

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
CONFERENCE ON WORLD HUNGER AND AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITY
SMITH COLLEGE
NORTHAMPTON, MASSACHUSETTS

February 19, 1976

Recently a full-page Wall Street Journal advertisement asked the question --

"CAN ANYONE FEED A FAMILY OF EIGHT BILLION?"

"If there's hope for the future," said the ad, "it's improved technology."

Down at the bottom of the column, the ad concluded:

"But we know technology is not enough.

"So, we'll also be praying for sunshine, warmth and rain."

But if we're really going to feed seven or eight billion people 35 years from now we better add a few things to that prayer list. Things like common sense, sound economics, parity for producers, equity for consumers, luck, and most important of all, the will to do what's necessary.

At the World Food Conference in Rome, Pope Paul told us that only about one half of the world's arable land is in use. He and others have speculated that the globe could sustain a population of 30 to 40 billion people.

What has been holding us back is not a lack of physical capacity to produce enough food. We have the technology, the resources and the ability.

What we lack is the will to banish hunger -- and the plan to get it done.

There is no United States food policy. And we have only the beginnings of a world food policy.

Our farmers were asked this year to plant row to row and they were promised access to world markets. But before the harvest was completed, the government again placed controls it calls "voluntary restraints" on export sales.

The consumer also has suffered since 1972 from price changes and fluctuations in supply. You may recall that it was in 1972 that the Administration allowed our food reserve to dwindle from a supply of several months to less than a month.

It is being said today that food policy is too important to be left to the Department of Agriculture. I disagree. While we need to have a coordinated policy, the basic responsibility and initiative should rest in the Department of Agriculture.

Food policy is too important to be left to chance. It is too important to be left to a Secretary of Agriculture who refuses to face a changed world but still want to stay in office.

It is no wonder that some of the responsibility for food decisions has drifted to the Departments of State, Labor and Commerce, as well as White House staffers not very well posted on food matters. There is a very real leadership vacuum at the Department of Agriculture.

We have been inviting disaster for farmers and consumers for the past three years. And disaster has come calling sometimes for farmers, sometimes for consumers, and sometimes for both at the same time.

Part of the reasoning for the Nixon-Butz decision in 1972 to get rid of existing food reserves was that they were too costly to keep.

It is true that the cost of carrying food stocks today is small, and that government costs of farm programs are down sharply.

I doubt, however, that you have noticed the saving on your tax bill.

But you have noticed what has happened to your food bill. It went up by about 35 percent from 1972 to 1974.

The food bill of American citizens has increased by more than \$57 billion in the last three years. This is the result of reducing the government's role in stabilizing food production and marketing and turning you over to the tender mercies of the Butz boom and bust market.

That \$57 billion is more than it cost the taxpayer in farm stabilization and conservation programs in the last 40 years.

A recent study by Georgetown University shows that in only 11 of the last 50 years did our farmers break even or make a profit. This should end the notion that our farmers have been subsidized by urban America. To the contrary, our farmers have been subsidizing the American consumer for years.

I like the subject of this conference, and I believe that America has a unique role to play in this hungry world.

But how can we keep or even make sense in talking about world hunger when we do not have the basic elements of a workable food policy in our own country?

The time has come to turn away from the failures of the past several years.

How many more times will our producers and consumers have to be burned by volatile markets?

How much longer will we expose our overseas customers to the gnawing uncertainty about us as a supplier?

And how long will we turn our backs on the real and present hunger in the world?

It no longer is good enough for the poor to eat only in the good years.

It no longer is good enough for farmers to prosper only once in a while.

It no longer is good enough to ask our farm families to plant this year's crops when wildly gyrating prices give them no clue as to whether they will recover their investment, let alone make a profit.

It no longer is good enough for our export customers to wonder whether they will be left holding an empty bag if supplies tighten up here.

It no longer is good enough to have to choose between supplying our own people and those beyond our borders.

And it no longer is good enough to hide behind the excuse that we can't feed the whole world -- and use that to justify doing less than we are able to do.

I've recited some of the problems with our present policies. Now let me explain what I believe we need in a food policy.

First, it must be based on a commitment to abundance.

Next, it must be comprehensive and coordinated -- an integrated set of policies relating food production, processing, marketing, distribution, exports, trade, consumption and nutrition.

Third, it must seek several specific objectives, including:

- A fair return to farmers to sustain high-level production:
- Adequate food supplies at reasonably stable prices for consumers and users of farm products;
- Being a reliable supplier on the world export market;
- Supporting feeding programs for the needy here and abroad;
- Improved nutrition, here and abroad: and
- Assuring adequate inputs, transportation and credit for agricultural requirements.

A national food policy geared to these objectives is more than just desirable. It is essential. And I am convinced that the American people would support such a policy.

I have been chairing some food policy hearings being conducted by the Technology Assessment Board of the Office of Technology Assessment to identify the components of a comprehensive national food policy.

In the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, which I chair, we have given attention to the role which agriculture must play in a full-employment, full-production economy.

And in the Foreign Agricultural Policy Subcommittee, which I also chair, we have been examining ways of achieving better coordination of our food policies.

I have spent much of my time on the producer side of the food problem equation because it is the least understood by the public -- and because we have a great deal to lose unless we can keep our family farmers producing at high levels. It generally is not realized that the American food and agricultural economy is a \$600 billion industry -- about eight times the size of the auto industry.

But there is a purchasing power side to the food problem as well. Our whole food situation would be much brighter if we were functioning in a healthy national economy.

Even in good economic times, about 10 percent of our people have been hungry or malnourished. With today's massive unemployment and continuing inflation, many more citizens have been forced into this vulnerable class.

If a lesson can be drawn from the experiences of the past three years, it is that we have a new ball game. New mechanisms for decision-making are needed to respond to the structural changes in agriculture.

While U.S. stocks have increased sharply in the past year, world production is only slightly above 1974 and three percent less than 1973. The prospects for the world is continuing tight supplies, with possibly a food deficit of 85 million tons in the developing countries by 1985. We need to be prepared for scarcity or occasional years of surplus.

In developing a food policy we must balance the needs of consumers and farmers. We do not have to put our livestock, poultry and dairy producers through an extreme of boom and bust, fueled by volatile feed prices.

And we also need to balance short and long term interests. In recent years, our decision-makers sometimes have taken short-term approaches with little regard for the longer term impact.

Thus, it was decided to put a cap on beef prices even though it was destined to create dislocations and higher prices in the future.

Later, it was decided to impose controls on exports even though this could set off a cycle of reduced sales abroad, depressed farm income, and reduced productivity.

We no longer can afford to have separate policies for different kinds of agricultural producers. In fact, we need not an agricultural policy, a consumer policy or a trade policy, but a policy which interrelates and balances all of these elements.

We must be conscious, too, that agriculture does not function in a world of its own. Efficient food production is highly dependent upon credit resources, energy, transportation, distribution, tax policies and basic research.

What I have said about the need for a balanced, interrelated U.S. policy on food also applies to a world which has entered a new era of food insecurity.

There is an new internationalism abroad in the world -- not based upon the old imperatives of diplomacy and security -- but based upon a sense of interdependence in the areas of commodities, technology, production and trade.

We have made efforts in this direction. But they have been feeble.

At the World Food Conference in Rome, we had to be dragged grudgingly into talking about what the conference wanted to discuss -- hunger and food security.

The Administration proudly has announced that our food exports -- at a value of around \$23 billion -- account for about 55 percent of food moving in the world market. And we provide about 80 percent of the world's food aid.

But the Administration is almost bashful about providing leadership. And it is in our interest to promote policies which encourage international cooperation and stability in the world food market.

In the words of Dr. Addeke Boerma, former Director General of the UN Food and Agricultural Organization:

"The world has allowed itself to drift into a degree of dependence on the powers exercised on the plains of North America."

At the UN Special Session last September, we did much better in trying to deal sympathetically and on an equal basis with the other nations of the world. And we can only hope that the follow-through will be in the spirit of economic cooperation declared by our spokesman.

The international crisis in energy has taught us some lessons in international cooperation. And one of them is that access to supplies is important as well as access to markets.

I have been a supporter of international economic cooperation and commodity agreements since I first came to the U.S. Senate in 1949.

The farmers and consumers of the world need an alternative to a world commodity trading system dominated by international corporate giants.

We also need to establish a world food reserve. It is not enough just to be for it. We must help implement it and make it work.

We need to be hard-boiled about insisting that the reserve be used for strategic and emergency purposes, not manipulated to drive the farmer out of business or to hold down prices. Thus far, negotiations under the International Wheat Council have been bogged down in discussions over the method by which stocks would be released.

As for a national reserve, it really is not that complicated a problem if we will trust farmers to keep the bulk of the stocks on the farm.

We can do this by providing an extended loan program for farmers. When the farmer sells, he will pay off the loan and interest. He's protected, the consumer is protected and society is better off.

A national food reserve and a world food reserve can benefit both farmers and consumers. But if we are going to use the food reserve to level off the peaks, there must be a parallel policy to level off the valleys.

We're all frustrated about the boom and the bust. But we have to get rid of both at the same time.

A balanced national food policy also must take into account the needs of the food deficit nations. We have provided over \$27 billion of food aid, and many more billions in aid to increase food production.

Food aid is not something which should be doled out haphazardly or in response to fluctuations in supply and prices in this country. It should be programmed to encourage production and not lock local farmers into a subsistence agriculture.

The world doesn't really lack food. It lacks effective purchasing power. And until this can be generated, we just will be treating the symptoms, not the real problem.

We ought to use our food aid to turn the people of the recipient nations into commercial customers for food products of their own or other farmers.

And we know that the food deficit nations can increase greatly their own production by utilizing today's existing technology. For example, rice yields in Bangladesh are only 53 percent of the world average and 24 percent of the U.S. average.

When we provide food aid, it is important that the recipient nations not discourage their own producers through cheap food policies. This will avoid developing permanent clients for our food aid.

And we must more sharply focus our aid programs aimed at expanding food production, rural credit, family planning, research and education. These programs ultimately tie back to poverty and inadequate food production.

In recent weeks, there have been numerous newspaper headlines about using our food as a weapon of foreign policy.

When I authored some of the early bills, including the Food For Peace Act, I talked about food as an instrument of foreign policy. But not in the sense of using it for coercion.

I visualized Food For Peace as a way to promote the foreign policy of the U.S. and help build world peace.

I did indeed refer to using food in the "arsenal of peace."

I pointed out that Food for Peace is more than a farm program -- that it is a foreign policy program and one in which we prove that we really care about people.

To sum up, America's first responsibility in this hungry world is to update its vision of the world and our place in it -- because it's a changed world.

The days of cheap food are over, and the days of plentiful food are in serious danger.

We still can have plentiful food for all. It is within our capacity.

But we have to choose between the mismanaged and self-defeating policies of today and the development of a managed program of abundance in a comprehensive, integrated national food policy.

If we continue on our present course, we are not going to be of much help to the hungry world. If we do not cope with hunger and poverty, whole societies may break down in violence and revolution.

On the world front, this will require cooperation, not confrontation.

Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University, declared:

"With a vision of a world which is larger than ourselves and our concerns of the moment, we can see that isolated lives of abundance would be mocked by indifference to the needs and desires of the vast majority of the human family.

"No nation, conceived and dedicated as this one was, could long endure as a community or moral individuals, while ignoring what is happening outside its borders, while ignoring its own role in perpetuating misery. Nor could we hope to secure the interests we have in the developing countries if we did not also respond to their needs as well. In this, there is a happy coincidence of our self-interest as Americans and our moral interest as part of the human family."

Today, we face the challenge of food insecurity -- whether we like it or not. We live in a dangerous world -- like it or not.

Those of use who are privileged to be Americans, with our opportunities and resources, the science and technology to produce food, must choose to use these resources constructively and wisely.

The nation which could conceive the Marshall Plan, Food for Peace, the Peace Corp, and so many other noble initiatives, is not short on courage or imagination. And we need not fail the hungry world at this crucial moment.

There is a destiny and a role for America. It's your choice now and mine.

#

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

CONFERENCE ON WORLD HUNGER AND AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITY

SMITH COLLEGE

NORTHAMPTON, MASSACHUSETTS

FEBRUARY 19, 1976

RECENTLY A FULL-PAGE WALL STREET JOURNAL ADVERTISEMENT

ASKED THE QUESTION --

"CAN ANYONE FEED A FAMILY OF EIGHT BILLION?"

"IF THERE'S HOPE FOR THE FUTURE," SAID THE AD, "IT'S

IMPROVED TECHNOLOGY."

DOWN AT THE BOTTOM OF THE COLUMN, THE AD CONCLUDED:

"BUT WE KNOW TECHNOLOGY IS NOT ENOUGH."

"SO, WE'LL ALSO BE PRAYING FOR SUNSHINE, WARMTH AND RAIN. 21!"

BUT IF WE'RE REALLY GOING TO FEED SEVEN OR EIGHT BILLION

PEOPLE 35 YEARS FROM NOW WE BETTER ADD A FEW THINGS TO THAT

PRAYER LIST. THINGS LIKE COMMON SENSE, SOUND ECONOMICS, PARITY

FOR PRODUCERS, EQUITY FOR CONSUMERS, LUCK, AND MOST IMPORTANT

OF ALL, THE WILL TO DO WHAT'S NECESSARY.

L AT THE WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE IN ROME, POPE PAUL TOLD US
THAT ONLY ABOUT ONE HALF OF THE WORLD'S ARABLE LAND IS IN USE.

L HE AND OTHERS HAVE SPECULATED THAT THE GLOBE COULD SUSTAIN A
POPULATION OF 30 TO 40 BILLION PEOPLE.

L WHAT HAS BEEN HOLDING US BACK IS NOT A LACK OF PHYSICAL
CAPACITY TO PRODUCE ENOUGH FOOD. WE HAVE THE TECHNOLOGY, THE
RESOURCES AND THE ABILITY.

L WHAT WE LACK IS THE WILL TO BANISH HUNGER -- AND THE PLAN
TO GET IT DONE the mobilization of Resources

L ^{overall} THERE IS NO UNITED STATES FOOD POLICY. AND WE HAVE ONLY
THE BEGINNINGS OF A WORLD FOOD POLICY.

L ~~OUR FARMERS WERE ASKED THIS YEAR TO PLANT ROW TO~~
ROW AND THEY WERE PROMISED ACCESS TO WORLD MARKETS.

BUT BEFORE THE HARVEST WAS COMPLETED, THE GOVERNMENT AGAIN PLACED CONTROLS IT CALLS "VOLUNTARY RESTRAINTS" ON EXPORT SALES.

THE CONSUMER ALSO HAS SUFFERED SINCE 1972 FROM PRICE CHANGES AND FLUCTUATIONS IN SUPPLY. YOU MAY RECALL THAT IT WAS IN 1972 THAT THE ADMINISTRATION ALLOWED OUR FOOD RESERVE TO DWINDLE FROM A SUPPLY OF SEVERAL MONTHS TO LESS THAN A MONTH.

IT IS BEING SAID TODAY THAT FOOD POLICY IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE LEFT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. I DISAGREE.

WHILE WE NEED TO HAVE A COORDINATED POLICY, THE BASIC RESPONSIBILITY AND INITIATIVE SHOULD REST IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

FOOD POLICY IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE LEFT TO CHANCE. IT IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE LEFT TO A SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE WHO REFUSES TO FACE A CHANGED WORLD BUT STILL WANTS TO STAY IN OFFICE.

IT IS NO WONDER THAT SOME OF THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOOD
DECISIONS HAS DRIFTED TO THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, LABOR AND
COMMERCE, AS WELL AS WHITE HOUSE STAFFERS NOT VERY WELL POSTED
ON FOOD MATTERS. THERE IS A VERY REAL LEADERSHIP VACUUM AT THE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

WE HAVE BEEN INVITING ^{trouble} ~~DISASTER~~ FOR FARMERS AND CONSUMERS
FOR THE PAST THREE YEARS. ^{trouble} AND ~~DISASTER~~ HAS COME CALLING
SOMETIMES FOR FARMERS, SOMETIMES FOR CONSUMERS, AND SOMETIMES
FOR BOTH AT THE SAME TIME.

PART OF THE REASONING FOR THE NIXON-BUTZ DECISION IN 1972
TO GET RID OF EXISTING FOOD RESERVES WAS THAT THEY WERE TOO
COSTLY TO KEEP.

IT IS TRUE THAT THE COST OF CARRYING FOOD STOCKS TODAY IS SMALL,
AND THAT GOVERNMENT COSTS OF FARM PROGRAMS ARE DOWN SHARPLY.

L I DOUBT, HOWEVER, THAT YOU HAVE NOTICED THE SAVING ON
YOUR TAX BILL.

L BUT YOU HAVE NOTICED WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO YOUR FOOD BILL.
IT WENT UP BY ABOUT 35 PERCENT FROM 1972 TO 1974.

L THE FOOD BILL OF AMERICAN CITIZENS HAS INCREASED BY MORE
THAN \$57 BILLION IN THE LAST THREE YEARS L THIS IS THE RESULT
OF REDUCING THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN STABILIZING FOOD
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING AND TURNING YOU OVER TO THE TENDER
MERCIES OF THE BUTZ BOOM AND BUST MARKET.

L THAT \$57 BILLION IS MORE THAN IT COST THE TAXPAYER IN
FARM STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION PROGRAMS IN THE LAST
40 YEARS.

A RECENT STUDY BY GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY SHOWS THAT IN ONLY 11
OF THE LAST 50 YEARS DID OUR FARMERS BREAK EVEN OR MAKE A PROFIT.

THIS SHOULD END THE NOTION THAT OUR FARMERS HAVE BEEN
SUBSIDIZED BY URBAN AMERICA. TO THE CONTRARY, OUR FARMERS HAVE
BEEN SUBSIDIZING THE AMERICAN CONSUMER FOR YEARS.

I LIKE THE SUBJECT OF THIS CONFERENCE, AND I BELIEVE THAT
AMERICA HAS A UNIQUE ROLE TO PLAY IN THIS HUNGRY WORLD.

L BUT HOW CAN WE ~~MAKE SENSE~~ MAKE SENSE IN TALKING ABOUT
WORLD HUNGER WHEN WE DO NOT HAVE THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF A
WORKABLE FOOD POLICY IN OUR OWN COUNTRY?

*Need for
National Food Policy*

L ~~THE TIME HAS COME TO TURN AWAY FROM THE FAILURES OF THE
PAST SEVERAL YEARS.~~

*Some question that
reveal the lack of coordinated
policy*

L HOW MANY MORE TIMES WILL OUR PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS
HAVE TO BE BURNED BY VOLATILE MARKETS.

L HOW MUCH LONGER WILL WE EXPOSE OUR OVERSEAS CUSTOMERS TO
THE GNAWING UNCERTAINTY ABOUT US AS A SUPPLIER?

reliable

AND HOW LONG WILL WE TURN OUR BACKS ON THE REAL AND
PRESENT HUNGER IN THE WORLD?

IT NO LONGER IS GOOD ENOUGH FOR THE POOR TO EAT ONLY IN
THE GOOD YEARS. - *The need of a Nutrition Policy* -

IT NO LONGER IS GOOD ENOUGH FOR FARMERS TO PROSPER ONLY
ONCE IN A WHILE.

IT NO LONGER IS GOOD ENOUGH TO ASK OUR FARM FAMILIES TO
PLANT THIS YEAR'S CROPS WHEN WILDLY GYRATING PRICES GIVE THEM
NO CLUE AS TO WHETHER THEY WILL RECOVER THEIR INVESTMENT,
LET ALONE MAKE A PROFIT. - *The need of a Price + Supply Policy*

IT NO LONGER IS GOOD ENOUGH FOR OUR EXPORT CUSTOMERS TO
WONDER WHETHER THEY WILL BE LEFT HOLDING AN EMPTY BAG IF
SUPPLIES TIGHTEN UP HERE. - *The need of an export Policy*

in a situation of short supply

*I need for
Humanitarian
acts
Policy*

↳ IT NO LONGER IS GOOD ENOUGH TO HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN
SUPPLYING OUR OWN PEOPLE AND THOSE BEYOND OUR BORDERS.

AND IT NO LONGER IS GOOD ENOUGH TO HIDE BEHIND THE EXCUSE
THAT WE CAN'T FEED THE WHOLE WORLD -- AND USE THAT TO JUSTIFY
DOING LESS THAN WE ARE ABLE TO DO.

↳ I'VE RECITED SOME OF THE PROBLEMS WITH OUR PRESENT
POLICIES. NOW LET ME EXPLAIN WHAT I BELIEVE WE NEED IN A

FOOD POLICY. Policy

↳ FIRST, IT MUST BE BASED ON A COMMITMENT TO ABUNDANCE.

↳ NEXT, IT MUST BE COMPREHENSIVE AND COORDINATED -- AN
INTEGRATED SET OF POLICIES RELATING FOOD PRODUCTION, PROCESSING,
MARKETING, DISTRIBUTION, EXPORTS, TRADE, CONSUMPTION AND
NUTRITION.

THIRD, IT MUST SEEK SEVERAL SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES, INCLUDING:

-- A FAIR RETURN TO FARMERS TO SUSTAIN HIGH-LEVEL PRODUCTION;
(Share the Risk)

-- ADEQUATE FOOD SUPPLIES AT REASONABLY STABLE PRICES FOR

CONSUMERS AND USERS OF FARM PRODUCTS;

Reserves

-- BEING A RELIABLE SUPPLIER ON THE WORLD EXPORT MARKET;

-- SUPPORT of FEEDING PROGRAMS FOR THE NEEDY HERE AND ABROAD;

-- IMPROVED NUTRITION, HERE AND ABROAD; AND

Research on new varieties, storage, Processing

-- ASSURING ADEQUATE INPUTS, TRANSPORTATION AND CREDIT, fertilizer

FOR AGRICULTURAL REQUIREMENTS.

A NATIONAL FOOD POLICY GEARED TO THESE OBJECTIVES IS

MORE THAN JUST DESIRABLE. IT IS ESSENTIAL. AND I AM

CONVINCED THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WOULD SUPPORT SUCH A

POLICY.

I HAVE BEEN CHAIRING SOME FOOD POLICY HEARINGS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD OF THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT TO IDENTIFY THE COMPONENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL FOOD POLICY.

IN THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS, WHICH I CHAIR, WE HAVE GIVEN ATTENTION TO THE ROLE WHICH AGRICULTURE MUST PLAY IN A FULL-EMPLOYMENT, FULL-PRODUCTION ECONOMY.

h AND IN THE FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE, WHICH I ALSO CHAIR, WE HAVE BEEN EXAMINING WAYS OF ACHIEVING BETTER COORDINATION OF OUR FOOD POLICIES.

h I HAVE SPENT MUCH OF MY TIME ON THE PRODUCER SIDE OF THE FOOD PROBLEM EQUATION BECAUSE IT IS THE LEAST UNDERSTOOD BY THE PUBLIC -- AND BECAUSE WE HAVE A GREAT DEAL TO LOSE UNLESS WE CAN KEEP OUR FAMILY FARMERS PRODUCING AT HIGH LEVELS.

IT GENERALLY IS NOT REALIZED THAT THE AMERICAN FOOD AND

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY IS A \$600 BILLION INDUSTRY -- ABOUT EIGHT

TIMES THE SIZE OF THE AUTO INDUSTRY.

(needs attention)

↳ BUT THERE IS A PURCHASING POWER SIDE TO THE FOOD PROBLEM

AS WELL. ↳ OUR WHOLE FOOD SITUATION WOULD BE MUCH BRIGHTER IF

WE WERE FUNCTIONING IN A HEALTHY NATIONAL ECONOMY.

↳ EVEN IN GOOD ECONOMIC TIMES, ABOUT 10 PERCENT OF OUR PEOPLE

HAVE BEEN HUNGRY OR MALNOURISHED. ↳ WITH TODAY'S MASSIVE UNEMPLOYMENT

AND CONTINUING INFLATION, MANY MORE CITIZENS HAVE BEEN FORCED INTO

THIS VULNERABLE CLASS.

↳ IF A LESSON CAN BE DRAWN FROM THE EXPERIENCES OF THE PAST

THREE YEARS, IT IS THAT WE HAVE A NEW BALL GAME. ↳ NEW MECHANISMS

FOR DECISION-MAKING ARE NEEDED TO RESPOND TO THE STRUCTURAL

CHANGES IN AGRICULTURE.

Falling supply

WHILE U.S. STOCKS HAVE INCREASED SHARPLY IN THE PAST YEAR,

WORLD PRODUCTION IS ONLY SLIGHTLY ABOVE 1974 AND THREE PERCENT

LESS THAN 1973. *h* THE PROSPECTS FOR THE WORLD IS CONTINUING TIGHT

SUPPLIES, WITH POSSIBLY A FOOD DEFICIT OF 85 MILLION TONS IN THE

DEVELOPING COUNTRIES BY 1985. *h* WE NEED TO BE PREPARED FOR SCARCITY

as well as
OR OCCASIONAL YEARS OF SURPLUS.

h IN DEVELOPING A FOOD POLICY WE MUST BALANCE THE NEEDS OF
CONSUMERS AND FARMERS. *h* WE DO NOT HAVE TO PUT OUR LIVESTOCK,
POULTRY AND DAIRY PRODUCERS THROUGH AN EXTREME OF BOOM AND BUST,
FUELED BY VOLATILE FEED PRICES,

h AND WE ALSO NEED TO BALANCE SHORT AND LONG TERM INTERESTS.

IN RECENT YEARS, OUR DECISION-MAKERS SOMETIMES HAVE TAKEN SHORT-TERM
APPROACHES WITH LITTLE REGARD FOR THE LONGER TERM IMPACT,

THUS, IT WAS DECIDED TO PUT A CAP ON BEEF PRICES EVEN THOUGH IT WAS DESTINED TO CREATE DISLOCATIONS AND HIGHER PRICES IN THE FUTURE.

LATER, IT WAS DECIDED TO IMPOSE CONTROLS ON EXPORTS EVEN THOUGH THIS COULD SET OFF A CYCLE OF REDUCED SALES ABROAD, DEPRESSED FARM INCOME, AND REDUCED PRODUCTIVITY.

WE NO LONGER CAN AFFORD TO HAVE SEPARATE POLICIES FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS. IN FACT, WE NEED NOT AN AGRICULTURAL POLICY, A CONSUMER POLICY OR A TRADE POLICY, BUT A POLICY WHICH INTERRELATES AND BALANCES ALL OF THESE ELEMENTS.

WE MUST BE CONSCIOUS, TOO, THAT AGRICULTURE DOES NOT FUNCTION IN A WORLD OF ITS OWN. EFFICIENT FOOD PRODUCTION IS HIGHLY DEPENDENT UPON CREDIT RESOURCES, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, DISTRIBUTION, TAX POLICIES AND BASIC RESEARCH.

L WHAT I HAVE SAID ABOUT THE NEED FOR A BALANCED, INTERRELATED

U.S. POLICY ON FOOD ALSO APPLIES TO A WORLD WHICH HAS ENTERED A NEW

ERA OF FOOD INSECURITY.

L THERE IS AN NEW INTERNATIONALISM ABROAD IN THE WORLD -- NOT

BASED UPON THE OLD IMPERATIVES OF DIPLOMACY AND ^{military} SECURITY -- BUT

BASED UPON A SENSE OF INTERDEPENDENCE IN THE AREAS OF COMMODITIES,

TECHNOLOGY, PRODUCTION AND TRADE.

L WE HAVE MADE EFFORTS IN THIS DIRECTION. BUT THEY HAVE BEEN
FEEBLE, *when we should be leading*

L AT THE WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE IN ROME, WE HAD TO BE DRAGGED

GRUDINGLY INTO TALKING ABOUT WHAT THE CONFERENCE WANTED TO DISCUSS --

HUNGER AND FOOD SECURITY.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROUDLY HAS ANNOUNCED THAT OUR FOOD EXPORTS --
AT A VALUE OF AROUND \$23 BILLION -- ACCOUNT FOR ABOUT 55 PERCENT
OF FOOD MOVING IN THE WORLD MARKET. AND WE PROVIDE ABOUT
80 PERCENT OF THE WORLD'S FOOD AID.

BUT THE ADMINISTRATION IS ALMOST BASHFUL ABOUT PROVIDING
LEADERSHIP. AND IT IS IN OUR INTEREST TO PROMOTE POLICIES WHICH
ENCOURAGE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND STABILITY IN THE WORLD
FOOD MARKET.

IN THE WORDS OF DR. ~~ANDRE~~ BOERMA, FORMER DIRECTOR GENERAL
OF THE UN FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION:

"THE WORLD HAS ALLOWED ITSELF TO DRIFT INTO A DEGREE OF
DEPENDENCE ON THE POWERS EXERCISED ON THE PLAINS OF NORTH
AMERICA."

L AT THE UN SPECIAL SESSION LAST SEPTEMBER, WE DID MUCH BETTER IN TRYING TO DEAL SYMPATHETICALLY AND ON AN EQUAL BASIS WITH THE OTHER NATIONS OF THE WORLD. AND WE CAN ONLY HOPE THAT THE FOLLOW-THROUGH WILL BE IN THE SPIRIT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION DECLARED BY OUR SPOKESMAN.

h THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS IN ENERGY HAS TAUGHT US SOME LESSONS IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION. AND ONE OF THEM IS THAT ACCESS TO SUPPLIES IS IMPORTANT AS WELL AS ACCESS TO MARKETS.

2 I HAVE BEEN A SUPPORTER OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND COMMODITY AGREEMENTS SINCE I FIRST CAME TO THE U.S. SENATE IN 1949.

L THE FARMERS AND CONSUMERS OF THE WORLD NEED AN ALTERNATIVE TO A WORLD COMMODITY TRADING SYSTEM DOMINATED BY INTERNATIONAL CORPORATE GIANTS.

h WE ALSO NEED TO ESTABLISH A WORLD FOOD RESERVE. IT IS NOT ENOUGH JUST TO BE FOR IT. WE MUST HELP IMPLEMENT IT AND MAKE IT WORK.

h WE NEED TO BE HARD-BOILED ABOUT INSISTING THAT THE RESERVE BE USED FOR STRATEGIC AND EMERGENCY PURPOSES, NOT MANIPULATED TO DRIVE THE FARMER OUT OF BUSINESS ^{with a low Prices} ~~OR TO HOLD DOWN PRICES~~ THUS FAR,

NEGOTIATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT COUNCIL HAVE BEEN BOGGED DOWN IN DISCUSSIONS OVER THE METHOD BY WHICH STOCKS WOULD BE RELEASED.

h AS FOR A NATIONAL RESERVE, IT REALLY IS NOT THAT COMPLICATED A PROBLEM IF WE WILL TRUST FARMERS TO KEEP THE BULK OF THE Domestic Reserve STOCKS ON THE FARM.

WE CAN DO THIS BY PROVIDING AN EXTENDED LOAN PROGRAM FOR FARMERS. WHEN THE FARMER SELLS, HE WILL PAY OFF THE LOAN AND INTEREST. HE'S PROTECTED, THE CONSUMER IS PROTECTED AND SOCIETY IS BETTER OFF.

L A NATIONAL FOOD RESERVE AND A WORLD FOOD RESERVE CAN BENEFIT BOTH FARMERS AND CONSUMERS, BUT IF WE ARE GOING TO USE THE FOOD RESERVE TO LEVEL OFF THE PEAKS, THERE MUST BE A PARALLEL POLICY TO LEVEL ~~OF~~^{OUT} THE VALLEYS.

WE'RE ALL FRUSTRATED ABOUT THE BOOM AND THE BUST. BUT WE HAVE TO GET RID OF BOTH AT THE SAME TIME. *But above all,*

L A BALANCED NATIONAL FOOD POLICY ~~is~~^{we} MUST TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE NEEDS OF THE FOOD DEFICIT NATIONS. WE HAVE PROVIDED OVER \$27 BILLION OF FOOD AID, AND MANY MORE BILLIONS IN AID TO INCREASE FOOD PRODUCTION.

L FOOD AID IS NOT SOMETHING WHICH SHOULD BE DOLED OUT HAPHAZARDLY OR IN RESPONSE TO FLUCTUATIONS IN SUPPLY AND PRICES IN THIS COUNTRY.

L IT SHOULD BE PROGRAMMED TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION AND NOT LOCK LOCAL FARMERS INTO A SUBSISTENCE AGRICULTURE.

L THE WORLD DOESN'T REALLY LACK FOOD, IT LACKS EFFECTIVE
PURCHASING POWER. AND UNTIL THIS CAN BE GENERATED, WE JUST
WILL BE TREATING THE SYMPTOMS, NOT THE REAL PROBLEM.

L WE OUGHT TO USE OUR FOOD AID TO TURN THE PEOPLE OF THE
RECIPIENT NATIONS INTO COMMERCIAL CUSTOMERS FOR FOOD PRODUCTS
OF THEIR OWN OR OTHER FARMERS.

L AND WE KNOW THAT THE FOOD DEFICIT NATIONS CAN INCREASE GREATLY
THEIR OWN PRODUCTION BY UTILIZING TODAY'S EXISTING TECHNOLOGY.

L FOR EXAMPLE, RICE YIELDS IN BANGLADESH ARE ONLY 53 PERCENT OF
THE WORLD AVERAGE AND 24 PERCENT OF THE U.S. AVERAGE.

L WHEN WE PROVIDE FOOD AID, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE RECIPIENT
NATIONS NOT DISCOURAGE THEIR OWN PRODUCERS THROUGH CHEAP FOOD

POLICIES. L THIS WILL AVOID DEVELOPING PERMANENT CLIENTS FOR

FOOD AID.

Foreign Aid

-20-

AND WE MUST MORE SHARPLY FOCUS OUR AID PROGRAMS AIMED AT
EXPANDING FOOD PRODUCTION, Farm Coops, RURAL CREDIT, FAMILY PLANNING, RESEARCH
AND EDUCATION. THESE PROGRAMS ULTIMATELY TIE BACK TO POVERTY
AND INADEQUATE FOOD PRODUCTION.

IN RECENT WEEKS, THERE HAVE BEEN NUMEROUS NEWSPAPER HEADLINES
ABOUT USING OUR FOOD AS A WEAPON OF FOREIGN POLICY.

WHEN I AUTHORED SOME OF THE EARLY BILLS, INCLUDING THE FOOD
FOR PEACE ACT, I TALKED ABOUT FOOD AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FOREIGN
POLICY. BUT NOT IN THE SENSE OF USING IT FOR COERCION.

I VISUALIZED FOOD FOR PEACE AS A WAY TO PROMOTE THE FOREIGN
POLICY OF THE U.S. AND HELP BUILD WORLD PEACE.

I DID INDEED REFER TO USING FOOD IN THE "ARSENAL OF PEACE."

I POINTED OUT THAT FOOD FOR PEACE IS MORE THAN A FARM
PROGRAM -- THAT IT IS A FOREIGN POLICY PROGRAM AND ONE IN WHICH WE
PROVE THAT WE REALLY CARE ABOUT PEOPLE.

Sum L TO SUM UP, AMERICA'S FIRST RESPONSIBILITY IN THIS HUNGRY WORLD
IS TO UPDATE ITS VISION OF THE WORLD AND OUR PLACE IN IT -- BECAUSE
IT'S A CHANGED WORLD.

L THE DAYS OF CHEAP FOOD ARE OVER, AND THE DAYS OF PLENTIFUL FOOD
ARE IN SERIOUS DANGER, *but*

L WE STILL CAN HAVE PLENTIFUL FOOD FOR ALL. IT IS WITHIN OUR
CAPACITY.

L BUT WE HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN THE MISMANAGED AND SELF-DEFEATING
POLICIES OF TODAY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MANAGED PROGRAM OF
ABUNDANCE IN A COMPREHENSIVE, INTEGRATED NATIONAL FOOD POLICY.

↳ IF WE CONTINUE ON OUR PRESENT COURSE, WE ARE NOT GOING TO BE
OF MUCH HELP TO THE HUNGRY WORLD. ↳ IF WE DO NOT COPE WITH HUNGER
AND POVERTY, WHOLE SOCIETIES MAY BREAK DOWN IN VIOLENCE AND
REVOLUTION.

↳ ON THE WORLD FRONT, THIS WILL REQUIRE COOPERATION, NOT
CONFRONTATION.

↳ FATHER THEODORE M. HESBURGH, PRESIDENT OF NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY,
DECLARED:

↳ "WITH A VISION OF A WORLD WHICH IS LARGER THAN OURSELVES
AND OUR CONCERNS OF THE MOMENT, WE CAN SEE THAT ISOLATED LIVES
OF ABUNDANCE WOULD BE MOCKED BY INDIFFERENCE TO THE NEEDS
AND DESIRES OF THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE HUMAN FAMILY."

"NO NATION, CONCEIVED AND DEDICATED AS THIS ONE WAS,
COULD LONG ENDURE AS A COMMUNITY OR MORAL INDIVIDUALS,
WHILE IGNORING WHAT IS HAPPENING OUTSIDE ITS BORDERS, WHILE
IGNORING ITS OWN ROLE IN PERPETUATING MISERY. NOR COULD
WE HOPE TO SECURE THE INTERESTS WE HAVE IN THE DEVELOPING
COUNTRIES IF WE DID NOT ALSO RESPOND TO THEIR NEEDS AS WELL.
IN THIS, THERE IS A HAPPY COINCIDENCE OF OUR SELF-INTEREST
AS AMERICANS AND OUR MORAL INTEREST AS PART OF THE HUMAN
FAMILY."

L TODAY, WE FACE THE CHALLENGE OF FOOD INSECURITY --
WHETHER WE LIKE IT OR NOT. WE LIVE IN A DANGEROUS WORLD --
LIKE IT OR NOT.

THOSE OF US WHO ARE PRIVILEGED TO BE AMERICANS, WITH
OUR OPPORTUNITIES AND RESOURCES, THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
TO PRODUCE FOOD, MUST CHOOSE TO USE THESE RESOURCES
CONSTRUCTIVELY AND WISELY.

THE NATION WHICH COULD CONCEIVE THE MARSHALL PLAN, FOOD
FOR PEACE, THE PEACE CORP., AND SO MANY OTHER NOBLE INITIATIVES,
IS NOT SHORT ON COURAGE OR IMAGINATION, AND WE NEED NOT FAIL
THE HUNGRY WORLD AT THIS CRUCIAL MOMENT.

THERE IS A DESTINY AND A ROLE FOR AMERICA. IT'S YOUR
CHOICE NOW AND MINE.

#####



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