

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

President Johnson has sent to the Congress the President's Annual Report on Food For Peace, covering activities under Public Law 480 during the last calendar year. In his letter of transmittal to the Congress, the President sets forth the accomplishments and objectives of the Food for Peace program and discusses the challenge posed by trends in population growth and food supplies.

Additional facts about activities under P.L. 480 drawn from the Annual Report:

--Shipments: Nearly 18 million tons of Food for Peace commodities worth \$1.4 billion were shipped overseas during 1965. This brings total shipments since P.L. 480 began in 1954 to 155 million metric tons of farm products worth \$14.6 billion.

--New Commercial Record: Total U.S. agricultural exports in 1965--both P.L. 480 and commercial--reached \$6.2 billion. The \$4.8 billion in normal commercial exports of farm products was a record high.

--Increased Dollar Savings: Foreign currencies received for Title I sales were increasingly used to pay U.S. overseas expenses. During the year this saved a dollar outflow of \$311 million. Of currencies to be generated by new Title I agreements signed in 1965, over 20% will be set aside for U.S. uses, while 62% will be set aside for economic development loans to foreign governments.

--Food for Work Gains: Over 12 million people in 49 countries received P.L. 480 commodities in 1965 as part payment of wages on food-for-work and other self-help economic and community development projects.

--Donations for the Needy: Direct donations of U.S. food and fiber, through private agencies and government-to-government arrangements, reached 93 million people in 116 countries, including 40 million school children and 10 million disaster victims.

--Stress on Nutrition: In view of findings that the quality of diet is as important as the quantity, the Agency for International Development spent \$2.5 million to fortify milk and grain donations with additional vitamins and minerals to combat the debilitating physical and mental effects of malnutrition.

--Cooley Loan Activity: 38 Cooley loans worth \$35 million were made last year to private enterprise overseas from local currencies generated by Title I sales. This brings the total to 356 loans in 25 countries.

--Market Development Programs: Since P.L. 480 began, more than half of the \$109 million spent under USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service program to create and develop markets overseas for U.S. farm products has come from Title I sales proceeds. Dollar exports of U.S. agricultural commodities increased from \$2 billion in 1955 to \$4.8 billion in 1965.

--Financing Research: Some 800 research projects in such fields as medicine, agriculture, and education were financed from Title I sales proceeds. These scientific inquiries abroad were directed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, and other

MORE

U.S. government agencies.

--Benefits to Education: 16% of total local currency disbursements-- the equivalent of over \$200 million--were directed toward the advancement of knowledge and education in 1965.

--Books for U.S. Libraries: Over 300 American libraries received 1.5 million publications from Library of Congress offices overseas supported by P.L. 480 local currencies.

--Stepped up Dollar Credit Sales: In the past 4-1/2 years, since Title IV was enacted, 65 agreements for long-term dollar credit have been entered into with 23 countries. The 1.7 million metric tons of commodities shipped under Title IV last year nearly equalled the combined tonnage shipped under this title in its first 3-1/2 years of operation. Dollar repayments have totalled \$35 million.

# # #

13  
1. Rostow to note  
Page 2  
2. Wiggins

June 9, 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Subject: Presidential Directives of February 10 and March 30, 1966

In his special Message of February 10 on Food for Freedom the President said:

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by ten percent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of dairy products under the authority of the 1965 Act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U. S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 Act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 Act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

In his special Message of March 30 on Food for India the President said:

The Indian people want to be self-supporting in their food supply.

Their government has adopted a far-reaching program to increase fertilizer production, improve water and soil management, provide rural credit, improve plant protection and control food loss. These essentials must be accompanied by a strong training and education program.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with AID, to consult with the Indian government to ascertain if there are ways and means by which we can strengthen this effort. We have long experience with short courses, extension training and similar programs. If they can be used, I feel certain that American agricultural experts would respond to an appeal to serve in India as a part of an Agricultural Training Corps or through an expanded Peace Corps. Many of our younger men and women would especially welcome the opportunity.

It would appreciate receiving a brief report from you by 6:00 p. m. Friday, June 17 as to what has been done to date by your Department to carry out each of these directives.

Joseph A. Califano, Jr.  
Special Assistant to the President

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
POLICY PLANNING COUNCIL  
WASHINGTON

W

14

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

June 6, 1966

TO: See Distribution

FROM: *JF* S/P - Jerome F. Fried

SUBJECT: A Multilateral Approach to the World Food Problem

Your comments are invited on this preliminary draft of a policy planning study exploring possible multilateral approaches to the World Food Problem. I would appreciate it if your comments reached me by the close of business June 20. Shortly after I am planning to call a meeting to discuss the present draft of this paper and the issues raised by the comments received.

Distribution

OECD - Ambassador Tresize  
EUR/RPE - Deane Hinton  
- Anthony Albrecht  
OES - Leighton Van Nort  
E/OR - Edward Fried  
M/FFP - Richard Reuter  
INR/RES - Herbert Glantz  
AA/PG(AID) - Gustav Ranis  
- J. Saxe  
AA/WR - Herbert Waters  
- Mrs. Jacobson, Department of Agriculture  
- Lester Brown, Department of Agriculture  
- Francis Bator, The White House  
- Alfred Reifman, Board of Economic Advisers

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

6/4/66

14a

A MULTILATERAL APPROACH TO THE  
WORLD FOOD PROBLEM

Dimensions of the Food Problem

The less developed world is falling behind its capacity to feed itself.

Food production in the developing countries is lagging behind a rapidly rising food demand generated by population and income growth. During the past 10 years food production in the LDCs has barely kept up with population growth and during the past four years per capita production, which is at the very unsatisfactory level of 2,100 calories and particularly deficient in proteins, has begun to decline.

As a result the less developed nations have shifted from being net exporters of food grains to being net importers. In the 1934-38 period the less developed world exported 11 million metric tons of grain annually. By the 1948-52 period, the less developed world had become a net importer of grains of some 4 million metric tons. Grain imports have been increasing steadily, reaching 13 million metric

tons in 1957-58, 25 million metric tone in 1964, and over 30 million metric tons in 1966.

During the past ten years, a growing portion of these imports was met by food aid. Grain shipments under PL-480 have been running at about 15 million tons annually during the past five years and will approach 20 million tons in 1966.

If these trends continue, the food deficit of the developing countries will continue to rise rapidly in the years ahead. Using the UN medium population projection, and assuming a modest increase in incomes such that the UN minimum standard of averaging 2400 calories per day could be reached by the end of the decade, and assuming no greater increase in agricultural production than now foreseeable under existing and currently planned programs, the LDC food import deficit that would have to be satisfied by food aid by 1975 is estimated at 42 million tons.

Food aid requirements would be substantially higher if China were to be included in such an estimate.

Even without China by 1985, on present trends, the deficit

would be of such a magnitude as to be beyond the capacity of the food exporting countries of the world to meet.

Flow Of Food Aid

The US has become increasingly cognizant of this problem, as its own surpluses of wheat have been reduced from some 40 million tons, only a few years ago, to 15 million tons at present, which is considered a minimum safe carryover. Because of the Indian food crisis, our stocks are likely to be drawn down further, to about 10 million tons, by July 1, 1967. Our recent decision to increase wheat acreage by 15% (8 million acres) will do no more than stabilize stocks at approximately that level, if food aid requirements continue at the present levels.

The new Food for Freedom bill would permit us to increase the level of our food aid by approximately 50%, from the present \$2 billion to \$3.3 billion. This would make it possible to finance grain shipments up to about 30 million tons, as compared with 20 million at present.

To achieve this increase, another 15 million acres of

reserve land would have to be brought back into production, out of a total of around 50 million acres.

In the longer run, if all of the land withdrawn from production since the early 1950's were to be reactivated, the volume of US food aid could probably be stepped up to maximum of about 50 to 58 million tons.

But food aid can only be an interim solution, to buy time for the developing countries to adopt essential measures, in the field both of family planning and of agricultural production. Failure to do so would mean ultimate famine and chaos. Recognition of this fact has led the US to make any future food aid contingent upon appropriate self-help measures by the recipient countries.

Thus far, the US has been virtually alone in supplying food aid. Consideration must now be given to how US policy and programs are to be related to those of other countries in dealing with a world problem of rather shattering proportions.

While much of the remaining efficient unused capacity for

supplying grain for food aid is in the US, there is the potential for significant additional supplies from Argentina, Canada, Australia, France, and some of the rice exporting countries of Southeast Asia.

If these resources are to be fully and effectively utilized a multilateral approach is called for to: (1) assure that new expansion of production from these different producing countries meets the long-run needs, without resulting in either short-run gluts or shortages; (2) provide for the financing of concessional shipments by food exporting countries unable to carry this burden themselves; (3) coordinate policy so that food aid from the various suppliers meets the common objectives of serving as an incentive rather than a deterrent to agriculture progress in the countries receiving food aid.

A multilateral institution that can serve to support this new multilateral initiative in food aid is the World Food Program set up under the auspices of the FAO and the UN in 1962. In its first three years of operation it has shown promise of becoming an effective institution for a

food aid strategy. It appears to have an efficient executive director, and its members include the donor countries and recipient countries, which has inherent advantages as well as disadvantages. Thus far, its operations have been limited. In the first three years \$94 million of food aid resources were made available to it. In the years 1966 through 1968 the target has been increased to \$275 million, with the US contributing 50 percent on a matching basis.

As this operation has evolved, there is reason for believing that it could be the multilateral instrument for a greatly expanded program linking food aid to development.

For this to happen, however, there will have to be an agreement on the part of the donor countries, and particularly the US, that would permit the organization to shift from a project to a program approach in carrying out its objective. In addition there would have to be a willingness on the part of donor countries who are not food exporters to contribute their share in the form of loans for financing food exports.

Apart from the food aid function, this organization could conceivably be the multilateral instrument for managing an international food reserve, if this should prove to be desirable.

Flow Of Capital Assistance To Agriculture

To support the accelerated agricultural development programs of the LDC's, increased capital assistance from the developed countries to the agricultural sector of the developing countries will be needed.

A preliminary analysis recently completed by the OECD Secretariat shows that in the period 1962-64 the total official capital assistance commitments to LDC countries for agricultural development and agricultural related industries by DAC member countries and multilateral institutions amounted to \$1.3 billion, representing only 4 percent of the total bilateral aid commitments of the member countries and about 14 percent of the total commitments of the multilateral agencies, mainly the IBRD, IDA, the IDB and the EEC. The US accounted for 35 percent of the total, the other DAC countries 28 percent, and the multilateral agencies 37 percent.

There is not as yet available an estimate of the capital assistance the LDC's may need in this field over the coming decade, if the present trends resulting in an increasing gap between food demand and food production are to be reversed. However the currently accepted analysis of the problem does indicate that agricultural productivity, if it is to be increased in the LDC's in the coming decade at the needed rate, must depend more on increasing the productivity of presently cultivated land and far less on bringing into cultivation new lands.

This means that agricultural growth will require more capital intensive investment (particularly when investment in the human factor is included) than has been true of the past, and will therefore involve a very substantial increase in requirements on external official capital assistance as well as a greater inflow of foreign private capital (e.g. fertilizer plants).

The instrument for a coordinated multilateral policy to assess and meet this problem should be the DAC. As an initial step consideration could be given to set up within

DAC an executive committee to keep the problem under continuous review.

Agricultural Planning in LDC's

If the LDC's are to be able effectively to absorb an increased flow of assistance, fundamental changes in policies, (e.g. agreed relaxation of control on agricultural prices with the impact this would have on the cost of living) and in institutions, and more systematic efforts in the preparation of development projects will be necessary. These changes will be in many cases far-reaching in nature and involve highly sensitive domestic issues and interests.

The LDC's technical ability and willingness to undertake the necessary actions and institutional development may not be commensurate with the need. It will, therefore, be necessary for the donor countries to provide technical assistance and apply leverage in this area. This might be done for some of these countries through a multilateral approach, rather than on a bilateral government-to-government basis.

When a World Bank Consortium is in operation, as in India,

this may well be the principal multilateral means for exerting leverage and providing technical assistance. It will be important however to assure that in such cases this is properly related to evolving DAC policy.

The FAO can also make an important contribution. In the past the FAO has been an organization primarily oriented toward technical research and assistance in carrying out its UN mandate to assist LDC's in the development of their agriculture.

It has not been operating in the field of food aid or capital assistance. There seems little ground for reorganizing or reorienting the organization to assume such major operating responsibilities.

However, what needs to be done is to encourage and strengthen the effort, on which it is already embarked, to relate its technical assistance operations more effectively to agricultural development planning problems in LDC's. In this connection three FAO areas of activity may deserve increased US support:

1. The FAO is engaged in a comprehensive planning exercise, designed to be completed within the next two years, which would seek to identify the major problems in agriculture of the developing countries and relate these in a systematic way to an indicative agricultural plan and strategy. Modest additional US financial support might be helpful.

2. The FAO now is seeking to use its technical resources to identify, and perhaps help plan, appropriate agricultural projects for World Bank financing. The scope of this may well be expanded to include US AID projects.

3. FAO Secretary General Sen is seeking a limited Agricultural Resources Fund, which FAO could use in conjunction with its technical assistance activities. This Fund would be made up of contributions in cash or kind (not food). It is not clear at this point whether this type of fund would get the FAO into a capital assistance operation, which would seem to be undesirable, or whether it would be of such a limited nature as, in fact, to serve the purpose for which it is intended -- namely to make

FAO technical assistance activities somewhat more credible and effective. In the latter case, it deserves support.

Possible Action In DAC In The Forthcoming  
Washington Meeting

In the April DAC meeting an important step was taken in focusing the attention of DAC member countries on the world food-population problem. The DAC Ministerial meeting scheduled for July in Washington should provide an opportunity for follow-up and new initiatives. Presumably this meeting will pass a general resolution calling for increased efforts; hopefully, some sort of executive committee will be set up to explore possible post-Meeting action to this end. The following possible measures may be worth exploring in such a committee and perhaps even discussed informally and bilaterally with some countries at the DAC Meeting:

1. If a world grains arrangement is negotiated in the Kennedy Round, call on other major grain trading countries, both exporters and importers, to join in a substantial multilateral food aid program, in the context of that world grains arrangement. The program might be of the order of 10 million tons (\$700 million) annually, of

which the US might be prepared to supply 40%. The contributions could be in cash or in kind, and would be channelled through the World Food Program.

2. If it is premature to consider a world grain arrangement at this time, seek to elicit an offer from the Common Market countries on the order of \$100 million (1.5 million tons of wheat), which we would be prepared to match, and which would be channelled through the World Food Program.

3. Earmarking of loan money by donor countries for projects identified by the FAO.

4. Support for Sen's Agricultural Resources Fund proposal for FAO.

5. Creation of a standing commission made up of men of stature and competence in this field, to keep the world food/population problem under continuing review and advise governments, from time to time, about further needed action.

6. Challenge the Soviet Union and other Communist countries to get engaged in the world food-population problem by such actions as joining the FAO.

April 21, 1966

TO: S/P - Mr. Owen

FROM: EUR/RPE - LeRoy F. Percival, Jr.

SUB: DAC Emphasis on World Food Problem

REF: Our telephone conversation this morning

Here is the draft of our memo to Mr. Mann and a copy of Phil Trezise's telegram.

We have not cleared it formally as yet but, based on the conversations we have had, Agriculture and Dick Reuter favor holding the meeting in Washington and we have no reason to believe that E would pose any objections.

It would be very helpful to have a reading from Walt on this soonest since we are under some pressure to get our memo to Mr. Mann today and we would like to include a word on how the White House views the matter.

Walt - They don't want a Presidential reaction, - just your view as to whether they can tell Tom Mann in good faith that this course is not precluded by the President's reaction to the last proposal. Could you let me know? They would like to tell Tom they've checked with you.

EUR/RPE:ALBRECHT:am 4/21/66

→ Mr Restow

file

ES - 4/25/66  
15

Draft

15a

TO: Mr. Mann

FROM: EUR - Robert J. Schaezel

THROUGH: S/S

SUBJECT: DAC Emphasis on World Food Problem: Ambassador Trezise's proposal to invite DAC to hold its annual July Ministerial meeting in Washington.

A. Mr. Bell's memorandum April 14 to you on the DAC program on the World Food Problem referred to Ambassador Trezise's proposal for the July high-level DAC meeting to be held in Washington made in CEDTO 698 in this way:

"The President has turned this proposal down once. My own feeling is uncertain on this point. I would be agreeable to having the meeting in Washington if that is deemed necessary to get high level U.S. participation. On the other hand, there is much to be said for convincing the Europeans on their home ground. If we want to give the meeting high-level attention, we can do it in Paris as well as here. In any case, I suggest that we leave this matter as it stands until Ambassador Trezise comes to Washington for consultations during the first week in May."

B. Our comments on Mr. Bell's memorandum are as follows:

1. We do not believe that "The President has turned this proposal down once," as Mr. Bell states. The original recommendation to the President was that he approve the proposal to invite the DAC to hold its July Ministerial Meeting in Washington and that he agree to make the welcoming address. Ambassador Trezise does not propose the President's personal involvement and this is the crucial difference.

2. One of the chief reasons for having the meeting in Washington is to attract key European political leaders and get their agreement on the gravity of the problem. (The top U.S. leadership is already convinced).

3. OECD meetings at Ministerial level in Paris are routine. They are, therefore, less likely to attract the top-level participation and world wide attention that would result from a Washington meeting. If DAC treats the world food problem in the relatively routine context of the

annual Paris meeting, both governments and the public may also treat it routinely as a problem for aid specialists which they can forget.

C. EUR fully supports Ambassador Trezise's proposal for inviting the DAC to meet in Washington for the following reasons:

1. Holding the DAC meeting in Washington would be the most effective way to publicize the initiative and leadership of the U.S. in dealing with the world food problem. We are getting a very bad press in Europe over Vietnam (description of napalm victims, etc) and almost no genuine credit for almost single-handedly warding off mass starvation in India (even Le Monde calls our effort surplus disposal).

2. At a meeting in Washington, we have a much better opportunity to stimulate and focus widespread public and international attention on this problem than would be the case in Paris.

3. The threat of starving millions presents the DAC governments with a rare opportunity to give foreign aid a shot in the arm. A Washington meeting with dramatic qualities that a routine Paris meeting would not provide could set the stage for a longer-term effort to increase the volume of aid. Private campaigns have raised millions of dollars to help feed the Indian people. If the DAC could channel this generosity by emphasizing, as President Johnson has done, that much of the general aid effort must go to increase food productivity as well as fight hunger and malnutrition, the public and political figures might have a new, clearly understandable reason for increasing aid.

4. The balance of payment aspect should not be overlooked. Having the DAC meeting in Washington would be a first step toward having more meetings of international organizations held in the U.S.

*In addition to the immediate benefit of having over 50 delegates here*

Recommendations <sup>(7)</sup>

1. That you approve, for internal U.S. planning purposes, the concept of holding the DAC high-level meeting in July in Washington.

2. That a final decision on this <sup>e</sup> issuance of invitations for a high-level Washington DAC meeting be made when you and Mr. Bell have an opportunity to discuss the matter with Ambassador Trezise who will be here on consultation beginning May 2.

Approve —

Disapprove —

CLEARANCES:

F - Mr. Fried  
AGRIC - Mrs. Jacobson  
          Mr. Brown  
M - Mr. Reuter

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

1. Mr. Smith  
2. File  
16

Tuesday, May 24, 1966, 9:20 a. m.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: OECD Meeting on Food Aid

At Tab A is a request from Secretary Rusk that you authorize State to invite the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD to hold its July Ministerial meeting in Washington. The DAC is the principal coordinator of Free World aid. At our insistence, the July meeting will focus on the world food problem, and give us a chance to needle the Europeans to lend more of a hand. (The Secretary also believes that such a meeting in Washington would help improve our image in countries worried about Vietnam.)

Unlike the more elaborate proposal which you turned down last month, this would not involve a commitment to a Presidential speech (the Vice President or the Secretary would do it), and we would not propose a panel of wise men.

*FMB*

Francis M. Bator

*I support this proposal well*

Attachment \_\_\_\_\_

Approve \_\_\_\_\_

Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

Speak to me \_\_\_\_\_

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4(d)

White House Guidelines, Feb. 24, 1983

By Det, NARA, Date 11-2-89

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

THE SECRETARY OF STATE  
WASHINGTON

1430

16a

May 16, 1966

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: World Food Problem

DECLASSIFIED  
E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4  
NEJ 93-321  
By ing, NARA, Date 2-1-94

Recommendation:

I recommend that the United States invite the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD to hold its July Ministerial meeting in Washington.

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

Discussion:

There is no precedent which would require that you address the meeting; the Vice President or I could do this.

The meeting -- wherever held -- will focus on the World Food Problem, dramatizing its seriousness, advancing coordinated efforts by other major donors to deal with it, and establishing international doctrine about the essential need for the developing countries to take self-help steps to increase their own agricultural productivity. The agenda will also include the annual report of the DAC Chairman and consideration of the debt problems of the developing countries.

Holding a meeting of major aid donors in Washington would more clearly demonstrate United States leadership and initiative in dealing with the world food problem. Our objectives would be to:

- a) move us forward in dealing with one of the most important problems we will have to face in the next decade;
- b) improve the U.S. "image" in countries now concerned over the war in Vietnam;
- c) provide a basis and a rationale for reviving public and parliamentary support for foreign aid both here and in Europe;
- d) create a rallying point for cooperative action, and thus for strengthening the bonds of the Western community at a time of crisis; and,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 2 -

e) give us a much better opportunity to stimulate and focus widespread public and international attention on the problem than would be the case at a relatively routine meeting in Paris.

We can expect some objections in the DAC, particularly from the French, to the idea of holding the meeting outside of Paris. But we find it hard to believe that they would try to insist that the DAC turn down the invitation from the United States, especially since some DAC representatives favor holding DAC meetings in other capitals.

George Woods has expressed reservations<sup>+</sup> to Dave Bell about a Washington meeting, but, at Dave's urging, promised to keep an open mind on the matter of his own attendance.

*Dean Rusk*

Dean Rusk

MR PRESIDENT:

\* WOODS IS NOT AGAINST — HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT GETTING <sup>ENOUGH</sup> HIGH LEVEL EUROPEANS TO WASHINGTON. RUSK DOES NOT THINK THAT WILL BE A PROBLEM.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

833  
Orig to Bator 3/29  
17

MAR 29 1966

DECLASSIFIED  
E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4  
NEJ 93-221  
By ing, NARA, Date 2-1-94

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Multilateral Food Initiative

Recommendations:

1. I recommend that you approve the proposal to invite the DAC to hold its July Ministerial Meeting, which will -- like the prior April DAC meeting -- focus on concerted Free World assistance in meeting the food needs of developing countries, in Washington and that you agree to make the welcoming address.

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

2. I recommend that you (or I in your name) telephone William B. Murphy, President of the Campbell Soup Company, asking him to serve on the proposed Wise Men's Group which would be set up at the April DAC Meeting if the proposal is accepted by others. The U.S. Delegate should have a name to present at the April meeting. (A memorandum outlining such a telephone message is attached.)

Background:

The attached memorandum describes proposed actions to implement the multilateral food initiative which you discussed with Foreign Minister Luns. It reflects the view of the State Department, AID and the Department of Agriculture. Our proposals look to focusing this year's meetings

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

-2-

meetings of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee on the food/population problem, as per the above recommendations.

The Committee will also deal with other agenda items at the July Meeting. The major item will be the Chairman's report on the Development Assistance efforts and policies of member countries.

*W. Dean Rusk*

Dean Rusk

Enclosures:

1. Memorandum: Follow-up on the President's Multilateral Food Initiative
2. Suggested telephone message to Mr. William B. Murphy

11 4 13 05 12 13

~~SECRET~~

RECEIVED  
McGEORGE ~~INDY'S~~ OFFICE

1965 MAR 29 PM 4 13

~~SECRET~~

17a

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4

NEJ 93-721

By isp, NARA, Date 2-1-94

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Follow-up on the President's Multilateral Food Initiative

The President spoke to Foreign Minister Luns of his intention to press ahead with multilateral discussion and action to meet the food/population problem. This memorandum suggests next steps.

A. Special April DAC Meeting. The Special April meeting of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee, which will be held at the official level, will focus on the food/population problem, as Ambassador Trezise has suggested. An agenda has been circulated by the Chairman. It would permit the U.S. representative to do the following at this and/or subsequent meetings preparatory to the July Ministerial meeting.

1. The Long-Term Problem.

a) Description of the long-term food/population problem -- by either Ambassador Trezise or an FAO representative.

b) Description of U.S. programs designed to meet the long-term problem: proposed legislation based on the concept of gearing domestic production to foreign needs, rather than vice versa; increased emphasis in our aid programs on expanding foreign agricultural production and on population control programs -- by a Department of Agriculture representative.

c) Description of the Woods fertilizer plan by an IBRD man.

d) Discussion

~~SECRET~~

d) Discussion of measures that other countries might take to meet the long-term problem: developed countries providing aid (fertilizer, pesticides, technical assistance, food, etc.) to stimulate foreign agricultural production; and developing countries putting more emphasis on increasing that production in their own domestic programs.

2. The Short-Term Problem.

a) Description of the Indian famine threat and what the GOI is doing about it -- possibly by an Indian Government representative.

b) Discussion of aid being given by the U.S. and other countries, and of what still needs to be done -- looking mainly to maximizing the 1966-67 Indian harvests -- by a Department of Agriculture representative.

3. Follow-On: Proposing to set up a Wise Men's Group to report to the summer DAC Ministerial meeting on further measures to meet both the long-term and short-term problem. This proposal is conditional on good men being available, e.g., William B. Murphy of Campbell Soup (or, alternatively, Willard Cochran of the University of Minnesota, who is familiar with the Indian problem); Oliver Franks, who got to know the Indian problem as an IBRD Wise Man in 1958; Walther Casper, a prominent German businessman, CDU Bundestag member, and head of the German Peace Corps, who is strongly interested in the Woods fertilizer plan; comparable men from France, Canada, Australia (Menzies?), and Japan. The IBRD and FAO might, in conjunction with senior officials from national governments provide needed staff support. If we cannot get a good group of Wise Men, we should propose setting up a working group of government officials at senior level; their report would be knowledgeable and

persuasive

persuasive to governments, but would probably have less political impact outside governments.

B. July Ministerial DAC Meeting. Consideration should be given to inviting the DAC to hold the July Ministerial Meeting in Washington, with President Johnson making the welcoming address. The discussion of the food/population problem after the President's address, could include:

1. Report of the Wise Men's Group.
2. Discussion of its recommendations by Ministers -- with Sen (FAO) and Woods (IBRD) in attendance.
3. Passage of a general resolution.
4. Hopefully, specific country action pledges. (However, since DAC is not an action body, these pledges will need to be worked out bilaterally).
5. Setting up an executive committee of Ministers of key countries to monitor and coordinate execution of the agreed remedial measures, and to report back on same.

C. Other Forums.

1. We should use UN forums for discussion. The food/population problem might be the main theme of the next GA.
2. Consideration might be given to shifting the World Food Conference from 1968 to 1967, although this may present serious scheduling difficulties. One could also consider raising this issue in the biannual FAO Conference in the fall of 1967.

Suggested Telephone Message to Mr. Murphy

I am calling to ask you if you would be willing to devote two months to the service of your country and of millions of people beyond its borders.

History may well judge that the most important contest of our time was that being waged against hunger. The short-term threat of famine in India has gained the headlines, but this is only one aspect of the widening gap between food and population in the developing countries. Unless this gap can be closed, the second half of the twentieth century may witness a series of human catastrophes whose toll could vastly overshadow that of most wars -- past and present.

This gap cannot be closed by U.S. action alone. A large cooperative free world effort is needed.

To stimulate such an effort, we intend to propose that the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD appoint a Wise Men's Group to study the problem and report back its proposals, if possible, to a July meeting of Ministers concerned with aid matters. We would hope that this Wise Men's Group would include the most distinguished and knowledgeable men who can be assembled

from

from the key food and capital surplus nations to review the data that are at hand, visit countries in the forefront of the battle against hunger, and prepare recommendations. They would be given a good staff.

This proposal depends in the first instance on our being able to nominate a first-rate American to serve. I know of your accomplishments and hope that, if we succeed in establishing the Wise Men's Group, you will accept this opportunity to take part in an effort that could save the lives of millions of men, women, and children.

If you wish further information, the Secretaries of State and Agriculture and the Administrator of AID are at your service.

MEMORANDUM

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4(b)

White House Guidelines, Feb. 24, 1983

By DA, NARA, Date 11-2-89

~~SECRET~~

28  
THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Thursday, March 31, 1966; 10:00 a. m.

*Handwritten notes:*  
Noyes  
April 4, 66  
18  
J. Tol  
SS &  
FOR

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Europe and the World Food Problem

A useful way of getting the Europeans to focus on the world food problem would be to make it a major item of continuing business for the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Phil Trezise, our Ambassador to the OECD, has done a lot of work to prepare the ground. Due to his efforts, the next working-level meeting of the DAC (April 4-5) will be devoted entirely to food.

To build on this start, it has been suggested that:

- (1) we invite the DAC to hold its July Ministerial meeting in Washington;
- (2) you give the opening address;
- (3) you, or Dean Rusk on your behalf, sound out William Murphy (Campbell Soup) as a possible U. S. member of a group of Wise Men assigned to study the food problem and report to the July meeting. (They are not likely to come up with anything new. But an international Wise Men's report would help to dramatize the problem in Europe.)

A memorandum from the Secretary of State recommending all this is at Tab A. Orville Freeman and Bill Gaud agree that it makes sense. It would not commit us to do more about the food problem than you have already proposed doing, and might put a little pressure on the other producers and the Europeans to pitch in. (Dave Bell, who is just back, is not enthusiastic. But then, he generally takes a jaundiced view of spectacular international conferences.)

If you have doubts about Murphy, we can come up with other names. Agriculture has suggested Willard Cochrane, who would be competent but wouldn't swing much weight. Irwin Miller, who did a first-rate job for you last Spring on East-West Trade, would be another (better) possibility.

A State memorandum at Tab B goes into detail on the agenda for the two meetings. At Tab C is a State talking paper in case you want to telephone Murphy yourself. It is a bit formal, but makes the right points.

*Handwritten:* (RM) agree-Hm  
Francis M. Bator

- 1. Approve invitation to DAC to hold Ministerial Meeting in Washington \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove invitation \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. I will make opening address \_\_\_\_\_ Don't promise opening address \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. I have called Murphy \_\_\_\_\_ Rusk should call Murphy \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Speak to me  \_\_\_\_\_

FILED BY DAN BISHOP

SECRET

18a



18-8

THE SECRETARY OF STATE  
WASHINGTON

**DECLASSIFIED**  
**E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4**  
**NJ 93-321**  
By isp, NARA, Date 2-1-94

March 29, 1966

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Multilateral Food Initiative

Recommendations:

1. I recommend that you approve the proposal to invite the DAC to hold its July Ministerial Meeting, which will -- like the prior April DAC meeting -- focus on concerted Free World assistance in meeting the food needs of developing countries, in Washington and that you agree to make the welcoming address.

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

2. I recommend that you (or I in your name) telephone William B. Murphy, President of the Campbell Soup Company, asking him to serve on the proposed Wise Men's Group which would be set up at the April DAC Meeting if the proposal is accepted by others. The U.S. Delegate should have a name to present at the April meeting. (A memorandum outlining such a telephone message is attached.)

Background:

The attached memorandum describes proposed actions to implement the multilateral food initiative which you discussed with Foreign Minister Luns. It reflects the view of the State Department, AID and the Department of Agriculture. Our proposals look to focusing this year's

meetings

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

-2-

meetings of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee on the food/population problem, as per the above recommendations.

The Committee will also deal with other agenda items at the July Meeting. The major item will be the Chairman's report on the Development Assistance efforts and policies of member countries.

*Dean Rusk*

Dean Rusk

Enclosures:

1. Memorandum: Follow-up on the President's Multilateral Food Initiative
2. Suggested telephone message to Mr. William B. Murphy

~~SECRET~~

RECEIVED  
McGEORGE BUNDY'S OFFICE

1966 MAR 29 PM 4 13

18-c



~~SECRET~~

18-d

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4

NEJ 93-321

By           , NARA, Date 2-1-94

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Follow-up on the President's Multilateral Food Initiative

The President spoke to Foreign Minister Luns of his intention to press ahead with multilateral discussion and action to meet the food/population problem. This memorandum suggests next steps.

A. Special April DAC Meeting. The Special April meeting of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee, which will be held at the official level, will focus on the food/population problem, as Ambassador Trezise has suggested. An agenda has been circulated by the Chairman. It would permit the U.S. representative to do the following at this and/or subsequent meetings preparatory to the July Ministerial meeting.

1. The Long-Term Problem.

a) Description of the long-term food/population problem -- by either Ambassador Trezise or an FAO representative.

b) Description of U.S. programs designed to meet the long-term problem: proposed legislation based on the concept of gearing domestic production to foreign needs, rather than vice versa; increased emphasis in our aid programs on expanding foreign agricultural production and on population control programs -- by a Department of Agriculture representative.

c) Description of the Woods fertilizer plan by an IBRD man.

d) Discussion

~~SECRET~~

d) Discussion of measures that other countries might take to meet the long-term problem: developed countries providing aid (fertilizer, pesticides, technical assistance, food, etc.) to stimulate foreign agricultural production; and developing countries putting more emphasis on increasing that production in their own domestic programs.

2. The Short-Term Problem.

a) Description of the Indian famine threat and what the GOI is doing about it -- possibly by an Indian Government representative.

b) Discussion of aid being given by the U.S. and other countries, and of what still needs to be done -- looking mainly to maximizing the 1966-67 Indian harvests -- by a Department of Agriculture representative.

3. Follow-On: Proposing to set up a Wise Men's Group to report to the summer DAC Ministerial meeting on further measures to meet both the long-term and short-term problem. This proposal is conditional on good men being available, e.g., William B. Murphy of Campbell Soup (or, alternatively, Willard Cochrane of the University of Minnesota, who is familiar with the Indian problem); Oliver Franks, who got to know the Indian problem as an IBRD Wise Man in 1958; Walther Casper, a prominent German businessman, CDU Bundestag member, and head of the German Peace Corps, who is strongly interested in the Woods fertilizer plan; comparable men from France, Canada, Australia (Menzies?), and Japan. The IBRD and FAO might, in conjunction with senior officials from national governments provide needed staff support. If we cannot get a good group of Wise Men, we should propose setting up a working group of government officials at senior level; their report would be knowledgeable and

persuasive

persuasive to governments, but would probably have less political impact outside governments.

B. July Ministerial DAC Meeting. Consideration should be given to inviting the DAC to hold the July Ministerial Meeting in Washington, with President Johnson making the welcoming address. The discussion of the food/population problem after the President's address, could include:

1. Report of the Wise Men's Group.
2. Discussion of its recommendations by Ministers -- with Sen (FAO) and Woods (IBRD) in attendance.
3. Passage of a general resolution.
4. Hopefully, specific country action pledges. (However, since DAC is not an action body, these pledges will need to be worked out bilaterally).
5. Setting up an executive committee of Ministers of key countries to monitor and coordinate execution of the agreed remedial measures, and to report back on same.

C. Other Forums.

1. We should use UN forums for discussion. The food/population problem might be the main theme of the next GA.
2. Consideration might be given to shifting the World Food Conference from 1968 to 1967, although this may present serious scheduling difficulties. One could also consider raising this issue in the biannual FAO Conference in the fall of 1967.

18-2



Q.

18-f  
-8

Suggested Telephone Message to Mr. Murphy

I am calling to ask you if you would be willing to devote two months to the service of your country and of millions of people beyond its borders.

History may well judge that the most important contest of our time was that being waged against hunger. The short-term threat of famine in India has gained the headlines, but this is only one aspect of the widening gap between food and population in the developing countries. Unless this gap can be closed, the second half of the twentieth century may witness a series of human catastrophes whose toll could vastly overshadow that of most wars -- past and present.

This gap cannot be closed by U.S. action alone. A large cooperative free world effort is needed.

To stimulate such an effort, we intend to propose that the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD appoint a Wise Men's Group to study the problem and report back its proposals, if possible, to a July meeting of Ministers concerned with aid matters. We would hope that this Wise Men's Group would include the most distinguished and knowledgeable men who can be assembled

from

from the key food and capital surplus nations to review the data that are at hand, visit countries in the forefront of the battle against hunger, and prepare recommendations. They would be given a good staff.

This proposal depends in the first instance on our being able to nominate a first-rate American to serve. I know of your accomplishments and hope that, if we succeed in establishing the Wise Men's Group, you will accept this opportunity to take part in an effort that could save the lives of millions of men, women, and children.

If you wish further information, the Secretaries of State and Agriculture and the Administrator of AID are at your service.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE  
WASHINGTON

686  
1-Bator 3/14  
2-Ril.  
(Rec. also #833)

March 12, 1966

19

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Multilateral Food Initiative

Recommendations:

1. I recommend that you approve the proposal to hold the July DAC Ministerial Meeting, which will -- like the prior March DAC meeting -- focus on multilateral assistance in meeting the food needs of developing countries, in Washington and that you agree to make the welcoming address.

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

2. I recommend that you telephone William B. Murphy, President of the Campbell Soup Company, asking him to serve on the proposed Wise Men's Group which would be set up at the March DAC Ministerial Meeting. (A memorandum outlining such a telephone message is attached.)

Background:

The attached memorandum describes proposed actions to implement the multilateral food initiative which you discussed with Foreign Minister Luns. It reflects the views of the State Department, AID and the Department of Agriculture. Our proposals look to focusing this year's meetings of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee on the food/population problem, as per the above recommendations.

~~SECRET~~

**DECLASSIFIED**  
E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4  
NJ 93-321  
By ing, NARA, Date 2-1-93

~~SECRET~~

-2-

The Committee would also, of course, deal with such other agenda items as the Chairman's report on IBRD President Woods' discussion of debt servicing problems in developing countries.

*Dean Rusk*

Dean Rusk

Enclosures:

1. Memorandum: Follow-up on the President's Multilateral Food Initiative
2. Suggested telephone message to Mr. William B. Murphy

~~SECRET~~

19a

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Follow-up on the President's Multilateral Food Initiative

The President spoke to Foreign Minister Luns of his intention to press ahead with multilateral discussion and action to meet the food/population problem. This memorandum suggests next steps.

A. Special March DAC Meeting. The Special March meeting of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee, which will be held at the official level, should focus on the food/population problem, as Ambassador Trezise has suggested. A possible agenda would be as follows:

1. The Long-Term Problem.

a) Description of the long-term food/population problem -- by either Ambassador Trezise or an FAO representative.

b) Description of U.S. programs designed to meet the long-term problem: proposed legislation based on the concept of gearing domestic production to foreign needs, rather than vice versa; increased emphasis in our aid programs on expanding foreign agricultural production and on population control programs -- by a Department of Agriculture representative.

c) Description of the Woods fertilizer plan by an IBRD man.

d) Discussion

**DECLASSIFIED**

**E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4**

**NEJ 93-321**

**By ing, NARA, Date 2-1-94**

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

-2-

d) Discussion of measures that other countries might take to meet the long-term problem: developed countries providing aid (fertilizer, pesticides, technical assistance, food, etc.) to stimulate foreign agricultural production; and developing countries putting more emphasis on increasing that production in their own domestic programs.

2. The Short-Term Problem.

a) Description of the Indian famine threat and what the GOI is doing about it -- hopefully by an Indian Government representative.

b) Discussion of aid being given by the U.S. and other countries, and of what still needs to be done -- looking mainly to maximizing the 1966-67 Indian harvests -- by a Department of Agriculture representative.

3. Follow-On: Proposing to set up a Wise Men's Group to report to the summer DAC Ministerial meeting on further measures to meet both the long-term and short-term problem. This proposal is conditional on good men being available, e.g., William B. Murphy of Campbell Soup (or, alternatively, Willard Cochran of the University of Minnesota who is familiar with the Indian problem); Oliver Franks, who got to know the Indian problem as an IBRD Wise Man in 1958; Walther Casper, a prominent German business man, CDU Bundestag member, and head of the German Peace Corps, who is strongly interested in the Woods fertilizer plan; comparable men from France, Canada, Australia (Menzie?), and Japan. The IBRD and FAO might, in conjunction with senior officials from national governments at the assistant secretary level, provide needed staff support. If we cannot get a good U.S. Wise Man, we should propose setting up a working group of government officials at the assistant secretary level; their

report

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

-3-

report would be knowledgeable and persuasive to governments, but would probably have less political impact outside governments.

B. July Ministerial DAC Meeting. Consideration should be given to holding the July Ministerial Meeting in Washington, with President Johnson making the welcoming address. The agenda, after the President's address, could be:

1. Report of the Wise Men's Group.
2. Discussion of its recommendations by Ministers -- with Sen (FAO) and Woods (IBRD) in attendance and the Indian Agriculture Minister there for the discussion of India.
3. Passage of a general resolution.
4. Hopefully, specific country action pledges. (However, since DAC is not an action body, these pledges will need to be worked out bilaterally).
5. Setting up an executive committee of Ministers of key countries to monitor and coordinate execution of the agreed remedial measures, and to report back on same to the scheduled OECD meeting of Agriculture Ministers this fall.

C. Other Forums.

1. We should use UN forums for discussion. The food/population problem might be the main theme of the next GA.
2. Consideration might be given to shifting the World Food Conference from 1968 to 1967, although this may present serious scheduling difficulties. One could also consider raising this issue in the biannual FAO Conference in the fall of 1967.

~~SECRET~~

Suggested Telephone Message to Mr. Murphy

I am calling to ask you if you would be willing to devote two months to the service of your country and of millions of people beyond its borders.

History may well judge that the most important contest of our time was that being waged against hunger. The short-term threat of famine in India has gained the headlines, but this is only one aspect of the widening gap between food and population in the developing countries. Unless this gap can be closed, the second half of the twentieth century may witness a series of human catastrophes whose toll could vastly overshadow that of most wars -- past and present.

This gap cannot be closed by U.S. action alone. A large cooperative free world effort is needed.

To stimulate such an effort, we intend to propose that the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD appoint a Wise Men's Group to study the problem and report back its proposals, if possible, to a July meeting of Ministers concerned with aid matters. We would hope  
that this

that this Wise Men's Group would include the most distinguished and knowledgeable men who can be assembled from the key food and capital surplus nations to review the data that are at hand, visit countries in the forefront of the battle against hunger, and prepare recommendations. They would be given a good staff.

This proposal depends in the first instance on our being able to nominate a first-rate American to serve. I know of your accomplishments and hope that, if we succeed in establishing the Wise Men's Group, you will accept this opportunity to take part in an effort that could save the lives of millions of men, women, and children.

If you wish further information, the Secretaries of State and Agriculture and the Administrator of AID are at your service.

NOTICE: There should be no premature release of this Message to the Congress, nor should its contents be paraphrased, alluded to or hinted at in earlier stories. There is a total embargo on this message until 12:00 noon February 10, 1966, which includes any and all references to any material in this message.

Bill Moyers

-----  
THE WHITE HOUSE

MESSAGE ON FOOD FOR FREEDOM

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

Men first joined together for the necessities of life -- food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter.

These are the essentials of peace and progress.

But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill-housed, the world is restless -- and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

A War on Hunger

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth.

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

A Program for Mankind

The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman or child need suffer want of food or clothing.

The key to victory is self-help.

Aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it. Unless it is, more harm than good can be the end result.

I propose:

1. Expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are under way.

more

Even with their maximum efforts abroad, our food aid will be needed for many years to come.

2. Increased capital and technical assistance.

Thus, self-help will bear fruit through increased farm production.

3. Elimination of the "surplus" concept in food aid.

Current farm programs are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. Fortunately the same programs are flexible enough to gear farm production to amounts that can be used constructively.

4. Continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities.

Increased purchasing power, among the hundreds of million of consumers in developing countries, will help them become good customers of the American farmer.

5. Increasing emphasis on nutrition, especially for the young.

We will continue to encourage private industry, in cooperation with the government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

6. Provision for adequate reserves of essential food commodities.

Our reserves must be large enough to serve as a stabilizing influence and to meet any emergency.

#### America's Past Efforts

This program keeps faith with policies this nation has followed since President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the Four Freedoms of mankind.

After World War II, we helped to make Europe free from want. We carried out on that continent massive programs of relief, reconstruction and development.

This great effort -- the Marshall Plan -- was followed by President Truman's Point Four, President Eisenhower's Act of Bogota and its successor, President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. Under these programs we have provided technical and capital assistance to the developing nations.

Our food aid programs have brought over 140 million tons of food to hungry people during the past decade.

Hunger, malnutrition and famine have been averted.

Schools and hospitals have been built.

Seventy million children now receive American food in school lunch and family and child feeding programs.

Nevertheless the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

more

### A Balance is Required

One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on International Health and Education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem.

### Improving Local Agriculture

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. The overwhelming majority of those who till the soil still use the primitive methods of their ancestors. They produce little more than enough to meet their own needs, and remain outside of the market economy.

History has taught us that lack of agricultural development can cripple economic growth.

The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.

They must bring the great majority of their people -- now living in rural areas -- into the market economy.

They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.

They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

They must increase their exports, and earn the foreign exchange to purchase the foods and other goods which they themselves cannot produce efficiently.

In some developing countries, marked improvement is already taking place. Taiwan and Greece are raising their food output and becoming better cash customers for our food exports every year. Others have made a good beginning in improving agricultural production.

### The Need for Self-Help

There is one characteristic common to all those who have increased the productivity of their farms: a national will and determination to help themselves.

We know what would happen if increased aid were dispensed without regard to measures of self-help. Economic incentives for higher production would disappear. Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon United States food increased.

more

Such a course would lead to disaster.

Disaster could be postponed for a decade or even two -- but it could not be avoided. It could be postponed if the United States were to produce at full capacity and if we financed the massive shipments needed to fill an ever-growing deficit in the hungry nations.

But ultimately those nations would pay an exorbitant cost. They would pay it not only in money, but in years and lives wasted. If our food aid programs serve only as a crutch, they will encourage the developing nations to neglect improvements they must make in their own production of food.

For the sake of those we would aid, we must not take that course.

We shall not take that course.

But candor requires that I warn you the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations -- unless present trends are changed.

Dependence on American aid will not bring about such a change.

The program I present today is designed to bring about that change.

#### Better Nutrition

Beyond simple hunger, there lies the problem of malnutrition.

We know that nutritional deficiencies are a major contributing cause to a death rate among infants and young children that is thirty times higher in developing countries than in advanced areas.

Protein and vitamin deficiencies during pre-school years leave indelible scars.

Millions have died. Millions have been handicapped for life -- physically or mentally.

Malnutrition saps a child's ability to learn. It weakens a nation's ability to progress. It can -- and must -- be attacked vigorously.

We are already increasing the nutritional content of our food aid contributions. We are working with private industry to produce and market nutritionally rich foods. We must encourage and assist the developing countries themselves to expand their production and use of such foods.

The wonders of modern science must also be directed to the fight against malnutrition. I have today directed the President's Science Advisory Committee to work with the very best talent in this nation to search out new ways to:

-- develop inexpensive, high-quality synthetic foods as dietary supplements. A promising start has already been made in isolating protein sources from fish, which are in plentiful supply throughout the world.

--improve the quality and the nutritional content of food crops.

--apply all of the resources of technology to increasing food production.

### New Directions for Our Abundance

Our farm programs must reflect changing conditions in the United States and the world. Congress has provided --

--For American farmers, a continuing prospect of rising incomes.

--For American consumers, assurance of an abundance of high quality food at fair prices.

--For American taxpayers, less dollars spent to stockpile commodities in quantities greater than those needed for essential reserves.

Today -- because of the world's needs, and because of the changing picture of U. S. agriculture -- our food aid programs can no longer be governed by surpluses. The productive capacity of American agriculture can and should produce enough food and fiber to provide for:

1. domestic needs,
2. commercial exports,
3. food aid to those developing countries that are determined to help themselves,
4. reserves adequate to meet any emergency, and to stabilize prices.

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by ten per cent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of dairy products under the authority of the 1965 Act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U. S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 Act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 Act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

These actions supplement earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. Although our present reserves of wheat are adequate to meet all likely shipments, the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended programs for voluntary diversion of additional spring wheat plantings.

Our 60 million acres now diverted to conservation uses represent the major emergency reserve that could readily be called forth in the critical race between food and population. We will bring these acres back into production as needed -- but not to produce unwanted surplus, and not to supplant the efforts of other countries to develop their own agricultural economies.

These actions illustrate how our domestic farm program will place the American farmer in the front ranks in the world-wide war on hunger.

#### Food for Freedom

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will:

- make self-help an integral part of our food aid program.
- eliminate the "surplus" requirement for food aid.
- emphasize the development of markets for American farm products.
- authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate.
- emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies. Except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of five years.
- continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation.
- increase emphasis on combating malnutrition. The Act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods.
- continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs.
- provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

#### Food and Fiber Reserves

I recommend a program to establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by providing for food and fiber reserves.

This program supplements Food for Freedom.

It establishes a reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber, and from high prices in times of emergency.

more

The legislation I recommend to the Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets:

-- the productive genius of our farmers.

-- the potential that lies in the 60 million acres now withdrawn from production.

In case of need, most of those acres could be brought back into productive farming within twelve to eighteen months. But because of the seasonal nature of farming time would be needed to expand production even under the flexible provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1965. Therefore we need a reserve to bridge this gap.

We have been able to operate without a specific commodity reserve policy in recent years, because the surpluses built up in the 1950's exceeded our reserve needs. This condition has almost run its course.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures. As we continue to reduce our surpluses we need to amend the law to authorize the maintenance of reserve stocks.

The Act I recommend will do that.

It will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum reserve levels. Under the Act, he must take into account normal trade stocks, consumer and farm prices, domestic and export requirements, crop yield variations and commitments under our domestic and foreign food programs.

The reserve would be used to meet priority needs, under prices and conditions to be determined within the broad guidelines established by existing law.

The Act could be implemented in the year ahead without any additional cost to the Government. We are still reducing our surpluses of most agricultural commodities. During the first year of the new program, it is not likely that we will have to purchase any commodity to build up a reserve.

\* \* \* \* \*

Under the two Acts I recommend today, with the farm legislation now on the statute books -- and with the foreign assistance program I have recommended -- we will be able to make maximum use of the productivity of our farms.

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world -- wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

#### A Unified Effort

To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing

more

countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together, even more closely than they have in the past in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

In the past few years AID has called upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves.

Under the Food for Freedom Act, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have authority to determine the commodities available. He will act only after consulting with the Secretary of State on the foreign policy aspects of food aid and with other interested agencies.

We must extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the states, universities, farm organizations, and private industry.

#### An International Effort

It is not enough that we unify our own efforts. We cannot meet this problem alone.

Hunger is a world problem. It must be dealt with by the world.

We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture.

We shall work to strengthen the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The efforts of the multilateral lending organizations, and of the United Nations Development Program should be expanded -- particularly in food and agriculture.

We are prepared to increase our participation in regional as well as world-wide multilateral efforts, wherever they provide efficient technical assistance and make real contributions to increasing the food-growing capacities of the developing nations. For example, we will undertake a greatly increased effort to assist improvements in rice yields in the rice-eating less developed countries, as part of our cooperation with FAO during this International Rice Year.

#### For a World at Peace

The program I recommend today will raise a new standard of aid for the hungry, and for world agriculture.

It proclaims our commitment to a better world society -- where every person can hope for life's essentials -- and be able to find them in peace.

It proclaims the inter-dependence of mankind in its quest for food and clothing and shelter.

It is built on three universal truths:

more

-- that agriculture is an essential pursuit of every nation,

-- that an abundant harvest is not only a gift of God, but also the product of man's skill and determination and commitment,

-- that hunger and want -- anywhere -- are the eternal enemies of all mankind.

I urge Congress to consider and debate these suggestions thoroughly and wisely in the hope and belief we can from them fashion a program that will keep free men free, and at the same time share our leadership and agricultural resources with our less blessed brothers throughout the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

THE WHITE HOUSE,

February 10, 1966.

# # #

✓ <sup>21</sup>  
Mr. Bundy

Friday, November 19, 1965  
8:50 AM

MEMORANDUM FOR  
THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: World Food Production

Colin MacLeod, Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and your Science Advisory Committee have been doing preliminary work on the problems of World Food Production for several months. We would now like, with your permission, to establish a Panel of your Science Advisory Committee on World Food Production to consider the problems in depth and formulate potential programs.

The reasons for doing so at this time are as follows:

1. World food production is not keeping pace with the rapid increase in population. This is particularly true in the less developed countries.
2. In certain areas of South America and South East Asia per capita food production is actually declining from the maximum that was reached about 1958. There is a real possibility that widespread famine will occur within the next decade.
3. Failure to produce adequate supplies of food appears to be due not to the inefficiency of traditional agricultural practices but rather to lack of modern technology developed locally to meet local requirements.
4. There is general agreement that export of our agricultural technology will not suffice but that it must be modified locally. However, the general approach that has been followed by USDA in the development of U. S. agriculture is exportable in all likelihood.

5. Less developed countries with a deficiency in food production are unable to generate the capital necessary for their economic and cultural development.

6. Under even the most optimistic estimates, U. S. agricultural production can never meet the world needs for food. Even though we could, we would have to give the food away which is an economic impossibility for us and would only protract the time necessary for less developed countries to become self-reliant and economically viable.

7. Food from the seas in greatly increased amounts may be possible at some time in the distant future. For the near future we must rely on increased agricultural production to alleviate the world food shortage.

The Panel will be asked to examine the following questions:

1. The technological requirements for increasing agricultural production in selected geographic areas where per capita food production is falling or failing to increase at a satisfactory rate.

2. The qualitative as well as quantitative requirements of food crops for adequate nutrition, especially high quality protein.

3. The role of synthetic foods as dietary supplements.

4. The possibility of increased food production from the oceans.

5. The technological resources in the United States and other developed countries that can be mobilized and deployed to improve food production in a selection of less developed countries.

6. The means that can be used to deploy these resources.

Because of our own agricultural surpluses there has been reluctance on the part of the Congress to approve programs to build up agricultural production in foreign countries. The argument has been that this would cut down the market for U. S. sales abroad and increase our surplus problem. On the other hand, the real problems are in less developed countries that cannot afford to purchase the amounts of food necessary to relieve widespread malnutrition.

Donald F. Hornig

cy for Mr. Bundy

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

22

OFFICE OF  
THE DIRECTOR

November 16, 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: A New Food Aid Policy

Last Thursday, and again today, Mr. Bundy spoke to you about a new approach to food aid. Attached are:

- a Presidential statement outlining a new set of policies
- a Presidential memorandum to agency heads instructing them to proceed with those policies.

The new approach contains the following major elements:

1. A strong emphasis is given to self-help measures by recipient countries to increase their own food production. Food shipments will not be used as a mere "hand-out," keeping these countries dependent on U. S. gifts.
2. Food aid and other economic assistance are to be tied together and made conditional on such self-help measures.
3. Food aid will be gradually shifted away from sales for useless local currency to long-term dollar repayable loans.

By issuing the attached statement you can:

- take the initiative in this field before the World Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization starts in Rome on Monday
- pre-empt the NEW YORK TIMES and other papers who have been trying to make our food policies for us.

Two other alternatives you may wish to consider are:

1. Tying this statement to a Thanksgiving Day announcement.
2. Waiting to incorporate it in the State of the Union Message.

(signed) Charles L. Schultze  
Charles L. Schultze  
Director

Attachments

Statement of the President

22a

I have today initiated a series of actions directed at the mounting food crisis in the underdeveloped countries. Our objective is victory in the war against world hunger. Our basic strategy is to encourage a rapid increase in food production in the underdeveloped countries themselves.

Twenty-five years ago President Roosevelt looked beyond a world war to the securing of the freedoms which are the fruits of peace. One of those freedoms is Freedom from Want. Since that war we have kept faith with his vision:

first, in war-devastated areas through our relief and reconstruction efforts

then, in the developing nations with whom we have shared our postwar agricultural abundance and joined in their struggle for development.

In the past decade the United States has shipped over <sup>140</sup>~~137~~ million tons of food to developing nations. We have shared with them the technical miracles which have yielded our own remarkable productive capacity. We were among the

founders of the World Food Program and other international efforts to reduce hunger and increase agricultural production.

And these efforts have achieved results. During the past 12 years, food production in the major developing countries of the Free World has risen <sup>35</sup>~~26~~ percent. In many instances widespread famine has been averted. Roads, schools, hospitals, private and public enterprises of every description have been financed through the proceeds of our \$15 billion Food for Peace Program.

But I am deeply concerned at the mounting evidence that we are not winning this battle. Burgeoning populations are cutting deeply into the advances which have been made in food production in poorer countries. Some nations have become increasingly dependent upon United States food assistance to prevent mass hunger and starvation. Food consumption in 1961 was already well below minimal nutrition levels. And since 1961 per capita food consumption in these countries has actually declined. Unless strong measures are taken this trend will continue and indeed accelerate. The gap between food needs and what the developing countries are able to produce or buy commercially will more than double over the next decade.

Several courses lie open to us:

- . We could ignore the growing numbers of under-nourished people and the widening gap between the well-fed and the undernourished. This course would be shortsighted and unworthy of us as a nation. As hunger saps the strength of individuals, so it also gnaws at the vitality of nations. It means economic stagnation and political unrest. It threatens freedom and national independence. It invites external aggression and internal subversion. We can turn our face from hunger and malnutrition only at the expense of our conscience and at the ultimate peril of our security.
  
- . We could make up the gap by massive increases in shipments of American food aid. This course would be undesirable, for it would make developing countries indefinitely dependent on the charity of others for their food. It would be impractical, because our projections show that even with our enormous agricultural capacity we would not be able

to feed the undernourished world indefinitely. And in the end it would be self-defeating because it would stifle the growth of a vigorous agriculture in the less-developed countries.

- We could place main emphasis on helping other countries to develop their own food production, and through increased food aid shipments fill the immediate gap until their production can be expanded. This course would result in most rapid decline in dependence on food aid and in a more rapid rate of economic growth. It would also be the policy most conducive to an increase in commercial food exports. Most importantly, it is the best assurance of an adequate long-term food supply for the world.

Only the last alternative is consistent with our basic principles. With those to whom our assistance goes, we seek a relationship of mutual respect and mutual responsibility. A never-ending and ever-increasing flow of charity aid would not fit that relationship. It would sap responsibility,

poison the respect due between sovereign nations, and ultimately frustrate the very development it alleges to serve. The less-developed countries must intensify their own efforts to increase food production and to earn the foreign exchange to purchase what they cannot grow themselves. In this process we can be of invaluable assistance. And while they are about it, our food aid shipments can help to fill the food gap. But this must be a joint effort in which both we and they participate.

I propose that we set in motion a three-point program to meet the problem of world hunger:

1. Self-help. U. S. assistance -- both food aid and economic development assistance -- must be accompanied by rigorous efforts on the part of the developing countries to help themselves. The vigor of their efforts will determine the nature and scope of our assistance. Age-old agricultural and social practices which discourage increased farm productivity must be changed. Additional resources must be devoted to improvements in agriculture and agricultural marketing facilities. And all of this must go hand-in-hand with progress in education, health, and population control. We know that changes will not be easy. We also know that success can be realized.

In Taiwan, agricultural output has doubled over the last 15 years. This rapid growth is due largely to U. S. assistance in the form of seeds, tools, and fertilizer, and aid to farm credit institutions, farm-to-market roads, and irrigations works.

In Pakistan, agricultural production has accelerated from a growth rate of 1 percent a year in the 1950's to 4 or 5 percent in each of the last 3 years. Key factors in this progress have been the introduction of tubewells for irrigation which reduces the high salinity of the land, the establishment of price incentives, and wider distribution of fertilizer to local farmers.

In Bolivia, after years of disruption following a revolution, agricultural production dramatically increased an estimated 10 percent last year. This transformation reflects reform in a feudal land system and U. S. assistance in improving roads, credit institutions, and marketing cooperatives.

2. Food aid. Even with maximum effort, a sharp rise in food production in the less-developed countries will not occur

overnight. In the meantime we must be prepared to continue, and even increase, our food aid shipments where the need is growing and self-help efforts are under way.

But our food aid program must be redirected:

- . It must be more closely linked with our other economic assistance. In this way both may be better used to encourage increased agricultural production in recipient nations. In view of our declining surplus stocks, most of this food aid will have to come from current production.
  
- . We must also continue, and where possible accelerate, the shift towards financing food aid through long-term dollar repayable loans. Such terms for food aid would be consistent with our practice in the case of other economic assistance. They also underline to recipient countries the importance we attach to food as a means of long-term economic development. In this transition we will have to take account of the external debt burden

of recipient countries as well as our own balance of payments situation.

- Finally, we must expand our attack on the problems of malnutrition, especially among infants and young children. This can be done through the manufacture and marketing of protein-enriched grain and milk products. Seventy percent of the pre-school age children in the developing countries suffer from malnutrition. And malnutrition is linked to retarded mental and physical growth. Moreover, many deaths among young children from relatively minor infectious diseases are actually related to undernourishment.

3. Agricultural development assistance. Where practical and far-reaching efforts are instituted by other countries to increase agricultural production, we are prepared to lend assistance adequate to the need. There is no magic formula in the success story of American agriculture. It flows from a compound of hard work, ingenuity, capital investment, and free institutions. Much of that success can be transferred to other countries -- if they are willing to take the steps to use it:

- . We can help them develop a framework of laws and market incentives to unlock the dynamic potential of millions of free individual farmers;
- . We can share the knowledge of our land grant colleges and research stations, of soils, seeds, fertilizer, and water and help them develop the research capability to apply and expand that knowledge;
- . We can share our experience with extension services, cooperatives, farm credit institutions, and market facilities and help in the development of parallel institutions;
- . We can provide needed fertilizer, machinery, and pesticides, and help them establish facilities to provide the necessary five-fold increase in their consumption. When conditions are favorable, private American investment can sharply accelerate the process of facility investment.

I propose to begin this new approach toward the problem of world hunger immediately. I have directed the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development

- . to redirect their current programs along these new lines to the maximum extent possible within existing authorities;
- . to develop, in cooperation with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, procedures to insure that our food aid and economic assistance programs are closely linked, and in particular that they are related to vigorous agricultural self-help measures in the recipient nations;
- . to present to me such legislative proposals for the extension and amendment of the basic food aid legislation, P.L. 480, as are necessary to carry out the program I have outlined.

The United States is uniquely qualified to take the lead in a war against world hunger. Our primacy in agriculture is unchallenged. When communist agriculture is beset with shortages, ours produces in abundance. The experience of Pakistan, Taiwan, and Bolivia shows that this know-how can be transferred. We are ready to join fully in the fight to conquer hunger with those who are prepared to take the difficult steps necessary to win that fight.

I intend to transmit to the Congress, early in the next session, a detailed statement of this three-point program against world hunger, together with a request for such legislative authority as may be necessary to carry it out.

22-b

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF STATE  
THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE  
THE ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT  
THE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Subject: Food crisis in underdeveloped countries

I have announced a new three-point policy to help meet the mounting food crisis in underdeveloped countries. The gap between the food demands of the less-developed countries and their ability to meet those demands is growing rapidly. Our interest in the stability and security of the Free World requires that this trend be reversed. A copy of my statement outlining the new policies is attached.

I request that you undertake the following steps to carry out these policies:

1. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development should review their programs; determine what changes can be made, within existing legislative authorities, to redirect their programs along the lines outlined in the attached policy statement; and initiate those changes immediately. You should

make sure that each official charged with responsibility for carrying out food aid and economic assistance programs is thoroughly acquainted with the new policies. In particular you should convey to them my firm intention that all of our assistance programs encourage a rapid increase in efficient agricultural production among aid recipient countries.

2. In cooperation with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, you should develop for my approval procedures to insure:

- . that food aid and other economic assistance are closely integrated.
- . that both forms of assistance are related to practical and vigorous measures to expand agricultural production in recipient nations.
- . that our food aid program is administered in such a way as to minimize its impact on our balance of payments.

In this connection negotiations with aid recipient countries should, wherever possible, encompass both forms of assistance in a comprehensive program.

3. Public Law 480, the basic authorizing legislation for our food aid program expires next year. You should develop proposals for extension of this legislation, together with such amendments as you believe necessary to carry out my policies.

By December 15 you should report to me on the steps you have taken and the procedures you have developed to reflect the new policy directives I have announced. By January 15 you should present to me the legislative proposals which you have developed.

Attachment

23

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

OFFICE OF  
THE DIRECTOR

November 16, 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: A New Food Aid Policy

Last Thursday, and again today, Mr. Bundy spoke to you about a new approach to food aid. Attached are:

- . a Presidential statement outlining a new set of policies
- . a Presidential memorandum to agency heads instructing them to proceed with those policies.

The new approach contains the following major elements:

1. A strong emphasis is given to self-help measures by recipient countries to increase their own food production. Food shipments will not be used as a mere "hand-out," keeping these countries dependent on U. S. gifts.
2. Food aid and other economic assistance are to be tied together and made conditional on such self-help measures.
3. Food aid will be gradually shifted away from sales for useless local currency to long-term dollar repayable loans.

By issuing the attached statement you can:

- . take the initiative in this field before the World Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization starts in Rome on Monday
- . pre-empt the NEW YORK TIMES and other papers who have been trying to make our food policies for us.

COPY FOR MR. BUNDY