

James Patton  
Gov Anderson

~~Mr. Burke Joseph~~  
Geo Mc Govern

Mr Wilson

Excerpts of Remarks By  
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Food for Peace Conference  
Minneapolis, Minn.  
June 9, 1962

Seventeen months ago, when Mr. George McGovern was appointed Food For Peace Director, the President said: "America's agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way. . . We must make the most vigorous and constructive use possible of this opportunity."

Just how has President Kennedy's executive order been implemented? What has

80% of Population on farms -  
almost 50% - Rural  
40% - E. C. C. C.

This is the place for  
a Food for Peace  
Conference  
Midwest!

happened to Food For Peace?

Probably the best answer would come  
from a Moroccan laborer who owes his very  
job to Food For Peace . . . a school boy  
in Peru who is getting a nourishing meal  
each day for the first time in his life. . . .  
or a family of Chinese refugees in Hong  
Kong who are finding that people do care.

In statistical terms, 45 billion  
pounds of U.S. commodities were programmed  
for overseas shipment under Food For Peace  
authority during the 1961 calendar year.

This is an all-time record in utilizing  
our abundance in a coordinated attack on

45  
Billion  
Pounds

hunger and poverty throughout the world.

Here are only a few of the many other accomplishments of Food For Peace:

(1) The negative concept of "surplus disposal" has been replaced by a positive view of U. S. agricultural abundance as a precious national resource. This change in concept is fundamental to the success of the program. It has given rural America an appreciable stake in American foreign policy. It has resulted in much greater appreciation for U. S. food aid both at home and abroad. Critical food shortages in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Sino-Soviet Bloc

*Rural  
America  
Stake in  
U. S. Policy*

highlight the enormous food assets of the United States. Food is our most valuable material resource, and our clearest advantage in any competition with the communist world.

(2) The Departments of State and *the Dept of* Agriculture and the Agency for International Development have demonstrated a growing awareness of the importance of food in foreign assistance. Officials in State and AID in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture are taking steps toward a much-improved integration of food with other overseas development resources.

1957-  
what  
I found.

2 Although progress is being made, there is a need for more consideration by U. S. loan agencies and foreign assistance planners of the possibilities of using food to supplement dollar aid. <sup>are</sup> No United States official should give final clearance to a foreign loan until he is convinced that the possibility of using food as a substitute or supplement for aid dollars has been fully evaluated.

(3) Food as an instrument of economic development has been sharply increased. Two countries, Tunisia and Afghanistan, <sup>were</sup> ~~were it a~~ using U. S.-donated food for the partial payment of wages on public works projects at the beginning of the Kennedy Administration.

Eleven countries have such programs today,  
and negotiations are underway with 25  
others.

27 Countries

(4) Important new school lunch programs  
were established in a number of countries  
in 1961. Ambassador James Loeb of Peru  
advises that the first Latin American  
government-to-government school lunch program,  
which George McGovern signed with Prime  
Minister Pedro Beltran a year ago, has had  
a remarkably good impact. Aside from  
noticeable nutritional improvements, school  
attendance has increased by 40%. So  
successful has this program been that it

School  
Lunches

School  
Attendance

was recently enlarged to feed more than  
175,000 Peruvian children during the current  
school year.

Friends  
of  
America

(5) Six nations have signed agreements  
to purchase food for long-term loans with  
repayment in dollars. These agreements are  
the first of this kind.

Title 4

(6) In 1960, 54 million persons were  
fed with U. S. foodstuffs donated to private  
voluntary agencies. That number was increased  
by 10 million in 1961, and further increases  
are in the making. Voluntary agencies  
established feeding programs in eight additional  
countries last year.

The  
importance  
of  
Voluntary  
Agencies

(7) Food For Peace moved swiftly to meet

famine, flood, and other disaster conditions  
in the Congo, Vietnam, Kenya, North Africa,  
and other areas in 1961. Steps have been  
taken to broaden and add flexibility to our  
refugee feeding programs.

(8) An American Food For Peace Council,  
representing a broad cross-section of the  
public, has been organized to develop public  
understanding and support for the program.

(9) A U. S. Freedom From Hunger Foundation  
has been established to support the U. N. Food  
and Agriculture Organization's five-year  
campaign against hunger. Former President Truman  
was named by ~~the~~ <sup>Kennedy</sup> President as honorary chairman.



(10) As delegate to the FAO meeting  
in Rome in April 1961, George McGovern  
suggested, with the President's approval,  
that the United States would contribute \$40  
million in surplus commodities toward an  
overall U. N. food bank of \$100 million in  
food and cash. That proposal has since been  
approved by the FAO Conference and the  
United Nations and is being implemented  
within the U. N. system.

(11) An interagency committee has been  
established to evaluate new food processes  
that will increase the effective use of our  
foodstuffs abroad.

*Interested*

*Coordination  
Action!*

(12) The Food For Peace Director has  
proposed that the Alliance for Progress can  
be assisted by a formula under which the  
United States would provide feed grains to  
Latin America poultry-raising cooperatives.

Feed  
Grains  
to  
Poultry  
Coops.

Part of the poultry proceeds could be used  
to finance social and economic projects.

This is another way in which cereal surpluses  
can be converted to high-protein foods.

cereals  
to  
Proteins

These are just a few of the positive  
accomplishments of the Food For Peace program  
during the past 17 months. / The program has  
proved to be the most ambitious and imaginative  
effort in world history to construct a bridge

between the abundance of the United States  
and the undernourished half of the world  
that cries for food.

*Here is what it does,*

*Summary* (X) ↙ It helps the United States find  
constructive outlets for our <sup>amazing</sup> ~~surplus~~ food  
production; it reduces our storage costs;  
it stimulates our shipping industry and  
our ports; it bolsters farm income; it  
develops future dollar markets overseas;  
it raises purchasing power of other countries;  
and it strengthens U. S. foreign policy  
objectives. — *Some program, I'd say!*

(X) ↙ On the other side, sharing our food  
abundance reduces human misery, sickness

and premature death. It gives men the strength to work, students the energy to study, and brings nourishment and hope to millions. In supplementing the resources and the energy of food-deficient countries, the Food For Peace Program has become a powerful ingredient in economic and social development throughout the world.

I know that President Kennedy and the American people stand ready to share our resources so that every child can have food in his stomach, strength in his arms, hope in his heart and light in his eyes.

For transforming this into deeds, we owe

~~a debt of gratitude to the Food For Peace  
program, and to its imaginative Director,  
George McGovern.~~

*— the future*  
What does the future hold for Food For  
Peace?

Today, U. S. Food For Peace assisted  
school lunch programs are reaching 30 million  
children in 80 countries of the world. But  
there are 700 million children around the  
world who need such a program. Is Food For  
Peace equal to that challenge? Will the  
local governments do their part in establishing  
a school lunch for every needy child? I hope  
that some day in the not too distant future  
we can answer in the affirmative both of those  
questions.

*— yes a  
world  
program!*

The Food For Peace program faces other challenges. They are continuing challenges. They are immense challenges.

The three, basic challenges to our generation -- and perhaps to many generations to come -- are represented by three, tragic statistics of human need reported to me by the Library of Congress.

First, 83 per cent of the world's people are underfed.

Second, 70 per cent of the world's people are either sick or ill-housed.

Third, 62 per cent of the world's people are illiterate.


Is it any wonder that this earth is torn by conflict and scarred by repeated violence?

These conditions of hunger, misery and ignorance are more than disgraceful reminders that mankind has lacked the wisdom to put his technical knowhow to work to banish poverty and misery.

These conditions nourish the seeds of discontent, revolution and violence.

These conditions are the allies of *all forms of Evil* - Communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

These conditions are the real and the basic enemies of freedom, of peace, of justice.



~~We in the United States must learn to  
face these challenges squarely. We need  
to understand fully and deeply the meaning  
of the hunger, poverty and ignorance which  
stalks two-thirds of the world.~~

Our response to these conditions of  
misery must be more than a fleeting or  
momentary sense of compassion and sadness  
for "The rest of the world."

We must place our understanding of  
these conditions into the context of the  
present world struggle and our own struggle  
for the security and survival of freedom.

We must realize the practical and



political effect of hunger, sickness and  
ignorance.

↳ The hunger of any man weakens to some  
degree the chances of freedom for all men.

↳ The sickness or poverty of any human  
being strengthens the forces of ~~tyranny~~ *tyranny and oppression*.

↳ The ignorance or illiteracy of any  
citizen of this world cuts into the prospects  
for peace and contributes to the ingredients  
for war.

↳ We in this nation must realize that we  
are not threatened merely by the ambitious,  
aggressive personalities of particular  
leaders in specific nations.

We must realize that the dangers we face are not limited to guns or bombs.

We must realize that this struggle in which we are engaged is deeply meshed with the struggle of all mankind to lift itself out of the chains of poverty and ignorance.

Let me pause for a moment to comment on those who whine that this nation is being led by a "no win" policy.

They wave the banner of victory. I am not critical of that.

But they demand victory now. ~~On~~  
~~in their most patient mood -- they demand~~  
~~victory by next Tuesday.~~

(X) want & wants  
Dignity -  
Equality  
Wants opportunity  
Wants freedom  
Self-Govt  
Nations

I suggest that those who rave about a "no win" policy are really guided by a "know nothing" approach to today's international struggle.

~~They~~ <sup>they</sup> would win now, or tomorrow ~~or at~~  
~~the latest next Thursday~~ with guns and bombs. }

~~And, of course, they~~ <sup>they</sup> would win ultimately  
~~nothing but death and desolation and at best~~  
~~a reversal to the dark ages.~~

More and more Americans, fortunately, are  
coming to realize that the security of the  
United States and of freedom is not linked <sup>only</sup>  
~~merely~~ to military strength.

The people of this nation realize that  
this struggle demands military strength,

yes, but also <sup>moral,</sup> economic and technical strength -- and the use of them throughout the world.

And there is yet another dimension to our strength which is unique, and which gives us a distinct and powerful advantage in the struggle with totalitarianism ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>Violence</sup>

This ~~fourth~~ <sup>fifth</sup> strength is our agricultural abundance.

No other nation in the world has the strength and the power of an agricultural abundance ~~to the degree~~ <sup>which</sup> we enjoy, ~~and almost~~ <sup>many</sup> ~~all~~ nations are gripped by tight food shortages and agricultural failures. I need

Food Power

not remind you that the Soviet Union, most of its satellites and Red China are hindered and checked in their aggressive aims by shortages of food.

I can remember the days in the late 1940's when this nation was confident, proud -- and even a bit smug -- because we had a monopoly of atomic weapons. We lost that monopoly quickly, and with that loss a bit of our confidence too.

Today, we have a comparable advantage -- a super-abundance of food and fiber. I would hope that more Americans will realize the power of this advantage, and will gain renewed

confidence from it.

Clearly, we must use our agricultural abundance to feed and to lift those millions throughout the world who are chained to hunger and poverty.

✓ We have begun.

Food For Peace is no longer a dream. It is no longer a goal. It is no longer a slogan in American political campaigns.

Food For Peace is a practical, vital, effective instrument of the foreign policy of the United States and a compassionate arm of the people of the United States.

Victory will be ours. We will win this

struggle for freedom and progress -- not today, not tomorrow, not next Tuesday. We will win it with an effort which will take many years and perhaps even several generations.

✓ The victory we seek is a victory over the basic conditions of misery which have chained men through all of recorded history.

With a growing Food For Peace program -- fully utilizing the agricultural abundance given to us by God and cultivated by the skills of our people -- we cannot and will not fail.

(END)

June 9, 1962  
Minneapolis

SENATOR HUMPHREY'S FOOD FOR PEACE DINNER REMARKS

All of us here share with all Americans a sense of pride in the accomplishments of the Food for Peace program. Food from the farms of America is feeding millions of men, women and children throughout the world--whose hunger is the smoldering fire of revolution; feed from the farms of America is feeding the workers who are building schools and roads, and planting forests; food from the farms of America is providing the capital for much of our international development program. Food is literally building the schools, the roads, the hospitals in the developing countries.

The truly significant accomplishment of Food for Peace, however, is not measured in terms of how much food we have moved from our warehouses and elevators. Nor is it measured



in the millions of people who have been fed through this program, although God knows this is a worthy measure of our work. The outstanding accomplishment of Food for Peace, it seems to me, is in the change in concept of the program in the past few years. President Kennedy has repeatedly warned that we make a grave mistake if we regard Food for Peace as primarily a program of surplus disposal. We finally have begun to fully appreciate the potential of our agricultural productivity in international affairs--the full value of our agricultural abundance as a resource. We have finally begun to realize the full meaning of "Food for Peace."

With the accomplishment of a nuclear test-ban agreement, we hopefully--and prayerfully--can now turn our national attention and efforts to waging peace. And we have discovered that one of our most potent weapons for peace is food. I have

remarked--and I am constantly intrigued by this concept--  
that our use of food as an instrument of peace is a 20th  
century form of alchemy. We are engaged in the magic of  
turning food into gold--to buy hope and life for millions.

This is surely the time for an appraisal of the past,  
present and future of our Food for Peace program--for I am  
convinced that we are at a moment in history when man's  
struggle for peace can--and must--bear fruit. And in Food  
for Peace we know by our experience that we have a resource  
that can weigh heavily in this struggle, if we use it with  
imagination, with ingenuity, with confidence, and with hope.

In welcoming you to this meeting, Dick Reuter said  
that the full potential of Food for Peace is yet to be  
realized. This should be our challenge--a recognition of  
the potential of Food for Peace, and a determination to  
realize that potential.

Murray Lincoln, Donald Murphy, George Forell, William Benton, Mary Lasker and I were invited--and honored--to present to President-elect Kennedy recommendations for implementing the Food for Peace program--and we did so in January of 1961. At that time we said, and I quote, "It is our conclusion that tremendous opportunities exist for transforming our present surplus disposal operations into a constructive effort to use our abundance of food and fiber in building lasting foundations for durable peace and for the development of the emerging countries of the world."

[ We have come a long way since January 1961 in seizing these opportunities--as you have heard here today. We have laid the foundation for a Food for Peace program that holds the promise of being one of the finest efforts ~~of~~ man ever conceived for the benefit of his fellow man.

However, laudable our record may be to date in sharing our agricultural abundance, we would do well to regard it as a foundation--as a suggestion as to what is possible.

What are the <sup>New</sup> frontiers of Food for Peace? Let me remind you of some of our goals--some of our unfinished tasks--.

① Food for Wages programs have proved to be dramatically successful in the past two years--but the potential of this device is virtually unlimited in public works programs benefit~~ing~~ing hundreds of thousands in the developing countries.

School lunch programs --thanks to the splendid efforts of the cooperating voluntary agencies--are essential to the development of the finest resource of any country--the children. Here, too, the potential is unlimited. In the past year, the child feeding programs in Latin America--

known there as the "Alianza Para Los Ninos"--"Alliance for the Children"--have been one of the outstanding visible accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress. The school lunch programs of Japan, El Salvador, Peru and Ecuador can be equally successful in dozens of countries in the world--and can spell the difference between malnutrition and good health for millions of children.

The voluntary agencies-- the overseas aid and relief agencies of our great church and charitable organizations--have contributed new and glowing chapters to the history of humanitarian work in their cooperative efforts in the Food for Peace program. We must continue to rely on their contribution, and encourage the expansion of programs in which they are involved.

National Food Reserves still remain as one of the best answers to famine, disaster and merciless price-gouging

based on limited supplies of food. Our contribution to the establishment of national food reserves and adequate storage facilities in critical countries offers one of the most promising opportunities of our Food for Peace program.

Bi-National Foundations - for health, education, research and the public welfare, financed by PL-480-generated local currencies, can make a substantial contribution to development. This is still virtually an unplowed field. Such foundations can provide the essential and continuing non-governmental link in the development process in many countries.

④ Local currencies generated through the sale of our food and fiber can and must make a greater contribution to development programs. The Agency for International Development has made impressive advances in the past two years in the imaginative and constructive use of PL-480-generated

local currencies to finance development projects. But our balance of payments situation demands that we make even more creative use of this resource--our treasury of agricultural abundance.

Address by the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey  
at the  
AMERICAN FOOD FOR PEACE COUNCIL  
Midwest Region -- University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
Saturday, June 9, 1962

Thank you very much, George McGovern, the Food For Peace Director, the guiding light and really the inspiration of this tremendous national and international program. Governor Andersen, my thanks to you for your words and your splendid message this evening. Mr. Willis, Jim Patton, and to our able Director of the Agency for International Development, foreign aid administration, Fowler Hamilton -- Fowler, we're delighted that you're here. You have honored Minnesota and this community by your presence. And to our good friend Burton Joseph, who has been so willing to chair this convention, sponsor this program -- I want to thank you, Burton, for all that you've done. I know of your deep interest in these efforts. Whenever I see Jim Patton around, I know there's going to be somebody talk about food. Jim, I don't see how you keep your weight down, considering your great interest in food. But you are always a source of inspiration to me.

By the way, may I join with George McGovern in expressing my appreciation for the participation of the panelists at this splendid meeting that you have had all day. And I want to say to the reverend clergy that are here tonight, I don't think we could ever hold a Food For Peace conference in the proper environment without your presence, without the words of spiritual guidance which really direct the purposes of this program.

I believe the Governor properly stated what this program is about. This is not a material program, even though materials are involved. This is not a political program, even though foreign policies are involved. This is not an agricultural program, even though food and fiber are involved. This is a moral program. Feed ye the hungry and heal ye the sick. And clothe ye the naked. Governor, that's not only bi-partisan -- that's Old Testament and New, and I think it's a good enough policy for anybody, and I say that in all sincerity.

Now, George McGovern was kind enough to tell you that I was his next-door neighbor. I see more of George on the road than I do at home, and he sees more of me out around at these meetings than at home. Public life, as we all know, leaves little time for private life, but there are many joys in this life. George McGovern has told you that I was at least one of his favorite Senators -- be careful, George, because Senators are all very jealous of who is the favorite and you need all of us there in the Senate. So we'll amend your remarks and say that I am one of your favorite Senators.



And he said that I had bigger ambitions for myself. Well, he only had half as much ambition for me as I have for me, too, but I want you to know that this Food For Peace Program really works. Every Tuesday morning I have a little Food For Peace over with Mr. Kennedy. At a breakfast -- he gives me breakfast and keeps me peaceful all week long on that basis. That's our legislative breakfast.

I am going to talk to you tonight in terms that may seem beyond the scope of this immediate subject matter. I want to visit with you in a most informal manner about peace, what we are trying to do to obtain peace. Because I believe in peace. I really believe that this is the great objective of this nation, and it should be the great and the noble objective of every individual. I really believe that blessed are the peacemakers.

Now, sometimes you don't believe that any of you believed in peace when you hear so many of us say such unkind things and apparently so filled with the desire to find words that exemplify power, but actually there is no word that brings greater power than the word peace. Because when one is at peace he is in perfect relationship with his fellow man as well as his Maker. And that is power beyond human description.

So the topic of Food For Peace could easily be called food for power. Because food is power. And in a very real sense it's our extra measure of power. In 1962, as I have traveled around this world a bit, I find that it may be the one thing that we have in a mightier sense in greater abundance and the ability to produce it in even greater abundance over and beyond anyone else -- food.

I've seen Russian soldiers. I've seen their airplanes and their tanks and their bombs and they make them big. Every time we make a big one, they make one. Every time they make one, we make one. There is no victory in the arms race -- at least ultimately. So tonight we can talk about our quest for peace. Because that's really what we are trying to do as a people and as a nation.

This afternoon I journeyed from Washington to Chicago and from Chicago to Minneapolis. And all afternoon our pilots were searching and then, thank goodness, finding a way through the storm clouds. There was a solid bank for mile after mile of thunderheads going 35 to 40 to 45,000 feet. Any one of them could have destroyed that plane. But because of science, and technology, and training, and patience, calm judgment, good equipment, the pilot probed his way -- searched his way through these clouds, each one being a tremendous problem, all of them possessing potential disaster, but these pilots found their way -- first to the Chicago airport and then to the Minneapolis - St. Paul airport.

And in a very real sense, we are trying to do the same thing. All, should I say, in a broader sense. There are clouds all over the international horizon -- every place you look. Any place you look it appears that this could be the end of the line -- the last day for humanity. But because we are privileged to be people and not animals, and are endowed by a mentality and reason and soul, we search through these clouds, we search around them, we find paths to a safe landing. I use that analogy to say that we seek paths to peace.

This past month the Congress has brought to my attention some developments in this country that worry me, and I am literally going to throw away what I had planned on saying because I think you've heard it a dozen times today -- there is very little new to be said about anything relating to the structural aspects of the Food For Peace Program -- the legislation and the plans and the designs that we have.

But I want to say something about what I think is happening in America today which I think is unhealthy. I stood in the Senate of the United States for nine days while we debated and prepared first the preliminaries for the debate on the farm bill, as we call it, and then a week on the farm bill. And while I was there, and I was floor leader during that time, I heard all too few voices raised in the Congress of the United States -- in the Senate -- and Senators like to call that body the most deliberative body in the world. I heard all too few voices talk about food as a power for good, food and its moral value as well as its physical and financial value. I heard all too few voices raised as to what would be an adequate supply of food for the American people and the American nation to fulfill, first, its moral responsibility, and secondly, its international responsibility.

And I'll tell you why. Because we are weak -- materially weak -- with the idea that we are burdened down with unbelievable surpluses. It's been pounded into us for years. Democrats and Republicans alike. Until we can hardly make a speech about agriculture any more but what somebody has to raise his hands about the unbelievable surpluses. And the cost of the surpluses.

So what was the objective of the farm debate? I want to say in all due respect to the President and his Secretary of Agriculture and those who designed the measure, that in the measure there is all the authority that is necessary for proper reserves, proper supplies for domestic needs, for our needy people at home, our school lunch program, for our Food For Peace Program, and for reserves that we may need if drought should come or any act of nature should destroy a crop.

But what Hubert Humphrey is talking about to you is what did the people's elected representatives say? I want to pay my regards to Senator Aiken of Vermont -- he and I had many arguments over agricultural policies --

but he raised his voice about the need of an abundant supply of food and fiber for our moral and our political and our economic responsibilities. And I can say in all good conscience that not ten out of a hundred United States Senators spoke that way.

What did they speak about, and how did we get some of the votes that we needed for that bill? That we would cut down on the costs of storing grain. I am not opposed to cutting down on the costs of storing grain if you have more grain than you need, and I think there are some areas in which we have more than we possibly can use at this moment. But what I am saying to you is that it's about time that people like you in this room start to talk to your fellow citizens about a food and fiber program that means more than just double entry bookkeeping requirements. Or you're going to wake up and find out that you've had some fine speeches on Food For Peace, you'll have clergymen, governors, and Senators, and you'll have community leaders like yourselves talking about Food For Peace -- and there won't be any food and there won't be any peace. Because sometimes people become too determined to cut down on their production and they -- to use an old and simple analogy -- they kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

And I worry about this. I don't think it's going to happen immediately, but I sense that this country is more concerned about its fiscal habits than it is its moral habits. More concerned about what happens on the stock market than what happens in its schools. And more concerned, if you please, with what happens about a Federal budget or even a State budget than with what happens with the time and how we budget our personal time to do some of the things that were mentioned here today. Personal involvement in community life and in community good. This is a representative democracy and you get in the legislature and the Congress what you get at home -- hardly as much, I might add by the way, at times. And when it looks pretty ragged and when it looks a little dirty down our way or over here in St. Paul, just take a look in the mirror.

Now just let me mention one other little thing and I'm going to get back to a couple other thoughts I have. About three days ago I had quite a debate in Congress about whether we should have food and fiber made available to a country like Poland or Yugoslavia. It's a very good practice to sort of clear the air before you start on a main argument. I don't think we have to go through this room and give each other FBI tests. I don't see any Communists here -- I don't even see any Socialists -- maybe one or two I haven't seen. I don't believe we have to get up and say, "I am not a Communist."

I think what we might ask ourselves, however, is whether or not a policy that is being pursued by Government that brings people a little closer to the fresh air of freedom is a worthy policy. Or to put it another way -- if food can be the ticket that gives one person behind the Iron Curtain even a trip into the plains and the plateau of freedom, is it

worthwhile? Or to put it another way, if food can open the Iron Curtain for so little, is it worthwhile? Or to put it yet another way, if there are hungry people, should we feed them or help to feed them? Or to put it yet another way, do you really believe that these countries will never change?

I think they're changing more than we are. I think that Poland, for example, has become more liberal than we have become collective, by far. I don't see any growth of Communism in America -- none whatsoever. In fact, what few they have got, are just plain nuts, to put it in the vernacular. But I do say, and I have been in Poland, I have seen thousands of people that clutch the Declaration of Independence to their hearts like they do Holy Scripture.

They love freedom, but your representatives in the Congress went on a binge the other day. We got them sobered up 24 hours later, thank goodness, partially -- almost a lost weekend. And they decided that the way to handle this situation is to cut off all food assistance as well as any economic assistance, and we're not giving any economic assistance that amounts to anything. Anyway, we don't give it at all -- it's all loans in dollars and repayable with interest in dollars, and I've never heard of anybody going broke doing that.

But we decided to slam the door shut at the very time that Mr. Khrushchev had all the boys in the back room in Moscow and said to them, "Look, some of you fellows have been moving from the path of Communist dogma. You've been flirting with the West -- you've been doing business with the West. We have far too much of your commerce with the West. Get in line -- you're going to stay inside the house of the Sino-Soviet bloc." And we had people in Congress who said, "Khrushchev, you're right. We'll slam the door shut on them, and you take them and keep them."

And they said this is the way to do business. This is the way you prove that you are an anti-Communist and a pro-freedom man. Well, I said it there so I'll repeat it here. I said in the Senate, "I think we have lost our minds."

But may I say that this is the response we get from people when I go around the country. My mail runs about 100 to one for slamming the door shut. My mail runs about 1,000 to one saying, "Humphrey, what we want is a victory now." And we have orators that run up and down this country and say, "What we have to do is have victory." Well, I am prepared to listen to their formula.

I was at Offutt Air Base last Monday and I can guarantee you one thing -- and I want to say this in all sobriety and sincerity. Fellow Americans, I can guarantee that we can unleash on this world such deadly devastation that God Almighty may never forgive mankind for the next 500



years. We have it within our power today to literally destroy 50 percent of all humankind and all forms of life on this earth in 24 hours. Is that what you want? We can do it. Of course, the other half of it will be coming from the other side. Is that the kind of victory that you want? It makes a good speech. I've been at club meetings, I have sat and listened to people talk about the "We need a victory program. Stand up to these fellows." Well, we're standing up to them. Some people don't only want to stand up to them, they want to hurl this new power that was talked about here tonight, and I wonder how many people know what this new power is.

Let me give you one example. One B-52 that flies over this city now, right now, or within the path of this city, at this hour, carries more destructive power than all mankind has put together since the beginning of history. One -- one B-52 -- and 15 percent of all of your B-52 bombs -- and I won't tell you how many we have because it's a matter of classified information -- 15 percent of them are in the air every minute, loaded. Which is 15 times more than all of the power ever unleashed by man upon fellow man since the dawn of history. Is that what people want? Is this the cry of the orator who says, "Let's have victory." Thank God that our Presidents, whoever they may have been -- Truman, or Eisenhower, or Kennedy -- have not been men that shouted that kind of victory. They were temperate men. They were spiritually motivated and they were unwilling to unleash this terrible destructive force.

What's the purpose of it then? A deterrent. A call to reason. The purpose of the high-flying plane and the missile and the rocket that penetrates outer space is to get men to sit at tables and talk. To get people to reason together. As the Prophet Isaiah said, "Come let us reason together." Many people are unwilling to do that yet, but the time will come when either they will do it or all that we've created will be obliterated. There will be no inbetween. Don't kid yourselves. Because you and your people and my people and your country and my country and other people and their country have now created the sources of power, and the power resources and reserves, that are capable of literally obliterating and destroying everything that we have produced thus far as a civilization. Oh, I'll leave one ray of hope, if you call this hope. It is possibly a fact, as the Foreign Minister of Communist China said, that if they lose 400 million, there might be 300 million of them left. But there would be no Russians. We've got that taken care of. This I know. And I don't think there will be any Americans -- not very many. Because apparently they have that taken care of.

I sat in a place a week ago this Monday where I saw the kind of a mechanism that indicates target. By the way, let me just say to you, as one General said to me, "Senator, we have no room left in this outfit for ordinary people. We need people of super intelligence. We need college graduates." I saw young men sitting at a table, reading a map, Governor --

masters degrees - sergeants in the armed forces. We don't have room any more in this country, at least in the armed services of this country and the kind of a technology and breakthrough that we have for people, but that they have a high I.Q., and their mind is trained razor-sharp. And you can rest assured that is exactly what the other fellow is doing, too. Don't underestimate him.

So I say I've seen a couple of developments lately that have shaken me up a bit. One of them is that I saw us argue agricultural policy without bringing in what I think is one of the most important aspects of it. The moral, the social, the psychological, the spiritual aspect. One of the justifications for the family farm is what it does for people. I happen to think it's efficient -- maybe there are other farms more efficient -- but I have never found the word efficient in either the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Magna Charta, or the Old or the New Testament. I found a lot of words like justice, love, compassion, freedom, and brotherhood, but the word efficiency popped up a little later along in man's deliberations. And it may be very true that there are some forms of agricultural production more efficient than the family farm -- none more spiritually wholesome. And I thought when we talked agricultural policy that we ought to talk about that, too.

And then let me say to this fine audience that people who attend the church of their choice -- the cathedral, or the temple, or the church -- it appears to me that one of the most powerful forces in the world is love. Compassion. Understanding. For some reason or other we have forgotten a little bit about that, too. And so we have substituted atom bombs and nuclear weapons and space objects. Now, don't misunderstand me -- space objects and even weapons may be a temporary platform on which you have to stand. But everything that everybody in this audience has ever been taught, or don't you transfer your Friday or your Sunday message to you the rest of the week? -- everything else that we have been taught indicates that there is something more powerful than guns. And I think there is. If I didn't think so, I'd quit Congress. Because I am convinced that we're never going to build the kind of a world that you and I work for, hope for, and pray for by the fact that the Senate of the United States and Appropriations Committee yesterday reported out a \$50 billion budget.

And let me tell you something about it. We don't say that we can't do it, either. You know what I have heard, George? I have heard about food distribution. I want to compliment the Governor on his emphasis upon voluntary activity. Because this is vital. And what have I heard when we have talked about expanding this program? I know that George McGovern once said in the Congress in a speech in Washington, we have over -- what is it -- 30 million people in the school lunch program overseas? He said there are 700 million needy children in this world. He didn't say that we could feed them all, but he was talking about a program that all the nations might join together in, and those who have this abundance

or those that could produce this abundance would pool that abundance and we would have a school lunch program for the needy children of the world, and as the school lunches were developed, so the schools were developed. And the children attend the schools. In fact, in some parts of the world, school attendance is directly related to the school lunch program. When you have a program of school lunches, you have children in school. When you don't have school lunches, no children in school. So education is tied in with it.

But what is the common complaint when a man like George McGovern, who thinks in big terms and rightly so, and is imaginative, when he says, "Look, let's pool our efforts -- let's think in big terms and think of the school lunch program in hundreds of millions of children," somebody says, "You can't do that -- you have no way of distribution. It can't be done."

My dear friends, if you can snatch a capsule out of outer space with a Navy airplane over the Pacific, a capsule that is coming to earth at the rate of over 1,000 miles an hour and a plane that's passing over the surface of the water at over 500 miles an hour -- and we have done it -- don't tell me that you can't build places to serve school lunches. If you can put tracking stations to watch Commander Shepard or Lt. Col. Glenn or Commander Carpenter -- and we have -- we have put tracking stations with radar, with fantastic equipment -- all over the world every place so that no matter where this astronaut of ours is in the air and in space -- no matter where he is -- he is in a radar pattern. With TV, we can watch him.

Do you think that the Project Mercury fulfilled its program by having people who said, "Oh ho, you can't do that. We have never caught an object from outer space in a net below an airplane. How are we going to track this fellow going 17,000 miles up there over 100 miles in the air? How are we going to do that? We can't do that."

Those can't-do fellows were fired before they were hired in the space program. We've got no room in the space program for can't-do people. We've got all those over in the food program. Oh yes! How many times have I heard "Well, you people can't put more food into Asia. They don't have any warehouses."

Let me tell you something, fellow Americans. If our troops have to go to war on the Mekong River in Thailand, you'll have warehouses. And we'll build them so fast they'll wonder how they got there. You know it! If you can build a major city in Thule Air Base in Greenland -- if you can put men in the Arctic Circle -- if you can put men in a submarine 60 days below the sea -- you can build a warehouse in India, a long ways up the hill, too. And if you can't, you'd better get those troops out of Thailand in a hurry, because somebody may start shooting. And I hope we're planning on feeding our forces over there.

I remember when we first had the aid program to India. I am pleased that the Governor mentioned it. By the way, Governor, that little program that you mentioned did produce \$5 million in individual contributions. Interesting.

All the voluntary agencies met with us down in Washington. Do you know how the program started? Out of sheer frustration. I went to people and they kept telling me -- you can't do it. I met some folks. I knew Madame Pandit, the Ambassador from India at that time, I talked with the Indian Food Minister -- this was 1952. They told me that there was famine stalking the land, and I said, "Well, why don't we do something about it?" We've had all kinds of stuff out here in Minnesota we didn't know what to do with, we had so much of it. So we started talking about it -- some of us down there and people out here, people in the Red Cross and the CARE program, different programs -- the Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Relief -- all these many programs. We all got together, and they said, "Well, why don't we do something about it?" So we started to do it and we collected enough money to send a couple of shiploads of wheat.

In the meantime, I kept going around to Government officials and every time I would run into one, he would say, "Well, Senator, you can't have a food program for India." The Indians didn't ask for something for nothing, by the way, they wanted to buy four million tons of wheat. And I won't name any names because it would be embarrassing -- I went from office to office and by the way, Governor, it was in a Democratic administration, and I found more people who said you couldn't do this than I could count.

But a man by the name of Bishop Pickett came back from India. And it was as if he had been sent there by a miracle. I had practically given up. He came to my office and I talked to him and when he got through talking to me, I want to tell you I was so moved that I said, "We have got to do something about this." He said, "Well, why don't you get me over to see the President and maybe we can convince him."

And it was one of those lucky moments. I picked up the phone and called the President -- Mr. Truman was then President. I went over to see the President -- he was there -- Bishop Pickett talked to him about 15 or 20 minutes and when we got all through, the President said, "Well, Hubert, why haven't you been over to see so-and-so about this?" I said, "I have." And he said, "What did he say?" I said, "He said he didn't think we could do it." He said, "Well, why don't you go back to the office and about 15 minutes from then call him up. He may have a change of mind." And it was amazing! All at once, all the problems disappeared. And all at once those who said it couldn't be done said, "Oh, of course" and it was done. And in case you're interested, the Indians are paying for that food in dollars with interest. If that moves somebody!



We can do what we want to do. And if we can't do what we think we want to do and what we ought to do, then we're licked before we start. This country has never done anything but what some people said it couldn't be done.

There were all of those calamity howlers at Valley Forge and many of them were in the Continental Congress. They wanted to get Washington home. Call off the war. Forget it. Make love to King George. Fold up the tents. Get out. But George had a lot of confidence in his God and in his troops. And hoped for a little luck. And he stuck it out.

And I visited Yorktown. And you know what happened there. The British surrendered and when they did, the song that they played is "The World is Upside Down." It was for them. A whole new world had been started that day.

And they said that Lincoln, too, couldn't do it. They said, you can't win. Compromise. Give it up. And when he came to the Emancipation Proclamation, there were eight nays and one aye, and the ayes had it. Because he was the aye.

And how many of you remember too that Woodrow Wilson said, "What we need is a League of Nations." And they said, "You can't do it. It can never be done." He didn't live to see it done, but it became the United Nations.

And then how many of you remember when Franklin Roosevelt said, "We'll produce 50,000 planes a year." And I can still see some of the editorials that said "We always knew he was crazy and now here is the living proof." But we produced 93,000 in 1945, the last year of the war.

We're just getting going, as a matter of fact. We can do it. Anything we want to do. Now that tells me this -- that we can do more in the Food For Peace Program than we are doing. We're doing well. What was it, George -- 45 or 65 -- 45 billion pounds of food and fiber in 1961. Some of you may think that this doesn't take some doing. If I were to tell you the hours and hours that we have put in throughout the years trying to get a little amendment to a bill on Public Law 480, oh, my goodness! If I were to tell you of a trip in 1957 -- I took off in April at Easter time with literally no plan. I just knew that something was going wrong and I went into Southern Europe and the Middle East and North Africa. I went to study the Food For Peace Program.

By the way, it's called Food For Peace. Do you know that the Congress turned down that title? They wanted Surplus Disposal. Really, I shouldn't be this unkindly tonight to my colleagues. But I offered the amendment to call this program officially by law Food For Peace. And I want to say to the everlasting debt and gratitude and everlasting thanks to

President Eisenhower -- I was over talking to him one day and told him about this experience, and he said, "We'll call it that anyhow." We didn't get it by act of Congress. It's in there now, but at that time -- oh no, we wouldn't have that. It was Surplus Disposal. We were looking for some sort of an international garbage can to get rid of this surplus. Dispose of it.

We've changed that concept, too. We're talking about use of our abundance -- the use of our abundance! 45 billion pounds of food and fiber! We need to have more and we're going to have to plan it. I remember only a few weeks ago in the Senate some member of the Senate got up and said, "Let's give the starving Chinese all of our feed grains." I said, "But you know there may be some that, when you say please pass the grain sorghum, they don't like it." It's a fact, you know. Some of the food that we have as surplus is made for chickens, pigs, and cattle -- not people. But the whole idea was to empty the bins. Save the taxes. Well, we appealed to reason and, finally, that amendment was withdrawn.

We have so much to be grateful for in this abundance. We're in the land where we ought to talk about Food For Peace, too. In the Midwest. I want to tell you what Mr. Khrushchev would give for that Minnesota land -- that Iowa land. What productive power we have here and what marvelous relationship between management, ownership, and technology we have on our farms. Science and people, put together. The care of the individual with his own property and his cooperatives. To put this force together on even greater power, we have perfected a system of production here that is the miracle of the world -- the marvel of the world.

And you know something? We have been going around the world talking about our big factories until just a few years ago. And you know something? They have got bigger factories in Germany than we have. And they have got some bigger ones in Russia than we have. And we were going around to some other people who didn't have any factories, and we said how big our factories are. When we had what they really wanted -- something to eat. We didn't want to talk about that, except as a problem.

Imagine going into South America, where many of you have been -- imagine going into the back country of South America and talking about the American problem of abundance. They think you're off your rocker! Either that, or completely immoral. And maybe both are right. Imagine going into the parts of the world where the statistics are staggering in terms of poverty, illiteracy, and hunger, and talking about our problem of production. Somebody says, "Oh, have you had a bad crop?" You say, "Oh no, it's too good." And he says, "Did you say problem?" And you say, "Yes, I said problem." And he looks at you and says, "I believe those people who have been telling me about those Yankees are right."

Is this a problem? And I am not fooling you, my friends. I found some statistics here that were just shocking to me. I just want you to listen to this, the challenge that I think we face today, the real challenge: 83 percent of the world's people underfed! By any standard that anybody could lay down. 70 percent of the world's people sick! Organically sick, diseased, cripples, blindness, skin diseases, blood diseases, stomach diseases, dysentery -- call it what you will, they're sick. And 62 percent of the people of the world illiterate! And we say the problem is Communism! My friends, if you will eliminate the three figures that I put to you there won't be any Communism that amounts to anything. I know that Communism doesn't only come because of social disorders, social inequities. I know that Communism is a powerful, political force. But I know that Communism will not long live as a threat -- material and political threat -- if you can reduce the figure of 83 percent of the world's people who are today living on a diet less than is required for a strong body, if you can reduce the figure of 72 percent of the world's people who are sick, and 62 percent who are illiterate. And I'll tell you something else. You'll never stop revolutions and violence and Communism until you do something about those figures.

I have said about this character, Castro -- and I have been to Cuba and I have talked to Cubans in Cuba this year -- lots of them. And you know what we do for Castro? We make this fellow look really big. And what I'm saying to you I have said to my own partisans and I am critical of many in government and many in the party -- and of the other, too. We have an obsession about Castro. You'd think that Castro somehow or other was going to invade us. The Miami Police Department can put this fellow out of business in an outright military action, you know. We have got Castro really believing he really amounts to something. Why, we haven't had a conference for a year and a half to two years on Latin America but what the first thing we insist on doing is -- and Fowler, I don't know how this is going to go back up there in Washington when we get back, but I am going to get it off my chest.

We haven't had one Foreign Ministers conference, we haven't had one conference of the Organization of American States, but what we get all the foreign ministers and all the representatives of the Latin American countries back in a corner and we say, "Now listen, we want you to take a pledge against Castro." And after we bend them and twist them and shove them and give them all the treatment we can give them, including a few goodies like offers of loans and what have you, we get 14 or 15 of them to say, "Well, we don't like Castro."

So then everybody's happy. Big headlines. "U. S. wins victory. 14 out of 22 nations anti-Castro." It took us a month to get it, in their part of the world! And then we start interpreting it. And that is the major accomplishment according to what the public is led to believe. The public is led to believe that we were tough, that we were able to get our friends in Latin America to come out against Castro.

Listen, my friends, what about getting them to come out against corruption? What about getting 14 or 20 or 22 of them to come out against poverty? What about getting 14 or 22 of them to come out against military dictatorships? Why don't we get obsessed with the hunger in Latin America? I have seen it. I would like to have this country get obsessed with the 450,000 hungry people in the slums of Santiago, Chile. And I want to say to my friends of the clergy, thank God that the clergy at least is fighting down there. I have seen them. 23,000 people and one faucet of water! Why don't we get obsessed about that?

One of the reasons that Castroism has some force in Peru, and there's an election there this week, one of the reasons that Castroism has some power in Chile is because we are so obsessed with Castro we forget about the folks. I know the Alliance for Progress is doing good things. But we need all of our energy on the Alliance for Progress. We can keep that little fellow Castro bottled up.

And to put it in the toughest terms, I was out on the Enterprise and the Forrestal. There's enough air power and enough fire power on either of those two to sink Cuba in the ocean. He is not going to get lost. Castro's menace isn't his military power. And don't let anybody kid you -- we are not going to let him put any missile bases there either that threaten us. We're not that foolish. Castro's menace is the fact that we have not become sufficiently obsessed with what caused Castro. When we get obsessed with the disease, rather than the product of the disease, we'll start to stop Mr. Castro.

Now we're getting that way. I'm just laying it on you because I want you to get obsessed. There's no way that representative government will do any more than you want it to do. These are the things that I think need to be done. We have to have the right obsessions.

What do you really want to win, my fellow Americans? What is your victory goal? What do you really want to win? And what do you want to win over? Now you know as well as I know tonight, if you want to be rational with me, that to win over the military power of the Soviet Union tonight, which I think we can do, will cost this nation in blood and treasure unbelievable sacrifices. Is that the kind of a victory that you want tonight? The bomb? The attack? The preventive war? Because if you're going to win, my friends, you had better strike first -- in this kind of a war. Have you seen any of our missile bases? Have you seen the Minuteman? Have you seen the Atlas? Do you know what they can do? 5,200 miles and 150 foot off from target? I don't dare tell you what the megatron bomb hit is.

Now, we have a "win" policy. I think what we ought to be trying to win over is what we're talking about -- poverty, illiteracy, sickness, frustration, hunger, and then what should we try to win for? We should be winning wars and winning battles for human dignity. That's what people want.



This is what the struggle is about in Asia. In Latin America and Africa people want to be people. Not second-class people -- people. Individuals. Yes, Governor, individuals, not mass. I don't like that word mass. The only place that word ought to be is either in church or in pharmacy. Pill mass, or go to your religious service. But the mass of humanity -- no. There is no mass -- they are individuals, each person personally important. Each endowed with soul and spirit.

I say that what we have to win is the struggle for human dignity, and thousands at home, too. Now, on Route 40 from Washington to New York the Ambassador of Nigeria stops into a restaurant and is told, "You're colored. Get out." I don't care how many millions of dollars you send to Africa, my friends. They will take your money and spit on you because what they want is dignity. They have been poor a long time -- they have been used to that. But they want equality. They want acceptance. And the number one problem that this government has today in its foreign relations with Africa is not Congo -- it's nothing even that fellow down in Guinea, who's already kicked out the Soviet Ambassador when we thought he was a Communist -- but namely the head man in Guinea. The number one problem we have with Africa today is the way we treat our own people here. They call it segregation.

And what else do people want? Opportunity. How much opportunity? Just a chance to make something out of themselves. And this is where our aid program comes in. This is where our technical assistance program comes in. This is where our Peace Corps program comes in. This is where our Food For Peace Program comes in. We're using all of these many programs to do what? Not to do things for people, but to do things with people. To help people help themselves.

Dignity, opportunity, but what else do they want? Freedom. They want it just like you want it. Everybody in this country wants freedom. Everybody in this country has freedom. And we've talked the doctrine of freedom for 300 years. We've sold it to the world -- it's been the best thing we have done. And it's been so good for us that people say "If it's good for you, and it's good for us, let us have some of it." And freedom to them means self-government. And when they govern themselves sometimes they do it in a rather crude way. Because they are not ready for it, many of them.

I heard a man say here the other day at the Minnesota Bankers Association that some of these new nations are like adolescents. Do any of you have a 16-year-old or a 15-year-old or a 17-year-old or an 18-year-old? Can't you remember some of it? One minute they look like they are almost grown up and the next minute they're a child. One minute they love you and the next minute they reject you. One minute they want to sit and talk about the problems of the world and the next minute they have got you and themselves in more trouble than six lawyers can get you out of. That's adolescence.

Do you know what you do? You just hope and pray that somehow or other it will come out all right with some kind of guidance. Just keep a steady hand. You don't go rushing in and hit them over the head every minute.

People want dignity, people want opportunity. People want freedom. People want dignity, people want work, and they want self-government. And this is what we stand for. And the Food For Peace Program is filled with this.

Well, I conclude on this note. You know what we have been able to do? The old medieval baron, or king, used to look through his realm and try to find somebody that he thought could take base metal and change it into gold. Do you remember those stories they used to tell us when we were children? They used to lock this chemist, or alchemist, as they called him -- they used to put him up in a tower and if he couldn't change old pig iron into gold, off came his head. Well, somebody once told me that we now have people who can do that. That's a tax lawyer.

But there's someone else who can do it, too. We have been able to take wheat and look what we have been able to do with it. Dr. Carver, the great Negro scientist, took a peanut and made 152 products, they say. Look what we have been able to do with something like wheat or butter or vegetable oil or cheese or feed grains or meal. Whatever you wish. We have been able to take wheat, feed hungry people, give jobs with it, build hospitals with it, build roads with it, build schools with it, provide scholarships with it, translate books with it, publish magazines with it, give research grants with it. Wheat, just wheat! We have taken a kernel of wheat and we have literally made a world out of it, in some parts of this world.

This is Food For Peace. This is what we do with what we call Title I -- in Greece tonight there's rural electrification. In 1957 there was none. I was there. There was \$100 million in Greek drachmas that had been accumulated from the sale of surplus wheat, as we called it. The Prime Minister of Greece told me last October that we will be happy to know that the program that we talked about here five years ago is a reality. Farmers in Greece tonight have rural electrification out of this wheat. Your vegetable oils. I think that is pretty good. 29 countries have jobs paid for by food from our stockpiles.

There are programs of research underway in Asia, India, Indonesia, in the Philippines, in Taipei, Formosa -- there are programs of research in cancer, where some of the leading world specialists in cancer are being paid out of the proceeds of wheat. In the meantime, the people were fed with it. And one of the great breakthroughs in high blood pressure treatment came out of funds that were made available to doctors in India out of rupees from the sale of wheat. Not bad. Even curing hypertension with this kind of research.

So I feel that we have a program here that's of tremendous proportions. And I ask you to have a lot of faith in it and I want you to do one other thing. Don't let this program die at home because of neglect.

And beware, my fellow Americans, of overpromising abroad and failing to deliver at home. This United States of America today has commitments with over 80 countries in the world on food, and I shudder lest we are not going to be able to fulfill those commitments to them. The sure way to start violence and revolution is to start a program that helps people and then take it away from them prematurely. So when you talk to your Congressman, whoever he may be in whatever state you come from, I want you to talk to him about this program, and if he tells you that it costs a lot, you remind him that we are going to spend between now and 1968, \$50 billion to try a one-shot at the moon. We will spend next year more money on the moon shot program than we have spent since 1954 on all the years of Food For Peace, and if we get to the moon we don't quite know what we are going to do when we arrive! I am not opposed to it. I think we have got to do that, but I think we should have some priorities. Frankly, I think if we had taken care of a few things on earth a little better, everybody would not be so anxious to get to the moon. Or at least maybe we would be willing to take it in slower pace. Because it is the speed of this effort that costs the dollars.

Let us put first things first. Peace can be won -- peace can be won. By patient perseverance and persevering patience. By calm courage. It can be won by strength. Every form of strength. Strength in our economy, strength in our civil liberties and civil rights. Strength in our political structure. Strength in our military, strength in our foreign policy, strength in our United Nations, strength in our Food For Peace.

This is why I came out here. Just to tell you that. You have been a patient audience and I thank you very much.



# 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)