From the Office of Citizens for Humphrey Committee 1625 Hennepin Avenue Minneapolis, Minnesota

For Release: Wednesday a.m.'s September 21, 1960

HUMPHREY CONDEMNS PARTISAN TALK ON PEACE OR WAR

MARSHALL, Sept. 20 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today sharply criticized candidates "who attempt to take personal credit for peace and cast scornful blame on others for war."

"Peace is no partisan issue," the Senator declared. "Peace is the deeply-desired goal of every American - Democrat or Republican."

Humphrey, addressing a DFL dinner meeting here, denounced "the all-too-frequent political practice of using such phrases as 'war party' and 'peace party'."

"The central issue of this campaign - and of this generation - is how America can best win a just and enduring peace for mankind," Humphrey said.

"Our party believes that the first and most essential requirement is vigorous leadership," he declared. "In a world of constantly changing and increasing dangers, we need imagination and action from Government, not smiles of reassurance that all is well.

"Our party believes that the people must be told the truth about the dangers facing the Nation and the sacrifices required of them. We know that our efforts can succeed only if the people have understanding and determination.

Humphrey said the key to peace is "safeguarded disarmament," and added: "All of the programs and promises of this campaign will be meaningless if America can not assure our survival by securing peace. And all of our yearnings for peace will be in vain if we do not lead the way to safeguarded agreements to end the terrifying arms race."

· Geo Hulstrand (Konshiyalie) primis denton Haroldson Hordon Dunous KWLM. Birkamiro GooTreema Gene Knutson Spoke last Nite Reaples Campaign KARM- Food Health DAIRY - Rep. Farm Believy

Montuiter

Dennes de la company de la com

FAMILY FARMING IN THE SOVIET UNION

Montevideo, Minn. 12:15 p.m., Tuesday, Sept. 20, 1960

In Hunt

watth Katshon

We often hear the comment that the family farmer is the "forgotten man" in America today.

In many ways he is. People throughout the United States -- and some of the highest leaders of government -- act as if they have completely forgotten the contributions of family farming to America's strength.

And too many people -- including officials of the current Administration -- believe that family farming is out-dated and old-fashioned.

They speak of "efficiency," and equate efficiency to bigness, to the corporate form of agriculture.

Now I think differently.

I know that the free-enterprise, family
farm system, operating through farm cooperatives
is a key to America's strength. I know that

America's abundant food and fiber supply would
be impossible without the family farmer. I
know that family farming not only contributes
to our agricultural and general economy, but
that it nourishes the great democratic
traditions of free-enterprise and the deepest
values of family life.

But all of us must offer more evidence than our own beliefs if we are to assure the preservation of the family farm system in America.

______ Today I offer evidence of a unique sort.

It is evidence from within the Soviet Union itself.

Most of you may be surprised to learn that a semblance of the free-enterprise family farm system still exists inside the Soviet Union.

And that system -- limited as it is -- is so efficient that the Kremlin has been forced

to accept it.

Let me explain how this form of family farming works in Russia.

Each of you know that Soviet agriculture is almost -- but not quite -- completely collectivized.

Collective farms in the Soviet Union sprawl over tens of thousands of acres and are worked by thousands of farmers responsible only to the State.

But each family on the collective farm

is allowed a small -- and often tiny -- plot

of earth to cultivate. These plots, seldom

more than an acre, are usually adjacent to the

family's dwelling.

The families are allowed to develop these plots by theemselves. They are also allowed to sell the food and fiber produced on them in free market places for their own profit.

Many visitors to the Soviet Union have observed that the Soviet farmers take tremendous pride in these small plots. The farmers exert extra effort to produce and market their food and fiber efficiently.

Until a few years ago, it was assumed that the Communist leaders intended to eliminate these

last bits of free-enterprise in their collectivized society.

But in 1958, the Kremlin instead eliminated the previously heavy taxes placed on food and fiber produced from the private farm plots.

The reasons are simple. The Soviet Union needs food. Food from the small plots are often better qualitatively and quantitatively than the food from collective farms.

In short, produce and livestock from these small plots of land have become a valuable -- and vital -- part of the Soviet economy.

Khrushchev and other Communist leaders have been required to allow this limited family farm system in order to obtain enough food and fiber for the people.

These facts should give pause to those in America who say that the family-farm system is "old-fashioned" or "inefficient."

The Soviet Union itself would never admit
that this form of free-enterprise is most efficient.

But the <u>fact</u> of the existence of these thousands
of small family plots is reluctant recognition
that the best form of agriculture is not
collectivization.

We in America appreciate the family farm not just for its efficiency, but also because it is in line with our basic beliefs in freedom, and the dignity of the individual.

The family farm is threatened today -- by concerted effort from leaders who talk about the importance of the individual and free enterprise, but

work to drive families off the farms and replace them with corporatized agriculture.

Yes, the family farm must be preserved.

Our nation must prove to the world that its agriculture is not dominated by corporate bigness, but is guided by the skills, hard work and determination of free men and women in rural America.

PEACE AND POLITICS DFL DINNER, MARSHALL, MINNESOTA 6:30 p.m., Tuesday, Sept. 20, 1960 There are dozens of issues in this campaign (and every campaign on which America's two political parties are in basic disagreement. Those differences should be clearly stated and discussed -- so the people may judge wisely and reasonably. But there is one subject in America which is not and should not be a partisan issue. subject is peace. I do not mind honest criticisms of my programs and beliefs. We Democrats do not mind a reasonable discussion of policy differences. But we cannot tolerate candidates who attempt to take personal credit for peace and (3) [lace with

cast scornful blame on others for war. I am saddened by the all-too-frequent political practice of using such phrases as "war party" and "peace party." This is nonsense. It is dangerous and demogogic. Peace is the deeply-desired goal of every American -- Democrat or Republican. Let us place the subject of peace in its proper place in this campaign. The issue is not which candidates or which party works for peace, but how the candidates and the parties work for peace. This is the central issue of this campaign -- and of this generation. How can America best

win a just and enduring peace for mankind? Our party believes that the people must be told the truth about the dangers facing America. We believe that we must inform the people of the threats against us, not just from Soviet missiles, but from Soviet education and economic warfare and Communist propaganda efforts. We believe that if Americans are aware of and understand the dangers to our security will they be willing to make the sacrifices necessary to answer the threats. / We know that we can succeed in our quest for peace only if the people have understanding and determination.

All of the programs and promises of this campaign will be meaningless if America cannot assure its own survival. All of the pledges and

proposals will be in vain if we cannot secure peace for ourselves and for the free world.

And all of our yearnings for peace will be lost if America does not lead the way to safeguarded disarmament agreements to end the terribying arms race.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, I am aware of all the problems, all the obstacles to the achievement of safeguarded arms control.

But <u>because</u> I am aware of the problems, I see the need to solve them. I see the need to put the energies of our government to work to find a way toward safeguarded disarmament.

J. MAN

A few weeks ago, the State Department announced the formation of a United States Disarmament

Administration -- to tackle the technical problems of arms control.

This announcement was welcomed.

But I wonder why it came now -- in the midst of an election campaign. For years, I have advocated the creation of such an office, and last February introduced legislation to establish what I call a National Peace Agency.

There was no word of support from the Administration the.

And for years, I have tried to get authorization from Congress for a \$400,000 appropriation for State Department studies of arms control problems. This year, I succeeded. This appropriation will allow the "Disarmament Administration" to begin work soon.

Jack Van Holtum

Francis Judge

LET'S DISCUSS THE ISSUES

DFL LUNCHEON, WORTHINGTON, MINNESOTA 11 a.m., Wednesday, September 21, 1960

What is the purpose of this campaign?

There is not one purpose, but many.

We meet and we work to organize, to become strong and effective, to inspire enthusiasm and dedication.

We meet and we work to know each other better, to become acquainted with our candidates and supporters.

But there is one, central purpose to this campaign which rises above all others in importance.

That purpose is to help inform the people - form

by discussing the issues.

I am concerned, frankly, at some of the patterns of politics.

More and more we hear candidates who speak only in generalized slogans about an opponent's personality

and character.

I agree that the candidate himself must be considered, viewed, met and judged by the people.

But the candidate for office must be discussed in relation to the integrity of his beliefs and the program for which he stands.

Our party must be as concerned with our goals as with our candidates.

We must emphasize not just the pleasant appearance and resonant voice of a man. We must know and understand his enduring principles and beliefs.

We must not confine our interest just to the task of getting out thousands of buttons and bumper strips. We must be determined that our party's goals are presented clearly and effectively.

What are those goals?

I believe that all are linked to two, central purposes.

The first is the winning of a just and enduring peace. There is nothing which is more important in this campaign or for this generation.

The quest of peace can not be a mere yearning, vaguely expressed in terms of "maybe" or "possibly" or "well, we'll try - but you know human nature."

The quest of peace must be at the heart and the core of our government's policies. America must work hard for peace.

That work can come through efforts such as my

Food for Peace program. It can come through projects

to help other nations develop their economies in an

orderly way. It can come through economic assistance

efforts channeled through the United Nations or such

regional groups as the Organization of American States.

Peace -- our central goal -- can never be secured unless the conditions of war -- poverty, hunger,

disease, illiteracy -- are reduced by Works for Peace programs.

The second basic purpose of our party is the establishment of Government with a Heart.

Our party wants a government which cares -- a government which serves all of the people with humanitarianism and effectiveness.

We do not want a government which is classified as a competing force in society -- to be set aside as a necessary but unfortunate evil of civilization.

We believe that government is and should be a noble extension of the will of all the people.

Government can not qualify for that description, however, unless its leaders and officials have the heart to concern themselves, with the needs and the problems of the people.

We know what those needs are -- effective medical care for the elderly, decent schools and teachers for

our children, proper protection for the family farmer, respect and consideration for the working man and woman.

These are the issues of this campaign. It is our purpose to discuss them fully and clearly.

I pledge myself to continue to campaign on the issues, and not on personalities or slogans.

our obliding propos provousion for sac taming the provousing the same working the same working

. orient this heart.

These are the lastes of this orangelyn, it is

our purpose to discuss when fully and obscip-

end no aglegman of entires of Tiery a Special I

language and setallingstop he for bits lesses.

Me atur

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.

