

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
A NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE GRAIN TRADE

November 2, 1973

Senator Humphrey: Thank you very much, Miss Dena. I was hoping you would brag on me a little. You know, coming from Washington these days you need someone to say a nice word about you! Even if you have to take it back after we leave. (Laughter) But I gather that my good friend, Orville Freeman has said, "Don't say too much about him. It goes to his head quickly and he will talk longer than he planned and that's longer than we planned on staying."

So let me say first of all how pleased I am to be with you and to share some thoughts at this fine seminar that you are having. Of course, I am pleased to see Mr. Vernon of the Kansas City Board of Trade. I am also pleased to see Mr. J. J. Henry and Mr. Lebeck, the new president of the Chicago Board of Trade, and Joe Ryan, my very dear and good friend who spoke to you this morning. But let us have what we call the "presumption of innocence" to start off with, that they are all fine folks, and we will save ourselves some time.

I have prepared some remarks for you, based upon some hearings that we are at present undertaking in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as some hearings in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I am privileged to serve on both of the committees. I also am chairman of the Consumer Economics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress. So I am deeply involved by desire, by direction and by interest in matters relating to agriculture and food policy.

(more)

I have served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I believe, for 15 years as a U. S. Senator. I worked with our good friend here, the former Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, during the years of President Kennedy's Administration and President Johnson's Administration. Orville used to have trouble with me from time to time, because occasionally, I would take a proprietorial interest in Minnesota farmers and he had become a national figure at that time. A little later, I was Vice President and I was a national figure without authority! (Laughter) That is the worst possible position. (Laughter)

Having said all that, let me just get to what I would like to say to you today. I say it as an associate, a friend, someone who is struggling to find some answers.

In the year 1793, Thomas Malthus predicted that man would breed himself into a corner of misery by increasing his numbers beyond his ability to feed himself. While historically this theory has been subjected to occasional debate, the advances of science and the general belief that the world's natural resources are unlimited have resulted in its being given little serious attention.

Might I say that when you live in the Midwest, as I do, and view the vast open spaces, it just doesn't seem that there is a serious population problem. But I changed this view quickly today when I landed at Kennedy Airport and tried to get into this town. (Laughter) There is not

(more)

HUMPHREY = 3

only a population problem, but could you please do something about the traffic?

During the past decade, scholars, scientists, social planners and government leaders have begun to reexamine the basic process underlying the Malthusian theory -- the ever shrinking ratio of people to resources.

One thing we learned in the space programs -- and I chaired that program for four years, was that when you put astronauts into a space capsule you measure the resources to the number of persons that are to occupy it and take into account the duration and time of their flight. You do not put five people into a capsule that was designed for three, with only enough food for two.

Wouldn't you think that we would be able to translate that experience into our everyday experience of living on this space satellite that we call "Earth?" The "Global Village?" Because just as surely as the Gemini program, the Mercury program and the Apollo program were space programs with space capsules and satellites, the earth is exactly the same thing, just on a larger dimension, that is all. But no one seems to want to measure the time that it can be in orbit in terms of the availability of resources and the carrying capacity of that capsule, or of that satellite called "Earth." So I bring you the issue then of population and food.

(more)

The United States, for instance, with six percent of the world's population, accounts for about 40 percent of the world's annual consumption of natural resources.

In other words, as that famous philosopher, Pogo, once stated, "We have met the enemy and they is us!"

Now you might very well ask, "What does all this have to do with agriculture and the world food situation?"

I'm here to tell you, "A lot."

The goal of controlling the continued expansion of world population still eludes us, despite tremendous efforts. The world's population continues to expand at a rate of about two percent a year, no matter what we have done, no matter how much money we have poured out and how much other people have done. It was two percent in 1890, two percent in 1900, two percent in 1920, and it is still two percent. Added to this demand factor of increased population is yet another major claimant on the world's food resources and other resources, which is rising affluence. When I get the NEW YORK TIMES on Sundays, I know that I have just consumed a forest! (Laughter) That's a fact, literally a fact. And we accept all of this as just the way it ought to be.

The U. S. automobile industry -- and, if any of its representatives are here I want to scold you -- this year is building bigger cars, consuming more fuel with larger engines, and building / longer wheel bases than it did a year ago. They pay no attention to the energy shortage, except in ads which are

(more)

tax deductible. These ads tell people, "Be nice. Don't consume too much. Drive slow, etc." And then they put 400 horses under the hood, so that you can drive from your home to the supermarkets nine blocks away! You might just as well buy yourself an Apollo capsule to travel from Albany to New York. You don't need it. We don't need it, but somehow or other we just don't care.

I am an old-fashioned politician, and I believe in what I call "physiological politics," -- empty stomach, full head; full stomach, empty head. As long as you have got it, don't worry. As long as it is working, nobody will care. I hate to be a cynic. But I have been at it a long time. And we Americans will not learn out of reason. We learn out of tragedy, sorrow, misery and crisis. We have not yet quite witnessed the crisis. We also have forgotten that it comes at geometrical rates and compound interest.

 If I were here three years ago talking as I am now, they would have said, "Huh, get the doctor. The fellow's in trouble." Five years ago, they would have said, "You are off your rocker." Of course there were many people who said that anyway.

(Laughter) Could you imagine a candidate for President five years ago running on the platform that we were going to face an energy crisis and a food crisis? At that time we thought we had energy that was unlimited and we had food in surplus, and my friend, Secretary Freeman, was wrestling with what were

(more)

called "the problems of surplus."

But in five years the crises are here. Five years ago we knew we had problems, but they weren't tough enough and big enough and sufficiently visible for a public like ours to understand them.

One of the reasons for this is that we don't have any planning in this country. You are parents, many of you, and you don't have plans for education beyond the next month for your children. You are not even sure that the budget will be there. Your Federal Government doesn't have any plans. Every school district in the United States has got to depend on about eight percent Federal aid, hopefully. School administrators don't know whether they are going to get ^{this assistance} / in January, February, March, April or May, or whether they are going to get it at all.

The only things that we plan for are Interstate Highways and the Pentagon. That is why they get the money. (Laughter) It's true. I'm not being critical. That's why they get the money. (Applause) The Pentagon has long-term plans for new weapon systems and they work on them for years and they get them. They got \$80 billion worth this year. We have an Interstate Highway System, because we locked up the money in a trust fund to insure that it would be spent for highways. They put pavements right smack bang through the cathedral and through the hospital and into your front room and across the baby's crib -- if you just give them enough money. Why?

(more)

They have plans. (Laughter) But we surely don't have a food plan. We haven't had an energy plan, and, might I add, that is what the problem is today.

Now, in the poor countries, the availability of grain -- as I have found out recently, averages only 400 pounds a year, or about one pound per day. Practically all of this grain is consumed directly.

In the United States and Canada, on the other hand, per capita consumption of cereal grains is now approaching nearly 2,000 pounds per year, most of which is converted into meat, milk and eggs.

What does this mean in terms of "input" requirements, the amounts of land, water, fertilizer and energy, seed, credit, transportation and storage needed to satisfy such consumption habits?

Briefly stated, it means that the amount of such resources used to support an average North American are nearly five times those required to support the average Indian, African or South American.

The United States today supplies almost 50 percent of the world's wheat exports, 60 percent of the world's feed grain exports and 90 percent of the world's soybean exports. While this means that our nation has an agricultural productive capacity far in excess of its own food needs, it also means that much of the world is directly dependent upon us for its food.

(more)

I might add -- that's power. Every time we see a three or four star general, someone says, "That's power." That's not power at all. Napoleon knew a lot about winning and losing wars, and he said that an army travels on its stomach. I listen to all this talk about national security, and I believe in national security, because I know that in the kind of crazy world in which we live you have to have it. But I want to ask you a question: "How much national security do we have when we are worried about whether we are going to have any heating oil out in the Midwest? How much national security do you have when you take a look at the food situation that I am describing today? National security is not just the number of bombs that a nation has. It is a lot of other things that I will not burden you with today, including the sense of confidence and trust of the people in their government. How much national security do you think we have?"

While we look at this tremendous reserve, at this power of food, let me remind you that it is also the new currency of the world. We have gone right back to primitive conditions. We are trading commodities today.

We also have to remember that our nation is dependent upon other parts of the world for the input resources needed to produce all of this food. That reminds me how conveniently we can ignore our relationships, for example, with the treasure house of resources called Africa. They have the resources, while we have been using ours up.

(more)

I come from Minnesota, and Orville comes from Minnesota, where the great open pit iron mines were located. A couple of wars and a lot of economic expansion took care of that. Today they are simply holes in the ground. Now we have to go to Liberia and other places for such resources. And yet all too often we pay too little attention to these nations in our diplomacy. We send our less experienced diplomats to them. We give them less attention economically. And we have not even decided to join the African Development Bank. We must do a better job of working with them.

In other words, food production and supply is a two-way street. And it is getting crowded. There are a lot of other folks in that street. Any disruption or denial of needed agricultural inputs will result in food supply shortages -- and, today, given the fact that the U. S. and world grain reserves are at their lowest levels in decades, anything adversely affecting food production in the near future, especially in the U. S., which is the real food reserve country, will have immediate and, I suggest, catastrophic effects on the food deficit areas of the world.

If worse comes to worst in this regard, the American consumer can be protected -- but not without a price. The price to the American consumer under these circumstances would likely be some shortages and much higher grocery bills, but the price to many outside the U. S. could mean no food at all -- starvation and death.

(more)

When the Arab countries cut off petroleum supplies to the U. S., they are in effect cutting food grain supplies that are available for export from this country to assist the needy and sometimes the starving peoples of the world, including many millions of Americans today. It takes nine calories of energy input to produce one calorie of food for the U. S. consumer. It takes five calories of energy input to produce one calorie that we export. Therefore, any substantial dislocation of the energy input, such as oil from overseas, will sharply reduce our production, and -- thereby -- could deny the needy nations, the poor nations of the world and their peoples, particularly in Africa and Asia, of the food they desperately need. If need be, we can, through export controls, have sufficient food for our own people.

I don't advocate export controls -- don't misunderstand me -- but, if it gets rough -- I think that somewhere in our diplomacy we need those who will say to some people round the world that there is a word spelled F-O-O-D, and we have it. And, if they don't start playing ball and quit trying to blackmail us, we know what we can do with it. (Applause) I think that there needs to be some kind of tough talk. (Applause)

(more)

God only knows that we don't want to do that, but there are people who will literally cut off their noses to spite their faces. And today in the Mediterranean area they need food. I notice, for instance, that the very countries in Africa that are cutting their diplomatic relations with Israel-African countries, other than the Arab countries, are the very countries that are dependent upon the U. S. today for grants of food. I just want to put it in perspective, because you need to know what your arsenal is, and you need to know what your tool kit is, and you need to know what your resources are, because other people do. We have become so accustomed to having food -- so much that we fill up all the garbage cans even before we fill the refrigerator or the cupboard -- that we have never realized how important it was, as a country, or as a people, or as you do. You are in the business; you know. But Mr. and Mrs. Consumer still do not understand its international implications. All that they understand about food right now is that it is high priced. You have got to help bring some understanding to this entire population of ours and the world as to what it is all about.

Senator Huddleston and I, chairing two separate subcommittees recently, joined together in a study called "The American Agricultural System: Domestic and Foreign Elements Affecting U. S. Agricultural Policy." We have copies available for you. It is a source book that you will find helpful.

(more)

We are also going to do a special study on the question of weather, transportation, storage, credit and a whole series of matters related to U. S. world food supply.

We want to get the American community more fully informed about agriculture -- and what a place to talk about it, New York! I remember when Orville used to give speeches on the Eastern seaboard on agriculture. No one wanted to listen.

I have had New York reporters in and given them basic courses like this: farmer, spelled F-A-R-M-E-R. Now let's spend two days on that. (Applause)

I talked with a young fellow from the Nader organization sometime ago. He was giving me a rough time on agriculture. And I said, "If you think it's so good, why don't you go out there and get a job? I've got a fellow who has been looking for a young fellow like you for years. He and his wife have to do all the farming, because he can't find anyone like you. If you want to talk about dairying, why don't you take one of those seven-day a week jobs? We have no five-day cows. We have only seven-day cows out our way."

Some of our young people don't understand agriculture at all. They have no comprehension of it. Our universities don't teach them anything about agriculture, except that milk comes in bottles, and that everything that you eat comes in cans. (Laughter) We have lost a whole generation or perhaps a couple of generations of understanding. But we are going to change this situation, don't worry.

(more)

Notwithstanding any man-made or political threats to the achievement of expanded agricultural production this next year, let us now examine what is in prospect, assuming normal weather conditions. World grain and oilseed prospects point to record crops this year. Rice supplies are the tightest among major commodities at present and will likely remain so for the immediate future.

Let's also examine world consumption estimates for this next year. While world grain production prospects point to record crops this next year, consumption is expected to exceed that record production, which will mean even further drawdowns on carryover or limited reserve stocks.

So, when you read those production figures -- and I know you are interested in them -- you have also got to think about the utilization figures. We are getting a whole lot more heating oil this year than we got 10 years ago in Minnesota. We are going to get more heating oil this year than we got three years ago. But we have more Minnesotans than we had 10 years ago and three years ago. Besides that, we have changed the type of fuel that we use. We have gone from coal to heating oil. So production is not the answer. It is production as it is balanced off ^{against} demand or utilization.

The world carryover, as we call it, reserve stocks of all grains: wheat, coarse grains and rice, is estimated at about 100m metric tons. When you say that to the average person, he says, "Well, what are you all excited about, Humphrey?"

(more)

That is about one month's supply."

On July 1st of this year wheat stocks in the four major exporting countries, the U. S., Canada, Australia and the Argentine, were at their lowest levels in two decades. Grain stocks in many other countries of the world have also been drawn down very sharply. What all this adds up to is that the world will be almost entirely at the mercy of next year's weather. Reserve stocks of grain during this next year will be too thin to protect against any major crop failure. Pardon me if I am concerned about it, but I grew up in South Dakota. For this reason I understood the Russians a couple of years ago, when they said that they had bad weather in August which adversely affected crop production. I saw my father literally weep and worry his life away looking at crops that were beautiful in July and were nothing in August. Bad weather!

And let's not pass over the "weather" portion of this equation too quickly.

During hearings on the world food situation, which I chaired with Senator Huddleston last week in Washington, Dr. Reid A. Bryson, Director of the Institute of Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin, reminded us of the 20-year drouth cycle to which the United States has historically been subjected.

While he gave no evidence, or in any way tried to convince us that our nation's Midwest and Great Plains regions would be subjected to such conditions next year, he did remind us that

(more)

the last major drouth occurred in those regions during the early 1960's and that, in his judgment, some repeat of such conditions probably could be expected sometime during this decade.

His general analysis of this situation should serve as an ominous and serious warning to the world about the need to protect against such changing weather patterns through explicit food reserve policies in the future.

Our nation and the other nations of the world must begin immediately to work towards national and international food and agricultural policies which recognize the inter-relationship of all of the inputs and all of their respective actions. Specifically, here is what I believe must be done to deal effectively with this galaxy of problems.

First, a more exhaustive and intensive effort must be undertaken by all countries to control continued population growth. There is a limit to arable, tillable land, and there is a limit to how much you can put on that land and still get more production. So we have to deal with the population problem. This is needed, not only in the developing nations where we are perfectly willing to say to them, "Slow down," but also in the more affluent nations where resource consumption has reached staggering levels. We may have a population growth rate of near zero here, but we eat so much and use so much that it is as if we had a population with a factor of two to one.

(more)

Second, affluent nations must also temper their own consumption habits in the future, especially as they relate to excessive depletion of nonrenewable resources. These resources are not unlimited.

Third, a world conference to deal with the problems threatening the world's food supplies should be convened immediate. I have urged the President in the amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of this year, plus correspondence with the President, to initiate a world conference to study and report on such issues as barriers to increased world food production, world availability of agricultural inputs, such as fuel and fertilizer, and the requirements for humanitarian food assistance over the coming decade.

Fourth, the countries of the world must give the highest priority to increasing the volume of farm output, instead of directing their attention only to ways to restrict production and markets by trade barriers, higher consumer prices and other such practices. I noticed yesterday again in the press that the OECD is now recognizing that our foreign aid programs over the past have been misdirected. They have been trying to industrialize people, when they should have been improving world food production.

By the way, our new Foreign Assistance Act places special emphasis upon the poorest of the poor nations, on food production, on nutrition, on family planning, health and education. That is what is in the Foreign Assistance Act this

(more)

coming year. Senator Aiken of Vermont and I wrote that Act. We did not take the Administration bill. We barely got our bill through the Congress, and we still have people who think that we don't need it. But there is no way in God's green earth that you can prevent world starvation without increasing the output of agricultural production in these less developed countries. It is absolutely essential.

Fifth, there must be immediate consultation between the exporting and importing nations of the world on the question of access and equitable sharing of available foods, those in short supply. In other words what are we going to do in a tight supply situation? Export controls, or what is the method that we are going to use? We can't run around like we did on the soybean business and just slam them on and take them off. We need to be a reliable supplier if we are going to be in this business. But we need to have some understanding and not constantly work as though we thought the problem would never arise. It would be unconscionable for the more developed countries to forget the crucial food requirements, too, of the developing world -- these poorer countries -- when they encounter temporary shortages. Tight supplies may mean spot shortages and rising prices in this country, but in many countries of the world food scarcity of sharp price increases means death and insolvency.

(more)

Sixth, the developing countries must be provided with greater assistance in their efforts to meet their own food needs by expanding their production. As I have indicated to you, that is what we are trying to do in our Foreign Assistance Act. We must develop a system that offers the consumers of the United States and the world at least a minimum level of food security and reasonably stable prices.

Seventh, unless the world develops a system which ensures the availability of stored reserves large enough to offset these periodic production swings, the consequences for farm producers and the consumers of the world will become increasingly disastrous. To do this, we must begin immediately to establish a system here in the U. S. of domestic reserves to protect the American consumer from wild price escalation, to assure a stable income to the American farmer and to maintain our credibility in the world as a dependable supplier of food and fibre.

Currently pending before the Senate is a bill (S 2005) I introduced last May that would provide for an adequate level of domestic reserves of agricultural commodities -- wheat, corn, and soybeans. It needs prompt attention, and it deserves the support of the Congress and the President.

The skyrocketing food prices of this past year should underline the need to provide some stability in the prices of essential food items. Farmers also should support it to protect their prices in times of overproduction. But this alone isn't enough.

(more)

The United States must also participate in the establishment of an international system of strategic food reserves. In my amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, the President is directed to cooperate fully with other nations to establish such a reserve system. This is something that I have been calling for in the Senate for nearly 20 years. Perhaps its day has finally come.

Such a reserve would provide a minimum level of security for the peoples of the world from the ravages of hunger and malnutrition, such as those being experienced in Africa and Asia today.

I would think that you people would be up in arms about the situation on food reserves. If I were talking to a group of bankers today and said, "We have got a chairman of the Federal Reserve Board who says that we are going to liquidate all the reserves," they would say, "Let's get him. Let's not wait. It's criminal." You would not let it happen. What would you think of a medical profession that said, "We always make sure that there are no blood banks in any hospital. If we need some, we will run out in the street, find someone and tap them." (Laughter and applause). What would you think about it? Look how angry you are today at oil companies, because they say that they do not have enough supplies in their reserve tanks. Yet we have an agricultural policy that says, "Get rid of it."

(more)

So, I repeat, what we need is some action. One of the reasons that we have not established these food reserves is that farmers have been led to believe in some of their associations that ^{they} / will depress their prices. Therefore, we have to develop a reserve program that does not depress the market, but is available when we need it.

Why we even have reserves of bombs. This year we bought double the number of atomic warheads, because we have to have reserves. They say we are never going to use them. I hope and pray we don't, but we've got a lot of them. In fact we have reserves of every conceivable thing that you can think of, but we don't have any reserves of food. Thank God, we don't have an ally that's getting hungry! (Applause)

We have -- I won't say enemy -- but someone who has not always been our best friend who got a little hungry, and we said, "Don't worry, old buddy comrade, come and see us."

(Laughter) Don't misunderstand me: I believe in trade. I believe in selling the Russians anything they can't shoot back. (Laughter and applause)

So I am asking you to give a little attention to the bill providing for a reserve of agricultural commodities that we have introduced in the Congress.

I think you would be interested to know that about two weeks ago I was holding hearings on the world food bank proposal and I had before me documentation of some hearings which occurred on May 28, 1956. I conducted those hearings,

(more)

as the chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The witness before me at that time was the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz. And the bill before us was the bill introduced by Senator Murray of Montana and Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota to establish an international food reserve. Mr. Butz was opposed to it, and I was for it. I am still working on him. I think that in another two or three years I will have him. (Laughter) I think he's coming around.

Mr. Orville Freeman,
President, Business
International Corp.

I don't believe it! (Laughter)

Senator Humphrey: Truthfully, over 20 years ago, we first introduced this legislation, in 1952, not because we thought that there was a critical need then, but looking down the road we thought there may be times when we would need such reserves -- and it can take a long time to get things going in this country.

As we were saying on the way coming up here, if we were able to get all the crude oil that all the Arabs could ship to us in all ^{the} boats that anyone could provide, it would not really help us in our energy situation, because we have not the refineries, we haven't the pipe lines, we don't have the super-ports. It just takes time. No matter how good the hen, it takes 21 days to hatch an egg, dear friends. It takes time to get these things done.

(more)

Therefore, to establish grain reserves, it takes time. The developed and the less developed -- both -- have to accumulate reserves on a planned basis, a little each year -- until they build those facilities and get those reserves operating as part of their total economic structure.

Now, there must be equitable sharing of the cost of such a system between both the producer and the consumer nations. We should not pick up the bill alone. We have gotten into the habit around here of saying, "Well, we'll just do that." We can't do that any more. I have reminded some of my associates that some other people have a lot of cash now. Let them in on the act. It is important, too, that these reserves should be strategically located as well in various parts of the world, so that they will be readily available when needed.

Finally, we must take the opportunity offered in the upcoming round of trade negotiations to tailor world agricultural policies toward increasing world farm output and expanding world agricultural trade.

Without generally accepted rules to guide national farm policies, we force governments to solve their own agricultural problems without regard to the external effects of such actions.

So now, if the nations of the world are to meet the food needs of their people, three basic issues must be dealt with. They are:

(more)

population control; access to the resources required to produce food (fuel, transportation, storage, fertilizer, seed, land, water, credit); and improved management and conservation of such resources.

Unless the world's continued population expansion can be stopped or at least slowed down, the horrible proof of Malthus' theory may soon be at hand.

Unless our nation and the rest of the world soon learns the importance of sharing access to the essential resources required to produce food, major breakdowns in even current production levels will likely occur -- petroleum today being a classic example and fertilizer another.

And, unless both our country and the rest of the world do more to improve the management and conservation of the world's limited resources -- especially the non-renewable type -- many of these resources which are essential to food production will be tragically lost through waste or misallocation.

In short, unless we become better managers of our own destiny, mankind will surely collide with himself and the natural limits to his environment.

So, today, I have discussed with you some of the issues which I believe we must address ourselves, and actions which ought to be taken if the world is to enjoy a minimum level of food security in the years and decades ahead. Food is power; food is wealth; food is national security; food is health; food is more essential than anything else, save the air that

(more)

we breathe and the water that we drink. The stakes are too high to let the food policies be established after the crises are upon us. When that occurs, it is usually too late, and our producers and consumers of the world demand that we act now and move towards a clearly defined national and international food policy. We need the best brains that this country has to offer and the best that the world has to offer before it is too late. Because, as surely as we are gathered in this room, a decade from now, in the year 1983, if we haven't acted, we shall be holding crisis meetings as to how to prevent mass starvation in this world. And, in that kind of world, there is no peace. A hungry man knows no reason. Thank you. (Applause)



consumption of natural resources.

In other words, as that famous philosopher, Pogo, once stated, "We have met the enemy and they is us!"

Now you might very well ask, "What does all this have to do with agriculture and the world food situation?"

I'm here to tell you, "A lot."

The goal of controlling the continued expansion of world population still eludes us, despite tremendous efforts. The world's population continues to expand at a rate of about two percent a year, no matter ~~what~~ ^{what} we have done, no matter how much money we have ~~pour~~ poured out and how much other people have done. It was two percent in 1900, two percent in 1890, two percent in 1920, and it is still two percent. Added to this demand factor of increased population is yet another major claimant on the world's food resources and other resources, which is rising affluence. When I get the ~~NEW YORK~~ NEW YORK TIMES on Sundays, I know that I have just ~~consumed~~ consumed a forest! (Laughter). That's a fact, literally a fact. And we accept all of this as just the way it ought to be.

The U. S. automobile industry -- and, if any of its representatives are here ~~...~~ I want to scold you -- this year is building bigger cars, consuming more fuel with larger engines, longer wheel base, than it did a year ago. ~~...~~ They pay no attention to the energy shortage, except in ads which are tax deductible. These ads tell people, "Be nice. Don't consume too much. Drive slow, etc." And then they put 400 horses under the hood, so that you can drive from your home to the supermarkets nine blocks away! You might just as well buy yourself an Apollo capsule to travel from Albany to New York. You don't need it. We don't need it, but somehow or other we just don't care.

I am an old-fashioned politician, and I believe in what I call "physiological politics," -- empty stomach, full head; full stomach, empty head. As long as you have got it, don't worry. As long as it is working, nobody will care. I hate to be a cynic. But I have been at it a long time. And we Americans will not learn out of reason. We learn out of tragedy, sorrow, misery and crisis. We have not yet quite ~~witnessed~~ witnessed the crisis, ~~...~~. We also have forgotten that it comes ~~at~~ geometrical rates and compound interest. (more)

Would you ever believe that a few years ago. If I were here three years ago talking as I am now, they would have said, ~~Heh,~~ get the doctor. The fellow's in trouble." Five years ago, they would have said, "You are off your rocker." Of course there were many people who said that anyway. (Laughter). Could you imagine a candidate for President five years ago running on the platform that we were going to face an energy crisis and a food crisis? At that time we thought we had energy that was unlimited and we had food in surplus, and my friend, Secretary Freeman, was wrestling with what were called "the problems of surplus."

But in five years the crises are here. Five years ago we knew we had problems, but they weren't tough enough and big enough and sufficiently visible for a public like ours to understand them.

One of the reasons for this is that we don't have any planning in this country. ~~■~~ You are parents, many of you, and you don't have plans for education beyond the next month for your children. You are not even sure that the budget will be there. You ~~■~~ Federal Government ~~■~~ doesn't have any plans. Every school district in the United States has got to depend on about eight percent Federal aid, hopefully. ~~■~~ School administrators don't know whether they are going to get it in January, February, March, April or May, or whether they are going to get it at all.

The only things that we plan ~~■~~ for are Interstate ~~■~~ Highways and the Pentagon. That is why they get the money. (Laughter). It's true. I'm not being critical. That's why they get the money. (Applause). The Pentagon has long-term plans for new weapon systems and they work on them for years and they get them. They got \$80 billion worth this year. We have an Interstate Highways System, because we locked up the money in a trust fund to insure that it would be spent for highways. They put pavements right smack bang through the cathedral and through the hospital and into your front room and across the baby's crib -- if you just give them enough money. Why? They have plans. (Laughter). ~~■~~ But we surely don't have a food plan. We haven't had an energy plan, and, might I add, that is what the problem is today.

~~■~~ Now, in the poor countries, the availability of grain -- as I have found out recently, averages only ~~■~~ 400

pounds year year, or about one pound per day. Practically all of this grain is consumed directly.

In the United States and Canada, on the other hand, per capita consumption of cereal grains is now approaching nearly 2,000 pounds per year, most of which is converted into meat, milk and eggs.

What does this mean in terms of "input" requirements, the amounts of land, water, fertilizer and energy, seed, credit, transportation and storage needed to satisfy such consumption habits?

Briefly stated, it means that the amount of such resources used to support an average North American are nearly five times those required to support the average Indian, African or South American.

The United States today supplies almost 50 percent of the world's wheat exports, 60 percent of the world's feed grain exports and 90 percent of the world's soybean exports. While this means that our nation has an agricultural productive capacity far in excess of its own food needs, it also means that much of the world is directly dependent upon us for its food.

I might add -- that's power. Every time ^{we} see a three or four star general, someone says, "That's power." That's not power at all. Napoleon knew a lot about winning and losing wars, and he said that an army travels on its stomach. I listen to all this talk about national security, and I believe in national security, because I know that in the kind of crazy world in which we live you have to have it. But I want to ask you a question: "How much national security do we have when we are worried about whether we are ~~going~~ going to have any heating oil out in the Midwest? How much national security do you have when you take a look at the food situation that I am describing today? National security is not just the number of bombs that a nation has. It is a lot of other things that I will not burden you with today, including the sense of confidence and trust of the people in their government. How much national security do you think we have?

While we look at this tremendous reserve, at this power of food, let me remind you that it is also the new currency of the world. We have gone right back to primitive conditions. We are trading commodities today.

(more)

We also have to remember that our nation is dependent upon other parts of the world for the ~~input~~ input resources needed to produce all of this food. ~~That reminds me~~ That reminds me how conveniently we can ignore our relationships, for example, with the ~~treasure~~ treasure ~~house of resources called Africa.~~ house of resources called Africa. They have the resources, while we have been using ours up.

I come from Minnesota, and Orville comes from Minnesota, where the great open pit iron mines were located. A couple of wars and a lot of economic expansion took care of that. ~~Today~~ Today they are simply holes in the ground. Now we have to go to Liberia and other places for such resources. And yet all too often ~~we pay too little attention to these nations~~ we pay too little attention to these nations ~~in our diplomacy.~~ in our diplomacy. We ~~send our~~ send our ~~less~~ less experienced diplomats to them. We give them less attention economically. And we haven't even decided to join the African Development Bank. ~~We~~ We must do a better job of working with them.

In other words, food production and supply is a two-way street. And it is getting crowded. There are a lot of other folks in that street. Any disruption or denial of needed agricultural inputs will result in food supply shortages -- and, today, given the fact that the U. S. and world grain reserves are at their lowest levels in decades, anything adversely affecting food production in the near future, especially in the U. S., which is the real food reserve country, will have immediate and, I suggest, catastrophic effects on the food deficit areas of the world.

If worse comes to worst in this regard, the American consumer can be protected -- but not without a price. The price to the American consumer under these circumstances would likely be some shortages and much higher grocery bills, but the price to many outside the U. S. could mean no food at all -- ~~starvation and death.~~ starvation and death.

When the Arab countries cut off petroleum supplies to the U. S., they are in effect cutting food grain supplies that are available for export from this country to assist the needy and sometimes the starving peoples of the world, including many millions of Americans today. It takes nine calories of energy input to produce one calorie of food for the U. S. consumer. It takes five calories of energy input to produce one calorie that we export. Therefore, any substantial dislocation of the energy input, such as oil from overseas, will sharply reduce our

(more)

production, and -- thereby -- could deny the needy nations, the poor nations of the world and their peoples, particularly in Africa and Asia, of the food they desperately need. If need be, we can, through export controls, have sufficient food for our own people.

I don't advocate export controls -- don't misunderstand me -- but, if it gets rough -- I think that somewhere in our diplomacy we need those who will say to some people round the world that there is a word spelled F-O-O-D, and we have it. And, if they don't start playing ball and quit trying to blackmail us, we know what we can do with it. (Applause). I think that there needs to be some kind of tough talk. (Applause.)

God only knows that we don't want to do that, but there are people who will literally cut off their noses to spite their faces. ~~And today in the Mediterranean area they need food. I notice, for instance, that the very countries in Africa that are cutting their diplomatic relations with Israel-African countries, other than the Arab countries, are the very countries that are dependent upon the U. S. today for grants of food. I just want to put it in perspective, because you need to know what your arsenal is, and you need to know what your toolkit is, and you need to know what your resources are, because other people do. We have become so accustomed to having food -- so much that we fill up all the garbage cans even before we fill the refrigerator or the cupboard -- that we have never realized how important it was, as a country, or as a people, or as you do. You are in the business; you know. But Mr. and Mrs. Consumer still do not understand its international implications. All that they understand about food right now is that it is high priced. You have got to help bring some understanding to this entire population of ours and the world as to what it is all about.~~

~~By the way, we have brought to your attention today a study that~~
~~our subcommittee have just put out~~
Senator Huddleston and I, chairing two separate subcommittees joined together in a study called "The American Agricultural System: Domestic and Foreign Elements Affecting U. S. Agricultural Policy." We have

Amphibian - 010

drowth

of the Institute of Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin, reminded us of the 20-year ~~cycle~~ cycle to which the United States has historically been subjected.

While he gave no evidence, or in any way tried to convince us that our nation's ^{Midwest} ~~Midwest~~ and Great Plains regions would be subjected to such conditions next year, he did remind us that the last ~~major~~ major drowth occurred in those regions during the early 1960's and that, in his judgment, some repeat of such conditions probably could be expected sometime during this decade.

His general analysis of this situation should serve as an ominous and serious warning to the world about the need to protect against such changing weather patterns through explicit food reserve policies in the future.

Our nation and the other nations of the world must begin immediately to work towards national and international food and agricultural policies which recognize the inter-relationship of all of the inputs and all of their respective actions. Specifically, here is what I believe must be done to deal effectively with this galaxy of problems.

First, a more exhaustive and intensive effort must be undertaken by all countries to control continued population growth. There is a limit to arable, tillable land, and there is a limit to how much you can put on that land and still get more production. ~~So~~ So we have to deal with the population problem. This is needed, not only in the developing nations where we are perfectly willing to say to them, "Slow down," but also in the more affluent nations where resource consumption has reached staggering levels. We may have ~~population~~ a population growth rate of near zero here, but we eat so much and use so much that it is as if we had a population with a factor of two to one.

Second, affluent nations must also temper their own consumption habits in the future, especially as they relate to excessive depletion of nonrenewable resources. These resources are not unlimited.

Third, a world conference to deal with the problems threatening the world's food supplies should be convened immediately. I have urged the President in the amendment to ~~the~~ the Foreign Assistance Act of this year, plus correspondence with the President, to initiate a world conference to study and report on such issues as barriers to

increased world food production, world availability of agricultural ^(more)

inputs, such as fuel and fertilizer, and the requirements for humanitarian food assistance over the coming decade.

Fourth, the countries of the world must give the highest priority to increasing the volume of farm output, instead of directing their attention only to ways to restrict production and markets by trade barriers, higher consumer prices and other such practices. I noticed yesterday again in the press that the OECD is now recognizing that our foreign aid programs over the past have been misdirected. They have been trying to industrialize people, when they should have been improving world food production. By the way, our new Foreign Assistance Act ~~BA~~ places special emphasis upon the poorest of the poor nations, on food production, on nutrition, on family planning, health and education. That is what is in the Foreign Assistance Act this coming year. Senator Aiken of Vermont and I wrote that Act. We did not take the Administration bill. We barely got it through the Congress, and we still have ~~some~~ people who think that we don't need it. But there is no way in God's green earth that you can prevent world starvation without increasing the output of agricultural production in these less developed countries. It is ~~absolutely~~ absolutely essential.

Fifth, there must be ~~an~~ immediate consultation between the exporting and importing nations of the world on the question of access and equitable sharing of available foods -- the world supplies of food commodities in short supply. In other words what are we going to do in a tight supply situation? Export controls, or what is the method that we are going to use? We ~~can't~~ can't run around like we did on the soybean business and just slam ~~them~~ them on and take them off. We need to be a reliable supplier if we are going to be in this business. But we need to have some understanding and not constantly work as though we thought the problem would never arise. It would be unconscionable for the more developed countries to forget the crucial food requirements, too, of the development world -- these ~~poorer~~ poorer countries -- when they encounter temporary shortages. Tight supplies may mean spot shortages and rising prices in this country, but in many countries of the world food scarcity of sharp price increases means death and insolvency.

~~The~~ ^{side} developing countries must be provided with greater assistance in their efforts to meet their own food needs by expanding their

if we haven't acted, we shall be holding crisis meetings as to how to prevent mass starvation in this world. And, in that kind of world, there is no peace. A hungry man knows no reason. Thank you. (Applause)



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