

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
NORTHWEST IOWA FARM CONVENTION BANQUET

Washington, D. C.

March 11, 1976

It is a pleasure to be with the Northwest Iowa Farm group tonight.

I enjoy working with your two distinguished Senators, Dick Clark and John Culver, both of whom have provided real leadership in the Senate.

And Berkeley Bedell is to be commended for bringing all of us together this evening. Berkeley is a real asset for the State of Iowa.

Just last week I addressed the first Birthright dinner of the American School Food Service Association. The theme of that meeting was "Enough to Eat is Every Man's Birthright," taken from the 25th Chapter of Genesis.

I said then that the first essential in working to see that people have an adequate diet is to assure that our food producers are able to stay in business. It is pointless to talk about fair and effective food distribution if we can't guarantee that an adequate food supply is on hand in the first place.

Our farmers need some assurance of a fair price -- at least a chance to make a profit -- if these humanitarian goals are to be achieved.

This nation always has been responsive to those in need. But in the process we often have taken the producer for granted.

In the years ahead we will face not only the urgent problem of feeding the needy, but also the growing overall struggle between an ever increasing population and limited world food supplies.

The earth's population today of about four billion people will nearly double by the end of the century. To realize the implications of this, we should note that the earth's population crossed the one billion mark early in the nineteenth century and was only 1.6 billion in 1900.

Since we are the world's chief supplier of grains and soybeans, the policies we follow will be the great planetary suspense story of the century.

We are not constrained by 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 fence to fence, and they were promised access to world markets. But before the harvest was completed, the government again placed controls that 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. The basic responsibility and initiative should rest in the Department of Agriculture rather than another Department or the White House where they don't know the difference between a corn-cob and a combine.

Food policy is too important to be left to chance. But it also 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.

The Administration recently established an agricultural policy committee with the Secretary of Agriculture in charge. We will have to wait and see if this is election year posturing, or if the Administration has learned anything from its mishandling of grain exports and palm oil imports.

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 anyone noticed a savings on his 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 turning you over to the tender mercies of the Butz boom and bust market.

That \$57 billion is far more than the \$40 billion 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 believe that America has a unique role to play in this hungry world. But to do so we need a balanced food policy.

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 crop 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 say that we can't feed the whole world -- 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.

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.

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.

In fact, we need not an agricultural policy, a consumer policy or a trade policy, but a policy which relates and balances all of these elements.

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.

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.

While U.S. grain and soybean stocks have increased sharply in the past year, world production is only slightly above 1974 and three percent less than 1973. The prospect for the world is continuing tight supplies, with possibly a food deficit of 85 million tons in the developing countries by 1985.

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 been slow in recognizing this new direction.

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

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 through an extended loan program.

We also 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.

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

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

We need to use our food to help build world peace.

The challenge before us is awesome.

The nation which conceived the Marshall Plan, Food for Peace, the Peace Corps, and so many other noble initiatives, is not short on courage or imagination. We need not fail our own people or the hungry world at this crucial moment.

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

# # # # #

Popul  
 Pop 1900 - 1.6 Billion  
 1975 - 4 Billion  
 2000 - 7 Billion

(X) By 1985 - supply  
 Developing countries  
 85 million metric ton  
 Deficit

Berkley Bedell / (672)  
 Sen Clark  
 Sen Culver

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Hunger

NORTHWEST IOWA FARM CONVENTION BANQUET

Agric + US Economy  
 Food + Popul  
 Food - Reserves  
 WASHINGTON, D. C.  
 MARCH 11, 1976

Importance  
 Food is Power  
 in life  
 in Hop  
 to Strength

(X) Problems

- ✓ White + Inheritance
- ✓ Grain Inspection
- ✓ Credit + Reserve
- ✓ Govt as Purchaser
- ✓ Embargoes

IT IS A PLEASURE TO BE WITH THE NORTHWEST IOWA FARM  
GROUP TONIGHT.

I ENJOY WORKING WITH YOUR TWO DISTINGUISHED SENATORS,  
DICK CLARK AND JOHN CULVER, BOTH OF WHOM HAVE PROVIDED  
REAL LEADERSHIP IN THE SENATE.

AND BERKELEY BEDELL IS TO BE COMMENDED FOR BRINGING  
ALL OF US TOGETHER THIS EVENING. BERKELEY IS A REAL TRIBUTE  
TO THE STATE OF IOWA. *Dick Clark, John Culver*

JUST LAST WEEK I ADDRESSED THE FIRST BIRTHRIGHT DINNER  
OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION. [THE THEME  
OF THAT MEETING WAS "ENOUGH TO EAT IS EVERY MAN'S BIRTHRIGHT,"  
TAKEN FROM THE 25TH CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

L I SAID THEN THAT THE FIRST ESSENTIAL IN PROVIDING OUR ~~IN WORKING TO SEE THAT~~

PEOPLE <sup>with</sup> ~~HAVE~~ AN ADEQUATE DIET IS TO ASSURE THAT OUR FOOD PRODUCERS

ARE ABLE TO STAY IN BUSINESS. L IT IS POINTLESS TO TALK ABOUT

FAIR AND EFFECTIVE FOOD DISTRIBUTION, IF WE CAN'T GUARANTEE THAT

AN ADEQUATE FOOD SUPPLY IS ON HAND IN THE FIRST PLACE.

L OUR FARMERS NEED SOME ASSURANCE OF A FAIR PRICE -- AT LEAST A  
CHANCE TO MAKE A PROFIT -- IF THESE HUMANITARIAN GOALS ARE TO  
BE ACHIEVED.

L THIS NATION ALWAYS HAS BEEN RESPONSIVE TO THOSE IN NEED,  
BUT IN THE PROCESS, WE OFTEN HAVE TAKEN THE <sup>far</sup> PRODUCER FOR GRANTED.

L IN THE YEARS AHEAD WE WILL FACE NOT ONLY THE URGENT PROBLEM  
OF FEEDING THE NEEDY, BUT ALSO THE GROWING OVERALL STRUGGLE BETWEEN  
AN EVER INCREASING POPULATION AND LIMITED WORLD FOOD SUPPLIES.

THE EARTH'S POPULATION TODAY OF ABOUT FOUR BILLION PEOPLE  
WILL NEARLY DOUBLE BY THE END OF THE CENTURY. TO REALIZE

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS, WE SHOULD NOTE THAT THE EARTH'S

POPULATION CROSSED THE ONE BILLION MARK EARLY IN THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND WAS ONLY 1.6 BILLION IN 1900,

SINCE WE ARE THE WORLD'S CHIEF SUPPLIER OF GRAINS AND  
SOYBEANS, THE POLICIES WE FOLLOW WILL BE THE GREAT PLANETARY  
SUSPENSE STORY OF THE CENTURY.

WE ARE NOT CONSTRAINED BY 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 FENCE TO FENCE,  
AND THEY WERE PROMISED ACCESS TO WORLD MARKETS. BUT BEFORE  
THE HARVEST WAS COMPLETED, THE GOVERNMENT AGAIN PLACED CONTROLS  
THAT IT CALLS "VOLUNTARY RESTRAINTS" ON EXPORT SALES. *Embargo*

↳ 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.

*(Farmers didn't benefit -*  
↳ IT IS BEING SAID TODAY THAT FOOD POLICY IS TOO IMPORTANT  
TO BE LEFT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, I DISAGREE.

THE BASIC RESPONSIBILITY AND INITIATIVE SHOULD REST IN THE  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RATHER THAN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT OR  
THE WHITE HOUSE WHERE THEY DON'T KNOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN  
A CORN-COB AND A COMBINE,

L FOOD POLICY IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE LEFT TO CHANCE L BUT IT  
ALSO 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,

L THE ADMINISTRATION RECENTLY ESTABLISHED AN AGRICULTURAL  
POLICY COMMITTEE WITH THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE IN CHARGE.

L WE WILL HAVE TO WAIT AND SEE IF THIS IS ELECTION YEAR POSTURING,  
OR IF THE ADMINISTRATION HAS LEARNED ANYTHING FROM ITS MISHANDLING  
OF GRAIN EXPORTS AND PALM OIL IMPORTS.

↳ 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 ANYONE NOTICED A SAVING ON HIS 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 TURNING YOU OVER TO THE TENDER MERCIES OF THE BUTZ BOOM AND BUST MARKET.

~~THAT \$57 BILLION IS FAR MORE THAN THE \$40 BILLION 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 BELIEVE THAT AMERICA HAS A UNIQUE ROLE TO PLAY IN THIS  
HUNGRY WORLD. BUT TO DO SO WE NEED A BALANCED FOOD POLICY.

~~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 CROP 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 SAY THAT WE CAN'T FEED  
THE WHOLE WORLD -- TO JUSTIFY DOING LESS THAN WE ARE ABLE TO DO.

## *Food Policy*

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.

h THIRD, IT MUST SEEK SEVERAL SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES, INCLUDING:

L A FAIR RETURN TO FARMERS TO SUSTAIN HIGH-LEVEL PRODUCTION;

L ADEQUATE FOOD SUPPLIES AT REASONABLY STABLE PRICES FOR

CONSUMERS AND USERS OF FARM PRODUCTS;

L BEING A RELIABLE SUPPLIER ON THE WORLD EXPORT MARKET;

L SUPPORTING FEEDING PROGRAMS FOR THE NEEDY HERE AND ABROAD;

L IMPROVED NUTRITION, HERE AND ABROAD; AND

L ASSURING ADEQUATE INPUTS, TRANSPORTATION AND CREDIT FOR

AGRICULTURAL REQUIREMENTS.

*(credit) Fed Reserve*

*Cooperatives*

L A NATIONAL FOOD POLICY GEARED TO THESE OBJECTIVES IS

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

CONVINCED THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WOULD SUPPORT SUCH A POLICY.

(X)

L 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.

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

L 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.

L 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.

L IN FACT, WE NEED NOT AN AGRICULTURAL POLICY, A CONSUMER  
POLICY OR A TRADE POLICY, BUT A POLICY WHICH RELATES AND BALANCES  
ALL OF THESE ELEMENTS.

L 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.

L 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.

↳ WHILE U.S. GRAIN AND SOYBEAN STOCKS HAVE INCREASED SHARPLY  
IN THE PAST YEAR, WORLD PRODUCTION IS ONLY SLIGHTLY ABOVE  
1974 AND THREE PERCENT LESS THAN 1973. ↳ THE PROSPECT FOR THE  
WORLD IS CONTINUING TIGHT SUPPLIES, WITH POSSIBLY A FOOD  
DEFICIT OF 85 MILLION TONS IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES BY 1985.

↳ 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 BEEN SLOW IN RECOGNIZING THIS NEW DIRECTION.

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

L 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 THROUGH AN EXTENDED LOAN PROGRAM.

L WE ALSO 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.

L WE'RE ALL FRUSTRATED ABOUT THE BOOM AND THE BUST. BUT WE HAVE TO GET RID OF BOTH AT THE SAME TIME.

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

# Food + National Security

L WE NEED TO USE OUR FOOD TO HELP BUILD WORLD PEACE,

L THE CHALLENGE BEFORE US IS AWESOME,

L THE NATION WHICH CONCEIVED THE MARSHALL PLAN, FOOD FOR  
PEACE, THE PEACE CORPS, AND SO MANY OTHER NOBLE INITIATIVES,  
IS NOT SHORT ON COURAGE OR IMAGINATION. WE NEED NOT FAIL OUR  
OWN PEOPLE OR 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](http://www.mnhs.org)