

From the Office of  
Citizens for Humphrey Committee  
1625 Hennepin Avenue  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
Federal 9-0521

For Release: Tuesday a.m.  
October 4, 1960

HUMPHREY GOP "REFUSAL TO ACT" ON FARM PROGRAM

WASECA, October 3 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey charged today that the Republican Administration has "callously refused to utilize legislation which would directly benefit the farmers."

The Senator cited as an example his legislation, approved by Congress two years ago, to send 50,000 tons of soybean oil overseas for relief purposes.

"If Secretary of Agriculture Benson had acted on this program," Humphrey said, "the market price of soybeans would today be 25 cents a bushel higher than it is."

Humphrey, speaking at a DFL bean feed here, said that if the program had been carried out, national farm income would have been increased \$200 million.

"The boost in Minnesota farm income alone would have amounted to \$12.5," Humphrey said. "In Waseca county alone, more than \$1 million would have come in through the increased market price."

The Senator, a top-ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, said the original request for the Humphrey legislation came from the National Council of Churches.

"The National Council of Churches and other voluntary agencies have appealed to the government repeatedly that some fats and oils be used as part of their relief feeding programs abroad," Humphrey reported.

"Two years ago, Congress approved my legislation authorizing Benson to meet the request of the National Council of Churches," Humphrey said.

"So far, he has simply refused to act, despite the fact that the program would help humanity and the farmers instead of allowing price-supported soybeans to pile up in costly storage.

"The program makes sense to me, even if it doesn't to the Republicans. I am sure a Democratic president will inaugurate such a program, and prove how soybean prices can be bolstered while helping humanity.

Humphrey said the purchase and diversion of the 50,000 tons of soybean oil could be accomplished at a cost of less than \$10 million.

"Most of this cost," he concluded, "would be offset by reduction of losses now involved in the soybean price support program."

From the Office of  
Citizens for Humphrey Committee  
1625 Hennepin Avenue  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
Federal 9-0521

For Release: Tuesday p.m.  
October 4, 1960

HUMPHREY CALLS FOR "MORAL MATURITY" ON RELIGIOUS ISSUE

WINONA, October 4 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today challenged every candidate and citizen to show "moral maturity" on the issue of religion in politics.

"We will be labeled an immature people and a hypocritical people unless we reject the expressions of religious bigotry which are so tragically frequent today," Humphrey said.

The Senator, speaking at a joint meeting of students from St. Mary's College and St. Theresa's College here, said he had been "shocked and shamed by the viciousness of attacks by bigots and political hate-mongers.

"I have been shocked because these attacks continue, despite the forceful statements of the Democratic presidential candidate supporting the concept of separation of church and state," Humphrey said.

"I have been shamed because the proud American traditions of decency, democracy and fair play have been blotched by demagogery," he added.

Humphrey said he was "surprised and saddened" that the religious issue has persisted "so long and so intensely" this year. He added:

"If America expects to endure in the democratic tradition and to lead the free nations toward a world of justice and peace, the people must show moral maturity on matters of race, religion and creed.

"Every American can help by ignoring or rejecting the bigots, and by turning attention to the positive programs of the candidates and the real issues of the campaign."

From the Office of  
Citizens for Humphrey Committee  
1625 Hennepin Avenue  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
Federal 9-0521

For Release: Wednesday a.m.  
October 5, 1960

COLD WAR SLOW-DOWN IN AMERICAN ECONOMY HELPS COMMUNISTS, SAYS  
HUMPHREY

WINONA, October 4 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey warned last night that the slow-down in United States economic growth puts a "strait-jacket" on America's capacity to compete with the Communist nations.

"The Soviet economy has grown 6 to 9 percent a year over the past eight years," Humphrey declared at a DFL Bean Feed here, "but under this Republican Administration the American economy has grown only 2½ percent a year."

Humphrey said authoritative studies by the Central Intelligence Agency and the Joint Economic Committee of Congress show Sino-Soviet economic development of heavy industry and power threatens to end American economic supremacy by 1970, if the American economy continues to lag behind its full growth potential.

"The Republican presidential candidate says it is unpatriotic to call attention to the slow-down in our economic growth," Humphrey said. "I say it is unpatriotic and foolish and dangerous to ignore it."

"It is the duty of Senator Kennedy to criticize the Republican tight-money economic policies which have put a straitjacket on America's capacity to compete in the Cold War," Humphrey declared. "And it is my duty to work for policies which will keep America strong."

Humphrey said the American economy grew an average of 5.5 percent a year from 1933 to 1953. "If this growth rate had continued under the Republican, our national income would now be \$600 billion instead of only \$500 billion -- 20 percent more money for military hardware plus schools and roads and homes and all the items which mean a higher standard of living for the American people," he added.

Ray Hemingway → Joe Donovan

FACTS -- NOT SLOGANS -- ON FARM PROGRAMS

Waseca, Minn., Bean Feed  
8 p.m., Monday,  
Oct. 3, 1960  
(Over Radio)

① Sandra Carlson  
Edwin Carlson  
Mrs

Marty Coughlin  
Marty Stobin  
Joe Moore  
Henry Galloghan  
Gene McCarthy

✓ Geo Shepard  
✓ Gov Freeman

L Tonight I speak to you not just  
as a Senator, but as a man who knows  
and cares about the problems and needs  
of America's farmers.

L I speak to you not in generalities,  
but in specifics.

L I speak to you not with slogans,  
but with facts.

L I come to you not to offer false  
promises and vague reassurances, but  
to speak the truth about my record  
and my party's program for agriculture.

KMMT-TV  
Channel  
6  
10:30

↳ It is time for all of us to  
take a hard look at the recent statements  
and programs of the candidates on  
agriculture.

↳ Let us first examine the program  
outlined by the ~~the~~ Republican presidential  
candidate, Mr. Nixon.

*now,* In a recent campaign speech, ~~he~~ *Mr. Nixon*  
has offered what he calls a "new  
program" to solve the farm problem.

↳ What does he say the problem is? *First,*  
He said the problem is surplus. In  
fact, he used the word "surplus" more  
than 50 times in just one speech.

And what is his answer to this  
"Problem"? He had one word to describe  
that answer -- "consume."

Now I take exception to Mr. Nixon's

happy simplification of America's

agricultural situation.

I say that America's food and fiber  
supply should be called "agricultural  
abundance," not "surplus."

I say that our agricultural abundance  
is not a "problem." It is a blessing  
and an opportunity.

We have an opportunity to use our  
tremendous supply of food and fiber --  
as a source of strenght, as a tool of  
relief, as an instrument of peace.

Our challenge is to use America's  
agricultural abundance to help America

grow and prosper, to relieve misery and suffering, and to banish hunger from the face of the world.

The challenge is not, as Mr. Nixon suggests, to "get rid of the surplus."

If he takes that attitude -- and he does -- he might as well suggest that we put a torch to fields of wheat or dump vast quantities of food and fiber in the ocean.

*Challenge is  
to use it!  
for people!*

And while we are discussing Mr. Nixon's inclination to "get rid of" things, let me mention one, sad fact.

Last week, in his debate with Mr. Kennedy, Richard Nixon suffered

*Debate*

a significant slip of the tongue.

He intended to say the government has a responsibility to "get rid of the surplus."

Instead, he said that we must "get rid of the farmers."

That was a slip of the tongue, to be fair. <sup>if it</sup> But was not a slip of the mind. For Mr. Nixon and others in the current administration do have it in mind to get rid of the farmers. They believe that the solution to all the problems of American agriculture is a matter of forcing more farmers off their lands and out of rural America -- to cut production and thus reduce "surplus."

In his recent campaign speeches,

Mr. Nixon has given us nothing new.

He has dressed up the same old  
Benson programs with cute phrases and  
catchy slogans.

"use surplus  
to get rid  
of surplus"

He has skipped only lightly over  
the real problem of American agriculture  
today -- low farm income.

What does he suggest? He suggests  
that parity of farm income be determined  
by the average market prices of products  
during the previous year.

Law of  
Diminishing  
Returns

My friends, this is the essence  
of Nixon's program. It is not new.  
It is not bold. <sup>and</sup> It is not what the  
farmers want. It is not the answer  
to falling farm prices and the plight

of the farmers.

It is straight, pure Bensonism. *and bunkum!*

It is Benson's program, put in slightly

different language. It is Benson's

*castly* ~~is~~ "sliding scale" for farm *— only more slide*

parity. It is nothing more than a

call to continuing drop in farm

income. It is disaster for America's

farmers.

Does the Vice President expect

any farmer to buy his program? Does

he expect any farmer to believe that

income will be improved by gearing price

support programs to the average prices of

the previous year. *??*

The "sliding scale" -- whether

it is in Benson language or Nixon

language -- means one thing. It

means falling prices. It means falling

income. It means that America's farmers

will be pushed so far down the economic

scale that thousands of them will be

forced off the farms.

*Right here in this v*

~~It means success for the Benson-~~

~~Nixon goal: To "get rid of" thousands  
of farmers.~~

*Nixon  
Goal!*

*Nixon  
Goal  
Get farmer  
off the land.*

Now let us look hard at the program  
of Mr. Kennedy, the Democratic presidential  
candidate.

*Kennedy  
Program*

Mr. Kennedy does not straddle the  
fence or hide from the real problem --

of low farm income.

*He knows this is the problem & he attacks it.*

He states clearly and forcefully

that he will work and fight for full parity of income for the American farmer.

And Mr. Kennedy defines ~~distinctly~~ *clearly* and ~~unequivocally~~ what he means by

full parity of income.

Parity of income, he says, is that income which gives average producers a return on their invested capital, labor and management equal to that which similar, or comparable, resources earn in non-farm employment.

*Parity*

This is what American farmers want and must have if they are to survive in a growing, expanding nation.

Mr. Kennedy's program strikes to the heart of the problem of farmers. It does not concern itself <sup>only</sup> ~~solely~~ with prices -- but with the farmer's net income. That is the only figure which means anything in determining his standard of living -- particularly in this age of the cost-price squeeze.

Mr. Kennedy says more which is sound and necessary. He pledges his work to assure this parity of income through supply management -- the adjustment of supply to demand at parity income prices.

# 2

The fundamental goal of Mr. Kennedy's

program is not to get rid of the farmers.

It is to achieve a balance between supply  
and demand -- and thereby assure prices which  
will yield parity of income and reasonable  
prosperity to the farmers.

Let me be blunt. As a ranking member  
of the Senate Committee on Agriculture,  
as one who has studied the problems of  
farmers first-hand, as an American who  
is deeply concerned with the survival  
of the free-enterprise, family farming

system, ~~I do not see any choice.~~

Mr. Nixon is vague. Mr. Kennedy is  
specific. Mr. Nixon is ~~ignorant~~ <sup>ignores</sup> of the  
real problem. Mr. Kennedy faces the real  
problem of farm income. Mr. Nixon wants

*I see only one choice - Kennedy*

to continue the Benson program of

sliding farm prices → and *Agria Recession*

Mr. Kennedy wants to boost and

increase farm prices → and *farm income*

Mr. Nixon want to reduce

(next page)

our food and fiber supply by "getting rid of  
the surplus" and, indeed, by "getting rid of  
the farmers". Mr. Kennedy <sup>of the Democ Party</sup> ~~wants~~ to strengthen  
the position and economic well-being of all  
farmers and assure the survival of America's  
democratic system of family farming.

Now let us turn to another candidate,  
and what he says about farm programs.

I speak of my own opponent.

You know, political candidates are advised  
that they should never identify their opponent  
by name. So let me just say that my opponent's  
initials -- and he loves to use them -- stand  
for Paltry Knowledge of the problems and needs  
of American farmers.

There is little to say about his program,  
because there is little program. He toes the  
Benson-Nixon line, using the same, old, unworkable

concepts and the same language. only less convincing

He does not speak positively or specifically of what he would do. Instead, he offers vague, negative slogans on agricultural policy.

He has offered one statement which is all his own. Nobody else has ever made the statement. ~~his own~~ Nobody else who has studied the record is so foolish & reckless would dare to make the statement.

His statement is that Humphrey has done nothing for the farmers.

I suggest that he find out just how alone he is in making that statement.

I suggest that he get out and talk with Minnesota's farmers to learn what Humphrey has done for them.

I invite him to come to my office and read the thousands of "thank-you" notes from farmers and the hundreds of letters from outstanding farm experts and farm bloc leaders

*Good time to look at the Record*

Natl Milk Producers Assoc  
Missouri Farmers Assoc  
Nat Catholic Rural Life Conference  
Natl Council of Churches

expressing appreciation and support for

Humphrey's work and accomplishments for farmers.

And, above all, I advise him to look at the record and study the facts of <sup>Senator</sup> Humphrey's efforts and successes on behalf of American agriculture.

Why, I will even help him. This is a long, full record of which I speak, and if my opponent took the time to study it, he would not have any time for campaigning. That would not be fair.

So here are the facts of Humphrey's record for the farmers, step by step and summarized for easy understanding by those who do not know much about farming or agricultural economy.

The Humphrey record on agriculture goes back further than 1948, when I was first elected to the Senate.

↳ It goes back to the farm depression in South Dakota in the 1930's, and a deep personal concern for the welfare of farm families. It goes back to 1933, and an understanding of what could be done by an Administration determined to restore an agricultural economy to health.

*my service as Mayor* → My record includes the sponsorship and hard work necessary to push five comprehensive farm bills through Congress. Each of those bills met the problem on <sup>our</sup> ~~the~~ farms -- low income. Each of those bills would have meant millions of dollars more income for the farmers of Minnesota *and less costly to taxpayer* and all America. Each of those bills was supported by the nation's farmers. Each of those bills was approved by the Democratic majority in Congress.

And every one of those comprehensive  
farm bills was vetoed by the Republican  
President and killed by the Republican  
minority in Congress.

*Vetoes*

What was the first Humphrey bill  
to be introduced in the Senate?

It was Senate Bill 881 -- a  
farm bill, a bill concerned with the  
level of dairy price supports *to*

1949 also

Was that nothing?

And in 1949, a high point of the Humphrey record was the successful sponsorship with the late Senator Langer of legislation authorizing the REA Rural Telephone System.

Was that nothing?

In 1951 - and it is in the record - your Senator sponsored and passed called for the shipment of surplus wheat to relieve misery

and hunger in India - a proposal ~~later~~ accepted by two administrations. Emergency Aid to India

Was that nothing?

1949+ you understand  
In 1952, Humphrey lived up to his pledge to the farmers to work for 90 percent of parity support programs.

It is in the record. I was one of the leaders of the successful fight to extend 90 percent of parity for basic commodities for two years.

Was that nothing? It was not. In Minnesota  
alone, extension of 90 percent of parity meant the  
safeguarding of \$90 million of income a year for  
Minnesota farmers.

*90 Million  
a year*

The real fight began in 1953, when Ezra Taft  
Benson assumed power over the welfare of America's  
farmers.

His executive orders were often outside the  
authority of Congress, but of more than 100 Benson  
attempts which required legislation, we defeated all  
but 16.

*Was that nothing?*

In 1953, I introduced Senate Bill 2102, an  
*Conservation*  
agricultural reserve bill which was not accepted  
until 1956 when the Nixon-Benson Administration

needed an election year farm proposal and picked up  
the soil-bank idea. ←

*Republicans distort it.*

Was that nothing?

Also in 1953, Humphrey urged the creation of  
an International Food Reserve - a sort of world food  
bank. This idea was not supported by the Republican  
Party until this year.

*WNT,  
FOOD  
+  
FIBER*

Was that nothing?

In 1954 - and every year since - Benson has  
attempted to reduce funds for the school lunch program,  
the Rural Electrification Administration and the A.C.P.  
Each year, I have helped to defeat these attempts.

*School  
lunch  
REA  
Conserv*

Was that nothing?

Also in 1954, the first proposals to allow REA  
cooperatives to enter the atomic-power field were put  
forward by Humphrey. The proposals were later accepted,  
and today the first REA nuclear power plant is standing

at Elk River, Minnesota.

Was that nothing?

<sup>1954</sup>  
The same year, I was the first to propose

that America's agricultural abundance be used as an  
instrument of foreign policy. This was the beginning  
of my Food for Peace program, long opposed by the  
Republican leadership but now given lip service by  
their candidates.

I ask you. Is my Food for Peace program

"nothing?"

During the 84th Congress, in 1955 and 1956, *as your Senate*

~~Humphrey~~ continued to fight Benson policies and worked  
for a better dairy support program, for more adequate  
credit sources for farmers, for fair national acreage  
allotment on corn, for incentive payments for marketing  
hogs at lighter weights.

Can these programs be called "nothing?"

In 1957, I introduced bills providing for a food-stamp program to use our abundance to feed the (Passed)  
needy at home, and for extension and enlargement of  
the Public Law 480 program to relieve hunger overseas. (Passed)

I sponsored legislation for a national milk sanitation ~~to Aid and protect milk producers~~  
program and for the humane slaughter of livestock. (Passed)

Can anyone say that these programs meant  
"nothing" to farm families.

In 1958, I opposed the Benson move to reduce  
dairy price supports below \$3.25 per hundredweight  
and co-sponsored with ~~Senator~~ <sup>Cong</sup> Johnson <sup>of Wis</sup> a plan to (Passed)  
enable dairy producers to stabilize their prices at (Voted)  
a reasonable level. ~~W.C.~~

- Was that nothing?

1958 - sponsored & Passed  
a Resol. to prevent any  
further Price support  
cuts.

*And*

In the 86th Congress, both houses approved the  
Humphrey bill to establish ~~the~~ <sup>permanent</sup> school milk program ~~e~~ <sup>(Passed)</sup>

~~permanently~~. The program now and every year helps  
stabilize dairy prices and improves the nutrition  
of America's school children.

No man could honestly call that accomplishment  
"nothing."

The Public Law 480 program was extended, and  
with it Congress agreed to my proposal for a food-stamp  
program. Benson refused to act on the food-stamp  
legislation, so I have since sponsored legislation  
requiring him to do so.

*Food Stamp*

Is it "nothing" to help our farmers and help  
the hungry by using our agricultural abundance for  
humanitarian purposes?

*your Senators*

Here are other parts of the ~~summary~~ record

for the farmer from just this year:

A proposal for the establishment of a new commission to study problems of the rural community.

Introduction of the hog-payment bill and development of a national poultry stabilization act.

*Poultry inspection Act*

Pressure on the Department of Agriculture which resulted in the reinstatement of USDA purchase of dried whole egg solids.

*up egg prices*

I am proud of my fight for Senate Bill 144, a bill to restore loan-making authority to the REA administrator. The President vetoed the bill, the Senate overrode his veto and the House failed to override by just four votes.

*REA*

\* \* \* \* \*

Now let me talk with you about the important, the real, the dollars-and-cents results of my work

and the work of other liberal legislators on behalf of farmers.

The dairy price support bill, sponsored by myself and Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, may be short-term and modest, but it will bring direct benefits to farmers.

It raises dairy price supports to \$3.22 per hundredweight on milk and 59.6 cents per pound on butterfat. Congress approved this bill, and -- under election year pressure -- it was signed into law by the President.

A 16 cent increase per hundred pounds of milk or three cents more per pound of butterfat will amount to an increase of \$11,500,000 for the farmers in Minnesota alone, and \$100 million for farmers nationally.

\$ 11 1/2 million

Is that "nothing?"

It is not Humphrey and other liberal farm-bloc senators who are guilty of "doing nothing" for the farmers.

The current administration and Benson-Republican policies are guilty not only of "doing nothing" to help the farmers. By its callous refusal to utilize legislation which would directly benefit the farmers, it has hurt them.

Let me give you a specific, factual example.

Two years ago, I introduced legislation to send 50,000 tons of soybean oil overseas for relief purposes.

That legislation was introduced after the National Council of Churches and voluntary agencies appealed to the government repeatedly that some fats and oils be used as part of our efforts to feed the hungry in underdeveloped lands.

Both houses of Congress approved my legislation for that purpose. The President and the Secretary of Agriculture thus had the authority to put the program into action.

They did not use the authority. They refused to act. They ignored this program -- despite the fact that it would help humanity and the farmers instead of allowing price-supported soybeans to pile up in costly storage.

If Secretary of Agriculture Benson had acted on this program, the market price of soybeans would today be 25 cents a bushel higher than it is. Yes, the diversion of 50,000 tons of soybean oil overseas would have boosted the market price per bushel by 25 cents.

That would have meant national farm income would have been increased by \$200 million.

Minnesota farm income would have been boosted

\$12.5 million.

And in Waseca ~~County~~ <sup>Trading Area</sup> <sup>\$2</sup> alone, more than ~~\$2~~ <sup>2</sup> million

extra in income would have come in through the increased market price of soybeans.

This program authorized by my bill and requested  
by the National Council of Churches makes sense to me,

even if it does not to the Republican candidates.

I am convinced that a Democratic President will inaugurate  
such a program, and prove how soybean prices can be  
bolstered at the same time we are helping humanity.

The Administration's refusal to put this program  
to work was a setback - a tragic setback - for the efforts  
of those of us who are working to help the farmer and to  
use our agricultural abundance for the good of mankind.

We have suffered many other setbacks, but we have  
been able to preserve much legislation which is vital  
to the farm economy.

*7 million Bushel  
Soybeans  
program  
this Area!*

*Catholic Relief Council  
Sullivan  
would*

If we had not worked and fought for the farmers throughout the past eight years, their problems would be far more critical today.

Agricultural experts estimate that gross farm income is 10 percent higher today than it would be if so-called "free market" policies of the Benson administration had been allowed to prevail.

At this rate, Minnesota's gross farm income this year is about \$170 million higher than if Benson had been allowed to have his way -- if Humphrey and others had not fought his policies at all.

If America today had an Administration and a Congress willing to act to restore parity prices, the farm economy would be far more healthy and prosperous.

Reliable estimates indicate that if current farm production were keyed to full parity prices, the typical Minnesota farm county would enjoy about \$5 million a year more in farm income.

Restoration of full parity prices on current levels of production would mean an income gain of almost \$400 million a year for the State of Minnesota.

These are the facts. These are the specific details about my record, the program of my party and the inadequacies of Benson-Nixon farm policies.

The facts stand for themselves. Study them and remember them. After you have, you will have no trouble deciding who has done something for the farmers of Minnesota and America and who has done nothing.

We who see America's agricultural abundance as a blessing -- and not a problem -- will continue to work for the farmer's interest in Washington.

We who want to preserve the free-enterprise, family farm system -- and not "get rid of the farmers" -- will continue to fight for a healthy, agricultural economy.

Humphrey and others do not concern themselves with the interests of the farmer only because they are friends of the farmer and understand his problems and needs.

We seek a stronger America, a growing America, an efficient America. We seek an America which leads the free world toward victory in the war against collectivization and totalitarianism. We seek an America which has the wisdom, the strength and the compassion to banish hunger from the world and help

every nation to develop in an orderly, democratic way.

These are our purposes. We know they can not be achieved unless American agriculture is a strong, healthy, prosperous force in our Nation.

We know that our own nation and the free world can not long endure if the American farmer is forced off of his lands by declining income.

We know that rural America is a key to the strength of all America, and that rural America must have a greater share of opportunity, a greater share of prosperity, a greater share of the vitality and vigor within our Nation.

10/2/60



It has taken me to green,  
springtime mountains of West Virginia  
and the summer heat of the East Coast.

And now it has brought me home  
to Minnesota for the fall.

I do not hide my purpose in  
these campaigns. I know and you  
know that I am out to win support,  
to win votes, to win re-election.

But there is another basic purpose  
to my work in these campaigns.

That purpose is to attempt to  
inform -- if I may say -- to educate  
the citizens of Minnesota and America  
on the issues.

Told by Nixon - now not the  
Time to Debate For Policy  
Help Kruusch

what is wrong? Ambassador  
Planning - Staffing - money  
Foreign Policy that offers New Hope,  
Heart, and Help! - Educa!!

My hope, my dream, my goal are  
not limited to winning cheers and gathering  
votes. My quest and my purpose are  
to help elevate the level of politics  
and the level of political thinking in  
America.

I was a teacher once, and I have  
not lost the sense of mission which  
every teacher must have -- to inspire  
intelligent, rational independent thought.

There is one level of thought --  
one low, bigoted level of thought --  
which has deeply disturbed me this year.

I have been surprised and saddened  
that the religious issue in this campaign  
has persisted so long and so intensely,  
~~this year.~~

I have been shocked and shamed  
by the viciousness of attacks by  
bigots and political hate-mongers ---  
---- Shocked because these attacks  
continue, despite the forceful statements  
of the Democratic presidential candidate  
supporting the concept of separation of  
church and state.

----Shamed because the proud traditions  
of decency, democracy and fair play  
have been blotched by demagoguery.

If America expects to endure in  
the democratic tradition and lead the  
free nations toward a world of justice  
and peace, <sup>then</sup> every candidate and every  
citizen must show moral maturity on  
matters of race, creed and religion.

The world is covered with diverse  
peoples, diverse thought, diverse  
religions. Millions elsewhere will  
label us immature and hypocritical unless  
we reject the expressions of religious  
<sup>intolerance</sup>  
bigotry which are so tragically frequent  
today.

↳ The spirit and strength of America  
cannot endure if we allow the decay  
of demagoguery to spread.

↳ Each of us can help -- by ignoring  
or rejecting the bigots and by turning  
our attention to the positive programs  
of the candidates and the real issues  
of the campaign.

Each man must be judged on the  
basis of his intelligence, his knowledge,

his experience, his skill, his integrity  
as an American and a human being.

Let us concern ourselves with those  
qualities. Let us strive to blot  
out prejudice and bigotry by informing,  
by educating, by teaching.

####

Sept 15  
John Mc Gill  
Joseph Reece

Cy Crawford  
Dum Peterson

Mary Beth Shafer

SLOW-DOWN IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Winona DFL Bean Feed  
7 p.m., Tuesday  
October 4, 1960

St Mary's St. Theresa's, Winona State College

Under Franklin Roosevelt and Harry  
Truman, the American economy grew at an  
average rate of  $5\frac{1}{2}$  percent a year.

Under this Republican Administration,  
the American economy has grown only  $2\frac{1}{2}$  percent  
a year.

Meanwhile, the Soviet economy has grown  
by 6 to 9 percent a year over the past eight  
years -- two to three times as fast as  
economic growth here under the Republicans.

Careful, objective non-partisan reports  
by the Director of our Central Intelligence

Agency and by the Joint Economic

Committee of Congress show that the brutally

fast, forced economic development of heavy

industry and power in the Soviet Union and

Communist China will threaten the economic

supremacy of the United States by 1970 if

our country lags behind its full economic

potential.

↳ The Republican presidential

candidate, Mr. Nixon, says it is

unpatriotic to call attention to the

slow-down in our economic growth.

↳ I say it is unpatriotic and foolish

and dangerous to ignore it.

↳ It is the duty of Senator Kennedy to

criticize the Republican tight-money

policies and penny-wise, pound-foolish

*Don't Discuss  
Foreign Policy*

fiscal policies which have put a straitjacket  
on America's capacity to compete in the  
Cold War.

L And it is my duty to work for policies  
which will keep America strong.

L If the Republicans had continued the  
Roosevelt-Truman growth rate, our national  
income would now be \$600 billion instead  
of \$500 billion.

Look  
\$600B

That would mean we would have 20 percent  
more money for schools and roads -- 20 percent  
more money for housing and automobiles and  
all the other items in the family market  
basket which provide a higher standard of  
living for the American people.

Here's  
how to  
pay!



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)