

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers
Folder Title: Tony Dolan Files: [RR Speeches, November 11, 1967] Veteran's Day Address by Gov. Ronald Reagan - North Albany Junior High School: Albany, Oregon
Box: 873

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 11.10.67

MEMO TO THE PRESS

C-O-R-R-E-C-T-I-O-N

Veterans Day Address by Governor Reagan - Saturday -
November 11. in Albany, Oregon:

Page 5, Paragraph 2 should read:

.....Justices Douglas and Stewart (instead
of Potter).

#

EXCERPTS FROM VETERANS DAY ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
North Albany Junior High School
Albany, Oregon
November 11, 1967

Some of us here remember this day as one named in observance of the silencing of guns in a war that was fought to end all wars and to make the world safe for democracy.

I know that many of you gathered here must be harking back in memory to some who cannot be with you---some you knew only as boys, but who were men in the price they paid for a cause.

Now this day has been renamed because other Americans have died, and died for noble causes. Twenty-odd years after that war to end wars, the sons of the Doughboy were G.I.'s in World War II, and they fought for our freedoms. They created an organization to end wars, and we have known very little peace since. They and their younger brothers and even their sons fought again in Korea, and today another generation of young Americans is dying in Vietnam.

We at home are torn with dissension and we accuse each other, trying to find blame and place blame for why this should be. There are those among us who charge that the fault is ours--that we are the aggressors--that peace could come to the world if we would but change our ways. To each solution that is offered, to every alternative, they plaintively cry "there are no simple answers to these complex problems." Is it possible that the answer is, in truth, simple, but one that demands too much--one that is simply too hard for too many of us to accept? Is it possible, perhaps, that peace has become so dear and life so sweet that some would buy it at the price of chains and slavery?

Let us start with the assumption that everyone in the world wants peace. We pick up our daily press and almost every issue carries stories of those who want peace. We know that our clergy, with the greatest of sincerity, urges that we pray for peace. (Of course we must be careful not to do this in a public schoolroom.) Businessmen form organizations to strive for peace.

peace, why, then, should it be so impossible to achieve? In all of history, one can find few, if any, instances where the people have started a war. War is the province of government, and therefore, the more autocratic government is, the more centralized, the more totalitarian, the more government can direct and control the will of the people, the greater the chance for war.

We hear the cry for peace everywhere, but another word seems absent---no voices seem to be crying "freedom". How long since we have heard about that? Each year we observe a Captive Nations Day. At one time, pronouncements on that day here in our own land anticipated the future freedom of those now held captive and enslaved. But more and more, we have diluted that theme, until now we use the day to speak of peace with no mention of freedom. Is it possible that while we are sorry for the captives, we do not want to offend the captors? If we have the courage to face reality, peace is not so difficult to come by. We can have peace by morning if we do not mind the price. What is blocking the quest for peace? We all know the answer even if some in high places are reluctant to voice it.

A totalitarian force in the world has made plain its goal is world domination. This has been reiterated by Nikita Khrushchev and by the present rulers of Russia. Each one has stated they will not retreat one inch from the Marxian concept of a one-world socialist state. So, all we have to do, if peace is so dear, is surrender. Indeed, not even that---just announce that we are giving up war and the tools of war, we are going to mind our own business, we will not fight with anyone for any reason, and we will have peace.

Why are we so reluctant to do this? Because there is a price we will not pay for peace, and it has to do with freedom. We want peace, but only if we can be free at the same time. Too many of us remember a few years back when the tanks rumbled through Hungary and over the bodies of the freedom fighters. And then above the echoes of the last few shots came that final radioed plea to humanity. "People of the world, help us. People of Europe, whom we once defended against the attacks of Asiatic barbarians, listen now to the alarm bells ring. People of the civilized world, in the name of liberty and solidarity, we are asking you to help. The light vanishes, the shadows grow darker hour by hour. Listen to our cry." And sometimes when the wind is right, it seems we can still hear that cry and we find ourselves wondering if the conscience of man will be hearing that cry a thousand years from now.

There are those in our midst who do believe we can bring peace by the unilateral action I have described---by simply refusing to fight. Please believe me it would be the height of folly for us to challenge their sincere belief that we can end the cold war simply by convincing the enemy of our good intentions, and that it isn't necessary that we ask him to give up his plan for imposing his will upon the world. But we can challenge their lack of touch with reality.

As I said earlier, we all share in their desire for peace. Not one of us will take second place to any other in willingness to do everything possible to achieve peace. It is precisely because we do want peace that we plead for a review of history. Page after page has been bloodied by the reckless adventures of power hungry monarchs and dictators who mistook man's love of peace for weakness.

How many nations have backed down the road of good intentions to end up against a wall of no retreat with the only choice to fight or surrender? We do not repudiate man's dream of peace. We must not. It is a good dream and one we share with all men for the dream is as old as man himself.

But we do repudiate an attempt to achieve that dream by methods disproven by all of our past experience, methods played against the background music of Neville Chamberlain's umbrella tapping its sorry way to the slaughter of a generation of young men.

Nor can we safely rest the case of freedom with the United Nations as it is presently constituted. Not until reconstruction of this organization puts realistic power in the hands of those nations which must, through size and strength, be ultimately responsible for world order, can we submit questions affecting our national interest to the UN and be confident of a fair hearing.

I realize there are those who will charge we offer an alternative of narrow nationalism and chip-on-the-shoulder sabre rattling, that we endanger the world and bring closer the dread day of the bomb.

A few months ago, there was talk of World War III as the Middle East bubbled and boiled over into a war that began and ended within a week. A small nation, faced with a denial of its sovereignty, indeed, of its very existence, reminded us that the price of freedom is high, but never so costly as the loss of it. They brought what almost seems to be a new concept of war to the world---victory---and it didn't bring on World War III.

the Red Chinese were threatening to invade the off-shore islands and Formosa. The world tensed and we heard the familiar terror talk that any action of any kind would bring on World War III. And then another voice was heard speaking in a tone we have not heard for too long a time in this land of ours. Dwight David Eisenhower said: "They'll have to crawl over the 7th fleet to do it."

The invasion of Formosa did not take place; no young men died; and World War III did not follow.

By contrast, we listened to those who said Laos would be the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. So we backed down to buy peace and we bought Vietnam.

Armistice Day is not being honored in Vietnam. The set of enemies who confront Americans in Southeast Asia are half a world removed in space--and perhaps even a whole century removed in time--from the collection of enemies whom we faced in that war to end wars in Europe half a century ago. And if we believe the more pessimistic political scientists, the war which we fight now in Asia, is one in which our enemy will never accept an armistice. He will fight on and on, we are told, until the United States gives up and withdraws in weariness and failure.

What about the solemn lessons that Americans were supposed to have learned from all the wars, great and small, which they have fought through the past half a century?

From those tremendous campaigns across Europe and Africa; and on the seas and under the seas and in the skies; and in Asia and among the Pacific Islands?

From the billions and billions of dollars beyond counting that have been spent on weapons and munitions, and on moving armies and fleets and air forces across the face of the earth--sums vast enough to support whole civilizations?

And what has happened to the warrior skills that came to Americans from experience in wars--experience unwanted and unsought, but unmatched nevertheless?

We Americans have had one general and continuing experience outside our waters these past 50 years. It is the experience of fighting wars, and trying to prevent wars. And yet, at this dismal juncture, somehow we are unable or at least unwilling to bring to terms, or force to an armistice, a ramshackle water buffalo economy with a gross national budget hardly equal to that of Pascagoula.

What has gone wrong? What has happened to our knowledge of politics and power?

Where did the American strategic responses in Southeast Asia begin to go awry?

I, for one, find it strange that two of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court should now assert in public that the legality of the American military operations in that part of the world should be reviewed by that Court.

If there are indeed true grounds for suspicion of illegal acts or actions, as Justices Douglas and Potter seem to imply, what a monstrous crime that would be! Here are more than 500,000 fresh troops being sent forth across the Pacific in their youthful innocence every year. If they are encouraged in illegal acts then scores of Generals and Admirals must be accessories before and after the fact. And if a crime has been committed, whose crime would it be? The President's? McNamara's? Or the Congress who passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution which the President insists provided him with legal sanctions? And how would Justices Potter and Douglas measure the offense, if an offense there be? Would the war-making be a felony? Or a misdemeanor? And what punishment would they prescribe to fit such a crime?

It is impossible to imagine anything sillier.

Maybe it could be argued as a legalism that the Administration of the hour has in fact misled the people and taken them wrongly into war. That would be a matter between the Executive Branch and the people. That is one thing, and I am not necessarily disposed to hold with either Justice on the point. The other thing is, of course, whether American forces should be in Viet Nam at all. Let me make my own position clear. I believe that the U.S. has work to do and a place to fill in the Pacific, and that we must not stop fighting until the security of our allies has been assured in freedom and independence. This war, in other words, had to be fought, even if it is not yet called a war, which it is. But I also hold that we got into it in an altogether strange and even mysterious way, and that is the cause of much of the confusion and acrimony and anguish among us.

The fundamental error was made just about six years ago and that first year, 1961, was a bad year for the United State's power position in the world. It was the year of the incredible botch at the Bay of Pigs; of Khrushchev's cold and calculated affront of our President at their meeting in Vienna; of the ominous start of another Soviet crunch at Berlin; of the earth-shaking Soviet breach of the nuclear test moratorium; of the first large, vicious armed attacks by the Viet Cong on the South Vietnamese villages; and of the breaking by the North Vietnamese of the promised neutrality of Laos.

The year 1961 was, on the fact of the record, the year when Soviet Russia in alliance with Ho Chi Minh in Asia, clearly decided to test, at places of their choosing, the nerve and stamina of a new Administration in Washington..

We decided not to stand in Laos. We accepted the occupation of Eastern Laos by the Pathet Lao Communists. Who, like the Viet Cong, were and remain a nationalist front for Hanoi. We did what in the international jargon of diplomacy is called a political and strategic retreat. But this retreat was not described to the rest of us as a retreat. On the contrary, the compact which thus split Laos into three parts was celebrated as a great feat of statesmanship.

What it did, of course, in the Eastern one third of Laos was to open uncontested access to the corridors in South Viet Nam from the North. It is known to our fighting men as the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

The sequence of American actions thereafter is clear, even if the strategical reasoning is not.

The prime recommendation of the Taylor-Rostow team was to raise the strength of the United States military mission in South Viet Nam from a few hundred men--(about 700 men, actually)--to some 15,000 men. The American forces already in the country were not combat troops. On the contrary, they were concerned almost exclusively with the chore of training and equipping a small South Vietnamese army, itself without experience and tradition in war. The additional troops who were sent in also were charged with continuing the training and equipping, but they were to do more of it faster.

From that point on, nothing went right.

The very people we were trying to help kept warning that an aggression was in the making, and that the appeasement in Laos would have the fatal effect of making South Viet Nam vulnerable. But Washington simply was not listening.

Well, it has been a dreary matter of addition ever since. There were a mere 700 or so training troops at the start. Then 15,000 more and then the combat formations--first by regiments--then by brigades, and finally by divisions. And now, only six years later, more than 500,000 American troops are there.

From the start, it was a case of being too late with too little, while tipping our hand to the enemy so that he always knew in advance what we proposed.

The strategy has been justified with a quotation from another General named Polybius. That strategy holds:

"It is not the purpose of war to annihilate those who provoke it, but to cause them to mend their ways."

Polybius was a Roman who wrote on war 2,000 years before our twentieth century invention of "wars of National liberation."

In any case, neither Polybius, or even General Maxwell Taylor, seem to have provided a satisfactory answer. Wars, or politics conducted in the form of war, simply cannot be won or settled this way.

And the cost of trying to get Ho to improve his manners keeps going up and up--to more than \$30 billion a year. Worse still, the options now open to us from the existing platform of strategy grow more difficult.

Some say the war cannot be won by force and that the bombing should be stopped. Stop the bombing, and we will only encourage the enemy to do his worst. A Marine General reported that in one bombing pause, his men counted 150 truck convoys and more than 300 sampans bringing up supplies. Some others hold for a closing of Haiphong and even an Inchon-type landing. The feasibility of such actions is a matter for the generals and admirals to decide---a professional judgment. But the military can only advise. It is for the government and the people, and only they, to decide what is to be done with such advice, if anything is to be done at all.

The one thing that is sure in this situation is that we Americans must finally make up our minds as a people whether we want to carry the war through to a conclusion, or give up.

We Americans who live on the West Coast do not look on the Pacific as an alien sea, or upon Asia as a feared or alien shore. For generations, we have traded across this ocean, and now the jets go back and forth. In a very real sense, we are a Pacific people, as we are also an Atlantic people. Senator Fulbright and Mr. Walter Lippmann to the contrary, we are not--nor can we ever be--indifferent to what happens there. And least of all can we turn away from an aggression which seeks to crush free and independent nations and, toward that end, would eject the protective American influence from the Western Pacific.

Isn't it time that we admitted we are in Vietnam because our national interest demands that we take a stand there now so we won't have to take a stand later on our own beaches?

Isn't it time that we either win this war or tell the American people why we can't? Isn't it time to recognize the great immorality of sending our neighbors' sons to die with the hope we can do so without angering the enemy too much? Isn't this a throwback to those jungle tribes sacrificing a few of their select young on a heathen altar to keep the Volcano from exploding?

The war in Vietnam must be fought through to victory, meaning first, an end to North Vietnam aggression, and second, an honorable and safe peace for our South Vietnam neighbors. We have been patient long enough and our patience wears thin. This is the way to peace and it is a way in keeping with our basic principles.

Probably no society has ever been founded completely on the principal of individualism, but certainly our government and our system has come closer than man has ever come in all the history of man's relation to man. Ours is the concept that an individual's rights are inviolate, and thus we are deeply disturbed at the idea that young men can be asked to die for a cause unless that cause is worth winning and worth involving the total effort of all of us collectively.

#

-8-

(Note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 11.16.67

RELEASE: Thursday, November 16
7:30 p.m.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Youth Opportunities Foundation Scholarship Fund Banquet
Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles
November 16, 1967

I consider it a great privilege to be able to speak here tonight, for a number of reasons.

Any opportunity to talk with and meet with a representative segment of the 10 percent of California's population that is Spanish-speaking is most welcome. Too often office holders have taken you for granted in the years between elections and then come around in election years and asked for your support. I am not here tonight to make a political speech or to ask for your support. I am here to tell you that we will continue in this administration to try to merit your support. And I am here to tell you what down deep we all know--that the two-party system functions better when it crosses ethnic and language barriers and when one party does not base its appeals on racist or racial grounds.

I want you to know, also, that this administration recognizes your problems, those that are peculiar to you with a dual language and a dual culture. And those that are common to all our people.

It is a privilege to be here because the Youth Opportunities Foundation is one of the finest examples of the Creative Society I know of anywhere.

Here we have more than 25 major businesses and industries and scores of individuals from the independent sector banding together to help provide college and professional educations for 50 young people of Mexican ancestry.

But the importance of the Youth Opportunities Foundation goes far beyond those 50 students. It is indicative of what the independent sector can do in the field of education and it is an example that can be followed and multiplied many times over, not only for American youths of Mexican descent, but also for qualified children of all nationalities who need help in getting an education.

But I am not here tonight to talk about the Youth Opportunities Foundation. You here are more qualified than I to enumerate its accomplishments. You know the needs of your area and your people better than anyone you might ask to speak at a banquet such as this.

I would like to talk a bit, however, about our recognition of the problems and what we at the state level are attempting to do in the area of education.

But first, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to those Americans of Mexican descent who are serving in this administration. I do not favor separating Americans into blocks or groups on the basis of their origin, their race or religion or even their occupation. The goal of all of us should be to eliminate dividing lines and think of each other only as fellow American citizens. This should hold true in selecting or electing those who serve in government positions. However, when you have a large segment of your citizenry who are a part of our rich history and yet are not participants in our present activities to the extent their numbers and their abilities warrant, then we have an obligation to make a special effort to involve them. That is why, altogether, more than 30 Americans of Mexican descent have been named to non-civil service positions so far where we can count on their advice and counsel as well as their special familiarity with the problems of their own people.

Especially I want to acknowledge one of your Youth Opportunities Foundation officers, Dr. Francisco Bravo, who not only serves as a member of the State Board of Agriculture, but who also has been a trusted friend and adviser since way back in the campaign days.

I would also like to pay tribute to two hard workers on my own personal staff, Bill Orozco, who is in charge of our Los Angeles office, and Armand Delgado, who is my aide in Sacramento for Spanish-speaking Affairs.

We have other appointments coming up in the weeks ahead, appointees who not only will meet special needs, such as serving as members of draft boards, but also appointees whose broad skills and talents will benefit all of the people of California.

Sometimes the things we are trying to do get lost in the shuffle of more exciting or newsworthy events.

One of those is our plan for helping low-income students who are otherwise qualified to receive educations in our state-supported universities and colleges.

There are some who have suggested that perhaps this is a plan better not talked of here because it involves tuition.

But I say this is the place to talk of it because it can result in your qualified boys and girls going to college.

And let me say this, those of you who would continue to depend on the so-called "free" education now offered are just kidding yourselves. At the last count, less than 100 persons with Spanish surnames were among the 27,000 students at UCLA.

And yet, every American of Mexican descent, no matter how poor, is paying with his taxes a part of the cost of supporting our University and college systems.

Let me tell you briefly about our Equal Education Plan which, yes, would be financed by tuition or, if you prefer a euphemism, a student charge.

But that tuition would be paid by those who can afford to pay-- and that is the lion's share of those now attending. For the fact is, the average income of the parents of students attending our public universities is almost identical with the average income of the parents of students attending private universities.

This is fine. But I can't help but remember that originally our public system of higher education was developed to help those who could not afford to go to private schools.

We think that at the very least an education in our state colleges and universities should be available to those whose only reason for not attending is money.

Our plan will accomplish that end. Here is how it will work.

First of all, it is based on total annual necessary expenditures of about \$2,000 a year including tuition, fees, room and board, books and incidental expenses.

Secondly, all loans are to be repayable only after the student has left college and has begun earning.

During his first year of college, the student will borrow 75 percent of his basic \$2,000 and receive 25 percent in scholarships.

In his second year, the student will borrow 50 percent and receive 50 percent in scholarships.

During his third year, the loan will be 25 percent and the scholarship 75 percent.

During his senior year, the student will receive a full scholarship.

An alternative proposal which also has merit is to reverse the procedure and make the first year free in order not to discourage potential students from low income groups. This is a detail we can work out.

That is the basic plan.

We do not yet know what the need level will be, although we have studies underway in this area. It is obvious that a family making \$7,500 a year and having one child is in a better position to educate him than a family making \$15,000 a year and having four children. Some sort of sliding scale appears to be the proper way of handling this.

Other questions arise about repaying the loans. What about women who receive loans and then marry before they are in a position to repay? What about men in the service? What about those who enter professional areas where great need exists?

In these and other cases we think there should be forgiveness features. Exactly how these would work are for the Regents and the Legislature to decide, since it is the Regents who will eventually approve the plan for the University and the Legislature for the colleges.

At this moment these details are not nearly so important as the fact that we must provide a way for all those who can use a college education to receive one.

I have outlined a financing method, but that meets only a part of the need.

We must also encourage those students who are qualified to go on to college.

This will take the active cooperation, not only of the colleges and universities, but also the school districts and the high schools.

It will take the cooperation, the interest and enthusiasm of all those in public education to make such a plan known, to explain it, and in many cases, to sell it---especially to students who come from homes where there is a language barrier, where there is illiteracy or where, because of environmental factors, there is lack of ambition and even hopelessness.

Therefore, this plan--any plan--will need an aggressive guidance and information program at the high school level, expanded counseling and even a recruiting system.

This should not be the responsibility of the high schools alone. The college and university systems should work hand in hand with the school districts to assure that every student capable of acquiring and absorbing a college education has access to one.

We hear much in meetings of the University Regents about the benefits to the University of having substantial numbers of out-of-state students. And rightfully so. These do broaden the range of students and make for a more meaningful student dialogue.

However, here in California we have a broad strata of students who, if they just could get into the University, would also add to the quality and variety of the student body.

Although qualified intellectually, they have been barred in many cases because language and financial barriers have not let them live up to their true potentials in high school. In other words, scholastically, they are not among the top 12½ percent of their graduating class.

We are already at work on that problem.

This year, the Legislature passed and I signed legislation making it possible to give early instruction in two languages---English and Spanish.

Many a youngster from a Spanish-speaking home comes into our schools bright and willing, but shy and handicapped by a lack of knowledge of English.

Because of shyness, he will not ask questions raised by his unfamiliarity with English. As a result, he drops farther and farther behind, and in too many cases, loses all interest.

That legislation should go a long way toward rectifying this problem.

I know there are many other problems that face any citizen who has a language barrier. These are problems that cannot be solved overnight or by laws or by money. Welfare is one.

To put a man on welfare does not solve a problem. Welfare at best should be a temporary expediency.

In recent years welfare too often has been seen as the salvation of the jobless, regardless of why he is unemployed, rather than as a stopgap.

But welfare is no salvation. In the long run, welfare destroys men's souls, robs them of their dignity, takes away their incentive, demeans their wives and children.

#

(Note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the governor will stand by the above quotes.)