countries, are in hard cold fact as much in the interest of North as of South, and that the alternative is disaster."

Events of the past three and one-half years have given us no evidence that Adlai Stevenson's assessment was wrong.

In fact, there is a great deal of evidence -- ~~clear~~ ~~and present evidence~~ in Southeast Asia and the Middle East -- that festering conditions of poverty and social unrest in even the most remote regions can draw the major powers into conflict and confrontation.

Yet, ~~we saw in our newspapers only~~
last week ~~that~~ the Congress ~~had~~ withheld funds ^{from}
~~for~~ both the Asian Development Bank and ~~for IDA~~ ^{the International Development Agency}
~~the soft loan window of the World Bank.~~ ^{of the World Bank}

That action was only symptomatic of a growing
and, I believe, short-sighted ^{attitude} ~~callousness~~ toward the
plight of the poor nations. KUP

~~The result is~~
This is, in the short term, no more or less
^{was the} ~~than~~ withholding necessary and available medicine
from a patient whose health depends on it.

~~It is~~ ^{It is} ~~we are~~
It is, in the long term, no more or less than
playing roulette with our own ultimate security.

* * *

But does the individual American citizen really
feel ~~callous~~ ^{this way} about all this?

I cannot believe he does.

This is, after all, the America of the Marshall Plan and of Point Four. It is the America of immigrants, and the sons of immigrants, who came here burning with the belief that all men should have the ways and means to lift themselves. It is the America of young men and women ready to sacrifice for others on dusty Southern roads and in deep slum neighborhoods.

Foreign battlefields and on

I believe much of the trouble here is the feeling by the individual citizen that he no longer truly relates to any of the problems, or solutions, which come pounding in at him day-after-day on his television set.

~~There is another gap here -- the gap between the instinct of the citizen thinking out his hopes and concerns within his living room, and the vote finally cast on his behalf by his Congressman.~~

And here, perhaps, is the place to talk about "participatory democracy" on an international scale.

If we are ever going to be able to mobilize public opinion for the necessary governmental actions to narrow the gap between international rich and poor, then we must begin now to ~~stimulate~~ ^{stimulate} the individual citizen to direct, personal action ^{which} he can undertake on his own level.

If honored by the people with the gift of the Presidency, I propose to do everything within my power to encourage and nourish this personal participation.

~~We must~~ ^{We must} propose to offer ~~a new~~ ^{an expanded and new} system of national service for our young people -- a system which offers ~~overseas~~ outlets far beyond the present numerical openings in the Peace Corps and in private voluntary agencies.

We must

~~I propose to~~ explore new tax and other

incentives for our universities, private corporations
and labor unions to engage their resources and
people in grass-roots health, education,
agricultural -- and manpower training -- projects
in the poor nations.

We must open

~~I propose~~ new opportunities for people

in their 40's, 50's, 60's and even 70's to provide
their organizational and technical skills to
countries desperately in need of those skills.

We must

~~I propose to~~ open new opportunities for

student and teacher exchange on a scale many
times larger than those available today.

we must

~~I propose~~, in short, ~~to~~ give every opportunity possible to every American ~~citizen~~ *to help* in the ~~largest~~ *major* task that faces this planet in the remainder of this century: The carrying of peaceful social revolution to all who seek it.

* * *

Will these new opportunities for personal commitment, of themselves, close the gap between rich and poor? They will not.

But they will help create a climate in this country in which it will be possible once again for this nation's elected leaders to undertake the governmental commitments they believe necessary to doing so.

And here, let me once again outline in the specific those governmental initiatives I believe to be

necessary.

*Initiatives designed to
Strengthen our Security and
build for Peaceful development*

-- First and foremost, a reordering of our national priorities and allocation of resources away from ever-wider military and armaments programs toward programs for peaceful development. As a first step, I believe we must -- in concert with our NATO allies -- seek a mutual thinout of men and armaments in Central Europe, through negotiation with the Soviet Union and the Eastern European nations.

← Second, an unequivocal commitment on the part of the United States to a policy of relaxation of tensions throughout the world. This should include a policy of active, peaceful "bridge-building" -- through trade, tourism, and personal contact -- not only toward the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but also toward mainland China.

-- Third, leadership toward family planning in the developing nations on a scale many times larger than now being considered.

-- Fourth, new emphasis in our development programs to food production and the ^{modern} building of rural economies.

-- Fifth, world-wide commodity agreements which stabilize prices enough so that raw-materials-producing nations may have at least an even chance of earning their own way.

-- Sixth, leadership toward international agreements and guarantees which will sharply increase the flow of private investment to the developing countries.

-- Seventh, a new emphasis on multilateralism in aid programs, with maintenance of only limited bilateral aid programs, and greater reliance on the World Bank, the United Nations, and African, Asian and Latin American institutions for investment and development. *This means a sharing of the burden of Aid by many countries*

-- Eighth, active encouragement of economic and political regionalism so that other nations may enjoy the benefits of large units of people, resources and markets such as the United States and European Community now possess.

-- Ninth, new priority to modernization of an international monetary system which must be able to provide the capital needed to finance the developing *nations*, as well as the developed.

-- Tenth, the steady removal of barriers to trade among the prosperous nations, and the establishment of a global preference system for the goods of the underdeveloped.

* * *

Do we have the resources to mount such a program?

Some of these things will surely require an additional investment of financial resources.

Yet, if we project the growth of the American economy at the rate of the past several years, ~~per capita disposal income in the United States -- in 1967 prices -- will exceed 6 thousand dollars by the~~

~~year 2000.~~ *by the year 2000 the*

~~That means an average annual family income~~ *will be*
~~of over 20 thousand dollars.~~

~~Again, I emphasize that these are stated conservatively in terms of 1967 prices.~~

Our Gross National Product will double every
15 or 16 years.

At the same time, projections from present trends in the developing countries show that, by the year 2000, there will be three billion people with incomes of less than 200 dollars a year.

*A dangerous
threatening explosive situation*

Facing this growing gap, the ~~the~~ question then is not whether or not we shall have the financial resources. It is clear that we shall, and so shall others in the Western world.

^{real}
The/question is one of our spiritual and moral resources.

~~The question is: Will the individual American citizen care enough to act personally and to influence the efforts of his government to meet this challenge?~~

~~Or will he fall back into the comfort of The Newest Place for Off-Season Vacations to await the deluge that must then surely come?~~

I have no doubt that if we, as a people, fail to muster these spiritual and moral resources that we shall find ourselves within a very few years surrounded by an increasingly-hostile and troubled world -- either withdrawn within ourselves as a garrison state ... or desperately extended in a series of worldwide firefighting expeditions ... or both.

And here I am talking directly about the course of the future lives of the young men here today.

Yet I ~~truly~~ have no doubt that if we, as a people, do rise once more to what we can be, we can help build a far safer and more peaceful world environment than we know today.

And that America may be seen throughout the world and by us, as Carl Sandburg saw her:

"I see America, not in the setting sun of a black night of despair ahead of us. I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun fresh from the burning, creative hand of God. I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision..."

#

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS
VICE-PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT
June 4, 1968

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

Admiral Engel, Admiral Smith, Senator Ribicoff, Governor Dempsey, Congressman St. Onge, Secretary Boyd, members of this distinguished graduating class, cadets, parents and friends, officers and teachers.

First, let me tell you that this is one of the more beautiful days that I've experienced in recent weeks. Every place I've been in the last two weeks we've had a deluge and for some reason or another, the fates are shining a little better today or being a little more kindly and I hope that we shall last it out.

But to be privileged to come here for the 82nd Commencement Exercises of the United States Coast Guard Academy is, to me, a high honor. I think I should say to the graduating class and to the assembled audience, that when I accepted this invitation I was in the most non-political stance. There was just one desire in my heart and that was to visit New London, Connecticut and to come to the United States Coast Guard Academy. I shall, with great determination, try to keep that prospective on all of my remarks to you.

Members of this class, may I first of all congratulate you. I have spoken to many graduating classes. Only last Saturday of this past week, I was in the State of Arkansas, for the University

of Arkansas graduation commencement exercises. This is one of the more refreshing and stimulating experiences of a man's life, a man in public life, particularly a former teacher. And I always like to take a look at students just in case that I may be back teaching. I only hope if that should be the case, that the Admiral has saved a place for me here. Bob Hope is one of the nation's most gifted and talented men and he also makes commencement speeches. About three years ago he was at Georgetown University and he looked up at this graduating class and he said, "My advice to you graduates about to go out into the world - don't go." Now, regrettably, you young men have no choice, you will have to go, but I want to assure you that it's a world filled with promise as well as danger. A world that John Kennedy spoke of as, when he said, "Peace and freedom are not cheap." He reminded us that we, all of us, are destined to live out the rest of our lives in a period of peril, of change and danger. But it's that kind of an era that brings out the best in us and challenges us to new heights of performance.

I have taken the liberty on these commencement occasions this year, to direct my thoughts towards the role of the individual in this complex world of ours. Because whether you are in uniform or not, you are still a man with your own identity, at least you want it, with your own personality, with all of your own traits and talents, with your strengths and weaknesses. And yet in this world today, and particularly in our great America, we have problems of bigness. Things are so big that sometimes we almost lose ourselves

in this complex, intricate, social organization that we call our society. Today I wish to follow this observation with an examination of a problem in the wider world. Not just in America, a wider world which, in the long run, may have more to do with our survival as individuals and the evolution and the nature of American institutions than anything that happens to us here at home. I come from that part of America known as the Midwest, and I have said repeatedly to my fellow citizens in that part of our land, that what happens to the young people of this generation, and yet generations unborn, will be more likely determined by what happens in the Middle East than anything that happens in the Middle West. It is only another way of saying that we are citizens of the world, a shrinking world, a world that is tied together ever more closely every day by science and technology; by communication. So, what I have to say to you is directly related to your career, since you are the future guardians, at least in part, of our national security, and the question is before the House so to speak, how do we best guard our security? How do we best protect America?

Today I speak to you of the problem of international development, development which in the words of Pope Paul VI is the new name for peace. I'm not looking at warriors. I'm looking at peacemakers and peacekeepers. The whole purpose of the defense structure of the United States is to guard the peace, not to make war, and that message needs to be broadcast throughout the world. That men in uniform representing this country are essentially the protectors of mankind, never the conquerors. They are in the sense

the protectors of the peace which is the ultimate act of statesmanship, not the makers of war. Our true security depends upon many things. It depends upon you. It depends upon the health and the strength of our economy. It depends upon the attitude of our people, the spirit and the moral fiber of our people, but it also depends as much on the conditions of life within other nations as it does on our own ability to produce men and weapons able to protect this nation. This is the lesson of the twentieth century.

There is no place to hide, gentlemen. We are the victims of our environment, or we are the masters of it. As an American, I take pride in the well-being and the relative affluence that we have been able to create for an increasing number of our citizens. I'm not ashamed of it. I'm prayerfully grateful. But I also do take shame at the hunger, the poverty, and the deprivation which surrounds this prosperous island known as America; this prosperous island of the Western World. I have seen in central Java and in Indonesia, hundreds of thousands of people lining the roadside to cheer the sight of the American Flag, only last year when I was there. And among them no more than a dozen pairs of shoes. People ill-clad, ill-housed, physically ill, poverty ridden. And I have seen in Africa and Latin America, towns and villages where a vast majority of the children will not even live to voting age. The terrible fact of life is this: there are more than a billion people in the world today, in countries where the average annual income per person is less than \$100.

My fellow Americans, that's dangerous, not only to them, but to us. Hundreds of millions live on less than \$50 a year. On the other hand, here in the United States, the average man, woman and child had at his disposal this last year something like \$2700, each to spend or save. And we are all too aware, even at this income level, of the poverty which still remains in our blessed country.

Now it would be an over simplification to say that the massive problems that we face in our cities and in our human rights and welfare areas stem alone from the gaps between the "haves" and "have-hots." But evidence shows that poverty and wide variation in employment, that is opportunity for employment, education, and for the sharing of the benefits of modern technology does bring tension to our society. In other words, it's a danger point. I'm convinced too, that a good deal of the unrest in the American family is to a large degree due to the revolution of rising expectations among our old people; people that were previously confined to both the physical and the psychological ghettos, who couldn't see out, who were walled in, but who today, through mass communication, through television, through radio, through press are able fully to see and hear what they are missing in the growing and prospering "other America," which you and I are a part.

The most revolutionary instrument of our time is the lens - the camera, and it has become something in the hands of everybody. Now if this is true here at home, and I believe it is, surely the same will be increasingly true in the wider human family of the world. People all over the world are in touch, so to speak.

The transistor radio, to be found in the mountains of the Andes, to be found in the vast plains of India. That transistor radio and the communications satellite will make this world of ours ever more closely knit; that people will be "in touch." They're going to know of their own deprivation and our good fortune. The man in Korea, Guatemala, Zambia, you name it, he knows what modern society can mean to his family. We have made that possible for him. He knows what you and I have, and he knows about our wealth and he knows about the vast resources at our command, and at the command of the more fortunate nations. And a hungry man, my friends, reasons not. Reason is the first casualty of hunger. Now what does he think? How long do you think he can be expected to cheer the American Flag? How long do you think he will look to us with respect, when he lives in such deprivation?

In the late 1964, my good friend Adlai Stevenson, then Ambassador to the United Nations, sent me a private letter, which today I read from for the first time. And he expressed in that letter to me, the fear that this growing disparity between the rich and the poor has failed to obtain the public recognition necessary to deal with it effectively. Adlai Stevenson was a statesman of peace. He was also a brave man. He was one of the noble men of our times; noble in spirit, in mind, in character. Here is what he said in his letter to me, "Means must be promptly found to convince public opinion, despite its growing cynicism and weariness, that the world which will result from the aggravation of this development gap will be an extremely dangerous one for

their children to live in." Then he put the challenge in clear and specific focus: "A failure of development to proceed with sufficient speed in underdeveloped countries -- and what is 'sufficient' will differ in each country -- will inevitably result, despite whatever force may be exerted from the outside, in the seizure of power by more and more extreme regimes and more and more countries." "Even where these regimes are not Communist and in alliance with the Chinese, as some of them probably will be, they will be increasingly ready to attack white 'bastions' in Asia and Africa." "Eventually, if the disease is not checked, a general north-south confrontation, more uncontrollable and bloody than the east-west confrontation, may eventually emerge." "In concrete practical terms," said Mr. Stevenson, "this means that governments, legislatures, and peoples of developed nations like our own, must be persuaded, despite their alleged role of Santa Claus, that larger economic aid and technical assistance programs, as well as arrangements for trade and investment favorable to the underdeveloped countries, are in hard cold fact, as much in the interest of the north as the south and that the alternative is disaster."

Let me buttress that statement of an American statesman by the words of Pope John XXIII, "Where there is constant want, there is no peace." And my fellow Americans, there aren't enough of us to keep peace in this world, in a world of deprivation, hunger, want, and disease.

I was so pleased to hear the words this morning of Secretary Boyd, because your mission is not only that of a military man,

but it's also the mission of a humanitarian. And it's to the everlasting glory of the Armed Forces of the United States that our men not only fight bravely, they give generously. Even now in Viet Nam, men who come from the field of battle help build villages, build schools, teach the illiterate, care for the children, heal the sick, teach the farmer -- this is the greatness of this country.

We have developed the most unique system of military defense that the world has ever known. Professionals and citizens, equipped not only to fight, but equipped to help people live. What a remarkable achievement. Well, my friends, Adlai Stevenson warned us that unless we did more to help people live, that the alternative was disaster. The events of the past three and one half years have given us no evidence that Mr. Stevenson's assessment was wrong. In fact there is a great deal of evidence in Southeast Asia and the Middle East that the festering conditions of poverty and social unrest in even the most remote regions can draw the major powers into conflict and confrontation. A conflict that none of us wants, but one which may be thrust upon us.

Yet only last week, the Congress of the United States withheld funds from the Asian Development Bank and the International Development Agency of the World Bank, despite the facts that stare us in the face like a beam of light. Now this action was only symptomatic of a growing, and I believe, short sighted attitude towards the plight of poor nations, not on the part of the Congress, but on the part of all of us. The result, in the short term, no more or less than the withholding of necessary and available

medicine from a patient whose health depends on it.

It is, in the long term, no more or less than playing roulette with our ultimate security. And I would be unworthy of being your Vice-President if I didn't tell you that the task of the civilian leadership is to keep you from going to war, as we seek to preserve our security. Our job is to find the path to peace. We call upon you when we fail. Now what does the average American really feel about all of this? Well, it's hard to know. But I can't believe that he is indifferent, and I'll tell you why. This is, after all, the America of the Marshall Plan and the Point Four. It's the America of immigrants, and the sons of immigrants, and the State of Connecticut is filled with them. People who came here burning with the belief that all men should have the ways and means to lift themselves. It is the America of young men and women ready to sacrifice for others on the field of battle, on dusty southern roads, and in deep slum neighborhoods.

I believe that much of the trouble here is the feeling by the individual citizen that he no longer truly relates to any of the problems, or the solutions, which keep pounding at him day after day over his television. We must begin now therefore, to stimulate the individual citizen, to direct personal action which he can undertake on his own level, and I have some suggestions -- suggestions which I hope to implement.

We must offer an expanded new system of national service for our young people, not as a substitute for military service, but as an additional service. A system which offers outlets far

beyond the present openings of the Peace Corps, and the voluntary agencies. We must explore new tax and other incentives for our universities, our private business corporations, and our labor unions who have vast resources, to engage those resources in people, in grass-roots, health, education, agricultural, manpower for the training projects in the poorer nations.

In other words, we must help others to help ourselves. We must open new opportunities for people in their 40's, 50's, 60's and 70's to provide their organizational and technical skills to countries desperately in need. We must open new opportunities for student and teacher exchange on a scale many times larger than we've ever known. We must, in short, give every opportunity possible to every American to help in the major task that faces this planet in the remainder of this century: the carrying out and the carrying of peaceful revolution to all who seek it. And I think I'm saying this at the right place.

We call upon men in this country, sometimes by compulsion, always by voluntary action to serve this nation in uniform. What is wrong about asking others to serve this nation in shirt-sleeves, or in the doctor's uniform or in the laborers, with the laborer's skill. You cannot defend America alone, and you should not. This is the peoples' business. It belongs to all of us. Our defense must be in greater depth than the fine line of the military. The defense of this republic must be in its economy, in the education of its people, in the dedication of its people, and the service of its people, to itself and to others.

Now will these new opportunities for personal commitment close the gap between the rich and the poor? I must tell you they will not. But they will help, and they will help create a climate in this country in which it will be possible once again for the nation's elected leaders to undertake the commitments they believe that are necessary.

And here, let me once again outline in the specific those governmental initiatives I believe to be necessary unless you unnecessarily give your life. I don't think we have the right to ask for your life, unless we have done the very best that we can do in our lives to prevent the ultimate sacrifice. I speak of initiatives to strengthen our security, not to play Santa Claus, and to build for peaceful development.

First and foremost, there has to be a reordering of our national priorities and the allocation of our resources away from the ever-wider military and armaments programs towards programs for peaceful development. Now I am not talking about unilateral disarmament. I understand the facts of life in this difficult world but as a first step I believe we can and we must with our NATO allies, seek a mutual thinout of men and armaments in central Europe, through negotiation with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. Not to do it willy-nilly by ourselves, but to see if we can't find a way to reduce the size of the commitment so that we have the same degree of security, and at the same time have the resources to be used for other priorities.

Secondly, there must be unequivocal commitment on the part of your country, to a policy of relaxation of tensions throughout the world. We must set our minds to this. This should include a policy of active, peaceful "bridgebuilding" through trade and tourism, and personal contact -- not only toward the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but also toward Mainland China. We cannot ignore these areas of the world. They're here, and we must understand how to deal with them and relate to them.

Third, leadership towards family planning in the developing nations on a scale many times larger, and now being considered, not imposed, but a willingness to help.

Fourth, new emphasis in our development programs to food production and the building of modern world economies. I repeat, hunger knows no reason.

Fifth, world-wide commodity agreements which can stabilize prices so that raw-material producing nations may have at least an even chance of earning their own way.

Sixth, leadership toward international agreements and guarantees which will sharply increase the flow of private investment to the developing countries.

Seventh, a new emphasis upon international aid programs greater reliance on the World Bank and other international institutions. This means a sharing of the burdens of world recovery.

Eighth, active encouragement of economic and political regionalism so that other nations may enjoy the benefits of large units of trade and of people, of resources such as the United

States and the European Community now possess.

Ninth, new priority to modernization of the international monetary system which must be able to provide the capital needed to finance the strengthening and developing nations as well as the developed.

And finally, the steady removal of barriers to trade among prosperous nations, and the establishment of a global preference system for the goods of the underdeveloped.

To a Coast Guard graduating Academy class you may say why these points, Mr. Vice-President? Because these are the weapons of your defense. There is no military weapon system alone that can defend us. What I have spoken of are the weapons of defense and security that can be created by the civilians of this land and you too, who are citizens with great responsibility. To leave you only with the sword is to leave you to your destruction. To equip you both with the sword and the shield of a strong economy and a dedicated purpose is to spare your life and to assure living for others. Do we have the resources to mount this program? We never doubt that we have resources for our military and I have been a strong supporter of adequate national defense in order to make and build that shield behind which, and around which, we can build a better world.

Some of the things that I've mentioned will surely require additional investment. Yet, if we project the growth of the American economy at the rate of the past several years, gentlemen, by the year 2000 the average annual family income of this nation

will be \$20,000 a year. Our gross national product will double every 15 or 16 years. This year it is 850 billion dollars. By 1983 it will be one trillion seven hundred billion dollars at a minimum. Don't tell me it's impossible because I've lived through those days when the pessimists said that it was impossible to have a five hundred billion dollar economy. Such an economy today would spell depression and disaster. At the same time projections from the present trends in the developing countries show that by the same year 2000 and you'll be busy, and alive, and active--I'll be hoping--I'm interested in you fellows because you're going to take care of my medicare and I want to be sure you're on the job -- but by that year 2000, there will be three billion people in this world with incomes of less than \$200.00 a year and we with incomes on a family of \$20,000 a year. An island, a minority of the rich in a turbulent sea of the poor.

I submit to you this is dangerous. More dangerous than Communism -- dangerous, threatening, explosive and is something that we deal with now. Facing this growing gap, the question then is not whether or not we shall have the financial resources, we have them, and will have them. The question is one of our spirit -- of our spiritual and moral resources and I have no doubt that if we as a people fail to muster these spiritual and moral resources, we shall find ourselves within a very few years surrounded by an increasingly hostile, angry and troubled world. Either we'll be withdrawn within ourselves as a garrison state and the freedoms

that we've known will have died, or we will be desperately extended in a series of world-wide fire fighting expeditions trying to be the policemen of the world or maybe both. What an unhappy future if we let that happen by default.

I know that you're going to do your duty -- you're taking that oath. I look to the people in the stands. Will we do our duty? These men may have to perform the ultimate sacrifice. All we have to do is to share of our technology, our science, our abundance and in the sharing thereof, assure ourselves of a better life.

I am today talking directly about the course of the future lives of the young men here today, and of their sons and daughters to be. Yet I have no doubt that if we, as a people, do rise once more to what we can be, we can help build a far safer and more peaceful world environment than we know today. Remember we have so much to lose, so much to save, that whatever the price of our insurance, it is worth it. America may once again be seen throughout the world by us as Carl Sandburg saw her, and this is my testimonial. I believe with Carl Sandburg and what he says. "I see America not in the setting sun of a black night of despair ahead of us. I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun, fresh from the burning, creative hand of God. I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision..." This is why Abraham Lincoln said of us "we are the last best hope of earth."

Gentlemen, when you've been honored with such immortal words as "the last best hope of earth," a nation of will and vision, we can do no less than to be worthy of it. So I call upon not only

those who graduate now, to rise to new heights of glory and of honor, but even more significantly I call upon the American people to unite behind their great programs of social progress and advance. To put aside our petty ambitions, and our sense of devisiveness, to join together as one family in building one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty, and justice for all -- the true message of this republic, the more perfect union that our founding fathers dreamed of -- the obligation of each generation to fulfill.

I salute you and congratulations.

Commencement Address

Vice President Hubert Humphrey
United States Coast Guard Academy
New London, Connecticut
June 4, 1968

Bob Hope is one of the nation's most gifted and talented men, and he also makes commencement speeches. About three years ago he was at Georgetown University and he looked at the graduating class and said, "My advice to you graduates about to go out into the world -- don't go."

Now you young men have no choice, you will have to go. But I want to assure you that it's a world filled with promise as well as danger. John Kennedy reminded us that we -- all of us -- are destined to live out the rest of our lives in a period of peril, of change and danger, for as he said, "Peace and freedom are not cheap."

But it's that kind of an era that brings out the best in us and challenges us to new heights of performance.

Today I wish to discuss the place of Americans as individuals, and our nation's place, in the world -- a wider world which, in the long run, may have more to do with our survival as individuals and the evolution of American institutions than anything that happens to us here at home.

I come from the Midwest, and I have said repeatedly to my fellow citizens there that what happens to the young people of this generation will more likely be determined by what happens in the Middle East than anything that happens in the Middle West. It is only another way of saying that we are citizens of the world -- a shrinking world, a world that is tied together ever more closely every day by science and technology, and by communication.

What I have to say is directly related to your career, since you are the future guardians, at least in part, of our national security. And the question before the house, so to speak, is how do we best guard our security? How do we best protect America?

I'm not looking at warriors. I'm looking at peacemakers and peacekeepers. The whole purpose of the defense structure of the United States is to guard the peace, not to make war, and that message needs to be broadcast throughout the world.

Our men in uniform are in a sense the protectors of the peace which is the ultimate goal of statesmanship, not the makers of war.

Our true security depends upon many things -- most of all upon peace. It depends upon you. It depends upon the health and the strength of our economy. It depends upon the attitude of our people -- the spirit and the moral fiber of our people.

But it also depends as much on the conditions of life within other nations as it does on our own ability to produce men and weapons able to protect this nation. Pope Paul VI said, "Development is the new name for peace." This is the lesson of the twentieth century.

There is no place to hide, gentlemen. We are the victims of our environment, or we are the masters of it.

As an American, I take pride in the well-being and the relative affluence that we have been able to create for an increasing number of our citizens. I'm not ashamed of it. I'm prayerfully grateful.

But I also feel shame at the hunger, the poverty, and the deprivation which surrounds this prosperous island known as America -- more broadly, this prosperous island known as the Western World.

When I was in central Java and in Indonesia last year, I saw thousands of people lining the roadside to cheer the sight of the American Flag. And among them there were no more than a dozen pairs of shoes...people ill-clad, ill-housed, physically ill, poverty ridden. And I have seen towns and villages in Africa and Latin America where a vast majority of the children will not even live to voting age. The terrible fact of life is this: there are more than a billion people in the world today living in countries where the average annual income per person is less than \$100.

That is dangerous not only to them, but to us. Hundreds of millions live on less than \$50 a year. On the other hand, here in the United States, the average man, woman and child had at his disposal this last year something like \$2700, each to spend or save. And we are all too aware, even at this income level, of the poverty which still remains in our blessed country.

Now it would be an oversimplification to say that the unrest we face in our cities stems alone from the gaps between the "haves" and "have-nots." But evidence shows that poverty and wide variation in opportunity for employment, education, and for the sharing of the benefits of modern technology does bring tension to our society.

I'm convinced that a good deal of the unrest in America is to a large degree due to the revolution or rising expectations among people who were previously confined to both the physical and the psychological ghettos, who couldn't see out, who were walled in, but who today, through mass communication -- through television, through radio, through the press -- are able fully to see and hear what they are missing in the growing and prospering "other America," of which you and I are a part.

Now if this is true here at home -- and I believe it is -- surely the same will be increasingly true in the wider human family of the world.

People all over the world are in touch. The transistor radio is to be found in the mountains of the Andes and the vast plains of India. That transistor radio and the communications satellite will make this world of ours ever more closely knit. People are going to know of their own deprivation and our good fortune. The man in Korea, Guatamala, Zambia -- you name it -- he knows what modern society can mean to his family. We have made that possible for him. He knows what you and I have, and he knows about our wealth and he knows about the vast resources at our command, and at the command of the more fortunate nations.

And a hungry man, my friends, reasons not. Reason is the first casualty of hunger. Now what does he think? How long do you think he can be expected to cheer the American flag? How long do you think he will look to us with respect, when he lives in such deprivation?

In late 1964, my good friend Adlai Stevenson, then Ambassador to the United Nations, sent me a private letter, which today I read from publicly for the first time. He expressed in that letter the fear that the growing disparity between rich and poor had failed to obtain the public recognition necessary to allow us to deal with it effectively.

Here is what he said in his letter to me:

"Means must be promptly found to convince public opinion in the rich nations, despite its growing cynicism and weariness, that the world which will result from the aggravation of this development gap will be an extremely dangerous one for their children to live in."

Then he put the challenge in clear and specific focus:

"A failure of development to proceed with sufficient speed in underdeveloped countries -- and what is 'sufficient' will differ in each one -- will inevitably result, despite whatever force may be exerted from outside, in the seizure of power by more and more extreme regimes in more and more countries."

"Even where these regimes are not Communist and in alliance with the Chinese, as some of them probably will be, they will be increasingly ready to attack white 'bastions' in Asia and Africa.

"Eventually, if the disease is not checked, a general North-South confrontation, more uncontrollable and bloody than the East-West confrontation, may eventually emerge.

"In concrete practical terms this means that governments, legislatures, and peoples of developed nations must be persuaded, despite their alleged role of Santa Claus, that larger bilateral and multilateral economic aid and technical assistance programs, as well as arrangements for trade and investment favorable to the underdeveloped countries, are in hard cold fact as much in the interest of the north as the south and that the alternative is disaster."

Let me buttress that statement of a great American statesman of peace with the words of Pope John XXIII, "Where there is constant want, there is no peace."

It is to the everlasting glory of the Armed Forces of the United States that our men not only fight bravely, they give generously. Even now in Viet Nam, men who come from the field of battle help build villages, build schools, teach the illiterate, care for the children, heal the sick, teach the farmer -- this is the greatness of this country.

But in general the events of the past three and one half years have given us no evidence that Mr. Stevenson's assessment was wrong. There is a great deal of evidence -- in Southeast Asia and the Middle East -- that the festering conditions of poverty and social unrest in even the most remote regions can draw the major powers into conflict and confrontation -- conflict that none of us wants, but one which may be thrust upon us. Yet only last week, the Congress of the United States withheld funds from the Asian Development Bank and the International Development Agency of the World Bank, despite the facts that stare us in the face like a beam of light. Now this action was only symptomatic of a growing and, I believe, short sighted attitude towards the plight of poor nations, not so much on the part of the Congress alone, but on the part of all of us.

The result, in the short term, is no more or less than the withholding of necessary and available medicine from a patient whose health depends on it. In the long term, it is no more or less than playing roulette with our ultimate security. And I would be unworthy of being your Vice President if I didn't tell you that the task of the civilian leadership is to keep you from going to war, as we seek to preserve our security. Our job is to find the path to peace. We call upon you when we fail.

Now what does the average American really feel about all of this? Well, it's hard to know. But I can't believe that he is indifferent, and I'll tell you why. This is, after all, the America of the Marshall Plan and the Point Four. It is the America of immigrants, and the sons of immigrants. The state of Connecticut is full of them -- people who came here burning with the belief that all men should have the ways and means to lift themselves. It is the America of young men and women ready to sacrifice for others on the field of battle, on dusty southern roads, and in slum neighborhoods.

I believe that much of the trouble here is the feeling by the individual citizen that he no longer truly relates to any of the problems, or the solutions, which keep pounding at him day after day over his television.

We must begin now, therefore, to stimulate the individual citizen, to direct personal action which he can undertake on his own level. I have some suggestions -- suggestions which I hope to implement.

We must offer an expanded new system of national service for our young people, not as a substitute for military service, but as an additional opportunity to serve -- a system which offers outlets far beyond the present openings of the Peace Corps and the voluntary agencies.

We must explore new tax and other incentives for our universities, our private business corporations, and our labor unions to engage their vast resources in people -- in grass-roots health, education, agricultural, and manpower training projects in the poorer nations.

We must open new opportunities for people in their 40's, 50's, 60's and 70's to provide their organizational and technical skills to countries desperately in need.

We must open new opportunities for student and teacher exchange on a scale many times larger than we've ever know.

We must, in short, give every opportunity possible to every American to help in the major task that faces this planet in the remainder of this century: the carrying on peaceful revolution to all who seek it.

And I think I am saying this at the right place. We call upon men in this country, sometimes by compulsion, always by voluntary action to serve this nation in uniform. What is wrong about asking others to serve this nation in shirt-sleeves, or in the doctor's uniform or in overalls.

You cannot defend America alone, and you should not. This is the peoples' business. It belongs to all of us. Our defense must be in greater depth than the fine line of the military. The defense of this Republic must be in its economy, in the education of its people, in the dedication of its people, and the service of its people, to itself and to others.

Will these new opportunities for personal commitment close the gap between the rich and the poor?

I must tell you that they alone will not. But they will help. And they will help create a climate in this country in which it will be possible once again for the nation's elected leaders to undertake the commitments they believe necessary.

And here, let me once again outline in the specific those governmental initiatives I believe to be necessary unless you are unnecessarily to give your lives. I don't think we have the right to ask for your life, unless we have done the very best that we can do in our lives to prevent the ultimate sacrifice. I speak of initiatives to strengthen our security -- not to play Santa Claus -- and to build toward peaceful development.

First and foremost, there has to be a reordering of our national priorities and the allocation of our resources -- away from ever-wider military and armaments programs toward programs for peaceful development. Now I am not talking about unilateral disarmament; I understand the facts of life in this difficult world. But as a first step I believe we can and we must, with our NATO allies, seek a mutual thin-out of men and armaments in central Europe through negotiations with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries.

Secondly, there must be unequivocal commitment on the part of your country, to a policy of relaxation of tensions throughout the world. We must set our minds to this. This should include a policy of active, peaceful "bridg-building" through trade and tourism, and personal contact -- not only toward the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but also toward Mainland China. We cannot ignore these areas of the world. They're here, and we must understand how to deal with them and relate to them.

Third, leadership toward family planning in the developing nations on a scale many times larger than now being considered.

Fourth, new emphasis in our development programs on food production and the building of modern world economies. I repeat, hunger knows no reason.

Fifth, world-wide commodity agreements which can stabilize prices so that raw material producing nations may have at least an even chance of earning their own way.

Sixth, leadership toward international agreements and guarantees which will sharply increase the flow of private investment to the developing countries.

Seventh, a new emphasis upon international aid programs, with greater reliance on the World Bank and other international institutions. This means sharing the burdens of world development.

Eighth, active encouragement of economic and political regionalism so that other nations may enjoy the benefits of large units of trade, of people, and of resources such as the United States and the European Community now possess.

Ninth, new priority onto modernizing the international monetary system which must be able to provide the capital needed to finance the developing nations as well as the developed.

And finally, the steady removal of barriers to trade among prosperous nations, and the establishment of a global preference system for the goods of the underdeveloped.

You may say, why these points to a Coast Guard Academy graduating class, Mr. Vice President? Because these are the weapons of your defense. There is no military weapon system alone that can defend us. What I have spoken of are the weapons of defense and security that can be created by the civilians of this land -- and by you too, who are citizens with great responsibility.

To leave you only with the sword is to leave you to your destruction. To equip you both with the sword and the shield of a strong economy and a dedicated purpose is to spare your life and to assure living for others.

Do we have the resources to mount this program? We never doubt that we have the resources for our military, and I have been a strong supporter of adequate national defense in order to make and build that shield behind which, and around which, we can build a better world.

Some of the things that I've mentioned will surely require additional investment. Yet, if we project the growth of the American economy at the rate of the past several years, gentlemen, by the year 2000 the average annual family income of this nation will be \$20,000 a year.

Our gross national product will double every 15 or 16 years. This year it is 850 billion dollars. By 1983 it will be one trillion seven hundred billion dollars at a minimum.

Don't tell me it's impossible, because I've lived through those days when the pessimists said that it was impossible to have a five hundred billion dollar economy. Such an economy today would spell depression and disaster.

At the same time projections from the present trends in the developing countries show that by the same year 2000 there will be three billion people in this world with incomes of less than \$200 a year -- when we have incomes on a family of \$20,000 a year. We will be an island -- a minority of the rich in a turbulent sea of the poor.

I submit to you that this is dangerous -- more dangerous than Communism... dangerous, threatening, explosive, and something that we must deal with now.

Facing this growing gap, the question is not whether we shall have the financial resources. We have them, and shall have them.

The question is one of our spirit -- of our spiritual and moral resources. And I have no doubt that if we as a people fail to muster these spiritual and moral resources, we shall find ourselves within a very few years surrounded by an increasingly hostile, angry and troubled world. Either we'll be a garrison state, withdrawn within ourselves, and the freedoms that we've known will have died; or we will be desperately extended in a series of world-wide fire fighting expeditions, trying to be the policemen of the world; or maybe both. What an unhappy future, if we let it happen by default.

I know that you're going to do your duty. You're taking that oath. But I look to the people in the stands. Will we do our duty? These men may have to perform the ultimate sacrifice. All we have to do is to share of our technology, our science, our abundance, and in the sharing thereof, assure ourselves of a better life.

I am today talking precisely about the future course of the lives of the young men here today, and of their sons and daughters to be.

I have no doubt that if we, as a people, do rise once more to what we can be, we can help build a far safer and more peaceful world environment than we know today. Remember we have so much to lose, so much to save, that whatever the price of our insurance, it is worth it.

America may once again be seen throughout the world by us a Carl Sandburg saw her (and this is my testimonial):

"I see America not in the setting sun and a black night of despair ahead of us. I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun, fresh from the burning, creative hand of God. I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision..."



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