

W
Civ. Cas
FILE SUBJ.
DATE SUB-CAT.
4/67

CP
4/5/67

ATE

April 5, 1967

PROGRAM FOR THE CARE AND
TRANSPORTATION OF WOUNDED
VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President—

In the children's ward of the Qui Nhon provincial hospital I saw for the first time what napalm does. A child of 7, the size of our 4-year olds, lay in the cot by the door. Napalm had burned his face and back and one hand. The burned skin looked like swollen, raw meat; the fingers of his hand were stretched out, burned rigid. A scrap of cheesecloth covered him, for weight is intolerable, but so is air. His grandfather, an emaciated old man half blind with cataract, was tending the child. A week ago napalm bombs were dropped on their hamlet. The old man carried his grandson to the nearest town. Destitute, homeless, sick with weariness and despair, he watched every move of the small racked body of his grandson.—Ladies' Home Journal, January 1967.

I have been an orthopedic surgeon for a good number of years. . . . But nothing could have prepared me for my encounters with Vietnamese women and children burned by napalm. It was sickening, even for a physician, to see and smell the blackened flesh. One continues for days afterward getting sick when he looks at a piece of meat on his plate because the odor of burned flesh lingers so long in memory. And one never forgets the bewildered eyes of the silent, suffering napalm-burned child.—Richard E. Perry, M.D., in Redbook, Jan. 1967.

These two quotes did not appear in some farout magazine. Rather, they appeared, as indicated, in two highly respected women's publications: the Ladies' Home Journal and Redbook. Any time there is a war, Mr. President, one expects a certain number of participants to be wounded or killed. Unfortunately, this is the inevitable consequence of such concentrated violence.

However, it rarely occurs to most people that another inevitable consequence is the wounding, maiming, and killing of innocent victims, such as the children mentioned in the above quotations. These children did not choose to be participants in this conflict; they are, for the most part, too young even to understand what it is all about. And yet, most of them have never known a world without such destruction.

I believe that we have a responsibility to these children—a responsibility to see that they get adequate medical treatment and attention, and to show them, insofar as possible, that there is a world in which people are engaged in doing things other than destroying each other. As it is written in the eighth chapter of Psalms, verse 2:

Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.

Fortunately, Mr. President, an organization has been formed known as the "Committee of Responsibility to Save-War-Burned and War-Injured Vietnamese Children." This committee, composed of some 100 leading physicians, clergymen, scientists, and others, has as its purpose the treatment and rehabilitation of these children who cannot be adequately cared for in Vietnam through the use of available facilities and services in the United States. The honorary chairmen are: Rev. John C. Bennett, of Union Theological Seminary; Prof. Bentley Glass; Methodist Bishop John Wesley Lord; Episcopalian Suffragan Bishop of Washington, Right Rev. Paul Moore, Jr.; Dr. Albert Sabin, Dr. Benjamin Spock, Mrs. Philip Stern, and Dr. Helen Brooke Taussig. It is a voluntary, nonprofit organization which has enlisted the aid of physicians, particularly plastic and general surgeons, and other medical personnel, secured hospital beds and obtained community and family support for temporary home care. It has enlisted the aid of voluntary agencies in this country, obtained consent for the entry and exit of Vietnamese children and appealed directly to the American people for funds and support.

One is reluctant to take a child from familiar surroundings, his family and friends, for medical treatment. If facilities and medical personnel were adequate in Vietnam, these children could best be treated on their own soil. However, such facilities and medical personnel are very, very inadequate in Vietnam. In South Vietnam approximately 100 hospitals provide approximately 25,000 beds to serve the ever-growing needs of the civilian population. Bed occupancy by two or three patients is not uncommon. It is reported that there are only about 250 Vietnamese doctors to treat all

ment to preschool children resulting from malnutrition."

I have mentioned population control and marine resource development as two methods of meeting the needs of a hungry world. I want now to discuss a basic program that must be undertaken and that directly affects you in the agriculture community. If the world is to avoid mass starvation in the coming decades, food production must be greatly increased, not only in the United States but in the less-developed countries as well. Even a dramatic increase in U.S. production will be ineffective in meeting the world's future food needs. By the end of the century, the number of people living in the already hungry regions of the world is expected to more than double. To feed this increase of nearly three billion people—the less-developed countries will need as much additional food as is now produced by all the farmers in the world. To meet this necessary increase in production will require the concentrated efforts of both developed and less-developed countries. The question then becomes, "How do we increase production?"

In the past, the increasing food needs of expanding populations were met by bringing new land under the plow. But today there remains very little farmable land left in the world that can be economically put to agricultural use. In fact, the needs of expanding populations are rapidly consuming much of the world's most productive farm land. In the U.S. alone, each year, it is estimated that two million acres of farm land are diverted to non-agricultural uses. In California, one of our richest farm states, agriculture land is being subdivided at the rate of 375 acres a day to house the thousands of people moving to that state.

More hopeful than increasing the amount of farm land in meeting the food needs of a hungry world, is the possibility of increasing the agricultural yield of the land already used for farming. In the less developed countries, this means the evolution of modern agriculture through such programs as the increased use of fertilizer, the development of hybrid grains, the development of irrigation systems, the education and technical training of farmers. In the developed countries, increased production means progressive government farm programs, and the development and adoption of new farming techniques and of high-yield crops. There have been recent break-throughs in the development of new wheat varieties that could have substantial impact in increasing grain yield. I understand that the new Gaines variety is expected to raise the crop yield from 140 to 200 bushels per acre and the Wichita variety increased the yield in sandy soil from 10 to 35 bushels per acre. NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC Magazine reports that a new high altitude variety called Sonora is expected to double wheat production in Pakistan.

But even more important than new hybrid seed and other technical advances, increased agricultural production in both the developed and less-developed countries is dependent on the price the increased amount of food produced will bring. As Mr. Harry Graham of the National Grange has so succinctly put it, "the key to world food crisis is production, and the key to production is price."

The price a farmer receives for food not only serves as an incentive to produce more, it also determines the amount of capital he will have to invest in agricultural inputs such as fertilizer, insecticides, and machinery so that he can increase production. This is true in both the United States and in the underdeveloped countries. It is also true, however, in both the developed and underdeveloped countries, that the politicians and policy makers are largely sensitive to the consumer base of politically powerful urban populations. This political sensitivity works to supposedly keep food prices down which in turn reduces the farmers' ability to invest

in methods to increase production and which reduces the incentive to maintain—let alone—increase production. Lowered production brings into play the supply-demand formula and food prices inevitably rise. Government, and the general population, must realize the relationship between price and production and must recognize that so-called "cheap food" policies, in the long run, will cost the consumer more.

The connection between price and production is not a relationship confined by national borders. The price a farmer receives for his produce in one country is intricately interwoven in the production level and price received in another country. For instance, the world wheat price is largely determined by what American farmers receive for this product. If our wheat prices were to collapse, there would follow a sharp decline in the world price as other producers struggled to remain competitive. It would be folly for us to expect a farmer in India to increase his production in the face of falling prices. The cause-effect relationship between price and production would then operate to reduce the amount of wheat produced and thereby increase the amount of hunger in the world.

You in the food marketing and advertising professions have a definite and positive challenge in helping to meet the growing food crises by helping the American farmer receive an adequate return on his investment and labor.

I would like to cite to you the results of an extensive survey made in another state several years ago, and the only one of its kind which has come to my attention. This was a cross-section survey to determine what the general public thought about agriculture.

Here are four significant public attitudes that were documented by that survey: First, agriculture does not play a major role in the lives of the individual, the state, or the nation. Second, most agriculture is subsidized by the federal government. Third, agriculture is backward and has shown little or no scientific progress. Fourth, agriculture is responsible for what townspeople consider to be the high cost of food.

We here today all know how untrue, how fallacious, these opinions are. But that is beside the point. The important point is that this distorted image of agriculture may be held by much of our population. This widely-held, distorted image, I believe, is the crux of many of agriculture's problems today. The vast majority of our population which has grown up in the cities and suburbs often do not recognize agriculture as one of the most efficient and economically significant of our national industries. They take food and the farmer for granted.

This distorted image of agriculture is a challenge and threat too long neglected. I can think of no better group to hand this challenge to than the marketers and advertisers gathered at this conference. You are among the most creative thinkers and leaders in your industry. You understand the techniques of persuading and informing people. You are familiar with, and have access to, the outlets most effective in reaching large numbers of people. It is my sincere hope that you will accept this challenge and lend your considerable talents to re-shaping the public's image of agriculture as a fundamental and significant aspect of the nation's past and future.

I believe that Americans have a strong sense of fair-play. If they realized the desperate economic plight of many of the nation's farmers, I am convinced that they would want our producers to get a fair return on their investment and labor—even if it meant higher retail food prices. We must remember two things. First, the farm population has diminished to a point where it has little national significance as a political block. Second, the prosperity of the agriculture industry is greatly dependent on government farm policy. The farmers, then,

must compensate for his small numbers by seeking the sympathy and support of other political groups.

There would be other tangible and intangible benefits arising out of a public enlightened to the problems of agriculture. There would likely be closer coordination and cooperation between agriculture and business. This prediction grows out of my own personal experience. Several years ago in Oregon we created an Agri-Business Council. Two of the primary purposes of this Council were to awaken the general public and the business community to the problems and prospects of agriculture, and to unite the resources of agriculture and business in solving these problems. The creation of the Council is a modest but promising step and is but one of innumerable methods of correcting the distorted image of agriculture.

Many of you attending this conference are daily involved in the art and science of communication and you are well aware that communication is a two-way street. Just as the true nature of the agriculture community must be interpreted to the "outside world" so must the emerging realities of the world be related back to this community. I believe that too often we have accepted the fact that the base of the population primarily engaged in agriculture has narrowed and have assumed that this narrowed the definition and boundaries of agriculture. But in fact, the agriculture industry is becoming more complex, more diversified yearly. We must overcome the unconscious isolationist attitude that interprets agriculture as a clearly defined industry with fixed frontiers. Today's food producer must recognize that the future will weave agriculture even more intricately into the total pattern of the national economy and international relationships. This will demand a broadened perspective and a willingness to make concessions to other interests.

You have very appropriately titled your conference "The New Age of Agriculture." A glance at your program indicates that you have been privileged to hear some very authoritative spokesmen define specific aspects of this topic. I will address myself to the new age and future of agriculture in terms of several problems I see emerging that demand realistic and thoughtful consideration by the agriculture community. I have discussed at length the unfolding world food crisis and in my view this problem will shape the new age of agriculture. The flesh-less hands of millions of starving people will be the primary sculptors of the problems and opportunities of the future. Food will be the determinant of international relations. Our foreign policy and aid will increasingly center around Food for Freedom programs and agricultural assistance programs in the less-developed countries. The increased world-market for food will bring both problems and opportunities for American agriculture. For the farmer, I believe it will mean a gradual disappearance of price supports. As markets open to accommodate increased production, production should become the goal of our farm programs and, hopefully, will lead to a gradual termination of acreage controls. I have stressed the word "gradual" because I feel that abrupt elimination of price support and acreage control programs at this point, a return to a *laissez faire* agricultural economy, might have a traumatic effect on the delicate price-production relationship both domestically and internationally.

As a greater portion of the food market becomes internationally based, it will mean constant adjustments by producers to problems arising from foreign competition. I believe it is in our national interest and in the interest of international progress to extend as far as possible a free-trade policy. But the American farmer must not be sacrificed in the process. I would reject any pro-

April 5, 1967

posal which had as its principal purpose the cementing of diplomatic relationships with foreign nations at the expense of the farmer. If, in a trade agreement, diplomatic considerations were allowed to override equitable consideration to the farmer, then I feel that costs should not be borne by our affected producing industries alone.

It will not be easy to establish a balance between encouraging free trade and protecting the interests of the farmer.

The problem of feeding the hungry will also demand other adjustments by the farmers. Not only must we seek to produce enough grain to prevent mass starvation, we must also shake off the shackles of traditions and produce new, more nourishing food such as soybeans to reduce malnutrition.

Food producers will also be forced to accept and accommodate into the agriculture community the inevitable farming of the sea. The impact of marine resource development on agriculture will be tremendous. The recent development of a high-protein extract from fish has already met with resistance in various farm groups. This extract, called Fish Protein Concentrate, is virtually colorless and odorless and is used as an additive to flour. It can provide all the animal protein necessary to human diet conveniently and at minimal cost. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has estimated that FPC can be produced domestically, and at a profit, to meet minimum protein requirements at an annual cost of \$2 per person. As new industries are created to harvest the resources of the sea, food producers will be faced with many hard questions. What will be the political effect of this new arm of agriculture? How successfully will this industry integrate with the larger food-producing community. How will such products as FPC affect the future of traditional foods?

Just as the producer will be forced to face complex challenges in the new age of agriculture, so will you who are involved in marketing and advertising. There will be many unconventional products that, despite their merit, will meet the resistance of tradition. It will take great skill and great patience to earn the acceptance of these products. This will be particularly true, unfortunately, among those people who are the hungriest. But the patterns and mores of centuries can be overcome. An outstanding example of this is a synthetic food called "Incaparina." It is made of maize, sorghum and cottonseed and has been skillfully promoted and marketed in Central America by the Quaker Oats Company.

The addition of FPC to flour will likely meet with considerable initial resistance. Even in a country as liberal and openminded as the United States, this product has not been wholly accepted. The Agency for International Development and other organizations who recognized the tremendous potential of this product in meeting the needs of protein-hungry nations nevertheless had a great deal of trouble getting Food and Drug Administration approval of this additive. Although FPC met all health and sanitary standards, FDA objected to it on the philosophical grounds that it was made from whole fish—scales, entrails and all. A member of the House of Representatives recently commented: "They say fish byproduct meal is high in protein, but so is cow manure, so are chicken feathers and rats. They say it will be less offensive in odor than dead fish . . . that means the odor will be somewhere between the odor of a skunk and a sewage disposal plant." I quote this description to give you a taste of the kinds of attitudes you will face when it comes to marketing this product.

But if the challenges are great, so can be the rewards. Can there be any greater satisfaction than knowing you had played a role in preventing the starvation of millions of people? This is the challenge of the new age of agriculture. You can answer it in many ways: by helping to awaken the American public to the dimensions of the growing food crisis; by making the public aware that a major key to this crisis is production and that the key to production is price; by correcting the public's distorted image of agriculture; by interpreting to the producer the changing nature of his profession and the demands that will be made on him; and by taking advantage of the challenges and opportunities in the marketing and promoting of new products.