



STEVENSON-KEFAUVER CAMPAIGN

General Headquarters: Dyckman Hotel
27 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis 2
Federal 8-8796 

For Release Saturday PM 7 October 27

RETURN FARM PROGRAMS TO FARMER CONTROL, SENATOR HUMPHREY INSISTS

Farmers can have "a greater voice in their own farm programs" by "getting rid of Ike and Ezra and electing Adlai Stevenson and Estes Kefauver", Senator Hubert H. Humphrey declared in a noon rally at Ivanhoe today.

"We are going to restore to the democratically-elected farmer-committees the authority Congress intended them to have," he promised.

Vigorously attacking Republican "undermining of this great farmer-committee system", Senator Humphrey warned that "no farm program, no matter how good the legislation may be, is going to work effectively and smoothly if farmers are deprived of any voice in its administration".

"One of our greatest contributions of the past two decades has been development of the farmer committee system giving local people a voice in choosing their neighbors to administer the farm program, and placing its control in the hands of farm people who understand local conditions and can best obtain widespread farmer participation so necessary to success of any program", Senator Humphrey, member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, declared.

Senator Humphrey, Chairman of a Senate subcommittee which investigated breakdown of the farmer committee system, told his audience of many of the "flagrant abuses of authority" uncovered "and the refusal of Secretary Benson to do anything about it."

"The only conclusion we could reach, despite continued lip-service to the democratic ideal of these farmer-committees, is that this Administration does not want farmers to have anything to say about their farm program, and wants instead to put it directly in the hands of appointed bureaucrats they can control", he said.

He declared that selection of office managers of county ASC offices "was still being dictated from the top" instead of being left in local hands despite repeated assurances from Secretary Benson that "county committees have the right to hire and fire such managers".

Recalling General Eisenhower's campaign pledge in 1952 to "get rid of the 'agricrats' and give farmers more to say about their programs, Senator Humphrey said

"Just like on Ike's other farm promises, they have done just the opposite. Instead of less 'agricrats', he has hired more; instead of giving farmers more to say about their farm programs, he has taken away any voice at all.

"After all the talk we heard in 1952 about getting rid of 'agricrats', it may come as a surprise to know that Ezra Benson has increased, not decreased, his hired-hands -- and just got rid of the farmers instead."

"Employment in the Department of Agriculture has gone up every year since the Republicans took over -- and there are nearly 10,000 more employees today than when Eisenhower and Benson were complaining about there being 'too many agricultrats'.

"These are the facts they do not tell you, the facts they want to hide. Benson has spent more, hired more, wasted more, lost more -- and produced less results than any Secretary of Agriculture in history. Yet he has Ike's full blessing -- bungling mismanagement and all."

"The only way to get rid of Benson and restore a real voice for farmers in our farm programs is to get somebody in the White House who cares what is happening to agriculture -- cares enough to take a look for himself, instead of leaving it all to Ezra", Senator Humphrey declared.

He urged the Seventh District to "make a real house-cleaning" on the national level, by electing Adlai and Estes and DFL Congressional Candidate, Clint Haroldson, and to "keep the gains we have made in Minnesota by reelecting Governor Orville Freeman and our entire DFL slate".

FOREIGN POLICY

SPEECH SECTION

*Kuwan
Mouty
Alex*

Apparently the Republicans plan to make "peace" a partisan campaign issue. I regret this development deeply, because I agree with Secretary of State Dulles when he said (11/29/55), "I never knew that peace was a controversial or partisan subject with the American people."

Moreover I am astonished that Republican campaigners are making such extravagant pretensions in view of other statements by Mr. Dulles like these (4/30/56): "In Korea there is an armistice, but there is no peace ... In Vietnam there is an armistice, but there is no peace."

Of course this conflict between slogans and facts has beset the Eisenhower Administration ever since it took office. It partially explains four years of confusion in our foreign policy which have frightened our friends abroad and worried all objective observers at home.

Since 1952 we have experienced a repeated lack of candor in presenting the realities of the international situation. Often our official words have not squared with the facts. Equally often they have not squared with our deeds. Unable to resist its proclivity for publicity gimmicks, the Administration has extended these devices from the political hustings into the previously bi-partisan area of foreign affairs. Examples range from the fraudulent "unleashing" of Chiang Kai-Chek in President Eisenhower's first State of the Union message; to the bluff and bluster of the misconceived "massive retaliation" doctrine so hastily abandoned on its first test in Indochina; to the notorious newsstand diplomacy and self-serving inaccuracies of Secretary Dulles' "brink of war" disclosures in Life magazine; to the fallacious assertions before Congressional committees that the Soviet economy is on the verge of collapse and that the Soviet "new look" is a confession of weakness; all the way to the recent merry-go-round of Administration

C
O
P
Y

views on "neutralism" with Mr. Eisenhower defending it, Mr. Nixon taking both sides, and Mr. Dulles castigating neutralism as "immoral" but finding himself unable to identify any present-day neutrals of the immoral kind. The Administration has not hesitated to claim credit where changed Communist tactics really deserve the credit: the Austrian troop withdrawal, and the truces in Korea and Indochina.

C
O
In domestic affairs this Administration has systematically sacrificed leadership for popularity, and achieved some success in doing so. In foreign affairs, the effort to do the same thing has resulted in a loss of both leadership and popularity. We should not forget this even during a campaign season when all the reasons for Mr. Dulles' "agonizing reappraisals" are forgotten in the election-year chorus of "peace and prosperity".

P
Y
Consider almost any portion of the globe today, and examples of the deterioration of our position can be found: In Europe our chief alliances have been badly strained by policy differences over Suez, Cyprus, North Africa, German rearmament, and East-West trade. On items of major importance to the future of Western Europe, like the strengthening of NATO and a long-term "trade-not-aid" program, this Republican Administration has paid lip-service to the objectives and failed to follow through.

In the Middle East a vacillating policy has alternately exasperated the young democracy of Israel and won us increasing enmity among the Arab nations as well. By her arms agreements with Egypt and Afghanistan, the Soviet Union has obtained footholds in the Middle East which have been Kremlin objectives for generations.

Our relations with India, the largest democracy on earth, have suffered many reverses since 1953, all of them aggravated by our ill-conceived arms agreement with Pakistan. Instead of working steadfastly to retrieve our position in South Asia, President Eisenhower has just withdrawn Ambassador Cooper from New Delhi for

political purposes in Kentucky.

Even our relations with Latin America have been marred by clumsy diplomacy like our effort to appease Peron shortly before the people of Argentina overthrew him. The Organization of American States remains weak and ineffective.

In the United Nations itself, the decline in American prestige has frequently been reflected in the increased measure of voting agreement with the Soviet Union. 60% of the members of the UN agreed more with the Soviet Union in General Assembly votes in 1955 than in 1954. Here as elsewhere lately, the Soviet Union has registered diplomatic gains, while we, in a frenzy of official activity, have drifted and bided our time.

Peace is positive, not negative, and the American Society of Newspaper Editors recognized this more honestly and realistically than the Republican speech writers when the Society voted 2-1 this year that America was currently losing the Cold War. For while all this has been going on, our alliances have begun to crumble, and our reputation has diminished all around the world.

Four years ago American prestige was high. Democratic leadership had successfully sought and fostered bi-partisan support in foreign affairs. NATO and the Marshall Plan were monuments to joint effort with our allies. The Truman Doctrine, the Berlin Airlift, and our swift response in Korea had taught the Communists that we were serious when we said we intended to block aggression. The United Nations was being utilized, not by-passed. The Point Four program was well under way.

The world that we knew in 1952 has now been turned upside down. Revolutionary events have occurred all around us -- in technology, in politics, and in the hearts and minds of men. Since 1952 the dreadful thermonuclear weapons race has continued, nationalist-minded revolt is sweeping the remnants of colonial Asia and Africa, Stalin's successors are offering us far more astute and dangerous competition than he ever did, and a whole new arena of non-military, economic and

psychological competition is upon us.

While I have been critical of many of the things that the Republican Administration has done in the past four years, I am even more critical of the many things they have left undone. Lincoln once said, "As our case is new, we must think and act anew." But these last four years have been wasted years -- years of holding operations and unexploited opportunities. In a time crying for imagination, we have exhibited little. In a time crying for creativeness and vision, there has been a poverty of new ideas.

Indeed we may say of our foreign policy since 1952: that which is new is not sound and that which is sound is not new. At best this Administration has borrowed the arguments and policies which were successfully devised by its Democratic predecessors to meet earlier dangers. At worst, if we are to believe our Secretary of State, it has practiced the "art" of going to the brink of war without telling us about it until afterwards; it has allowed our essential foreign economic assistance to become a political football by miscasting its appropriation requests and justifications before Congress, and it has struck unbecoming moralistic, legalistic and militaristic postures, all of which have recently inflamed world opinion against us.

America is generous and humanitarian, but one would never know it listening to the present Secretary of the Treasury or the I. C. A. Administrator. America has been the symbol of anti-colonialism, but one would never know it reading Mr. Dulles' joint statement with the Portuguese Foreign Minister describing Goa as a Portuguese Province". America is peace-loving but today in the midst of the Suez crisis, it is discomfoting to remember that General Eisenhower thought a pistol was an appropriate gift for the Egyptian chief-of-state, and had Mr. Dulles present it personally in Cairo only two years ago.

During this Republican administration incidents like these have come to symbolize the distorted image we are presenting to the world. Under a Democratic Administration we may hope to recoup some of the ground lost during the past four years, and return to our own best traditions. It is our Declaration of Independence, the spirit of "We the People" of our own Constitution which is on march in much of the world today. We must re-identify ourselves with our own tradition. This is why Jefferson said that our revolution was fought for all mankind. This is what Lincoln meant when he called our experiment in democracy the last best hope on earth. This is what Wilson meant when he said that America was brought into the world to unify mankind. This is what Franklin Roosevelt intended when he announced the goals of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear everywhere in the world.

These are the principles which have enriched America and which have lately been neglected and forgotten. This is the vision without which the people perish. We must rediscover and apply it as we go forward with Adlai Stevenson in a New America devotedly working toward genuine peace and real prosperity.



STEVENSON-KEFAUVER CAMPAIGN

General Headquarters: Dyckman Hotel
27 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis 2
Federal 8-8796 

For Release: Sunday A.M.
October 28, 1956

NON-SUPPORTED COMMODITIES LEAD FARM PRICE COLLAPSE, SENATOR HUMPHREY SAYS

Collapsing prices of meat animals since 1952 "puts the lie to Secretary Benson's efforts to blame price supports for losses in gross farm income," Senator Hubert H. Humphrey declared last night in addressing a four-county DFL 'Bean Feed' at Adrian.

"Two billion dollars of the decline in gross farm income since 1952 was on meat animals alone -- for which there are no price supports," Senator Humphrey declared. "Where does that leave Ezra with his cries about 'inheriting' a farm problem created by high price supports of the past?"

Party workers from Rock, Nobles, Pipestone, and Murray Counties gathered to hear Senator Humphrey, General Chairman of Minnesota's Stevenson-Kefauver campaign, appeal for "an outpouring of votes to give us a complete DFL sweep on November 6.

"Cattle prices in Minnesota went down 38% in the first three years of Republicanism. Egg prices went down 22%. Hog prices went down 16%.

"That is where our biggest trouble came from in declining farm income -- and Ezra cannot blame it on price supports for there were none at all.

"Secretary Benson says our farm depression was caused by 'inherited surpluses' and high price supports -- yet his own records show that price supports 'cushioned' the drop on wheat and corn, with the biggest decline for non-supported commodities or those getting lower level support under his discretion.

"Our biggest surpluses have been in wheat and corn -- yet wheat prices went down only 2% in the first three years of Benson, and corn went down only 7%. That is because we had legislation he could not tamper with so easily during the first few years of his administration.

"But where the decision was left to his discretion, look what happened: Rye went down 43%, oats went down 25%. Barley went down 28%, soybeans went down 16%.

"Those are figures from Benson's own Department -- official government figures. They are figures based on Minnesota prices paid farmers.

"It should be obvious that Secretary Benson can have only one reason for misleading the public about the 'mess' he has created -- to cover up his own poor judgment and mismanagement, and to plunge the rest of our farmers into the same boat with producers of meat animals by destroying the effectiveness of any price support program."

Senator Humphrey repeated his "standing challenge" to Secretary Benson "to come out here in the midwest and stand up before farmers to debate these issues with me, instead of appealing for support of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange."

Senator Humphrey said election of Stevenson and Kefauver would assure "enactment of a comprehensive farm program which, under intelligent and sympathetic Democratic administration, will make the rural homes of America better and healthier places in which to live."



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