

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
429 Nicollet Hotel
Minneapolis, Minnesota

For Release: Saturday P.M.
September 10, 1955

SENATOR HUMPHREY PREDICTS NEW 'GREEN UPRISING' IN MIDWEST DURING 1956

America's agricultural prosperity can be restored "at much less total cost than our economy is suffering right now from loss of farm income", Senator Hubert H. Humphrey declared today in addressing Midwest Democratic political leaders at a Conference at International Falls.

"But to do it, we must revise our farm price support program without delay -- then get a new Administration in Washington sincerely dedicated to the well-being of agriculture and unwilling to let farmers become second-class economic citizens," he declared.

"We can not afford to wait through another crop year, even though it will be an election year and the farmers' protest vote may grow as prices tumble. As a political party dedicated to the well-being of our people, we must put the economic welfare of our farm people ahead of any political considerations. As a responsible political party, we can not let the Midwest suffer in order to be able to say 'I told you so' during the next Presidential campaign.

"As the first step necessary in firming up our agriculture economy, we must tackle revision of our farm program immediately after Congress reconvenes in January. The American farmers expect political performance not political promises. They expect fulfillment of pledges and not apologetic hedges."

But, if farmers want any real assurance of equality of economic opportunity Senator Humphrey added, "they better finish the job they started in 1954 by getting rid of national Republican leadership in 1956."

However well the Democratic Congress may improve the farm program in the next session, Senator Humphrey said, "its effectiveness can be limited by bungling, inefficient, and unsympathetic administration."

For that reason, Senator Humphrey predicted "another uprising of farm votes in the Midwest in 1956 like the one that returned Harry Truman to the Presidency in 1948. The farmers are again witnessing a pre-election political propaganda concern over the plight of the farmers by the Republican spokesmen. The Republican leaders "are training" their political orators out in the Denver Republican Political Workshop to renew their promises to agriculture. They are getting ready to "Kassonize" the farm vote again -- big promises with lots of publicity and little or no performance and even less sincerity. The Eisenhower Administration does not need any new farm speeches and new farm promises. The speeches and promises of 1952 are still to be acted upon. The Administration has the power to fulfill its pledges but regretfully it does not have the will or the desire.

Senator Humphrey voiced a blistering attack against the Eisenhower Administration's "flagrant neglect of Midwest Agriculture."

"The Republican leaders have demonstrated a calloused disregard about the hundreds of millions of dollars of lost purchasing power and many billions of dollars of farm assets that have been completely wiped out. They concentrate their

M O R E

attention on the stock market and gleefully remind us that corporation profits and dividends are going up and up. They seem to completely ignore that farm prices and farm income are going down and down. I wonder if it would be asking too much of the Eisenhower Administration to at least cast an eye on the grain market, the hog market, the dairy market, and the other great agricultural markets, rather than staring in gleeful exaltation at the pyramiding of the New York stock market."

"President Eisenhower's agricultural spokesmen now refer to the farmer's plight as just a 'statistical depression'.

"Let them tell that to farm families watching a generation's hard toil wiped out as they are forced to the wall. Let them tell that to heart-broken young farmers seeing their hopes go down the drain with their investment in agriculture. Let them tell that to our rural bankers who are having to say 'no' to appeals for extension of credit from farm people.

"Maybe it is just a 'statistical depression' to the Eisenhower Administration, but it is the livelihood of thousands of fine Midwest families out here -- it is money out of people's pockets, money vanishing out of the lifestream of our Midwest economy.

"Part of the trouble with this Administration is that they seem to think farmers are just 'statistics' instead of people -- people with the aspirations and needs, and entitled to equality of opportunity in our democracy just as much as any other people."

Senator Humphrey said the Eisenhower Administration apparently "does not expect" agriculture to keep pace with the rest of progress in our economy.

"They seem to think prosperity is something to be reserved for Wall Street and General Motors, something farmers have no right to even think about", he declared.

"They say farmers should not look back on the prosperity of a few years ago, because that was just a 'dream world'. They infer it is not normal for farmers to make a fair profit, just as other people like to make money.

"They seem to expect agriculture to be satisfied with some kind of a stabilized recession -- a kind of second-class economic citizenship", he said.

Senator Humphrey quoted Don Paarlberg, Chief economist to Secretary Benson as making the following comment about past farm prosperity:

"This was a dream world, and no one expected it to last. The war and postwar years were not normal ones. They were the best years we ever had. Few things look good when compared with the best you ever had".

"What more proof do farmers need than the Eisenhower Administration's official attitude is that farmers should not expect to ever again do as well as they have in the past?" Senator Humphrey asked.

"It may have been a 'dream world' but out of that dream world came higher living standards than farmers have ever before enjoyed; out of that dream world came decent opportunities for farm children, prosperity for rural communities in the Midwest. Yet even in that 'dream world' of the best years agriculture ever had, per capita farm income failed to achieve quality with other segments of our economy. We were just making progress toward closing the gap -- until we suddenly did an about face and slid downhill in the wrong direction.

"If that period of decent farm income was a 'dream world' for agriculture, what have we got in the soaring stock market today? Were not the wartime years also 'the best they ever had' for corporate profits? Yet has not every year since been even better in terms of profits for America's great corporate enterprises?" Senator Humphrey asked. "Why must agriculture be asked to expect downward adjustments from wartime peaks, when all the rest of our economy is soaring still higher?"

"The American investment bankers were living in a "dream world" in the years 1951 and 1952 also. Yet the Eisenhower Administration had not been in office two months before it raised the interest rates on government securities, thereby expanding the already big profits of the banking houses. Corporation profits were in the "dream world" level in 1952 running at the annual rate of over twenty billion dollars and yet the Republican Administration gave excess tax concessions to corporations and big business in order to increase the unprecedented "dream world" policy.

"Apparently the "dream world" for corporations and financial institutions is a legitimate and wholesome environment. In fact so good and so wholesome that bigger and better "dream world" had to be encouraged. The Republican leadership applauds the "dream world" for its economic favorites, but encourages a nightmare for the American farmer."

Senator Humphrey said he agreed with Benson's economic advisor that "Few things look good when compared with the best you ever had", adding

"I think most farmers might apply that a little more realistically than Mr. Paarlberg expected. To them, Republican leadership no longer looks very good when compared to the best they ever had -- the Democratic leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

Issues

Democ Party Stand for

- ✓ Agriculture
- ✓ Fiscal & Tax Policy - Interest
- ✓ Regulatory Commissions
FPC - FTC

Young - School - Health
old - Nursing - Hosp.
Disabled & Handicapped
Insurance
Rehab.

- ✓ Public Power + Reclamation

Conservation
Dixon - Gates

- ✓ Housing + Urban Clearance

- ✓ Social Welfare - Health + Educ (Polic)

- ✓ Highways Schools

- ✓ Govt Security

- ✓ Civil Service + Pay bills

Atomic Energy
Defense Cuts

General Budget cuts

Bi-Partisanship - State - + Defense



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