

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WAR ON HUNGER WASHINGTON, D.C. FEBRUARY 20, 1968

This is a peace conference.

We are here today to talk about food -- the key to peace, to security and development...at home and abroad...for every nation.

For in a world where the majority of men still lead a hand to mouth existence...where hunger and malnutrition still destroy mental and physical powers...where war, pestilence, and famine still ride hand in hand...there can be neglect Norconthelle be neglect real security and full development for any of us.

Pop John - When there is constant war

Our generation has already known better than any other the prophecy of Isaiah: "And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God."

And it is not difficult to imagine a nightmare world in the future in which Thomas Malthus' terrible prophecies will come true.

What is sometimes difficult to remember, however, amidst all the grim statistics, is that the Malthusian trap is not inescapable.

It is within our power to throw back the jaws of that trap...to make decent nutrition, like sun and air, the birthright of every human being.

We must constantly remind ourselves that primitive technology -- <u>not</u> inadequate food growing potential -- is responsible for starvation yields in many countries today.

Add a little fertilizer, a little water, some improved seed, the tools and techniques of modern agriculture to the dust of those fields, and output increases radically.

We must remember also that self-help efforts in countries like India, Pakistan and Taiwan, in Latin America and Africa, are beginning to pay off.

We now expect that the world will produce more foodgrains
this crop year than ever before in man's history -- not
only because of good luck or good weather, but because
of solid, tangible progress in agriculture.

There is progress in family planning, too, even though
the rewards of that progress -- a significant downturn in
the world birth-rate -- may yet be a decade or more away.

The amount of resources now devoted to population planning...
the knowledge of contraceptive methods...and public acceptance
is at an all-time high. Today our foreign assistance investment
in family planning is 17 times what it was five years ago.

it is not destiny...not any tragic inevitability in the human condition...but people like us all around the world who will decide whether children born this year grow up strong and healthy -- or sick and hopeless.

Yes, there is reason to hope -- and because of it, more reason than ever for concerted, decisive action.

What weapons are now at hand for our war on hunger?

Food. We, and the other developed nations capable of producing food beyond our own domestic and commercial export needs, have an invaluable resource -- a resource which can buy time while developing countries struggle to their own feet agriculturally.

But food can be much more than a stop-gap palliative for famine.

In most developing economies it can be invested, just like money, in capital improvements which in turn

increase agricultural self-sufficiency. Just three months ago, I visited a successful U.S. sponsored food-for-work project at Demak, Indonesia, where irrigation tanks were being cleaned and restored. to use. Some 450 thousand tons of American food were invested in that kind of project last year alone. And food is the equivalent of hard cash for development spending in countries where foreign exchange must ordinarily be spent for food imports. Our present Food for Freedom legislation is designed specifically to serve those developmental objectives. enables us to do much more than simply release accidental

surpluses when the famine signal goes up.

We can now produce whatever is required to meet developmental needs, over and above the demands of our commercial market. However, we must be sure that in the process we provide a fair return to our own producers, to whom we and the world owe so much.

But the war on hunger is not an exclusively.

American challenge. It is a challenge shared by all mankind...

and all will suffer if it is not successfully met.

We have therefore begun to work with the other developed nations to establish a systematic international food aid program.

Z That is the purpose of the <u>Food Aid</u> provisions which were part of the Kennedy Round negotiation and which are now before the Senate for ratification.

The Food Aid Convention calls for 4.5 million tons of grain to be supplied by the developed nations each year --

of which I. 9 million would come from the United States.

The major share would be provided by other developed nations in grain or cash equivalent, thus increasing commercial demand. We hope to expand those quantities in the future.

The Food Aid Convention is accompanied by a wheat trade Agreement designed to assure farmers in all participating nations better prices for grain sold on the international market -- prices substantially higher than that specified in the 1962 Wheat Agreement.

The concept of an international food aid compact was at first misunderstood in some developed countries -- particularly those which have food deficits themselves and therefore felt they had nothing to contribute.

During my visit to Europe last spring I made every effort to impress upon the heads of state with whom I met that <u>all</u> developed nations not only had an obligation to give what they could -- if not food, then money -- but that such assistance would also serve to expand and stabilize world markets.

I am proud to say we had some success.

Ratification of the Food Aid Convention will be only a beginning -- but a good beginning -- in setting a pattern for the future.

It is a basis from which international cooperation in the war on hunger can be expanded, not only for the benefit of the developing nations but as a means of providing new markets and more price protection to farmers everywhere.

The O.E.C.D. has considered additional paths toward international cooperation in the war on hunger, as have the members of UNCTAD.

We look forward to the time in the future when all developed nations -- without regard for ideology -- will join with all developing nations as full participants in similar food aid and technology programs.

The time is here for a world without politics when it comes to hunger.

So international cooperation is a second important tool.

X Next comes technology.

A very few years ago we thought most farmers in the developing nations were hopelessly conservatives—bound to the techniques their forefathers had used for literally thousands of years.

Today, many of those same farmers have created an insatiable demand for fertilizer and improved seeds that has even caused black markets in agricultural inputs in some countries.

Farmers from Turkey to India this year harvested millions of acres of high-yield Mexican wheat developed by the Rockefeller Foundation -- a scant 3 years after its introduction.

mproved rice varieties developed at the International
Rice Research Institute in the Philippines are now being
adapted for use in over 20 major rice producing countries and
promise to triple or quadruple yields.

We can expect our laboratories and experimental farms to offer more technological progress in the future. But the real challenge before us today is to get the benefits of what we already know into the hands of the farmers and the mouths of their children.

That means extension work.

It means adapting our past discoveries to the needs of intensive agriculture.

It means localized rural radio stations and inexpensive transistor radios to carry the news of improved techniques.

It means adequate, inexpensive credit, easily obtained.

It means incentive returns to the farmer to break
the cycle of toil and poverty that is the essence of
agricultural backwardness.

Now, let me say a word about the private sector as a weapon in the war on hunger.

Agriculture is private enterprise in America. So is the production of fertilizer, pesticides, farm implements. So are our thriving farm cooperatives.

Leven the development and dissemination of new

technology -- once the exclusive preserve of our Land Grant colleges and our extension service -- is increasingly being taken over by the private sector. Today fully half of all U.S. agricultural research is financed and conducted by private firms.

Private promotional efforts deserve a lot of the credit for keeping American agriculture progressive and the envy of other nations.

So when we talk about the agricultural resources

America has to offer to the world, the independent farmers,
there cooperatives, and the booming new agribusinesses must be
counted as leading assets.

Cooperatives and foundations, many of which are represented here today, have already provided significant technical assistance.

Private industry has played the major role in exporting commodities sold under PL-480, and over 70 charitable organizations have helped distribute American food abroad.

Needless to say, agricultural development will mean economic development in general -- and a growing market for commercial exports of food, farm equipment and agricultural chemicals.

American farmers today invest roughly 42 dollars per acre in production supplies from the non-farm sector each year. Japanese farmers spend more than that for chemicals alone. Farmers in all developing nations will soon begin to rely much more heavily on the products of agribusiness.

I think the American free enterprise system can tap that market -- and help feed millions in the process.

Finally, let me mention the most critical need of all -- self-help on the part of the developing nations.

Some of them are already doing well.

But as George Woods, President of the World Bank, said in New Delhi a week ago, many still fail to grasp the terrible urgency of their situation.

There is much more to do in all aspects of economic development -- in agriculture and family planning, in land reform, in industrial development and export promotion, in management and maintenance of progress already achieved.

There is more to do in shaking off dogma and doctrine that make good anti-colonial rhetoric but bad development policy.

One of the most inhibiting of these is the outdated notion that foreign private investment means exploitation.

In the colonial era that was surely true. But today a new breed of capitalists -- domesticated capitalists, if you like -- are ready to offer not exploitation but jobs, management, production of exportable goods, and progress.

There is, of course, more to national development than progress in agriculture -- as critical as that progress is.

There must be education -- to emancipate the mind and release the human potential of every human being.

There must be health care -- to protect and preserve the vitality of our God-given human resources.

This is a time when the world's intentions for its future are being sorely tested...on the battlefield... in quiet Foreign Office corridors...in our souls.

Nowhere is that test greater than on the dusty plots and in the humble villages on the front lines of the war on hunger.

We know the dimensions of the battle.

We have the weapons to fight it.

But do we -- and all others who are comfortable and prosperous -- have the will to make a small sacrifice today for a peaceful tomorrow?

Sometimes I fear that Gunnar Myrdal is right -that we live on, "attending to the business of the day without
giving much thought to the unthinkables ahead of us."

There is a bill before the United States Congress today to extend a PL-480 program which is surely one of the most enlightened documents in the bleak annals of international relations.

We must pass it.

There is also the President's request for a foreign aid authorization. Fully one half of the development aid in that request will be devoted specifically to war on hunger.

We must pass it.

We have the chance to be remembered in history as the generation that finally decided to make its commitment to security and development for all mankind -- and to make an adequate diet the right of every child.

ADDRESS BY

Thirtiel

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WAR ON HUNGER*

WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL WASHINGTON, D. C. FEBRUARY 20, 1968

This is the sort of Conference the world longs for.

This is a peace conference and I want you to fed, act, live, and talk in that spirit.

If I were to select a text for this conference, it would be one I have used a hundred times, but its use in no way destroys its newness or its profundity. That great peasant priest and beloved spiritual leader,

Pope John XXIII, said, "Where there is constant want, there is no peace."

In a world where the majority of men still lead a hand-to-mouth existence, where hunger and malnutrition still destroy mental and physical powers, where war, pestilence, and famine still ride hand-in-hand, there can be no peace. Nor can there be real security or full development for any of us.

Moreover, I believe with all sincerity that national development and national security are one and inseparable. It is a message we must learn. Security is essential if there is to be development. And there is no security without development. They go hand-in-hand.

^{*}Called by the Committee on the World Food Crisis, Inc.

No matter how many good works we may perform, if there is violence and lawlessness, there is no development. No matter how much you may suppress the violence, if there is no development there is no peace. So we have a big task before us.

Our generation has already known better than any other the prophecy of Isaiah: "And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God."

Ghandi once said: "To the hungry man food is God." The Romans said: "Where there is hunger there is no reason."

Where there is want and deprivation, there is restlessness and hopelessness, frustration and violence.

It is not difficult to imagine a nightmare world in which Thomas Malthus's terrible prophecies will come true.

I remember when as students we used to discuss the Malthusian theory. We sort of laughed at it. Today we take it very seriously.

What is sometimes difficult to remember, however, amid all the grim statistics, is that the Malthusian trap is not inescapable.

It is within our power to throw back the jaws of that trap...to make decent nutrition, like sun and air, the birthright of every human being.

We must constantly remind ourselves that primitive technology-not inadequate food growing potential--is responsible for starvation
yields in many countries today.

If you add a little fertilizer, a little water, improved seeds--the tools and techniques of modern agriculture--to the dust of those fields--even the barren desert--output increases rapidly.

We know what to do, and we have the means to do it. It is all the more reason that we will never be forgiven if we fail to do it.

We must remember also that self-help efforts in countries like India, Pakistan, and Taiwan, in Latin America and Africa, are beginning to pay off.

We now expect that the world will produce more foodgrain this crop year than ever before in man's history--not only because of good luck or good weather, but because of solid, tangible progress in agriculture to which you and many more like you have contributed.

And there is progress, too, in family planning, even though the rewards of that progress--a significant downturn in the world birthrate--may yet be a decade or more away. The amount of resources now devoted to population planning... the knowledge of contraceptive methods... and public acceptance is at an all time high. Today our own foreign assistance investment in family planning is 17 times what it was five years ago.

We must constantly remind ourselves that hunger is not the destiny or the tragic inevitability, of the human condition. People like us all around the world will decide whether children born this year will grow up strong and healthy--or sick and hopeless. It's in our hands.

I am constantly reminded of what the President said in his
State of the Union address. We have no lack of capacity in this
country, we have no lack of ability, we have no lack of know-how,
The only question is: Do we have the will? Do we have the purpose?

I am one of the few optimists, you know, left in Washington.

They fade away each time there is a little more difficulty. I

happen to believe the history of our country is on my side, or I

should say that I think I am on the side of the history of our country.

We can do anything we want to do--if we are willing to put ourselves to the task. The problem is not resources, not know-how, but a marshaling of our resources, the will to use them, and agreement on objectives. There is reason to hope, and because of it, more reason than ever for concerted and decisive action.

The fact that we know we can wage a war on hunger is itself very constructive, positive, and hopeful. The fact that we have declared war on poverty is, in itself, a revelation of the moral purpose of this nation.

There have been hungry people for centuries, and there have been poor people for centuries. But only in this decade--only in this decade--have this great America of ours and other nations decided to declare war on these ancient enemies of mankind.

Many people are going to say we've not done enough. But I say the fact that you've made the decision to do something about these great trials and burdens of mankind is in itself a victory. Until one has decided what to do and expressed a willingness to do it, there is no hope for victory.

Our forefathers, in their struggle for our independence, had to decide first of all that they were going to win--that it was worth the sacrifice. And they said: "We pledge ourlives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." They pledged everything. They made the decision, and then seven years later, with the help of the French and others--and with technical assistance from the more developed countries--we finally gained our independence. In the meantime, the capital in the United States had been shifted eleven times.

Soldiers had deserted by the thousands. Tories had gone to other lands and the country was sorely divided.

So if you sometimes feel a little hopeless today, just remember how we got started. I love to talk about this, because I used to teach this course. I am sort of refreshing myself just in case I have to do it again.

I am always intrigued by these Johnny-come-lately Constitutional experts who forget to read the history of our country. That great Constitution which pledges free speech and free press was never conceived with either. There was no free press. Nobody ever looked in. They closed the doors. They locked in the members. They even assigned two people to watch Benjamin Franklin--when he got in his cups, he talked a little too much. And not a single person who went there was ever elected. They were appointed, and they didn't go to Philadelphia to write a new Constitution. They went there under false pretenses. They said they were going to revise the Articles of Confederation.

If anybody had known what they were going to do, they would never had let them meet. A hundred were invited, 55 came, 39 stayed, and 38 signed. We didn't do too well starting out.

This is the history lesson for the morning. I mention it because so many Americans these days to prove they are very, very learned go around looking as if they are in pain. A learned man ought to be a positive man. A person who has a knowledge of our country and our culture ought to be filled with at least prudent optimism. We can do what we have to do. And that's what we need in this country today, a little less wringing of the hands and a little more searching of the soul. We'll be able to do the things for our cities, for our people, for our defense, for our security that need to be done. We

have the means to do it. That's what Hubert H. Humphrey thinks. And I have good reason to believe it.

What weapons are now at hand for our war on hunger?

The first is food. We, and the other developed nations capable of producing food beyond their own domestic and commercial export needs, have an invaluable resource—a resource which can buy time while developing countries struggle to their own feet in agriculture. That's what our food abundance is for. We can't feed the world alone but we can buy time.

The next question is: What do we do with the time we buy?

Time is neutral, what you do with time determines whether it

becomes a liability or an asset.

Food can be much more than a stop-gap palliative for famine. In most developing economies it can be invested, just like money, in capital improvements which in turn increase agricultural self-sufficiency.

Just three months ago, I had an experience I'll long remember.

I visited a successful United States sponsored food-for-work project
in Demak, Indonesia, where irrigation ditches and tanks were being
cleaned and restored to full use by persons who had been unemployed.

Some 450 thousand tons of American food were invested in this kind of food and work project last year alone.

Food is the equivalent of hard cash for development spending in countries where foreign exchange must ordinarily be spent for food imports. Every one of you in this room knows this. We need to tell the American people, we need to tell ourselves of the value of this God-given commodity called food. It isn't just a palliative for famine. Food is a currency in its own right. Food is hard cash in a capital-starved economy. Spread this word. Get your Congressmen, your economists, your media thinking more about it.

Our present Food for Freedom program is designed especially to serve these developmental objectives. It enables us to do much more than simply release accidental surpluses when the famine signal goes up. How good it is that we have finally arrived at a point of national maturity where we look upon food as something to be used helpfully, continuously, constructively, rather than depending on the accident of surpluses to feed and to help other people. This is the fundamental change in the legislation that passed here just a few years ago.

We can now produce whatever is required to meet developmental needs, over and above the demands of our commercial market.

However, we must be sure that in the process we provide a fair return to our own producers. And let me say this. You do not ask a munitions company to produce one bomb without a profit. You do not ask one air craft company to produce one supersonic plane without a profit.

Why do you ask American farmers to do it? They are entitled to the same fair return on their investment as anyone else. And I know the argument—that this is the way it has always been. That was the argument for child labor.

The American farmer is entitled to ask a price for his commodity just like anybody else. General Motors didn't get big by having customers come around and say," We'll give you so much for your Chevrolet." They have a price tag on it. That's the way Humphrey's drugstore kept open, too, I might add.

But Mr. Farmer? He is the fellow you just offer something to! That doesn't go over with the Trade Union Movement. The Trade Union Movement says, "we will negotiate this contract, we'll bargain it out with you." I think our farm friends are beginning to catch on, and somebody is going to find out that they know how to ask for a fair price, too. That wasn't in this text that I have here, but I never fail to say it.

The war on hunger is not, however, an exclusively American challenge. It is a challenge shared by all mankind...and all mankind will suffer if it is not successfully met.

We have, therefore, begun to work with other developed nations to establish a systematic international food aid program.

This is the purpose of the Food Aid provisions of the Kennedy Round negotiation on trade. The Food Aid Convention calls for 4.5 million ton supply of grain to be supplied by the developed nations each year--of which 1.9 million would come from the United States. The major share would be provided by other developed nations in grain or cash equivalent, thus increasing commercial demand.

We hope to expand these quantities in the future.

The Food Aid Convention is accompanied by a wheat trade agreement designed to assure farmers in all participating nations better prices for grain sold on the international market--prices substantially higher than specified in the 1962 Wheat Agreement.

The concept of an international food aid compact was at first misunderstood in some of the developed countries--particularly those which have food deficits themselves and therefore felt they had nothing to contribute.

I took up this matter on my visit to Europe in March and April.

I made an effort in country after country to impress upon the heads of state that all developed nations not only had an obligation to give what they could—if not food, then money—but that such assistance would also serve to expand and stabilize world markets.

I also spoke here to the D.A.C., the Development Assistance
Committee, about a year ago. Again I said that the problems of
world hunger and food shortages were not an American responsibility
alone. This is a matter for the developed countries to concentrate
on in cooperation within the developing countries. This message is

beginning to be heard.

We've only made a beginning-the 4.5 million tons is a small amount. But I am becoming accustomed to taking short steps even though my vision calls for longer ones. It's 4.5 million tons more than we ever had before, and it is the beginning. I am proud to say we've had this much success.

Ratification of the Food Aid Convention will be only a beginning—but a good one. It is setting a pattern for the future. It is a basis from which international cooperation in the war on hunger can be expanded, not only for the benefit of the developing nations but as a means of providing new markets and more price protection to farmers everywhere.

The O. E. C. D. has considered other paths towards international cooperation in the war on hunger, as have the members of UNCTAD.

What I want you to do is become, in a sense, missionaries in this effort. We've had difficulty getting developed countries to take their full responsibility for this war on hunger. I call upon you to make this a priority matter. Many of you travel--you meet with leaders of many countries. We need dialogue. We need to build on this beginning.

We look forward to the time when all the developed nations, I repeat <u>all</u>--without regard for ideology--will join with all developing nations as full partners in similar food aid and technology programs.

The time is here for a world without politics when it comes to hunger.

One thing I learned a long time ago in this country is that when you're hungry, when you're broke, when you're down-and-out, it doesn't make any difference what your politics are when you go to the bank. If you're poor, if you're white or black, if you are unemployed, you are in trouble, then politics fades away. The same thing is true in the world today. Regardless of ideology, those nations with technical know-how and capacity for food production--the developed nations--must join together, and the developing nations must be brought into concerted planning with them.

Now let me say a few words about technology.

A few years ago we thought most farmers in the developing nations were hopelessly bound to the techniques their forefathers had used for literally hundreds and thousands of years. We know differently now.

Mahy of those same farmers have created an insatiable demand for fertilizer and improved seeds that has even caused black markets in agricultural inputs in some countries.

Farmers from Turkey to India this year harvested millions of acres of high-yeld Mexican wheat developed by the Rockefeller Foundation Foundation--a scant three years after its introduction.

Improved rice varieties developed at the International Rice
Research Institute in the Philippines are now being adapted for use
in over 20 major rice producing countries and promise to triple or
quadruple yields.

We can expect our laboratories and experimental farms to offer more technical progress, but the real challenge before us is to get the benefits of what we already know into the hands of the farmers and into the mouths of their children. This means education and extension work. And by the way, we have done it all here.

It means adapting our past discoveries to the needs of labor intensive agriculture.

It means localized radio--rural radio stations and inexpensive transistor radios to carry the news of improved techniques.

It means incentive returns to the farmer to break the cycle jof toil and poverty that is the essence of agricultural backwardness.

I just came back from a visit to Africa, and every place I went

I found African leaders talking about how they can improve their

agriculture. Three things they were most concerned about are education,

the improvement jof agricultural technology, and health. Those are

the three pillars of any successful foreign assistance program.

One of our problems in this foreign aid business is that we are too sophisticated. It dawned on me particularly in Africa. A man

there said to me: "Mr. Vice President, we just need a two-year college in this country. We don't need a Harvard, a MIT, or an Oxford. We need a two-year college. We have but one secondary school in the whole country." And he said, "One of the real problems we face is that the developed countries are so developed they don't understand what we are talking about."

And I said, I think I understand. My mother was a school teacher. She had a tenth grade education and she was a better school teacher than some of the Ph. D.'s I have run into. She knew what she was doing. She had a love of children and she had enough information for the needs of that time.

I can remember old Dr. Christenson out at the University of
Minnesota who used to put on three week or six week or three
month short courses to teach our farmers how to farm better.

He did not ask them to come to the University for seven years. They
didn't have the time. He was lucky if he could get them for three weeks.

But I'll tell you, he made good farmers of them.

And as a boy, I remember the county extension service. There were very few who had master's degrees, and if there was one, he never got up our way. They must have kept him down here for exhibition purposes at the Smithsonian. The people we had as county extension agents had an eighth grade or tenth grade education. But

than bear a lat about famming

My fellow Americans, we're a little over educated for some of the needs of this world. They need the beginnings. I don't want to be interpreted as being against advanced education. I simply say, everything in season. You cannot give a 12 year old boy the work to do of a 25 or 30 year old man. People have to learn. They have to have the beginnings.

Agriculture is private enterprise in America and in most places in the world. So is the production of fertilizer, pesticides, and farm implements. So are our thriving farm cooperatives.

If there is one thing I am proud of as a United States Senator it is Title V of the Foreign Aid Act. That title compelled this government—at long last—to do something about the promotion of farm cooperatives in the developing countries of the world. I had a State Department witness before our committee and I told him, "We're not going to rely on your good intentions any longer. My father told me there was a place paved with good intentions. We are going to see it is done by law. We are going to set up credit unions, farm cooperatives, and savings and loan associations. We are going to get people to help themselves." When a farmer owns his own piece of land and can cooperate with others in production and distribution and credit facilities, he is a free enterpriser. We have been making some progress.

The development and dissemination of new technology--once
the exclusive preserve of our Land Grant Colleges and Extension
Service--is increasingly becoming part of the private sector. Today
fully half of all agricultural research is financed and conducted by
private firms.

And let me put my plea in now for the partnership concept.

The Vice President doesn't have much authority but he can be a spokesman. This is an office filled with responsibility and no power, that I know. But one thing I do know is this: If we are going to do anything in this country, we are going to have to learn to work together. And there has to be a desire in government to work with the private sector of our economy. You cannot, Mr. Government, look upon a private businessman as if he is your competitor or enemy. He is your partner. And Mr. Businessman, you have to look upon your government not as your enemy but as your partner. We have to work together.

I know old antagonisms do exist. I ran into one situation in the

Far East. I asked how we could use American food to help one country

there, and I pointed out that a private firm under Title IV of the Food

for Freedom Act could purchase food on long-term credits. The food

could then be used not only for feeding hungry people but to develop

distribution facilities. A government man then said to me, "Mr. Vice

President, that means you expect me to work with a private business

firm which is going to make a profit." I said, "Yes, is that un-American?"

And he said, "That's the way we get in trouble."

"Well," I said, " you can afford to get in some trouble. I get in plenty of it. It won't hurt you a bit. And if you get in trouble under those terms, just remember the law directs you to do it."

But there is reluctance to do it. So I suggest that when you have a program where the private sector can work with government, don't take "no" for an answer. Get busy and say I think it will work and then have somebody examine the law.

Private industry has played a major role in our war on hunger.

It has played a major role in exporting commodities sold under Public

Law 480, and over 70 charitable organizations have helped distribute

American food abroad. What a blessing. Imagine if government had

to do it all. I've been a strong supporter of voluntary agencies in this

program. They humanize it. By the time you have filled out all

those government reports, any love of humanity is gone. You need

to have some of the human touch.

Needless to say, agricultural development can and will mean economic development in general and a growing market for commercial exports of food, farm equipment and agricultural chemicals. We need more exports. Any program that will stimulate exports is in our national interest as well as in the worldwide interest.

Our American farmers invest roughly \$42 per acre in production supplies from the non-farm sector each year. Our Japanese farmer friends, however, spend more than that for chemicals alone. Farmers in all the developing nations will soon begin to rely
much more heavily on the products of agri-business. And agri-business
and farmers and government have everything in common. You are not
enemies; the President knows you are not, and the Vice President knows
you are not. We need you and you need us if we are going to do this job.

I think the American free enterprise system can tap this great market--and help feed millions in the process.

Finally, let me mention the most critical need of all--self-help on the part of the developing nations.

Some of them are already doing very well.

But as George Woods, President of the World Bank, said in New Delhi, many still fail to grasp the terrible urgency of the situation.

There is much more to do in all aspects of economic development-in agriculture, in family planning, in land reform, in industrial
development, in export promotion, in management and in maintenance
of progress already achieved.

An encyclical came out a year ago. It said, "Development is the new name for peace." I believe that. Just as one of our great American heroes said: "Peace, peace, there is no peace." I say, "Peace, peace, there is no peace without development." And I say there is no development without security which makes peace possible.

There is more to do to shake off the dogma and doctrine that make good anti-colonial rhetoric but bad development policy. One

of the most inhibiting of these is the outdated notion that foreign private investment means exploitation.

In the colonial era, that may have been true. But today there is a new breed of capitalists—they have learned the hard way. I call them domesticated capitalists. They are ready to offer not exploitation but investments, jobs, management, production of exportable goods, and progress.

There is much more to national development than progress in agriculture.

There must be education -- to emancipate the mind and release the human potential.

There must be health care--to protect and preserve the vitality of our God-given human resources.

Without these three necessities of human development, all the shiny factories and new roads, all the banks and bicycles and the usual symbols of economic development, become little more than vainglorious monuments. The greatest resource God gave us is the human resource. That is what you tand to first.

This is a time when the world's intentions are being sorely tested, on the battle field, in the quiet Foreign Office corridors, in our souls.

Nowhere is this test greater than on the dusty plots in the humble villages on the front lines of the war on hunger.

We know the dimensions of this battle and we have the weapons to fight it.

But do we--and all the others who are comfortable and prosperous-have the will to make a small sacrifice today for a peaceful tomorrow?

Sometimes I fear Gunnar Myrdal is right--that we live on, "attending to the business of the day without giving much thought to the unthinkable ahead of us."

There is a bill in the Congress of the United States today to extend Public Law 480, which is surely one of the most enlightended documents in the bleak annals of international relations.

Help us pass it.

There is also the President's request for a foreign aid authorization.

Fully one-half of the development aid in that request will be devoted specifically to the war on hunger. We need your help.

We have the chance to be remembered in history as the generation that finally decided to make its commitment to security and development for all mankind. We have that chance. Or we can gain for ourselves a chapter in history as the generation that had the opportunity for greatness and settled for petty nonsense.

I hope we make the right decision. I think we will.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS BY

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WAR ON HUNGER* WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL WASHINGTON, D. C. FEBRUARY 20, 1968

Introduction by Herschel D. Newsom, Master, The National Grange, Washington, D. C.

"Ladies and Gentlemen, the Vice President of the United States."

Thank you very much, my dear and good friend, one of our truly great Americans, Herschel Newsom.

It's just an honor to be introduced by you, sir, and to be here in the presence of these fine delegates, that are concerned with a matter of very serious importance to all mankind.

May I first just make a brief apology. This has been a very busy morning for us over at the White House and I tried to send a message here that, with a Cloture Vote coming up in the Senate, Leadership Meeting in the White House, and two other conferences, our schedule just went by the board today, that's all. But I guess it's par for the course.

Ladies and Gentlemen ---

This is the sort of Conference that the world longs for.

This is a peace conference and I want you to feel, act, live, and talk in that spirit. If I were to select a text for this conference and my participation in it --- it would be one that I have used a hundred times but its use in no way destroys its newness or its profundity.

^{*} Called by the Committee on the World Food Crisis, Inc.

That great peasant Priest, that beloved, spiritual leader, Pope

John the 23rd, said, "Where there is constant want, there is no peace."

And there is constant want in many areas of the world today and what he was telling us in so many words was, that the building of peace is a tedious, hard, difficult, sacrificial task but absolutely urgent.

Now I said this is a peace conference and we are here to talk about food -- the key to peace, to security and development...at home and abroad...for every nation.

For a world where the majority of men still lead a hand-to-mouth existence...where hunger and malnutrition still destroy mental and physical powers...where war, pestilence, and famine still ride hand-in-hand...there can be no peace, nor can there be real security or full development for any of us.

I have said to you individually, some of you, and I believe with all sincerity that national development and national security are one and inseparable. It's a message which we simply must learn. For those of us that are so devoted to development because of what we believe are the ethical, the economic, the spiritual, and the political needs of development, may I also say that we would in a very real sense be guilty, be guilty of defrauding the people if we did not understand that security is also essential if there is to be development. And by the same token there isn't any security without development. They go hand-in-hand. And this is a lesson that we must learn.

No matter how many good works we may perform, if there is violence, lawlessness, rioting, aggression, subversion, there is no development. It adds up in futility. But no matter how much you may suppress the violence and the aggression and the subversion, if there is a failure to have development there is no peace. So we have a big task before us but we need to get our thinking straight first of all.

Now our generation has already known better than any other the prophecy of Isaiah, and you know his words: "And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God."

Many others have said it in similar language. Ghandhi once said:

"To the hungry man food is God"...and the Romans said, "Where there is hunger there is no reason"...and I believe that without all of those profound statements, we just plain know, that where there is want and deprivation, there is restlessness and hopelessness, frustration and even violence itself.

It's not at all difficult to imagine a nightmare world in the future in which Thomas Malthus' terrible prophecies will come true.

I remember as a student when we used to think of the Malthusian theory, we just sort of laughed at it. There are others today who take it more seriously.

What is sometimes difficult to remember, however, is that amid all the grim statistics, is that the Malthusian trap is not inescapable.

It is and I repeat, it is within our power to throw back the jaws of that trap...to make decent nutrition, like the sun and the air, the birthright of every human being. And we might add it as to one of the rights of man, the right to food. Surely he has that right.

We must constantly remind ourselves that primitive technology -not inadequate food growing potential -- is responsible for starvation yields
in many countries today.

We know that if you add a little fertilizer, a little water, some improved seeds, the tools and techniques of modern agriculture to the dust of those fields even the barren desert, output increases rapidly and radically.

So we know what to do and something else we have the means to do it. All the more reason that we will never be forgiven if we fail to do it.

We must remember also that self-helpefforts in countries like India,

Pakistan, Taiwan, in Latin America and Africa and others, are beginning
to pay off.

We now expect that the world will produce more foodgrains this crop year than ever before in man's history -- not only because of the good luck of good weather, but because of solid, tangible progress in agriculture to which you in this room and many more like you have contributed.

And there is progress too, in family planning, even though the rewards of that progress -- is significant downturn in the world birth-rate -- may yet be a decade or more away. The amount of resources now devoted to population planning...the knowledge of contraceptive methods...and public acceptance

is at an all-time high. Today our own foreign assistance investment in family planning is 17 times what it was five years ago.

And we must constantly remind ourselves that it is not destiny ... not any tragic inevitability in the human condition...but people like us all around the world who will decide whether children born this year grow up strong and healthy -- or quick or sick or hopeless. It's in our hands.

I am constantly reminded of what the President said in the State of the Union address about our country. We have no lack of capacity in this country, we have no lack of ability, we have no lack of know-how, the only question is do we have the will, do we have the purpose. I am one of the few optimists, you know, left in Washington. They fade away each time there is a little more difficulty. But I happen to believe that the history of our country is on my side, or should I say that I think I am on the side of the history of our country. We can do anything we want to do literally, if we are willing to put ourselves to the task. And the problem that we have is not resources, not know-how, but it's the marshaling of the resources and the will to use them, and the agreement upon objectives. So you see, there is reason to hope and because of it more reason than ever for concerted decisive action.

Now what weapons are now at hand for this war on hunger?

I might add first of all that, the fact that we know that we can wage a war on hunger, is within itself a very constructive, positive, hopeful matter. The fact that in this country of ours, we've declared war on poverty is within itself, I think a revelation of the moral purpose of this nation.

And I might add that there have been hungry people for centuries, and there ve been poor people for centuries, but only in this decade and I repeat only in this decade has this great America of ours and others decided to declare war on these ancient enemies of mankind. Now many people are going to say that we've not done nearly enough but I say that the fact that you've made the decision to do something about these matters...these great trials and burdens of mankind, the fact that we have made the decision is within itself a victory. Until one has decided what to do and expressed a willingness to do it, there is no hope for any victory. I know that our forefathers in the struggle for our independence had to make a decision first of all that they were going to win it, and that it was worth the sacrifice, and they said that we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. They pledged the whole works, everything. They made the decision and then seven years later and I remind you seven years later, with the help of the French and of many others and lots of foreign aid with technical assistance from the more developed countries at the time, with a lot of good luck and even with troubles in Britian we finally gained our independence. In the meantime, the capitol in the United States had been shifted eleven times, soldiers had deserted by the thousands, torries had gone to other lands and the country was sorely divided, so if you are a little hopeless today, just remember how we got started. I would remind you of that. And I might even tell you, I love to talk about this, because I used to teach this course, I am sort of refreshing myself just in case I have to do it again. I am always intrigued by these

"Johnny-come-lately constitutional experts," they forgot to read the history of our country, you know, that great Constitution which pledges free speech and free press was never conceived with either. There was no, no free press, nobody every looked in. They closed the doors, they locked in the members, they even assigned two people to Benjamin Franklin -- when he got in his cups, he talked a little too much -- just remember that. And not a single person that went there was ever elected. They were appointed, and they didn't go to Philadelphia to write a new Constitution, they went there under false pretenses. They said there were going to revise the Articles of Confederation. If anybody had known what they were going to do, they would never had let them meet. It's a fact. A hundred were invited, fifty-five came, thirty-nine stayed, and thirty-eight signed. We didn't do too well you know, to start out. I just threw this one in to give you your history lesson for the morning. I mentioned this because so many Americans these days are always going around to prove that they are very, very learned by looking in pain. A learned man ought to be a positive man. A person that has a knowledge of our country and some understanding of our culture ought to be filled with at least prudent optimism. We can do what we need to do. And that's what we need in this country today ... a little less wringing of the hands and a little more searching of the soul. And we'll be able to do the things for our cities, for our people, for our defense, for our security that needs to be done. We have the means to do it. That's what Hubert H. Humphrey thinks. And I have good reason to believe it.

Well I said, now what are these weapons on this war on hunger.

Well the first weapon we have, is the one we need, that's food. We,

and the other developed nations capable of producing food beyond our own

domestic and commercial export needs, have an invaluable resource -- a

resource which can buy time...while developing countries struggle to

their own feet, agriculturally.

That's what our food abundance is for.

We can't fee the world, alone, but we can buy time. The next question is what do we do with the time we buy? Time is neutral, it only depends what you do with time as to whether it comes a liability or an asset. But food can be much more than a stop-gap palliative for famine.

In most developing economies it can be invested, just like money, in capital improvements which in turn increase agricultural self-sufficiency. If there was as much concern in this world about the food standard as there is about the gold standard, I think we'd be well on the way of winning this war on hunger. And let me tell you there are more people that need food today than need gold. Both, I want to go on record for, are very vital. One has to be awfully careful these days what he says, because there are people just waiting in their bleachers, you know, and then decides, did he make a little mistake there, can we catch him, this game of hide-and-go-seek and it gets a little more so each month this year of 1968. So let me make it crystal clear before we move any further that I am for both food and gold.

Now just three months ago, just three months ago, I had an experience I'll long remember, I visited a successful United States sponsored food-forwork project in Demak, Indonesia, where irrigation ditches, irrigation tanks

were being cleaned and restored to full use by persons who had been unemployed; many of them very young and their pay was in food, and by the way it was in corn meal. We often think of Indonesia primarily as just being rice eating people, not at all, they will eat Bolgar wheat, they will eat corn meal, they will eat rice, they desperately need vegetable oils and I am happy to tell you that your country is keeping its shipments of food on schedule...in this vital part of the world. In fact, the food that is going there now may be the difference between the success and failure of those valiant people who are trying to cleanse themselves from the infiltration, of years past, of a foreign ideology and now trying to reestablish their own right as a free people with a spirit of nationalism encompassed in a concept so of international cooperation.

Some 450 thousand tons of American food were invested in this food and work project last year alone.

And food is the equivalent of hard cash for development spending in countries where foreign exchange must ordinarily be spent for food imports. Everyone of you in this room know this and I sometimes almost feel embarrassed to even say it to you, The reason I am saying it is because I am an old teacher and I find that in this noisy society unless you keep repeating some truths, people continue to hear nothing but the static. I also find out that all too often people are slow learners and education is somewhat involved in repetition andoccasionally it comes through osmosis. So, we need to tell the American people, we need to tell ourselves the value

of this God-given commodity called food. It isn't just a matter of a palliative for famine. Food is a currency in its own right. Food is like hard cash in a capital-starved economy. Spread this word, get your Congressmen thinking more about it, get your economists thinking more about it, get your media thinking more about it. I saw the other day where a fellow said a newspaper is but a moving library with high blood pressure. And I think that's true, it's constantly filled with new headlines. Get our press, and our TV, and our radio, talking the facts of this great blessing of American technology in agriculture, the confidence of agribusiness and the importance of our farm producers and the importance of food. Not just food to feed the hungry but food to build for peace.

Now our present Food for Freedom program is designed especially to serve these developmental objectives. It enables us to do much more than simply release accidental surpluses when the famine signal goes up. How good it is that we have finally arrived at a point of national maturity where we look upon food as something to be used helpfully, continuously, constructively, rather than depending on the accident of surpluses to feed and to help other people. This is the fundamental change in the legislation that took place here just a few years ago, two years ago I believe, Herschel.

We can now produce whatever is required to meet developmental needs, over and above the demands of our commercial market. However, we must be sure that in the process we provide a fair return to our own producers. And let me get my licks in right now. You do not ask

a single munitions company to produce one bomb without a profit. You do not ask one aircraft company to produce one of these supersonic planes without a profit. Why do you ask farmers to do it? They're entitled to the same kind of fair return on investment that anyone else is. And I know what the argument is. I know what the argument is. The argument is well, this is the way it is always been. That/the argument for child labor, too. And that was the argument against the Fair Labor Standards Act, too. You could always get someone to work for less than \$1,60 an hour, which is the present one, but that doesn't make it right. And this Vice President hasn't changed one bit on this issue since he came to Congress, not one bit. I think that the American farmer is entitled to ask for a price for his commodity just like anybody else. I don't think he ought to be just what they say ... we'll give you so much. That isn't the way General Motors got big...by somebody coming around and saying well, we'll give you so much for your Chevrolet. They have a price tag on it, it's the list price. That's the way Humphrey's drugstore kept open too, I might add. But Mr. Farmer, like he is supposed to be the fellow you just offer him something? It doesn't go over with the Trade Union Movement. The Trade Union Movement says that we will negotiate this contract, we'll bargain it out with you. And, Herschel, I think our farm friends are beginning to catch on and somebody is going to find out that they know how to ask for a fair price, too. So when I got my...that wasn't in this text that I have here, but I never fail to say it.

Now the war on hunger is not, however, an exclusive American challenge. It is a challenge shared by all mankind...and will suffer it it is not successfully met. All mankind will suffer.

We have, therefore begun to work with other developed nations to establish a systematic international food aid program.

This is the purpose of the Food Aid Provisions which were part of the Kennedy Round negotiation on trade and which are now before the Senate for ratification.

The Food Aid Convention calls for a 4.5 million ton supply of grain to be supplied by the developed nations each year -- of which 1.9 million would come from the United States. The major share would be provided, of course, by the other developed nations in grain or cash equivalent, thus increasing commercial demand. We hope to expand these quantities in the future.

The Food Aid Convention is accompanied by a Grain[†]s Agreement designed to assure farmers in all participating nations better prices for grain sold on the international market -- prices substantially higher than that specified in the 1962 Wheat Agreement.

Now the concept of an international food aid compact was at first misunderstood in some of the developed countries -- particularly those which have food deficits themselves and therefore felt they had nothing to contribute.

I took this matter up on my visit to Europe in March and April. Last Spring, I made an effort in country after country to impress upon the heads of state that all developed nations, not only had an obligation to give what they could -- if not food, then money -- but that such assistance would also serve to expand and stabilize world markets.

I spoke here to the DAC, to the Development Assistance Committee, here that met here in our country just about a year ago, less than a year ago, and agained outlined that the problem of world hunger and the problem of food shortages and food deficits was not an American responsibility alone.

That this was a matter for the developed countries of the world to concentrate their attention upon and in cooperation with the developing countries and this message is beginning to be heard. We've only made a beginning. The 4.5 million tons is a small amount. But, I guess I am becoming accustomed to making short steps even though my vision is broad and large. It's 4.5 million tons more than we ever had before, and it is the beginning.

Now I am proud to say that we've had this success.

Ratification of the Food Aid Convention will, of course, be but a beginning -- but it's a good one -- in setting a pattern for the future.

It is abbasis from which international cooperation in the war on hunger can be expanded, not only for the benefit of the developing nations but as a means of providing new markets and more price protection to farmers everywhere.

The O. E. C. D. has considered additional paths towards international cooperation in the war on hunger, as have the members of UNCTAD. I believe UNCTAD is meeting in Delhi, New Delhi. What I want you to do, is to become, in a sense, missionaries of this effort. We've had a great deal of difficulty getting the developed countries to take their full responsibility on this war on hunger and I call upon those of you who have such

keen interest in it to make this a priority matter of your effort and your attention. Many of you travel, you meet with the leaders of many countries and we're simply going to have to have a dialogue about this and talk it out and build on this beginning.

Now we look forward to the time in the future when all the developed nations, I repeat the word, all -- without regard for ideology -- will join with all developing nations as full partners in similar food aid and technology programs.

The time is here for a world without politics when it comes to hunger.

So international cooperation is a second important tool.

One thing I learned a long time ago in this country, as a young man, that when you're hungry, when you're broke, when you're down-and-out, it doesn't make any difference what your politics is when you go to the bank. If you're poor, if you're white or black, if you are unemployed, white or black, you are in trouble, and the politics of it seems to fade away insignificantly. I think the same thing is true in the world today. Regardless of ideology, those nations in the world that have the technical know-how and the capacity for food production -- the developed nations -- must join together and the developing nations must be brought in concerted planning with them.

Now let me say a few words about technology.

A few years ago we thought most farmers in the developing nations were hopelessly bound to the techniques their forefathers had used for literally hundreds and thousands of years. We know differently now.

Many of those same farmers have created an insatiable demand for fertilizer and improved seeds that has even caused black markets in agricultural inputs in some countries.

Farmers from Turkey to India, this year, harvested millions of acres of high-yield Mexican wheat developed by the Rockefeller Foundation

-- a scant three years after its introduction.

Improved rice varieties developed at the International Rice Research
Institute in The Philippines are now being adapted for use in over 20 major
rice producing countries and promise to triple or quadruple yields.

And we are honored today to have with us, the Under Secretary of Agriculture of the Republic of The Philippines, and one of the farmers of that friendly nation and of those good people. I was in the Far East as some of you know not long ago and wherever I went, I found this great interest in this new, this new type of rice. Rice is so vital, so vital, and yet my dear friends it is hard to get the American people and others to understand that in Asia today maybe one of the great elements of security of today and tomorrow is the adequate production of rice, and the proper means of its distribution. We can expect our laboratories and experimental farms to offer more technical progress, but the real challenge before us now is to get the benefits of what we already know into the hands of the farmers and the mouths of their children, and this gets down to education and extension work. And by the way we have done it all here.

It means adapting our past discoveries to the needs of an intensive agriculture.

It means localized radio, rural radio stations and inexpensive transistor radios to carry the news of improved techniques.

It means adequate, supervised inexpensive credit, easily obtained.

It means incentive returns to the farmer to break the cycle of toil and poverty that is the essence of agricultural backwardness.

Now I just came back from a visit in Africa and every place I went, I found African leaders talking to me about how they can improve their agriculture. Three things that they were most concerned about, education, an insatiable desire for it; the improvement of agricultural technology production methods, and distribution; and health. And those are the three pillars of any successful foreign assistance program. You know one of the troubles of we Americans about this foreign aid business, we are too sophisticated. Indeed, we are. I had it -- it dawned on me while I was...particularly in Africa. When a man said to me from one of the countries, he said: "Mr. Vice President, we just need a two-year college in this country, if we could just get a two-year college, we don't need a Harvard, or a MIT, or a Oxford, we need a two-year college. We have but one, one secondary school in the whole country." And then I thought to myself...then he said, "You know we have been trying to get help about how to set up these very basic elementary and secondary schools and these what you call community colleges. " And he said,

"one of the real problems that we have is that the developed countries are so developed that they don't understand what we are talking about." And I said, "I think that I understand, my mother was a school teacher and she had a tenth grade education and she was a better school teacher than some of the Ph.D.'s that I have run into. She knew what she was doing and she had a love of children and she had enough information for what were the needs of that time. I can remember old Dr. Christenson out at the University of Minnesota, who used to put on these 3 weeks, 6 weeks, 3 month short courses to teach our farmers how to farm better. He did not ask them to the University for seven years, they did not have the time. He was lucky if he could get them for three weeks but I'll tell you, he made some good farmers out of them. And as a boy, I remember the country extension service and there were very few who had masters degrees and if there was one he never got up our way. They must have kept him down here for exhibition purposes at the Smithsonian. The people that we had as county extension agents were people that maybe had an eighth grade education, tenth grade education but they knew a lot about farming. My fellow Americans we're a little over educated for some of the needs in this world. We have over-economic planning for some of the ... for some of the more primitive societies. They need beginnings and it is true in agriculture too. They are not all ready to use the latest that we have developed in the year 1968, they need the beginnings. I don't want to be interpreted as being against advanced education... I put a caveat on everything these days. I simply say that

everything in season. I simply say that you cannot, you cannot give a 12 year old boy the work to do of a 25 or 30 year old man and people have to learn. They have to have the beginnings, they have to have the starts.

Now agriculture is private enterprise in America and in most places in the world. So is the production of fertilizer, pesticides, farm implements. So are our thriving farm cooperatives. And if there is any one thing that I am proud of as a United States Senator and it is Title 5 to the Foreign Aid Act that compelled this government, at long last, to do a little something about the promotion of cooperatives, farm cooperatives in the developing countries of the world. I found that we had one person in the whole State Department in 1961 that could spell cooperatives.... that knew what they were, and Herschel, you know it's true. I had their witness up there before the committee and I said, "Well we're not going to rely on your good intentions any longer. My father told me there was a place that was paved with good intentions!" We are going to see that it is done by law, we are going to start to set up credit unions, farm cooperatives, savings and loan associations. We are going to start to get the people to help themselves. Because when a farmer owns his own piece of land and he can cooperate with others in his production and his distribution, and his credit facilities and so forth he is a free enterpriser. And we have been making some progress. Interestingly enough, in the most recent offensive in Vietnam, the first people to be selected out in the rural areas for slaughter, were the leaders of the newly established cooperatives. Great help wasn't it. We have 300 and some farm cooperatives established there. We've got our first rural electric cooperative, it was selected for assassination, in the name of humanity. I'd say in the name of anything but humanity. I have to control my views on these matters now-a-days.

Well, the development and dissemination of new technology -once the exclusive preserve of our Land Grant Colleges and our Extension Service -- is increasingly becoming a part of the private sector. Today fully half of all the research in agriculture is financed and conducted by private firms. And let me put in my plea now for the partnership concept. All through this government, you know, the Vice President doesn't have much authority but he can be a spokesman. This is an office filled with responsibility and no power, that I know. But I'll tell you one thing that I also know, that if we are going to do anything in this country, we are going to have to learn to work together. And there has to be in government a desire to work with the private sector of our economy. You cannot look, Mr. Government, you cannot look upon a private businessman as if he is somehow or other your competitor or your enemy, he is your partner and Mr. Businessman, you have to look upon your government, not as your enemy either, but as your partner. We have to work together. And I know that these old antagonisms do exist.

I ran into a situation...I can say if there is a Congressman present here, I see my old friend Harold down here. A great help to us Harold Cooley, I want to thank you. I ran into a situation in the Far East where

I brought up a matter relating to how we could use American food to help in that country and I said in this instance, a private firm under Title 4 of the Food for Freedom Act could purchase, on long-term credits, food and that food could be converted and used in cooperated with this particular government, not only for feeding hungry people but for developing certain distribution facilities. And a government man said to me, "Mr. Vice President, that means that you expect me to work with a private business firm, that's going to make a profit. "I said, "Yes, is that un-American?" But he said, "That's the way we get in trouble." Well, I said, you can afford to get in some trouble, I get in plenty of it. It won't hurt you a bit. And I said if you get in trouble under those terms just remember the law directs you to do it. But I submit to you that there is reluctance to do it. A reluctance and no better place to explain it than before this audience. So I suggest that when you have a program in mind where you believe that the private sector can work with the government, don't you take no for an answer, because you will get plenty of them because it's automatic reflexes in this town, just automatic, no thought behind them just, "No"...comes right on out. You just get busy and say that I think it will work and then have somebody examine the law. Harold, I remember one time when I was a Senator, I went up here to a department under the Cooley Amendment and I had the lawyer of that department tell me that what the Cooley Amendment meant. I said, I worked with Mr. Cooley to get that Amendment in the Act, I was

on the Senate side in the Conference Committee when Mr. Cooley put that Amendment on in the House side, and I said I think I know what that Amendment means. That is to take funds of our Counter Part Funds to use in private enterprise in foreign countries so that American business firms could borrow some of these, these foreign currencies that we generate under Public Law-480. And this particular lawyer spent one hour telling me, in the presence of the Under Secretary of State, that I didn't know what I was talking about. And I said to the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dillon, I said, Mr. Secretary, I want to tell you something, I am one of the co-authors of that law, now you've got a lawyer here that either doesn't know what he's talking about or he's telling me that I am studpid. If he is doing that, I want to remind you that I am on the Appropriations Committee. And I got a practical suggestion for you Mr. Secretary, get yourself a new lawyer and I'll be back tomorrow. Well you've never seen so much law learned in 24 hours in your life. And the company that received some assistance under that is one of the biggest implement companies in America and has been doing wonderful work in other countries. But if I had listened to that lawyer, they would have had those counter...those funds piled up that much higher, those soft currencies as we call them, that gather rust, moths, and a few other things.

Well I happen to think that private industry has played a major role in our war on hunger, has played a major role in exporting

commodities sold under Public Law 480, and over 70 charitable organizations have helped distribute American food abroad. And I see my good friend here, Bishop Swanstrom, and others, who have been deeply involved in this. What a blessing...imagine if we had to do it all by government. I've been a strong supporter of the voluntary agencies in this program, because it lends a little personality to it. It gets away from the quadruplet reports. By the time you have filled in all those reports any love of humanity is gone out of you, I can tell you that. You need to have some of the touch, of human touch.

Now, needless to say, agricultural development can and will mean economic development in general -- and a growing market for commercial exports of food, farm equipment and agricultural chemicals.

And may I just say, right now, last month was a tough month for this country in exports. We need more exports. We suffered a tragic blow last month on exports. So anything that we can do, any program that we can follow that will stimulate our exports, is in our national interest as well as in a world wide interest.

Our American farmers invest roughly, at least according to my friend Secretary Freeman, \$42 dollars per acre. Is that right, Dorothy? 42 dollars per acre in production supplies from the non-farm sector each year. Our Japanese farmer friends, however, spend more than that for chemicals alone. Farmers in all the developing nations will soon begin to rely much more heavily on the products of agribusiness. And agribusiness, and farmers, and government have

everything in common, you are not enemies; the President knows you are not, and the Vice President knows you are not. We need you and you need us if we are going to do this job.

I think the American free enterprise system can tap this great market -- and help feed millions in the process.

Now finally, let me mention the most critical need of all -- self-help on the part of the developing nations.

Some of them are already doing very well.

But as George Woods, President of the World Bank, said in New Delhi a week ago, many still fail to grasp the terrible urgency of their situation.

I spent a very enlightening afternoon with Mr. Robert Gardner of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa and Otisababa and when he talked to me about what was happening in population and food in Africa, I got the cold chills. That man ought to talk to you.

You ought to see the immensity of the challenge and yet he, and I am sure you, believe that it can be met. But we need to take a good look at it and plan it. You have to plan a war on poverty, you have to plan a war on hunger. This isn't any hap-in-stance operation, you have to figure out what resources will be required, where the command structure will be, how the logistics will be supplied and how the enemy will be defeated.

Now there is much more to do in all aspects of economic development -- in agriculture and family planning, in land reform, in industrial development and export promotion, in management and

maintenance of progress already achieved.

An encyclical came out just a year ago, it said, "Developments is the new name for peace." You see, I believe that. I believe that just as one of our great heroes in America said, "Peace, peace, there is no peace." I say, "peace, peace, there is no peace without development." And I say there is no development without security which makes possible peace.

There is more to do in shaking off dogma and doctrine that make good anti-colonial rhetoric but bad development policy.

Independence did not mean Utopia. Independence toward the developing nations has meant great troubles and challenges. One of the most inhibiting of these is the outdated notion that foreign private investment means exploitation.

In the colonial era that may have been true. But today, there is a new breed of capitalists -- they have learned the hard way, I call them domesticated capitalists, if you like. And, they are ready to offer not exploitation, but investment, jobs, management, production of exportable goods, and progress.

Now there is much more to national development than progress in agriculture.

There must be education -- to emancipate the mind and release the human potential.

There must be health care -- to protect and preserve the vitality of our God-given human resources.

Without these three necessities of human development, all the shiny factories and new roads, all the banks and the bicycles that are the usual symbols of economic development become little more than vainglorious monuments. The greatest resource that God gave us, was the Human resource. That is what you tend to first.

This is the time when the world's intentions for its future are being sorely tested...on the battlefield, in the quiet Foreign Office corridors, and in our souls.

Nowhere is this test greater than on the dusty plots in the humble villages on the front lines of the war on hunger.

Now we know the dimensions of this battle and we have the weapons to fight it.

But do we -- and all others who are comfortable and prosperous -- have the will to make a small sacrifice today for the peace of tomorrow?

Sometimes I fear that Gunnar Myrdal is right — that we live on 'attending to the business of the day without giving much thought to the unthinkable ahead of us."

There is a bill in the Congress of the United States today to extend Public Law-480 which is surely one of the most enlightened documents in the bleak annals of international relations.

Help us pass it ... and do it soon.

There is also the President's request for a foreign aid authorization. Fully one-half of the development aid in that request will be devoted specifically to the war on hunger. We need your help.

Foreign aid is today one of the most difficult assignments of the Congress and of the President and it's another symptom of our withdrawal, and which I consider to be the gravest danger facing this country. That when the going gets tough, when the results seem to be less than what you would want, when the difficulties mount, there is a generation of Americans now that have never known a depression or been involved in a war. Aided and abetted by some of the rest of us, who say, "let's withdraw. Stop the world I want to get off. Let America have her lost weekend. Let's live it up. Fortress America." I think this is the greatest challenge of our time. The re-emergence of the forces of isolationism in new clothes, with new symbols, with new slogans, the kind of isolationism which would tell us that all we need to do is to wish for a better world and it will come...the cheap way. There is no cheap way, to accomplish great things.

Now we have the chance to be remembered in history as the generation that finally decided to make its commitment to security and development for all mankind. We have that chance, or we can gain for ourselves a chapter in history as the generation that had the opportunity for greatness and settled for petty nonsense.

I hope that we make the right decision. I think we will because in times of stress, there is something about mankind, in times of stress the best that is in him generally comes forward. Let's hope and pray that that tradition of yesterday will be a reality for today and tomorrow.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Newsom:

ŧ

Mr. Vice President, at the risk of...Mr. Vice President, I only want to say two things. One of them is thank you. And the other one, if I may be so presumptuous as to transfer a statement from a great inaugural address, I'd like to say to you I think these fellow Americans of yours and mine have been trying to say to you they do not shrink from it, they welcome it. Thank you very, very much.

The Vice President:

Thank you very much.

ADDRESS BY

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WAR ON HUNGER* WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL WASHINGTON, D. C. FEBRUARY 20, 1968

Thank you very much, my dear and good friend, one of our truly great Americans, Herschel Newsom.

It's just an honor to be introduced by you, sir, and to be here in the presence of these fine delegates, that are concerned with a matter of very serious importance to all mankind.

May I first just make a brief apology. This has been a very busy morning for us over at the White House and I tried to send a message here that, with a Cloture Vote coming up in the Senate, Leadership Meeting in the White House, and two other conferences, our schedule just went by the board today, that's all. But I guess it's par for the course.

Ladies and Gentlemen ---

This is the sort of Conference that the world longs for.

This is a peace conference and I want you to feel, act, live, and talk in that spirit. If I were to select a text for this conference and m, participation in 11 — it would be one that I have used a hundred times but its use in no way destroys its newness or its profundity.

st Called by the Committee on the World Food Crisis, Inc.

That great peasant Priest beloved spiritual leader, Pope

John the 23rd, said, "Where there is constant want, there is no peace."

And there is constant want in many areas of the world today and what he was telling us in so many words was, that the building of peace is a tedious, hard, difficult, sacrificial task but absolutely urgent.

Now I said this is a peace conference and we are here to talk about food -- the key to peace, to security and development...at home and abroad...for every nation.

world where the majority of men still lead a hand-to-mouth existence, where hunger and malnutrition still destroy mental and physical powers, where war, pestilence, and famine still ride hand-in-hand, there can be no peace nor can there be real security or full development for any of us.

cerity that national development and national security are one and inseparable.

It's a message this we implement here is not those of us that are development because of the ethical, the economic, the spiritual, and the political needs of the logical may I alway, that we would in a special sense be guilty be cally of defrauding the people if we did not understand that security is also essential if there is to be development. And by the same token there isn't security without development. They go hand-in-hand. This is a lesson that we must learn.

No matter how many good works we may perform, if there is violence lawlessness, riding, aggression, subversion, there is no development.

It adds up in futility. But no matter how much you may suppress the violence and the aggression and the subversion, if there is a failure to have development there is no peace. So we have a big task before us but we need to get our thinking straight first of all.

if Isaiah. "And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God."

"To the hungry man food is God" the Romans said. Where there is hunger there is no reason." and I believe that without all of the found statements, we just plain know, the where there is want and deprivation, there is restlessness and hopelessness, frustration and wiolence itself.

It not all difficult to imagine a nightmare world in the future in which Thomas Malthus' terrible prophecies will come true.

I remember as students when we used to this the Malthusian theory, we just so laughed at it.

What is sometimes difficult to remember, however, amid all the grim statistics the Malthusian trap is not inescapable.

that trap...to make decent nutrition, like sun and air, the birthright of every human being. And we might add so one of the right of the right to food. Surely has that light

We must constantly remind ourselves that primitive technology -not inadequate food growing potential -- is responsible for starvation yields
in many countries today.

if you add a little fertilizer, a little water, some improved seeds -- the tools and techniques of modern agriculture -- to the dust of those fields -- even the barren desert -- output increases rapidly

it. All the more reason that we will never be forgiven if we fail to do it.

We must remember also that self-help efforts in countries like India, Pakistan, Taiwan, in Latin America and Africa and others, are beginning to pay off.

We now expect that the world will produce more foodgrain this crop year than ever before in man's history -- not only because of good luck good weather, but because of solid, tangible progress in agriculture to which you and many more like you have contributed.

And there is progress, too, in family planning, even though the rewards of that progress -- a significant downturn in the world birtherate -- may yet be a decade or more away. The amount of resources now devoted to population planning...the knowledge of contraceptive methods...and public acceptance

is at an all-time high. Today our own foreign assistance investment in family planning is 17 times what it was five years ago.

we must constantly remind ourselves that it is not described to the inevitability of tragic invitability in the human condition. That people like us all around the world who will decide whether children born this year grow up strong and healthy -- or quick or sick or hopeless. It's in our hands.

the Union address about our count. We have no lack of capacity in this country, we have no lack of ability, we have no lack of know-how, the only question is do we have the will? do we have the purpose? I am one of the few optimists, you know, left in Washington. They fade away each time there is a little more difficulty. But I happen to believe that the history of our country is on my side, or should? Say that I think I am on the side of the history of our country. We can do anything we want to do the history of our country. We can do anything we want to do the history of our country. We can do anything we want to do the history of our country is not resources, not know-how, but it is marshaling of the resources, and the will to use them, agreement pon objectives.

what weapons are now at hand for this war on hunger?

The fact that

I the mand first or all that the fact the we know the we can wage

a war on hunger is will itself a very constructive, positive, hopeful

The fact that in this country of ours, we we declared war on poverty

is a lin itself, I think a revelation of the moral purpose of this nation.



there have been hungry people for centuries, and there have been poor people for centuries. But only in this decade -- and I repeat this great America of ours and other decided to declare only in this decade -war on these ancient enemies of mankind. many people are going to say that we've not done nearly enough. But I say the fact that you've about these great trials and burdens made the decision to do something about these matters. of mankind and burdens of mankind, , the fact that we have made the decision is within itself a victory. Until one has decided what to do and expressed willingness to do it, there is no hope for victory. I know that our forefathers in their struggle for our independence, had to make a decision first of all that they were going to win, and that it was worth the sacrifice, and they said we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. They pledged the whole works, They made the decision and then seven years later, seven years later, / with the help of the French and of many others and of foreign aid with technical assistance from the more developed countries the time, we finally gained our independence. In the meantime, the capitol in the United States had been shifted eleven times. Soldiers had deserted by the thousands. Torries had gone to other lands and the country was sorely So if you are a little hopeless today, just remember how we got started. I would remind you of that. And I might even tell you, I love to talk about this, because I used to teach this course. I am sort of refreshing myself just in case I have to do it again. I am always intrigued by these

Johnny-come-lately constitutional experts' proport to read the history of our country, you know. That great Constitution which pledges free speech and free press was never conceived with either. There was no free press. Nobody ever looked in. They closed the doors. They locked in the members. They even assigned two people to Benjamin Franklin -- when he got in his cups, he talked a little too much just remember that. And not a single person the went there was ever elected. They were appointed, and they didn't go to Philadelphia to write a new Constitution, they went there under false pretenses. They said they were going to revise the Articles of Confederation. If anybody had known what they were going to do, they would never had let them meet. The fact. A hundred were invited, fifty five came, thirty nine stayed, and this past signed. We didn't do too well get know, to start out.

M

Americans these days are going around to prove the they are very, year learned to looking in pain. A learned man ought to be a positive man.

A person that has a knowledge of our country and some and the country and our culture ought to be filled with at least prudent optimism. We can do what we need to do. And that's what we need in this country today, a little less wringing of the hands and a little more searching of the soul.

And we'll be able to do the things for our cities, for our people, for our defense, for our security that need to be done. We have the means to do it. That's what Hubert H. Humphrey thinks. And I have good reason to believe it.

What weapons are now at hand for our war on hunger?

the first weeps we have the weapons this was on honger the first weeps we have the state of producing food. We, and the other developed nations capable of producing food beyond one own domestic and commercial export needs, have an invaluable resource -- a resource which can buy time while developing countries struggle to their own feet, as included the struggle to

That's what our food abundance is for.

We can't feed the world, alone, but we can buy time. The next question is what do we do with the time we buy? Time is neutral, it only determined becomes a liability or an asset. But food can be much more than a stop-gap palliative for famine.

in capital improvements which in turn increase agricultural self-sufficiency.

In most developing economies it can be invested, just like money,

If there was as much concern in this world about the food standard as there is about the gold standard, I think we'd be well on the way to winning this war on hunger. And here are tell you there are more people that need food today than need gold. Both, I want to go on record for, are very vital. One has to be awfully careful these days what he says, because there are people just waiting in the bleachers, you know. They wonder, did he make a little mistake there, can we catch him, this game of hide-and-go-seek and if gets a little more so each month this year of 1968. So let me make it crystal clear before we move any further that I am for both food and gold.

Now just three months ago, just three months ago, I had an experience I'll long remember. I visited a successful United States sponsored food-for-

as be cut it received

work project in Demak, Indonesia, where irrigation ditches irrigation tanks were being cleaned and restored to full use by persons who had been unemployed. Many then were very young their pay was in food, And it was a corn meal. We often think of Indonesia primarily as just being rice eating people. Not at all, then will eat Bolgar wheat. They will eat corn meal. They will eat rice. They desperately need vegetable oils and I am happy to tell you that your country is keeping its shipments and on schedule in this vital part of the world. In the food that going there now may be the difference between the success and failure of those valiant people who are trying to cleanse themselves from the infiltration, years past, of a foreign ideology. They are now trying to reestablish their own right as a free people with a spirit of nationalism encompassed and a concept of international cooperation.

Some 450 thousand tons of American food were invested in this food and work project last year alone.

in countries where foreign exchange must ordinarily be spent for food imports. Everyone of you in this room know this and I sometimes almost feel embarrassed to even say it to you. The reason I am saying it is because I am an old teacher and I find that in this noisy society, unless you keep repeating some truths, people continue to hear nothing but the static. I also find out that all too often people are slow learners and education is some what involved a repetition and occasionally is one though osmosis. So we need to tell the American people, we need to tell ourselves the value

of this God-given commodity called food. It isn't just a maffer of a palliative for famine. Food is a currency in its own right. Food is the hard cash in a capital-starved economy. Spread this word, get your Congressmen thinking more about it, get your economists thinking more about it, get your media thinking more about it. I saw the other day where a fellow said a newspaper is but a moving library with high blood pressure. And I think that's true, constantly filled with new headlines. Get our press, and our TV, and our radic talking the facts of this great blessing of American technology in agriculture the confidence of agribusiness of the importance of our farm producers and the importance of food. Not just food to feed the hungry but food to build for peace.

to serve these developmental objectives. It enables us to do much more than simply release accidental surpluses when the famine signal goes up. How good it is that we have finally arrived at a point of national maturity where we look upon food as something to be used helpfully, continuously, constructively, rather than depending on the accident of surpluses to feed and to help other people. This is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change in the legislation that the other people is the fundamental change is the other people is the fundamental change is the fundamental change is the o

We can now produce whatever is required to meet developmental needs, over and above the demands of our commercial market. However, we must be sure that in the process we provide a fair return to our own producers. And let me get my licks in right now. You do not ask

don't think he ought to take just what they say. we'll give you so much. That Consul Motors got big. by somebody coming around and saying we'll give you so much for your Chevrolet. They have a price tag on it will straight add. But Mr. Farmer? He is supposed to be the fellow you just offer him something! It doesn't go over with the Trade Union Movement.

The Trade Union Movement says that we will negotiate this contract, we'll bargain it out with you. And, Herschel, I think our farm friends are beginning to catch on and somebody is going to find out that they know how to ask for a fair price, too. That wasn't in this text that I have here, but I never fail to say it.

the war on hunger is not, however, an exclusive American all mankind...and will suffer

if it is not successfully met. All mankind will suffer.

We have, therefore, begun to work with other developed nations to establish a systematic international food aid program.

This is the purpose of the Food Aid Provisions which were part of the Kennedy Round negotiation on trade and which are now before the Senate for ratification.

The Food Aid Convention calls for a 4.5 million ton supply of grain to be supplied by the developed nations each year -- of which 1.9 million would come from the United States. The major share would be provided of course, by the other developed nations in grain or cash equivalent, thus increasing commercial demand. We hope to expand these quantities in the future.

The Food Aid Convention is accompanied by a Grain Agreement designed to assure farmers in all participating nations better prices for grain sold on the international market -- prices substantially higher than specified in the 1962 Wheat Agreement.

the concept of an international food aid compact was at first misunderstood in some of the developed countries -- particularly those which have food deficits themselves and therefore felt they had nothing to contribute.

I took this matter on my visit to Europe in March and April, last

I made an effort in country after country to impress upon the heads
of state that all developed nations not only had an obligation to give what
they could -- if not food, then money -- but that such assistance would
also serve to expand and stabilize world markets.

I spoke here to the Development Assistance Committee, and in our country less than a year ago. At again I willing that the problem of world hunger and the problem of food shortages and food were discussed not an American responsibility alone. That this was a matter for the developed countries of the world to concentrate their attention pon in cooperation with the developing countries. This message is beginning to be heard. We've only made a beginning the 4.5 million tons is a small amount. But the second and large it's 4.5 million tons more than we ever had before, and it is the beginning.

I am proud to say that we've had this success.

Ratification of the Food Aid Convention will, of course be that a beginning -- but its a good one setting a pattern for the future.

It is a basis from which international cooperation in the war on hunger can be expanded, not only for the benefit of the developing nations but as a means of providing new markets and more price protection to farmers everywhere.

The O. E. C. D. has considered additional paths towards international cooperation in the war on hunger, as have the members of UNCTAD, the line UNCTAD is meeting in New Delhi. What I want you to do is a become, in a sense, missionaries of this effort. We've had a great deal of difficulty getting the developed countries to take their full responsibility of this war on hunger. I call upon those of you who have such

keen interest in a to make this a priority matter of your effort and your attention. Many of you travely you meet with the leaders of many countries.

We need to have to have a dialogue about this and the it out and build on this beginning.

nations, I repeat <u>all</u> -- without regard for ideology -- will join with all developing nations as full partners in similar food aid and technology programs.

The time is here for a world without politics when it comes to hunger.

So international cooperation is a second important tool. -

One thing I learned a long time ago in this country, as a young man, that when you're hungry, when you're broke, when you're down-and-out, it doesn't make any difference what your politics is when you go to the bank. If you're poor, if you're white or black, if you are unemployed, white or black you are in trouble, and the politics of it seems to fades away insignificantly. I think the same thing is true in the world today. Regardless of ideology, those nations in the world that have the technical know-how and the capacity for food production -- the developed nations -- must join together and the developing nations must be brought in concerted planning with them.

Now let me say a few words about technology.

A few years ago we thought most farmers in the developing nations were hopelessly bound to the techniques their forefathers had used for literally hundreds and thousands of years. We know differently now.

Many of those same farmers have created an insatiable demand for fertilizer and improved seeds that has even caused black markets in agricultural imputs in some countries.

Farmers from Turkey to India this year harvested millions of acres of high-yield Mexican wheat developed by the Rockefeller Foundation -- a scant three years after its introduction.

Improved rice varieties developed at the International Rice Research

Institute in The Phillippines are now being adapted for use in over 20 major
rice producing countries and promise to triple or quadruple yields.

of Agriculture of the Republic of The Phillippines, and one of the farmers of that friendly nation and of those good people. I was in the Far East as some of you know not long ago and wherever I went. I found this great interest in this new, this new type of rice. Rice is so vital, so vital, and yet my dear friends it is hard to get the American people and others to understand that in Asia today and to one of the great elements of security of today and tomorrow is the adequate production of rice and the proper means of its distribution. We can expect our laboratories and experimental farms to offer more technical progress, but the real challenge before us now is to get the benefits of what we already know into the hands of the farmers and the mouths of their children. This gais down to education and extension work. And by the way we have done it all here.

It means adapting our past discoveries to the needs of intensive agriculture.

It means localized radio, rural radio stations and inexpensive transistor radios to carry the news of improved techniques.

It means adequate, supervised inexpensive could easily obtained credit.

It means incentive returns to the farmer to break the cycle of toil

and poverty that is the essence of agricultural backwardness.

I just came back from a visit Africa, and every place I went, I found African leaders talking to me about how they can improve their agriculture. Three things that they were most concerned about education, an insatiable desire for it; the improvement of agricultural technology production methods, and distribution, and health. And those are the three pillars of any successful foreign assistance program. know one of the troubles of we Americans about this foreign aid business is that we are too sophisticated. Indeed, we are. I had it -- it dawned on me particularly while I was in Africa. When a man said to mes the countries, he said "Mr. Vice President, we just need a two-year college in this country. If we could just get a two-year college, we don't need a Harvard, 🗪 a MIT, or an Oxford. We need a two-year college. We have but one secondary school in the whole country. " Then he said, "You know we have been trying to get help about how to set up these very basic elementary and secondary schools and these what you callcommunity colleges. And he said, "One of the real problems that we

have is that the developed countries are so developed that they don't understand what we are talking about." And I said, I think that I understand, my mother was a school teacher and she had a tenth grade education and she was a better school teacher than some of the Ph. D. 's I have run into. She knew what she was doing she had a love of children and she had enough information for the needs of that time. I can remember old Dr. Christenson out at the University of Minnesota who three week or six week or three month used to put on these 3 week, 6 week, 3 month short courses to teach our farmers how to farm better. He did not ask them to the University for seven years, they they have the time. He was lucky if he could get them for three weeks but I'll tell you, he made some good farmers of them. (And as a boy, I remember the county extension service there were very few who had masters degrees and if there was one he never got up our way. They must have kept him down here for exhibition purposes at the Smithsonian. The people we had as county extension agents were people that maybe had an eighth grade allowation, tenth grade education but they knew a lot about farming. My fellow Americans we're a little over Jours de tout educated for some of the needs this world, We have planning for some of the more primitive societies. They need beginnings and it is true in agriculture too. They are not all ready to use the latest we have developed in the year 1968, they need the beginnings. I don't want to be interpreted as being against advanced education. I put a caveat on everything these days. I simply say that everything in season. I simply muct, You cannot give a 12 year old boy the work to do of a 25 or 30 year old man and people have to learn. They have to have the

beginnings.

agriculture is private enterprise in America and in most places in the world. So is the production of fertilizer, pesticides, farm implements. So are our thriving farm cooperatives. and if there is one thing I am proud of as a United States Senator it is Title 5 to the Foreign Aid Act. That title compelled this government -- at long last -- to do all the something about the promotion of company farm cooperatives in the developing countries of the world. I found that we had one person in the whole State Department in 1961 that could spell cooperatives. that knew what they were, and Herschel, you know I told him, 11 witness up there before in committee and said. Well we're not going to rely on your good intentions any longer. My father told me there was a place the was paved with good intentions. We are going to see that it is done by lawx we are going to set up credit unions, farm cooperatives, and savings and loan associations. We are going to start to get the people to help themselves. When a farmer owns his own piece of land and can cooperate with others in his production and his distribution and his credit facilities and so forth he is a free enterpriser. And we have been making some progress. | Interestingly enough, in the most recent offensive in Vietnam, the first people to be selected out in the rural areas for slaughter were leaders of the newly established cooperatives. Great hel We have 300 and some farm cooperatives established there first rural electric cooperatives. Its leader in the name of humanity. I'd say in the name of anything but humanity. I-

have to control my views on these matters now a days,

Well the development and dissemination of new technology -once the exclusive preserve of our Land Grant Colleges and Extension Service -- is increasingly becoming part of the private sector. Today agricultural fully half of all is research in a riculture is financed and conducted by private firms. And let me put my plea now for the partnership concept. on know the Vice President doesn't have much authority but he can be a spokesman. This is an office filled with responsibility and no power, that I know. But I little on one thing I do also know if we are going to do anything in this country, we are going to have to learn to work together. And there has to be in government to work with the private sector of our economy. You cannot Mr. Government, look upon a private businessman as if he is somebow of our your competitor or enemy he is your partner and Mr. Businessman, you have to look upon your government not as your enemy but as your partner. We have to work together. And old antagonisms do exist. I ran into a situation in the Far East where how we could use American food to help 🚮 that pointed out that a private firm under Title 4 of the Food for Freedom Act could purchase, on long-term credits, and food could then be

converted and used in cooperation with this particular government, not only

for feeding hungry people but development distribution facilities.

you expect me to work with a private business firm going to make a profit. "I said, "Yes, is that un American?" he said, "That's the way we get in trouble." Well, I said, you can afford to get in some trouble. I get in plenty of it. It won't hurt you a bit. And the figure of the said if you get in trouble under those terms just remember the law directs you to do it. But a build there is reluctance to do it. A reluctance and no better place to explain it than before this audience. So I suggest that when you have a program where you believe the private sector can work with the government, don't that take "no" for an answer. You will get plenty of them because automatic reflection this first automatic, no thought behind their just, "NO" comes right on out. You just get busy and say the I think it will work and then have somebody examine the law.

Learning a situation. I can say if there is a Congressman present the proof of Multiple of the law of the law of the law of the to a department under the Cooley Amendment and I had the lawyer of that department tell me and what the Cooley Amendment meant. I said, I worked with Mr. Cooley to get that Amendment in the Act, I was on the Senate side in the Conference Committee when Mr. Cooley put that Amendment on in the House side, and I said I think I know what that Amendment means. That is to take finds of our Counter Part Funds to the use in private enterprise in foreign countries so that American business firms could be be some of these.

generate under Public Law 480. And this partial lawyer spent one telling Mile in the presence of the Under Secretary of State, didn't know what I was talking about. And I said to the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dillon Mr. Secretary, I am one of the co-authors of that laws how you've got a lawyer here that either doesn't know what he's talking about or he's telling me I am stupid. If he is doing I want to remind you that I am on the Appropriations Committee. And I a practical suggestion for you, Mr. Secretary, get yourself a new lawyer and I'll be back tomorrow. Well you've never seen so much law learned in And the company that received biggest implement companies in America and has been doing wonderful work in other countries. But if I had listened to that lawyer, they would have had funds piled up that much higher. Those soft currencies as we call them, agather rust, moths, and a few other things.

role in our war on hunger, has played a major role in exporting commodities sold under Public Law 480, and over 70 charitable organizations have helped distribute American food abroad. And I see my good friend here, Bishop Swanstrom, and others, who have been deeply involved in this. What a blessing, imagine if a had to do it all by the seen a strong supporter of a voluntary agencies in this program, it leads little personality to it. It gets away from the quadrupled reports.

By the time you have filled is all those reports any love of humanity is gone.

You need to have some of the human touch.

needless to say, agricultural development can and will mean economic development in general and a growing market for commercial exports of food, farm equipment and agricultural chemicals.

And may I just say

We need more exports. We suffered a tragic blow last month on exports. So anything we can do, any program we can follow that will stimulate exports is in our national interest as well as in world wide interest.

Our American farmers invest roughly at least according to my differed secretary Freedam, 42 dollars per acre/ Is that the follow 42 dollars per acre in production supplies from the non-farm sector each year. Our Japanese farmer friends, however, spend more than that for chemicals alone. Farmers in all the developing nations will soon begin to rely much more heavily on the products of agribusiness. And agribusiness and farmers and government have everything in common you are not enemies; the President knows you are not, and the Vice President knows you are not. We need you and you need us if we are going to do this job.

I think the American free enterprise system can tap this great market -- and help feed millions in the process.

Now finally, let me mention the most critical need of all -- self-help on the part of the developing nations.

Some of them are already doing very well.

But as George Woods, President of the World Bank, said in New Delhia week ago, many still fail to grasp the terrible urgency of the situation.

I spent a very enlightening afternoon with Robert Gardner of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa and Ottom when he talked about what was happ population and food in Africa, I got cold chills. That man ought to talk to you.

You ought to see the immensity of the challenge yet he and am it can be not. But we need to take a good look at it and plan it. You have to plan a war on poverty, you have to plan a war on hunger. This isn't any hoperstance operation, you have to figure out what resources will be required, the command structure the logistics will be supposed and how the enemy will be defeated.

development -- in agriculture family planning, in land reform, in industrial development export promotion, in management and in maintenance of progress already achieved.

An encyclical came out a year ago, it said, "Development is the new name for peace."

I believe that.

American

just as one of our great/heros said: "Peace, peace, there is no peace". I say, "peace, peace, there is no peace without development".

And I say there is no development without security which makes/possible.

There is more to do off dogma and doctrine that make good anti-colonial rhetoric but bad development policy.

peace

developing nations has meant great troubles and challenges. One of the most inhibiting of these is the outdated notion that foreign private

investment means exploitation.

In the colonial era that may have been true. But today there is a new breed of capitalists -- they have learned the hard way. I call them domesticated capitalists. And, they are ready to offer not exploitation but investments, jobs, management, production of exportable goods, and progress.

there is much more to national development than progress in agriculture.

There must be education -- to emancipate the mind and release the human potential.

There must be health care -- to protect and preserve the vitality of our God-given human resources.

Without these three necessities of human development, all the shiny factories and new roads, all the banks and bicycles the usual symbols of economic development become little more than vainglorious monuments. The greatest resource God gave us the Human resource. That is what you tend to first.

being sorely tested, on the battlefield, in the quiet Foreign Office corridors, and in our souls.

Nowhere is this test greater than on the dusty plots in the humble villages on the front lines of the war on hunger.

we know the dimensions of this battle and we have the weapons to fight it.

But do we -- and all others who are comfortable and prosperous --

Sometimes I fear Gunnar Myrdal is right -- that we live on "attending to the business of the day without giving much thought to the unthinkable ahead of us."

There is a bill in the Congress of the United States today to extend Public Law 480 which is surely one of the most enlightened documents in the bleak annals of international relations.

Help us pass it. . and do it soon.

There is also the President's request for a foreign aid authorization. Fully one-half of the development aid in that request will be devoted specifically to the war on hunger. We need your help.

Foreign aid in the most difficult assignments of the Congress and at the President it's another symptom of our withdrawal, which I consider to be the gravest danger facing this country. In that's when the going gets tough, when the results seem to be less than what you want want the difficulties mount, there is a generation of Americans they are aided have never known a depression or been involved in a war. and abetted by who say, "let's withdraw. Stop the world I want to get off. Let America have her lost weekend. Let's live it up. Fortress America." I think this is the greatest challenge of our time. The re-emergence of isolationism in new clothes, with new symbols, with new slogans, the kind of isolationism whith world I less than the say.

that all we need to do is wish for a better world and it will come. the cheap way. There is no cheap way to accomplish great things.

we have the chance to be remembered in history as the generation that finally decided to make its commitment to security and development for all mankind. We have that chance or we can gain for ourselves a chapter in history as the generation that had the opportunity for greatness and settled for petty nonsense.

I hope we make the right decision. I think we will because in time of stress, there is something the best come forward. Let hope and pray tradition of yesterday will be a reality for today and tomorrow. Thank you very much.

Mr. Newson:

Mr. Vice President, at the risk of...Mr. Vice President, I only want to say two things. One of them is thank you. And the other one, if I may be so presumptuous as to transfer a statement from a great inaugural address. I'd like to say to you I think these fellow Americans of yours and mine have been trying to say to you they do not shrink from it, they welcome it. Thank you very, very much.

The Vice President:

Thank you very much

REMARKS

Speeches-1968

815-17th Shut N.W.

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WAR ON HUNGER

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FEBRUARY 20, 1968

We are here today to talk about food and people -- and about victory in the war on hunger.

As a Senator and as Vice President I have travelled in most of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

No one who has had that experience can forget that the majority of our fellow human beings still lead a hand-to-mouth existence...that the world's population growth is accelerating... that outside sub-Sahara Africa and the Amazon Basin the amount of new land available for ploying is small.

Everyone in this room is concerned about the cost of hunger and malnutrition in human misery, in mental retardation, in economic backwardness...in tension and disorder.

No generation has known the prophecy of Isaiah better than we:

"And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry

they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and

their God."

Nor indeed does it take much imagination to envision a nightmare world populated by hollow-eyed, spindly-legged, children...guant and shuffling men...emaciated mothers, in years to come if we do not act. and shuffling our activities,

What is sometimes difficult to remember, amidst all the grim projections of a neck and neck the between people and food, is that the Malthusian trap is by no means inescapable.

It is within our power to throw back the jaws of that trap...

and to make a square meal, like sun and air, the birthright

of every human being.

We must certainly remind ourselves that it is primitive technology -- not inadequate food growing potential -- that produces starvation yields in many countries today.

Add a little fertilizer, a little water, some improved seed to the dust of those fields and output increases radically.

Remember also that self-help efforts in countries like

India, Pakistan and China, in Latin America and Africa, are
beginning to pay off. We now expect that the world will produce

more food grain this crop year than every before in man's history -
not only because of good luck or good weather, but because of solid,

tangible progress in agriculture.

There is progress in family planning, too, even though the consequences of that progress -- a significant downturn in the world birth-rate -- may yet be a decade or more away. The amount of resources now devoted to population planning...the knowledge of contraceptive methods...and public acceptance is at an all-time high. We ourselves will invest over 17 times as much foreign assistance to family planning efforts in 1968 as we invested five short years ago.

not any tragic inevitability in the human condition. ... but/you and long that the lendtraff that

Lytho will decide whether children born this year grow up strong

and healthy -- or sick and hopeless. Provident filmson's lendtraff

Yes, there is reason to hope -- and because of it, more reason than ever for concerted, decisive action.

What weapons are now at hand for our struggle against hunger?

Food. We, and the other developed nations capable of producing beyond our own domestic and commercial export needs, have an invaluable resource which will buy time while developing countries struggle to their own feet agriculturally.

But food can be much more than a stop-gap palliative for famines.

- and is being invested -

In most developing economies it can be invested, just like money, in capital improvement which in turn increase agricultural self-sufficiency. Just three months ago, I visited a successful U.S. sponsored food-for-work projects at Demak, Indonesia, where irrigation tanks were being cleaned and restored to use,—

tons of American food were used for such projects throughout the developing world last year.

wolf by

Food is the equivalent of hard cash for development spending in countries where foreign exchange must be spent for food imports.

Buffer stocks adequate to hold down food prices in a developing economy can make the difference between rising real wages and a frustrating inflationary treadmilt.

Our present Food for Freedom legislation is designed specifically to serve those developmental objectives. It enables us to do much more than simply release accidental surpluses when the famine signal goes up.

We can now produce whatever is required to meet developmental needs, over and the demands of our commercial market.

We can offer as much food as the needs and self-help efforts of recipient nations permit them to use constructively.

We are on the offensive.

But the war on hunger is not an exclusively American challenge.

It is a challenge shared by all mankind, and all will suffer if it

is not successfully met.

We have therefore begun to work with the other developed

nations systematically to budget the world's producing capacity, and	ges
for the first time in history, exporting & importing	d
That is the purpose of the Food Aid provisions which were	
part of the Kennedy Round negotiation and which are now before	
the Senate for ratification.	

The Food Aid Convention calls for 4.5 million tons of

grain to be supplied by the adveloping nations each year, of which

a major forther

Would be provided by other developed nations in grain or cash

equivalent. Our objective is + well continue to

the the expansion of this quantity.

Agreement designed to assure farmers in all participating nations

Letter

Lair minimum price for grain sold on the international market -
a price substantially higher than that specified in the 1962

Wheat Agreement.

The concept of an international food aid compact was at first misunderstood by some developed countries -- particularly by those which have food deficits themselves and therefore felt they had nothing to contribute to world food requirements.

During my visit to Europe last spring I made every effort

to impress upon the heads of state with whom I met that all

developed nations not only had an obligation to give what they could -
if not food, then money -- but that such assistance would also act

I am proud to say we had some success.

as a world market and price of a liver.

Ratification of the Food Aid Convention will be only a beginning -- but a good beginning -- in setting a pattern for the future.

It is a biss from which international cooperation in the war on hunger can be expanded, not only for the benefit of the developing nations but as a means of providing new markets and more price protection to farmers everywhere.

The O.E.C.D. and the D.A.C. have considered additional paths toward international cooperation in the war on hunger, as have the members of UNCTAD.

We look forward to the time when all developed nations will join with all developing nations as full participants in similar food and technology programs.

It is time for a world without politics when it comes to hunger.

125 B

So international cooperation is a second important tool.

Next comes technology -- not so much the need for new technology, but the need to make better use of the technology we already have.

A very few years ago we thought most farmers in the developing nations were hopelessly conservative -- bound to the techniques their forefathers had used for literally thousands of years.

Today, many of those same farmers have created a demand for fertilizer and improved seeds that has produced black markets in agricultural inputs in some countries.

Farmers Turkey to India this year, harvested millions of acres of high-yield Mexican wheat developed by the Rockefeller Foundation -- a scant _____ years after its introduction. Improved rice varieties developed at the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines are now being adapted for usin over 20 major rice producing countries and promise to triple or quadruple yields.

woth

We can expect more technological progress in the future. The
United States alone invested nearly 900 million dollars in 50 thousand
agricultural projects last year. The results will be new foods,
new nutrients, better diets.

Prospects are particularly bright for producing cheap protein from rough fish, soy, cottonseed, peanut products -- even crude oil.

That kind of laboratory progress is important. But the real challenge before us today is to get the benefits of what we already know into the hands of the farmers and the mouths of their children.

That means extension work. It means adapting our past discoveries to the needs of labor 'intensive a agriculture.

It means localized rural radio stations and cheap transistor radios which carry the news of improved techniques.

It means adequate credit easily obtained inexpensive,

It means incentive prices that offer to break the cycle

of toil and poverty that is the essence of agricultural backwardness.

Now Let we want about # purele sector

participation of the Common burger, and Agriculture is a private sector enterprise in America. So

are the production of fertilizer, pesticides, farm implements.

So are our thriving farm cooperatives.

Even the Dvelopment and dissemination of new technology -once the exclusive preserve of our Land Grant colleges and our
extension service -- is increasingly being taken over by the private
sector.

Today fully half of all U.S. agricultural research is financed and conduted by private firms.

Their promotional efforts deserve a significant part of the credit for keeping American agriculture up-to-date.

So when we talk about the agricultural resources America
has to offer to the world -- those independent farmers, those
cooperatives, and those booming new agribusiness must be counted

as a leading asset, Mong with all the private charitable organizations that have already done so much.

Recognizing private initiative and investment as "the west

long-term route to rapid growth," President Johnson established

an Office of Private Resources in the Agency for International

Development -- not only to facilitate American investment

in developing nations but expansion of private sectors in those

countries. I urge each of you in the agribusions seth

countries. I familiary of yourself which the

Wardless to work.

sector will mean an enormous market for farm equipment and chemicals. American farmers today invest roughly 42 dollars per acret in production supplies from the non farm sector each year. Japanese farmers, cultivating their small plots intensively and producing some of the highest yields in the world, spend more than that for chemicals fertilizers, posteriors.

pesticides, fungicides and herbicides alone. A growing havest for all those inputs will be one important feature of a successful war on hunger.

I think the American free enterprise system can tap that market -- and feed millions in the process.

Finally, let me mention the most critical need of all -- self-help on the part of the developing nations.

Some of them are already doing well. But George Woods,

President of the World Bank put it in New Delhi a week ago, "It is
earlier in their evolution, and there is much more to be done, than
many of their governments are aware." There is more to do in the
whole spectrum of economic development -- in agriculture and family planning is
land reform, in industrial development and export promotion, in
management and maintenance of progress already achieved.

There is more to do shaking off dogma and doctrine that made good revolutions but make bad development policy.

One of the most inhibiting of these is the outdated notion that foreign private investment means exploitation. In the colonial era that was surely true. But today a new breed of capitalists -- domesticated capitalists, if you like -- are ready to offer not exploitation but jobs, management, exportable goods, and progress.

* * *

My fellow Americans, this is a time when our national will -- our determination to achieve a better, safer world -- is being sorely tested...on a foreign battlefield ...in the quiet corridors of Foreign Offices around the world...in our cities here at home...in our souls.

Nowhere is that test greater than on the dusty plots and in the humble villages in the private lines of the war on hunger.

We know the dimensions of the battle.

We have the weapons to fight it.

But do we have the will to make a small sacrifice today

for a peaceful tomorrow? Sometimes I fear that Gunnar Myrdal is

right -- that we live on "attention to the business of the day

without giving much thought to the unthinkables ahead of us."

There is a bill before Congress today to extend the terms
of a PL-480 program which is surely one of the most enlightened
documents in the bleak annals of international relations.

We must pass it.

There is also the President's request for a foreign aid authorization.

Fully one half of the development aid in that request will be devoted specifically to war on hunger. That, too, must pass.

At the turn of this century, the American poet, Edwin Markham, inspired by Millet's painting, "The Man with the How," described our fellow men who still stand today in a hundred thousand villages around the world:

"Bowed by the wight of centuries he leans

Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,

The emptiness of ages in his face,

And on his back the burden of the world."

And Markham cried out:

"O Masters, lords and rulers in all lands,

Is this the handiwork you give to God?"

The answer is in our hands.

DP J 480, with which I have freen some of the most progressive peaces of legeslation ever enected. Dits wise Countries to graduate from the mession of the concessions of the sold only in ships the concessions who sales but also in the vigor of the sales but also in the vigor of the Eonmercial export muchit. We are now exporting over 5 fellowing delang y agr. Junite trade has for dollars I the private trade mude the spossible.

Hervere, we must be sure that in this process we goverte for where to our producers. to whom we all most so much. Simple fishie requires this.

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.

