

Bob  
Weaver  
Dave Bell

Dr. Roseman  
James Moore

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

URBAN DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

SPONSORED BY

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, SEPTEMBER 15, 1965

No  
countries  
code delegates

Bob  
Weaver  
Dave  
Bell

We Americans have been more urban than rural since 1920. But as you know, it was only this summer that we fully accepted this fact and established a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This doesn't mean we haven't been working on urban problems for a long time. As Mayor of Minneapolis, I worried about financing school expansion, improving housing, carving playgrounds and parks out of packed

city blocks, about highways and bus service, and building a tax base to pay for the things our people had to have.

└ As a member of the United States Senate I continued to work toward providing for these same needs.

└ Today, as Vice President, I act as the President's liaison with mayors, city managers, and local government -- with the people who deal day-to-day with the problems of urban America.

└ Our new Department of Housing and Urban Development will make possible coordination of federal programs for the cities . . . it will serve as a focal point for what we are doing.

└ With this new Department, I believe we'll do a better job of designing cities, of meeting problems like mass transit and water supply, of improving welfare programs,

open spaces, recreation

of providing educational opportunity -- of making our cities places to live in and not to escape from.

Our rich and strong country is today dedicated to this task, and to the task, in all our society, of helping create a life of both quality and quantity, a life in which each man has the equal opportunity to build something better for himself, his children, his country.

∠ And your objectives, I suspect, are not too greatly different. But your nations do not have our wealth and strength, your nations do not have as ready access to human and material resources. And, therefore, your task is even more difficult than ours.

∠ Looking at our own economic assistance programs -- at the kinds of things we're doing in partnership with other countries -- I think it is clear that we have begun to place a much higher priority than we once did on

urban development as a major concern in the problem  
of nation-building.

↳ As recently as five years ago, you would have had  
a hard time finding many AID projects that could be  
called part of an urban development program.

↳ The need was right before our eyes: people by the  
millions were streaming in from the rural areas in Bombay, Lima,  
and Caracas and Cairo, running from the poverty they  
knew on the ~~farm~~ <sup>land</sup> to the opportunity they thought beckoned  
in the city. But as recently as that, there was a feeling  
on your part and on ours that things like housing were  
luxury investments that would have to wait on the building  
of more factories, more power plants and more roads.  
Housing, so they said, wasn't productive. !

↳ But that's not true. You can build houses and  
community centers and schools and clinics with local materials.

It takes little precious foreign exchange. The biggest cost in laying sewers or water mains is labor. As far as being productive is concerned, in the United States the home-building industry is responsible for one out of every 18 dollars of our national product, and it provides jobs for 1 out of every 20 Americans.

And it is anything but productive to sit by and permit the mushrooming of miles of slums and shacks, crowded with sick and illiterate and miserable human beings whose very misery makes them receptive to any proposal, however violent and destructive, that seems to promise some hope.

In the last five years we have come quite a distance.

The increase in AID assistance for urban development is remarkable, especially in Latin America under the Alliance for Progress. AID alone has made more than 150 million

dollars in loans for housing construction and more than 200 million dollars has been loaned by the Inter-American Development Bank.

↳ To get private American capital investment in international housing, the Congress has given AID authority to make 400 million dollars in housing investment guaranties for Latin America, and reserved another 125 million dollars in guaranty authority for housing investments in Asia and Africa. ↳ Right now, private American investors are using this authority to launch joint housing ventures in Taiwan, Thailand, Nigeria and Tunisia.

↳ By themselves, the raw statistics of what we have achieved seem impressive. In Fiscal Year 1965 for example, the U.S. AID program helped other countries add decent dwelling units for 680 thousand people; ~~470~~ thousand of these in Latin America. Compared with what was happening

five years ago that is impressive. But compared with the need it is hardly a start. I know of no developing country in which the construction of new, decent housing has yet kept pace with the raw increase in urban population.

↳ If there is cause for optimism it is not because of the statistical results to date, but because of what lies behind these statistics. ↳ am encouraged by the growth of institutions and programs that will make a decent home economically possible for more and more people in the less-developed countries.

↳ The growth of savings and loan associations in Latin America, for example, has been remarkable, and I'm proud of the role that private American groups like the National League of Insured Savings Associations and the U.S. Savings and Loan League have played in this

growth through the AID program. In Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela and Guatemala alone 70 associations have been organized with more than 200,000 members, 55 million dollars in savings and 99 million dollars <sup>or available</sup> in loans ~~out~~ for the purchase of new homes.

To me, the experience with savings and loan associations, with credit unions, and with housing cooperatives now being organized with the support of American labor unions, makes it clear that the local funds to finance much of the needed urban housing are <sup>available</sup> ~~present~~, if they can only be mobilized.

I'm encouraged too, by the success of self-help housing programs in countries as distant and diverse as Nicaragua, Nigeria and Korea. The very poor have no buried savings to share in a cooperative or a savings and loan association, but they can contribute their own labor.



↳ This ~~device~~ has cut costs by as much as 40 per cent, and it has given the people who live in these houses a sense of participation and dignity that may be as important as the home itself.

↳ Our commitment to help with the problems of urban development is a firm one. But it is also clear to us, as I'm sure it is to you, that the problems of the growing city can be solved only partially within the city itself.

↳ In the 15 years or so since the beginning of our partnership for development with your countries and other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the pattern and the problems of progress have become fairly clear.

↳ We have seen some great achievements. Together, we have very nearly wiped out the threat of malaria for half the 1.3 billion people in the malarious areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America. ↳ We've done pretty well at building factories and putting up power plants. Industrial output has increased at an average of better than six per cent a year.

*Agrie*

↳ But farm output, in nearly every one of the less-developed countries, has barely kept pace with the increase in population. ↳ In many of your countries, it has fallen behind, despite sizable investments in fertilizer imports and factories, in rural roads, in irrigation projects.

↳ The result is more than food shortages in the cities. ↳ The result is rural poverty and the flight of more people to the cities. In most of your countries, rural people

still account for better than two-thirds of the population.

L If the farmers are not producing more, if their incomes are not rising, where is the growing internal market to provide more orders for urban factories, more jobs for city people?

sg L It is clear ~~to us~~ that we are also going to have to pay far more attention in our assistance programs to raising agricultural output. There is no other way to ease the pressure of migration on your cities, or broaden the internal markets that will create more city jobs.

L In his message this year on the Foreign Assistance program, President Johnson pledged the United States to use its own agricultural abundance and technical skills to help the less-developed countries increase their own ability to produce food of their own.

Keep  
Rural  
economy

Some of the steps involved are obvious: more fertilizer, better produce distribution, improved pricing practices, more irrigation. We in the United States are going to make better, more extensive use through the AID program of our own unique experience in agricultural development by involving our land grant universities and our own Department of Agriculture specialists. We are continuing to expand our use of experts from American farm cooperative groups in helping other countries raise farm productivity.

We can't reproduce our own American experience in your country. ~~nor should we~~ Countries are different and you can't transfer institutions willy-nilly. But we can provide ~~wonderfully~~ <sup>able +</sup> skilled people from our universities, our cooperatives, our Agriculture Department to help work out solutions that do make sense in another situation.

L If we persist together, <sup>+ work</sup> ~~I don't doubt for a moment that~~ <sup>we will be able</sup>

~~we will~~ turn up on the farms and in the villages the

same ~~buried~~ resources of human drive and ingenuity --

and maybe even a good deal of capital -- that the savings

and loan experiment has turned up in the Latin American

countries I mentioned earlier. ~~+~~

L As you may know, I have something of a reputation  
as an optimist. Well, I am.) It is easy to be discouraged

by the troubles of men and nations. Certainly we're all

sobered by what's happening in India and Pakistan today.

L And Vietnam is disturbing and tragic. ~~For~~ While men

are at war, we can't get on with the most important human

battle in Southeast Asia: the battle to develop the promise

of a rich and fertile land for the people who live there.

L But when I look back on our common history since  
World War II, what I'm impressed with is not the troubles

or the problems -- the world has always had those. I'm impressed with the new element in international relations: the steady effort, crystallized in our mutual development programs, our aid programs, by independent countries to work together on solving problems.

That is new, and different, and a cause for optimism.

For our part, I can assure you that we approach our role in the development partnership in the same way we have learned to view our investment in the development of our own cities. We don't see this as something we are doing for "somebody else." We see it as an investment in our own future and in the world we share with you.

In closing, may I say this:

The American character is one of activism and, sometimes, impatience. It is one which leads us, from time to time, into mistakes. It is one, I am sure, which

is often not fully understood in other places.

But I want to leave this message with you: We Americans are committed -- committed beyond recall -- to the building of a freer, better, happier world for all men.

There have been times, I know, when you may have doubted this. But today, as never before, our American nation has come to appreciate the oneness of mankind. This appreciation makes possible the great national programs we undertake today to build better cities, to fight poverty, to eliminate discrimination in our own society, to do something on behalf of our fellow men.

And today, as never before, we know that we cannot live rich in a world too-long poor.

I, for one, mean to do in my lifetime whatever I can to extend mankind's benefits to more of mankind. And I am joined by the overwhelming majority of the American

- 16 -

people. I am joined, certainly, by our President.

Let us, then, together pledge ourselves to creating the world of justice, hope and peace that all men long for, but have not yet achieved.

#####



REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR SPONSORED BY HOUSING AND HOME  
FINANCE AGENCY, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,  
STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, SEPTEMBER 15, 1965

We Americans have been more urban than rural since 1920. But as you know, it was only this summer that we fully accepted this fact and established a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This doesn't mean we haven't been working on urban problems for a long time. As Mayor of Minneapolis, I worried about financing school expansion, improving housing, carving playgrounds and parks out of packed city blocks, about highways and bus service, and building a tax base to pay for the things our people had to have.

As a member of the United States Senate I continued to work toward providing for these same needs.

Today, as Vice President, I act as the President's liaison with mayors, city managers, and local government -- with the people who deal day-to-day with the problems of urban America.

Our new Department of housing and Urban Development will make possible coordination of federal programs for the cities . . . it will serve as a focal point for what we are doing.

With this new Department, I believe we'll do a better job of designing cities, of meeting problems like mass transit and water supply, of improving welfare programs, of providing educational opportunity -- of making our cities places to live in and not to escape from.

Our rich and strong country is today dedicated to this task, and to the task, in all our society, of helping create a life of both quality and quantity, a life in which each man has the equal opportunity to build something better for himself, his children, his country.

And your objectives, I suspect, are not too greatly different. But your nations do not have our wealth and strength, your nations do not have as ready access to human and material resources. And, therefore, your task is even more difficult than ours.

Looking at our own economic assistance programs -- at the kinds of things we're doing in partnership with other countries -- I think it is clear that we have begun to place a much higher priority than we once did on urban development as a major concern in the problem of nation-building.

As recently as five years ago, you would have had a hard time finding many AID projects that could be called part of an urban development program.

The need was right before our eyes: people by the millions were streaming in from the rural areas in Bombay and Caracas and Cairo, running from the poverty they knew on the farm to the opportunity they thought beckoned in the city. But as recently as that, there was a feeling on your part and on ours that things like housing were luxury investments that would have to wait on the building of more factories, more power plants and more roads. Housing, so they said, wasn't productive.

But that's not true. You can build houses and community centers and schools and clinics with local materials. It takes little precious foreign exchange. The biggest cost in laying sewers or water mains is labor. As far as being productive is concerned, in the United States the home-building industry is responsible for one out of every 18 dollars of our national product, and it provided jobs for 1 out of every 20 Americans.

And it is anything but productive to sit by and permit the mushrooming of miles of slums and shacks, crowded with sick and illiterate and miserable human beings whose very misery makes them receptive to any proposal, however violent and destructive, that seems to promise some hope.

In the last five years we have come quite a distance. The increase in AID assistance for urban development is remarkable, especially in Latin America under the Alliance for Progress. AID alone has made more than 150 million dollars in loans for housing construction and more than 200 million dollars has been loaned by the Inter-American Development Bank.

To get private American capital investment in international housing, the Congress has given AID authority to make 400 million dollars in housing investment guaranties for Latin America, and reserved another 125 million dollars in guaranty authority for housing investments in Asia and Africa. Right now, private American investors are using this authority to launch joint housing ventures in Taiwan, Thailand, Nigeria and Tunisia.

By themselves, the raw statistics of what we have achieved seem impressive. In Fiscal Year 1965 for example, the U.S. AID program helped other countries add decent dwelling units for 680 thousand people, 470 thousand of these in Latin America. Compared with what was happening five years ago that is impressive. But compared with the need it is hardly a start. I know of no developing country in which the construction of new, decent housing has yet kept pace with the raw increase in urban population.

If there is cause for optimism it is not because of the statistical results to date, but because of what lies behind these statistics. I am encouraged by the growth of institutions and programs that will make a decent home economically possible for more and more people in the less-developed countries.

The growth of savings and loan associations in Latin America, for example, has been remarkable, and I'm proud of the role that private American groups like the National League of Insured Savings Associations and the U.S. Savings and Loan League have played in this

growth through the AID program. In Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela and Guatemala alone 70 associations have been organized with more than 200,000 members, 55 million dollars in savings and 99 million dollars in loans out for the purchase of new homes.

To me, the experience with savings and loan associations, with credit unions, and with housing cooperatives now being organized with the support of American labor unions, makes it clear that the local funds to finance much of the needed urban housing are present, if they can only be mobilized.

I'm encouraged too, by the success of self-help housing programs in countries as distant and diverse as Nicaragua, Nigeria and Korea. The very poor have no buried savings to share in a cooperative or a savings and loan association, but they can contribute their own labor.

This device has cut costs by as much as 40 per cent, and it has given the people who live in these houses a sense of participation and dignity that may be as important as the home itself.

Our commitment to help with the problems of urban development is a firm one. But it is also clear to us, as I'm sure it is to you, that the problems of the growing city can be solved only partially within the city itself.

In the 15 years or so since the beginning of our partnership for development with your countries and other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the pattern and the problems of progress have become fairly clear. We have seen some great achievements. Together, we have very nearly wiped out the threat of malaria for half the 1.3 billion people in the malarious areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

We've done pretty well at building factories and putting up power plants. Industrial output has increased at an average of better than six per cent a year.

But farm output, in nearly every one of the less-developed countries, has barely kept pace with the increase in population. In many of your countries, it has fallen behind, despite sizeable investments in fertilizer imports and factories, in rural roads, in irrigation projects.

The result is more than food shortages in the cities. The result is rural poverty and the flight of more people to the cities. In most of your countries, rural people still account for better than two-thirds of the population. If the farmers are not producing more, if their incomes are not rising, where is the growing internal market to provide more orders for urban factories, more jobs for city people?

It is clear to us that we are also going to have to pay far more attention in our assistance programs to raising agricultural output. There is no other way to ease the pressure of migration on your cities, or broaden the internal markets that will create more city jobs.

In his message this year on the Foreign Assistance program, President Johnson pledged the United States to use its own agricultural abundance and technical skills to help the less-developed countries increase their own ability to produce food of their own.

Some of the steps involved are obvious: more fertilizer, better produce distribution, improved pricing practices, more irrigation. We in the United States are going to make better, more extensive use through the AID program of

our own unique experience in agricultural development by involving our land grant universities and our own Department of Agriculture specialists. We are continuing to expand our use of experts from American farm cooperative groups in helping other countries raise farm productivity.

We can't reproduce our own American experience in your country. Countries are different and you can't transfer institutions willy-nilly. But we can provide wonderfully skilled people from our universities, our cooperatives, our Agriculture Department to help work out solutions that do make sense in another situation. If we persist together, I don't doubt for a moment that we will turn up on the farms and in the villages the same buried resources of human drive and ingenuity -- and maybe even a good deal of capital -- that the savings and loan experiment has turned up in the Latin American countries I mentioned earlier.

As you may know, I have something of a reputation as an optimist. Well, I am. It is easy to be discouraged by the troubles of men and nations. Certainly we're all sobered by what's happening in India and Pakistan today. And Vietnam is disturbing and tragic. For, while men are at war, we can't get on with the most important human battle in Southeast Asia: the battle to develop the promise of a rich and fertile land for the people who live there.

But when I look back on our common history since World War II, what I'm impressed with is not the troubles or the problems -- the world has always had those. I'm impressed with the new element in international relations: the steady effort, crystallized in our mutual development programs, our aid programs, by independent countries to work together on solving problems.

That is new, and different, and a cause for optimism.

For our part, I can assure you that we approach our role in the development partnership in the same way we have learned to view our investment in the development of our own cities. We don't see this as something we are doing for "somebody else." We see it as an investment in our own future and in the world we share with you.

In closing, may I say this:

The American character is one of activism and, sometimes, impatience. It is one which leads us, from time to time, into mistakes. It is one, I am sure, which is often not fully understood in other places.

But I want to leave this message with you: We Americans are committed -- committed beyond recall -- to the building of a freer, better, happier world for all men.

There have been times, I know when you may have doubted this. But today, as never before, our American nation has come to appreciate the oneness of mankind. This appreciation makes possible the great national programs we undertake today to build better cities, to fight poverty, to eliminate discrimination in our own society, to do something on behalf of our fellow men.

And today, as never before, we know that we cannot live rich in a world too-long poor.

I, for one, mean to do in my lifetime whatever I can to extend mankind's benefits to more of mankind. And I am joined by the overwhelming majority of

the American people. I am joined, certainly, by our President.

Let us, then, together pledge ourselves to creating the world of justice, hope and peace that all men long for, but have not yet achieved.



For the

**PRESS**

**AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**INFORMATION STAFF**

For Release to p.m. papers of  
Wednesday, September 15, 1965  
Also Released by HHFA

AID-65-184

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

URBAN DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

SPONSORED BY

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, SEPTEMBER 15, 1965

We Americans have been more urban than rural since 1920. But as you know, it was only this summer that we fully accepted this fact and established a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This doesn't mean we haven't been working on urban problems for a long time. As Mayor of Minneapolis, I worried about financing school expansion, improving housing, carving playgrounds and parks out of packed city blocks, about highways and bus service, and building a tax base to pay for the things our people had to have.

As a member of the United States Senate I continued to work toward providing for these same needs.

Today, as Vice President, I act as the President's liaison with mayors, city managers, and local government -- with the people who deal day-to-day with the problems of urban America.

Our new Department of Housing and Urban Development will make possible coordination of federal programs for the cities . . . it will serve as a focal point for what we are doing.

With this new Department, I believe we'll do a better job of designing cities, of meeting problems like mass transit and water supply, of improving welfare programs, of providing educational opportunity -- of making our cities places to live in and not to escape from.

Our rich and strong country is today dedicated to this task, and to the task, in all our society, of helping create a life of both quality and quantity, a life in which each man has the equal opportunity to build something better for himself, his children, his country.

And your objectives, I suspect, are not too greatly different. But your nations do not have our wealth and strength, your nations do not have as ready access to human and material resources. And, therefore, your task is even more difficult than ours.

Looking at our own economic assistance programs -- at the kinds of things we're doing in partnership with other countries -- I think it is clear that we have begun to place a much higher priority than we once did on urban development as a major concern in the problem of nation-building.

As recently as five years ago, you would have had a hard time finding many AID projects that could be called part of an urban development program.

The need was right before our eyes: people by the millions were streaming in from the rural areas in Bombay and Caracas and Cairo, running from the poverty they knew on the farm to the opportunity they thought beckoned in the city. But as recently as that, there was a feeling on your part and on ours that things like housing were luxury investments that would have to wait on the building of more factories, more power plants and more roads. Housing, so they said, wasn't productive.

But that's not true. You can build houses and community centers and schools and clinics with local materials. It takes little precious foreign exchange. The biggest cost in laying sewers or water mains is labor. As far as being productive is concerned, in the United States the home-building industry is responsible for one out of every 18 dollars of our national product, and it provides jobs for 1 out of every 20 Americans.

And it is anything but productive to sit by and permit the mushrooming of miles of slums and shacks, crowded with sick and illiterate and miserable human beings whose very misery makes them receptive to any proposal, however violent and destructive, that seems to promise some hope.

In the last five years we have come quite a distance. The increase in AID assistance for urban development is remarkable, especially in Latin America under the Alliance for Progress. AID alone has made more than 150 million dollars in loans for housing construction and more than 200 million dollars has been loaned by the Inter-American Development Bank.

To get private American capital investment in International housing, the Congress has given AID authority to make 400 million dollars in housing investment guaranties for Latin America, and reserved another 125 million dollars in guaranty authority for housing investments in Asia and Africa. Right now, private American investors are using this authority to launch joint housing ventures in Taiwan, Thailand, Nigeria and Tunisia.

By themselves, the raw statistics of what we have achieved seem impressive. In Fiscal Year 1965 for example, the U.S. AID program helped other countries add decent dwelling units for 680 thousand people, 470 thousand of these in Latin America. Compared with what was happening five years ago that is impressive. But compared with the need it is hardly a start. I know of no developing country in which the construction of new, decent housing has yet kept pace with the raw increase in urban population.

If there is cause of optimism it is not because of the statistical results to date, but because of what lies behind these statistics. I am encouraged by the growth of institutions and programs that will make a decent home economically possible for more and more people in the less-developed countries.

The growth of savings and loan associations in Latin America, for example, has been remarkable, and I'm proud of the role that private American groups like the National League of Insured Savings Associations and the U. S. Savings and Loan League have played in this growth through the AID program. In Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela and Guatemala alone 70 associations have been organized with more than 200,000 members, 55 million dollars in savings and 99 million dollars in loans out for the purchase of new homes.

To me, the experience with savings and loan associations, with credit unions, and with housing cooperatives now being organized with the support of American labor unions, makes it clear that the local funds to finance much of the needed urban housing are present, if they can only be mobilized.

I'm encouraged too, by the success of self-help housing programs in countries as distant and diverse as Nicaragua, Nigeria and Korea. The very poor have no buried savings to share in a cooperative or a savings and loan association, but they can contribute their own labor.

This device has cut costs by as much as 40 per cent, and it has given the people who live in these houses a sense of participation and dignity that may be as important as the home itself.

Our commitment to help with the problems of urban development is a firm one. But it is also clear to us, as I'm sure it is to you, that the problems of the growing city can be solved only partially within the city itself.

In the 15 years or so since the beginning of our partnership for development with your countries and other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the pattern and the problems of progress have become fairly clear.

We have seen some great achievements. Together, we have very nearly wiped out the threat of malaria for half the 1.3 billion people in the malarious areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We've done pretty well at building factories and putting up power plants. Industrial output has increased at an average of better than six per cent a year.

But farm output, in nearly every one of the less-developed countries, has barely kept pace with the increase in population. In many of your countries, it has fallen behind, despite sizable investments in fertilizer imports and factories, in rural roads, in irrigation projects.

The result is more than food shortages in the cities.

The result is rural poverty and the flight of more people to the cities. In most of your countries, rural people still account for better than two-thirds of the population. If farmers are not producing more, if their incomes are not rising, where is the growing internal market to provide more orders for urban factories, more jobs for city people?

It is clear to us that we are also going to have to pay far more attention in our assistance programs to raising agricultural output. There is no other way to ease the pressure of migration on your cities, or broaden the internal markets that will create more city jobs.

In his message this year on the Foreign Assistance program, President Johnson pledged the United States to use its own agricultural abundance and technical skills to help the less-developed countries increase their own ability to produce food of their own.

Some of the steps involved are obvious: more fertilizer, better produce distribution, improved pricing practices, more irrigation. We in the United States are going to make better, more extensive use through the AID program of our own unique experience in agricultural development by involving our land grant universities and our own Department of Agriculture specialists. We are continuing to expand our use of experts from American farm cooperative groups in helping other countries raise farm productivity.

We can't reproduce our own American experience in your country. Countries are different and you can't transfer institutions willy-nilly. But we can provide wonderfully skilled people from our universities, our cooperatives, our Agriculture Department to help work out solutions that do make sense in another situation.

If we persist together, I don't doubt for a moment that we will turn up on the farms and in the villages the same buried resources of human drive and ingenuity -- and maybe even a good deal of capital -- that the savings and loan experiment has turned up in the Latin American countries I mentioned earlier.

As you may know, I have something of a reputation as an optimist. Well, I am. It is easy to be discouraged by the troubles of men and nations. Certainly we're all sobered by what's happening in India and Pakistan today. And Vietnam is disturbing and tragic. For, while men are at war, we can't get on with the most important human battle in Southeast Asia: the battle to develop the promise of a rich and fertile land for the people who live there.

But when I look back on our common history since World War II, what I'm impressed with is not the troubles or the problems -- the world has always had those. I'm impressed with the new element in international relations: the steady effort, crystallized in our mutual development programs, our aid programs, by independent countries to work together on solving problems.

That is new, and different, and a cause for optimism.

For our part, I can assure you that we approach our role in the development partnership in the same way we have learned to view our investment in the development of our own cities. We don't see this as something we are doing for "somebody else". We see it as an investment in our own future and in the world we share with you.

In closing, may I say this:

The American character is one of activism and, sometimes, impatience. It is one which leads us, from time to time, into mistakes. It is one, I am sure, which is often not fully understood in other places.

But I want to leave this message with you: We Americans are committed, -- committed beyond recall -- to the building of a freer, better, happier world for all men.

There have been times, I know, when you may have doubted this. But today, as never before, our American nation has come to appreciate the oneness of mankind. This appreciation makes possible the great national programs we undertake today to build better cities, to fight poverty, to eliminate discrimination in our own society, to do something on behalf of our fellow men.

And today, as never before, we know that we cannot live rich in a world too-long poor.

I, for one, mean to do in my lifetime whatever I can to extend mankind's benefits to more of mankind. And I am joined by the overwhelming majority of the American people. I am joined, certainly, by our President.

Let us, then, together pledge ourselves to creating the world of justice, hope and peace that all men long for, but have not yet achieved.





# 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)