

For Release: Saturday p.m.  
Sept. 17, 1960

HUMPHREY CHALLENGES NIXON ON BENSON POLICIES

JACKSON, Sept. 17 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today challenged Vice President Nixon to tell "exactly and specifically how he stands on Benson farm policies."

Humphrey, speaking at a DFL luncheon here, said that the GOP presidential candidate "apparently considers Agriculture Secretary Benson a political hot potato right now."

"He realizes that America's farmers are fed up with the eight lean years of Benson policies," Humphrey said. "The GOP presidential candidate is now trying to pretend that he had nothing to do with Benson's farm program."

The Senator quoted Benson himself as saying that Nixon was "one of the architects" of the Administration's farm program.

"The farmers and the voters know where I stand and where the Democratic candidates stand on farm questions," Humphrey said. "They deserve to know if Nixon stands by the Administration program or if he is now ready to support legislation which would bring a fair share of the nation's income to farmers."

"Nixon said that the Administration has sought solutions to farm problems, but that Congress has refused to approve the Administration's program and has not come forward with one of its own," Humphrey reported.

"The fact is that the majority in Congress has approved five farm bills since 1953 and the Administration vetoed all five," he added.

"Let's set the record straight," Humphrey concluded. "Is Nixon going to defend the Administration's farm policies -- which he helped design? Or is he going to stand by legislation which will effectively boost farm income?"

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

For Release: Sunday A.M.  
September 18, 1960

HUMPHREY CALLS FOR REAPPRAISAL OF LATIN AMERICA POLICIES

WINDOM, Sept. 17 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey said here tonight that the United States should send "less military assistance and more technical aid" to the nations of Latin America.

The Senator, speaking at a DFL dinner meeting in Windom, called for a "complete reappraisal" of America's policies and priorities on the problems of Latin America.

"Recurrent crisis in Asia and Africa could be duplicated in Latin America," Humphrey warned. "Already we see strong signs of potential violence and evidence of growing anti-Americanism."

Humphrey emphasized the need to reappraise this Nation's military assistance program for Latin American countries.

"We should not do anything which would promote an arms race among these nations," he said. "And we should not give arms to a dictator so he can intimidate or tyrannize his own people."

"The United States has unnecessarily - and dangerously - poured money down the drain by sending arms to dictators in the past. Castro still reminds the Cubans that the United States supplied arms to Batista."

Instead, Humphrey suggested, America should press for regional disarmament in Latin America.

"The Organization of American States already provides efficient machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes," he said.

"With the support and encouragement of the United States," Humphrey added, "Latin America could become an international showcase of disarmament. The region could offer evidence that transfer of resources from weapons of war to peaceful economic development is possible."

Humphrey, a ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called for a step-up in economic aid and technical assistance from the United States to Latin America.

"These countries must speed their economic development," Humphrey said. "If not, misery and discontent will make them Communist camping grounds. We must encourage cooperative, coordinated planning through the Organization of American States."  
(over)

September 16, 1960

Memo to Senator

From: Win

Here is new material for use -- along with brief advance release -- on talk to the DFL Luncheon in Jackson, Saturday, September 17.

The details come from Mabel in Washington. She has air-mailed (special delivery) a copy of Nixon's speech. It should be here in the office Saturday morning if you wish to call for additional direct quotes. I will be in the office.

A clip from yesterday's Minneapolis Trib on the speech in in your folder.

Geo Mann (Farmers for Humphrey) Literature - Pins - cds  
Russ Schwartz Shopping notes  
Mayor Ads  
Distribution!

Greetings  
from  
Gov. Hansen

In a speech in Guthrie Center, Iowa, yesterday  
(Friday), Vice President Nixon offered the first  
installment of his campaign views on farm policy.

The Vice President said that the "farm problem"  
really means the surplus of food in America.

oh-no!

Nixon felt so keenly about this, in fact, that he  
used the word "surplus" more than 50 times in his  
speech.

He did not recognize the real problem on  
America's farms today -- low income.

Low Income

Nixon said that the Government got the farmer  
into the present surplus problem, that the  
government is responsible for the problem.

Jackson County Pilot  
Lyle George

A. Nelson was  
one of architects  
of farm policy

He then outlined his plan to get rid of the surplus, and dubbed the plan "Operation Consume."

*"Operation  
Safeguard  
next"*

"Operation Consume" has four parts:

1 -- "A sharp intensification of Food for Peace efforts." This includes a "new and more energetic effort" by surplus-producing nations to help less-favored nations through the United Nations. It also includes "continued sale" of our food surplus overseas under Public Law 480.

*Food  
for  
Peace*

(Nixon said repeatedly that America should "continue" this and "continue" that. Never did he say we must increase or expand the programs to use our agricultural abundance for the hungry and for peace.)

2 -- "Creation of a strategic food reserve in America." He adds nothing new to the old Humphrey proposal on this.

*Food  
Reserve*



3 -- "Payments in kind" to the farmers. That is fine, but it does nothing to solve the basic problem of decreasing farm income.

4 -- "Urgent exploration of conversion of grain  
to and protein foods for distribution at home and  
abroad."

L Now this last statment is the key to the Nixon and Republican attitude. They constantly propose a bold "exploration," a magnificent "study" or a new "approach." They never come right out and say that they will do something, that they will act to solve the problems of American agriculture.

L Nixon said also that our food surplus should be used to assure domestic school lunch and food stamp programs while "avoiding disruption of commercial markets."

School Lunch  
&  
Food  
Stamps

He did call for long-term contracts for school lunch and food stamp programs, but, again, did not say that more food should be utilized in these programs.

And he did not say that his Republican Administration has refused to act on the Humphrey food stamp program authorized by Congress.

Nixon sets a target date of four years (that's a coincidental figure) for "Operation Surplus" in which "the food surplus is reduced to manageable proportions."

(Nixon and the Republican Administration has had eight years to do something about the plight of farmers. They have had laws on the books which would have allowed them to act. They had legislation approved by the Democratic majority in Congress, but that legislation was vetoed)

(X)  
Food Stamp Plan

4 yrs

*Rep Promise*  
-5-

Can the farmers exist for another four years  
with nothing but golden promises?

Remember that Eisenhower promised "100 percent  
parity" in the 1952 campaign.

Remember that the GOP promised "full parity  
in the market place" in the 1956 campaign.

Nixon said nothing yesterday in the way of  
offering solutions or legislation to increase  
farm income.

He had fine words to say about the family  
farmer. But dig beneath his words and his  
golden promises and you have the same old Benson-  
Republican "approach."

*But!*  
Nixon has tried to make us believe he rejects  
the Benson policies. But he has not said specifically  
and exactly how he differs from Benson. Don't  
forget that.



"Operation Safeguard"

✓ And Nixon ended his speech in Iowa yesterday  
with the promise that he will offer the next  
installment next week in South Dakota. He will  
then outline "Operation Safeguard" -- his plan to  
avoid the building up of surplus.

Avoid  
Surplus

Sounds like a soap opera: "Tune in next  
week, friends, for the next chapter of 'Young  
Dr. Dick's Remedy' for the family farm."

But soap operas, I understand, are  
disappearing from radio, because they are not  
really believable to the listeners.

Mr. Nixon's fine words will fade away too,  
because the farmers of America no longer believe  
in or trust the golden promises. We have had promises  
for eight years. That is all we have had.

NEW PROBLEMS, NEW POLICIES FOR LATIN AMERICA

DFL Dinner, Windom, Minnesota

6 p.m., Saturday, September 17, 1960

✓ We are indebted for many reasons to  
Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

✓ He gave us strength, when weakness  
threatened the spirit and the will of a  
nation gripped by depression.

✓ He gave us leadership, when confusion  
and fear paralyzed our capacity to act.

✓ He gave us bold, new programs, when  
reaction snarled our efforts for vitally  
needed social reform.

Tonight I am particularly aware of  
one, enlightened offering of Franklin Delano  
Roosevelt.

He gave us the "Good Neighbor" policy  
-- a policy of respectful cooperation and  
effective assistance for Latin America.

But what has happened to the Good  
Neighbor Policy?

Today the very phrase "Good Neighbor  
Policy" is a target of scorn and ridicule  
by millions of citizens of Latin American  
nations. Anti-Americanism is rampant in  
many areas to our south.

Instead of respectful cooperation, the  
United States in the past decade has shown  
massive indifference to the problems and  
needs of Latin America.

Instead of effective assistance for the solutions of those problems, we have opened up the checkbook erratically and irresponsibly.

*Large Problem*

What's the problem?, you ask. Africa is in the headlines, ~~you say~~. Asia is full of threats and dangers. What's going on in Latin America?

I will tell you. And it is not very pleasant.

Millions of Latin American citizens struggle for survival under semi-primitive conditions.

Illiteracy stifles the chances of entire nations for progress and dignity.

Hunger and disease take horrible tolls of life among men, women and children.

✓ Poverty and ignorance bind entire communities and vast regions to a

backward, depressed standard of living.

✓ These are not the conditions of orderly development. These are not the conditions for peace. These are not the conditions for freedom and democracy.

Not Conditions  
for freedom  
& Peace

These are the conditions which invite Communist penetration. Latin America's condition and mood represent open camp-grounds for Communism.

Invitation  
to  
Communists

✓ And make no mistake. The Soviet Union and Red China are surveying the scene.

USSR  
China

✓ The Democratic leaders of Latin American nations are struggling honorably



and well to bring security and prosperity  
to their people.

But the forces of violence, hate and  
totalitarianism are at work.

We talk about crisis in Africa and  
danger in Asia. We should also begin  
talking about -- and acting to avert--  
the threats to freedom and democracy in  
Latin America.

Yes, the United States has done much  
for Latin America in the past decade.

But our program has been spotty and  
unplanned. And sometimes it has been  
downright dangerous.

The United States has unnecessarily  
-- and dangerously -- poured money down the  
drain by sending arms to dictators in the  
past. Castro still reminds the Cubans  
that the United States supplied arms to  
Bastista.

America should not do anything which  
would promote an arms race among the Latin  
American nations. We cannot give arms  
to a dictator to intimidate or tyrannize  
his own people.

Our nation must reappraise its whole  
approach and policy for Latin America.

↳ That policy must mean less military  
assistance and more technical aid to the  
nations of Latin America.

We must work not to build up the military strength of particular Latin American nations, but to press for regional disarmament.

The Organization of American States already provides efficient machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes.

With the support and encouragement of the United States, Latin America could become an international showcase of disarmament. The region could offer evidence that transfer of resources from weapons of war to peaceful economic development is possible.

We must step up economic aid and our technical assistance to Latin American nations. This cannot be done piecemeal.

We must have cooperative, regional planning  
through the Organization of American States.

/ If we do not help these countries speed  
their economic development, misery and  
discontent will make them Communist camping  
grounds.

/ A new program of regional economic  
development -- patterned after the Marshall  
plan -- will pay big dividends in good will  
and efficient progress for a relatively small  
investment of money and power.

And it will restore meaning and respect  
to the phrase "Good Neighbor Policy."



# 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)