

FOOD FOR PEACE
AND
THE VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

REPORT OF TASK FORCE
TO
THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

THE TASK FORCE:

UGO CARUSI, Chairman
DR. GORDON M. CAIENS, Member
JOHN B. FAEGRE, JR., Member
GEORGE N. LUND, Member
WILLIAM H. McCAHON, Consultant

338.19 Carusi, Ugo *33513 1/1/50*
C329 Food for Peace and the voluntary agencies;
report of task force to Advisory Committee
on Voluntary Foreign Aid. Ugo Carusi, et al.
Feb. 1966.
24 p.

OFF-SITE

1. Food for Peace. 2. Voluntary agencies. I. Title.
II. Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.



3-5-54

FOOD FOR PEACE AND THE VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

REPORT OF TASK FORCE

TO

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

* * *

OUTLINE

- I. THE PROBLEM
- II. THE VOLUNTARY AGENCIES AND THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:
A BRIEF BACKGROUND
- III. THE PRESENT STATE OF AFFAIRS
- IV. RECOMMENDATIONS
 - (A) GOVERNMENT PROCEDURES
 - (B) VOLUNTARY AGENCY ACTIVITIES
 - (C) LEGISLATION
- V. CONCLUSION

I. THE PROBLEM

Official statistics are plentiful. Government and private surveys are complete and detailed in their revelations. Periodicals and daily newspapers carry the facts, with pictures and the views of editorialists and columnists added, to the American home. In countries where two thirds of the world's population live, there is widespread hunger. Millions upon millions of human beings, in most of Asia, in most of Africa, in parts of Central and South America, are underfed, poorly fed, or, worse, unfed. Food production in the afflicted areas has fallen far behind the minimal needs of the people, a condition aggravated and promising to be worsened by progressive population growth. National economic instability, strife, political insecurity, individual poverty, disease, to name some of the prevalent ills, keep stirring the foodless pots. Natural disasters — the unidentical twins of drought and flood among them — add their recurring contributions to the total misery.

Other nations and other peoples have manifested their concern and their generosity in their efforts to give the assistance so desperately needed by this mass of suffering humanity. Principally among them have been the United States and her people — officially and personally. Blessed with enormous food production, with stores far in excess of domestic needs, our ability to make food available to the hungry of the world was a good match for our desire to do so. Under the authority of what we know

as Public Law 480 (The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954) this food "surplus" was made available by sale and donation for overseas relief, in recent years under Food for Peace. A significant amount, roughly one half of the total food donations under P.L. 480, is distributed through voluntary agencies registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. Word has come from official sources that the "surpluses" are becoming depleted. Some of the foods hitherto in that category are in very short supply -- at least for overseas distribution -- our inventory in several of them consisting of current or early future production.

Yet the need for a Food for Peace program has not lessened; it has grown. The call for voluntary agency assistance is greater. The problems of food production and distribution, of nutritive, health-preserving feeding, of related economic development in the recipient areas, all the things Food for Peace and the participating American voluntary agencies sought to serve overseas, remain. Special effort is called for. The expansion of authority and scope of the program should be looked into. New means to meet the changing and accelerating needs must be found. Procedures, public and private, must be reexamined and made to fit present conditions and demands.

It is in the light of all this that this Task Force was created by the Advisory Committee at its meeting of December 2, 1965, to make

an in depth study of the Food for Peace program, and particularly, the role of the American voluntary agencies in it.

II. THE VOLUNTARY AGENCIES AND THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE: A BRIEF BACKGROUND

The direct involvement of accredited United States voluntary agencies in the Food for Peace program has been underway now for better than ten years. During this time, changes in policy, procedure, and emphasis have taken place. Over the years progress has been made in improving Government-voluntary agency relationships. The Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, established by Presidential order in May 1946, has played an active part in these developments, and periodically has reviewed and made recommendations regarding program policies and procedures. The Committee has accepted as its mandate the responsibility of serving the interests of both the Government and the cooperating voluntary agencies, trying to understand and to interpret the special problems of each to the other, to the end that the best interests of both might be served. It has encouraged the "growing partnership", including the substantial overseas food aid programs of the voluntary agencies under Food for Peace. This experience has conclusively shown that these voluntary agencies, while retaining their separate identity as independent non-governmental groups, can, nevertheless, carry forward in partnership with Government mutually helpful programs in the name of the American people. It has also demonstrated that Government can work effectively with agencies of the United States private sector.

Using this experience as a base, and through a careful examination of existing programs and procedures, the Task Force seeks to point out ways in which this joint effort can be improved. We do this confident that both the Government and the voluntary agencies agree that significant improvements can be made, and that they are prepared to work together in good faith to accomplish this objective.

The idea of government committee supervision over private overseas relief as we now have it began while other nations were deep in World War II, roughly a year before the United States was brought into it. Because our country had a neutral status to preserve at that time, all private voluntary groups soliciting contributions from the American public for relief work in warring countries were required to make themselves formally known to the Department of State. In March, 1941, President Roosevelt named a committee to look into the problems of American war relief activities. From its study came the President's War Relief Control Board, established by Executive Order, July 25, 1942, to guide the agencies in their activities and to license approved programs of overseas relief. On May 14, 1946, the Board was succeeded by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, by direction of President Truman. The Advisory Committee established registration procedures, which, buttressed by legislative enactments, became the channel through which government support and subsidies (ocean freight, food donations, excess property,

contracts for services) became available to registered voluntary agencies.

We are tempted at this point to say something more about the development and value of the overseas relief partnership of the Government and the voluntary agencies, as well as the Advisory Committee's important part in it, but we prefer to quote the words of others who have said it best.

Herbert Hoover, on voluntarism in America:

"Many citizens ask themselves: For what reason must we continue to support the voluntary agencies? Why not let the Government do it all? The essence of our self-government lies in the self-government outside political government. The fabric of American life is woven around our tens of thousands of voluntary associations, the churches, the private schools and colleges, the research institutions, the professional societies, women's organizations, business, labor, the farmers' associations, and by no means the least, our charitable institutions. That is the very nature of American life. *** if these voluntary activities were to be absorbed by government agencies, this civilization would be over. Something neither free nor noble would take its place."

David E. Bell, Administrator AID:

"This partnership has a quality that government aid alone cannot achieve. It is a force of enduring strength and fellowship that binds together our people and the friendly peoples of other countries and furthers and strengthens the peaceful objectives of the free world."

Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator AID:

"We *** are indeed fortunate to have the American voluntary agencies assisting us in carrying forward a very important segment of our Food for Peace program. This is a partnership arrangement in a program which is completely voluntary. Facilities and food donations from the government are made available but it is the volunteers who decide whether and to what extent they should participate in the program. While working in cooperation with their Government, the independent nature of these organizations is recognized and preserved."

George McGovern, United States Senator:

"The great strength of the voluntary groups as compared to direct government programs is their ability to humanize foreign assistance. The warmth of a hand or the joy of a smile can transform a coldly impersonal foreign aid program into a heart-warming relationship between human beings."

Arthur C. Ringland, former Executive Director, Advisory Committee for Voluntary Foreign Aid:

"The President, when he enjoined the Advisory Committee upon its establishment "to tie together the governmental and private programs in the field of foreign relief," set up a benchmark that has been the point of reference in the relations of the Government and the voluntary agencies throughout the postwar years. This tying together has marked the most productive relief and rehabilitation operations of the registered voluntary agencies; for voluntary foreign aid is most productive when it complements public aid and that of the local agencies in the participating countries."

III. THE PRESENT STATE OF AFFAIRS

Harassed by over auditing, demands for payment of claims some of which are five years old, programming delays, on and off food availabilities, backing and filling on government policy and guidelines, the voluntary agencies are understandably reflecting frustration, negativism, and an over-cautiousness to an extent which could very well knock out the props which have supported voluntary agency cooperation with Government over the past twenty years.

This is in the face of the growing international concern about the widening food gap, statements and actions by the President and other responsible government officials firmly committing the United States to a high stake in the war against hunger, poverty, and disease (an area

in which voluntary agencies rather than government have done the pioneer work), recent steps by members of Congress and the Executive Branch to broaden substantially and to liberalize the legal authority under which the attack on world hunger can be carried forward, and the widespread enthusiastic support of this objective shown by the American people and their institutions, both profit and non-profit.

We are in full support of the President's statement of last March 31 when he said: "The Food for Peace program is one of the most inspiring enterprises ever undertaken by any nation in all of history," and, later on in the same message, "Food for Peace is, above all, a program which expresses the great and generous heart of the American people — and is a worthy expression of the compassion always so much a part of America's character. It deserves the continued support of the Congress and of all Americans." Every government official — high and low — connected with the program can find in the meaning and purpose of the President's words a clear guide for carrying out his daily responsibilities. The direction thus pointed by the President must not be lost or weakened in the process of implementing the program. Experience of better than ten years should lead us to accept the obvious now, rather than to wait for historians to tell us the facts of life — namely, that the role of the voluntary agencies in Food for Peace has been one of the most important, uniquely democratic, and effective instruments in furthering United States overseas objectives in this decade.

Prudence and humanity dictate a major effort on the part of the United States Government at this critical time to encourage maximum voluntary agency participation in the overall United States effort to close the world hunger gap. To do this -- and do it properly -- will mean taking another look at and probably revising significantly some of the procedures, regulations, and criteria we have set as conditions of voluntary agency participation. As we look back, we cannot escape the feeling that we may have erred in trying to apply (perhaps on occasion too rigidly) government thinking and practices to private agency thinking and practices, and that the gears just somehow don't quite mesh.

As an assist in finding a formula under which the gears may be made to mesh properly, the following recommendations are offered:

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

(A) GOVERNMENT PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES

Recommendation No. A-1. Find a satisfactory procedure to replace the present requirement for Interagency Staff Committee clearance of voluntary agency Food for Peace programs.

Discussion. The present system has proven time-consuming (therefore costly) and ineffectual. It has stirred up more dust than it has settled. Among the voluntary agencies, there are suspicions of it (pretty much unfounded but nonetheless real in the minds of some) on the

grounds that they are excluded from these deliberations, and notice of decisions taken are slow in reaching them. Their exclusion is because matters of security are discussed. It should not be difficult to resolve this problem. AID's Office of Material Resources has already developed proposals which would in large part satisfy this recommendation. These AID proposals, and any new ones along the same line, should be accepted and given effect, with the added feature that voluntary agency representatives be permitted to appear when their program requests are under review, if they so desire. Security matters need not be discussed at such sessions.

It may be noted that in the exercise of caution, the protection of security classifications can sometimes be overdone, resulting in the withholding of useful information from a party of interest. Since voluntary agencies are definitely parties of interest, as much pertinent information as possible should be shared with their accredited representatives, in a manner and to the extent that it can be done without adversely affecting the security of the United States or otherwise prejudicing the national interest.

Recommendation No. A-2. Give the Secretary of State (or, if feasible, the Vice President) the authority to make final decisions on unresolved interagency Food for Peace issues.

Discussion. A major difficulty in this area of the program up to the present has been that no one official (other than the President, of course) can call the shots and make them stick, because there are too many heads of agencies either with veto power or enough influence and delegated authority to enter objections and delay actions. From a literal reading of the Executive Order outlining the responsibilities of the Director of Food for Peace it would seem that he has this authority. However, in practice this could mean overruling an official or officials of cabinet rank, which for obvious reasons, has its built-in drawbacks.

Recommendation No. A-3. By Executive Order or legislation remove the overlapping responsibilities of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture in administering P.L. 480 (or successor legislation).

Discussion. This is a large and complicated program, we know, but it is made more complicated because of the absence of clearly defined responsibilities of the several Executive Branch agencies. This has significantly complicated voluntary agency relationships with government in their overseas food programs. The time has come to assign responsibility to the Department of State and AID for policy and programming decisions for that portion of our food aid which is headed overseas. The Department of Agriculture would continue to be responsible

for programs involving the use of food at home, such as school lunch, stamp plan, welfare uses, including the stepped up poverty program, disaster relief, etc. It would likewise continue to acquire, store, process, and deliver to United States ports the commodities needed for overseas use. In this latter field the Department of Agriculture's role would be limited to that of supplier, and it would not become involved, as it has up to now, in foreign policy considerations affecting program decisions, including voluntary agency Title III programs.

Recommendation No. A-4. The United States Government paper of August 26, 1959, entitled "Policies for Public Law 480 Title III Foreign Donation Program," should be updated to conform to changes in the law and to current practice.

Discussion. This policy paper, which to our knowledge, has been neither rescinded nor revised, was hammered out by the so-called Francis Committee (Interagency Committee on Agricultural Surplus Disposal) after more than a year of top level interagency discussion, which, prior to final acceptance of the paper, included in depth discussions with the voluntary agencies concerned and with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. For a number of years this policy paper provided useful guidelines for government officials and the voluntary agencies alike. In more recent years, although never officially rescinded, it seems to have vanished by default and to have been overtaken by a

maze of new government regulations and manual orders. The 1959 policy statement has much to commend it, and that which is still applicable and useful should be retained. This includes a clear statement that it is the policy of our Government to give all-out support to the expanded role of American voluntary agencies in overseas food aid programs. Whatever changes are made in the position paper to harmonize with advances which have occurred in program techniques, administration, and emphasis, a 1966 policy statement should by all means give equally strong support to the role of the voluntary agencies.

Recommendation No. A-5. Authorize payment of ocean freight on UNICEF Title III shipments on condition that UNICEF agrees to plow back the dollars thus saved from its own budget expenditures into improved nutrition; that is, research, pilot projects, purchase of supplemental foods, additives, fortifiers, and such.

Discussion. Legislative authority to do this now exists. Over the years the Executive Branch has refrained from paying such ocean freight charges on the ground that Congress would object to it as an additional dollar contribution over and above the funds appropriated by the Congress for support of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. In view of the new emphasis on nutrition, particularly with respect to the pre-school child, it would seem that this objection could be overcome, particularly if an understanding could be reached

with UNICEF that an equivalent amount would be used to further United States objectives in the field of nutrition as stated above. It is reasonable to believe that UNICEF would be receptive, since this is a field in which it has pioneered, and that both that agency and the United States would benefit by this arrangement.

Recommendation No. A-6. Find a balance between the time and expense devoted to auditing as against programming.

Discussion. Right now we see signs that the Government may be putting more time and staff into an attempt to discover faults in the program than it is in direct approaches to a more effective program. Steps are under way to correct this situation in part by staffing up on the program side. These steps should be encouraged, but at the same time a very close look should be taken at the present cost to the government of its auditing procedures as compared with the results achieved. It is recognized, of course, that the Executive Branch can only exert control over audits which are carried out under its aegis, namely, AID-Audit Division and the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of State. We are aware that the audits and inspections of the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Legislative Branch, are beyond the supervisory reach of the Executive Branch. They are not, we say, beyond the reach of constructive comment. Insofar as Food for Peace audits are concerned, the General Accounting Office

is exploring new ground, although in terms of personnel assigned to this task they have been building up very fast. Food for Peace, of course, is only a small part of the overall concern of the General Accounting Office. It represents, however, a very sensitive area both with regard to foreign policy implications and to relationships with United States voluntary agencies and their foreign counterparts. It is interesting to note that although the sales portion of the Food for Peace program represents better than 75% of the total, the General Accounting Office audits thus far have been running at least 50% on the much smaller donation programs. Over the years the United States Government has made a very sizeable investment in time, effort, and money to develop a nice balance in its relationships with the voluntary agencies. Substantial mutual benefits have resulted. This investment should be protected and continued. It would be foolhardy, through ill-advised auditing procedures not attuned to the necessities and practicalities of so complex and important an instrument of American foreign policy, to tear down what has taken years to build up. We respectfully suggest that this is a fit subject for Congress to consider as it deals with legislative proposals for a more effective Food for Peace.

Recommendation No. A-7. A reasonable percentage loss tolerance should be worked out and authorized on voluntary agency food distributions.

Discussion. The voluntary agencies are now held accountable for virtually every pound of donated food assigned to them. The Department of Agriculture exempts from its asserted claims only those losses having a value of three dollars or less. This is consistent with neither good commercial practice nor the Government's own experience in moving foreign aid supplies. The claims do not need to be based on proven carelessness, irresponsibility, inefficiency, or dishonesty attributable to the voluntary agency concerned. We exaggerate somewhat, but not completely, when we observe that in the war against hunger the rules seem to require that no bullet is to be fired without a money-back guarantee that it will find its mark. The loss tolerance to be allowed should take into account the many difficulties and variables involved in the movement and distribution of foods to outlying and in some cases previously inaccessible areas of foreign countries. Also woven into the fabric of the problem are: language barriers, inadequate or at times non-existent transportation and storage facilities, different standards and customs of recipients and local officials, unfamiliarity of recipients with our foods, civil strife and unrest, **natural disasters**, and Heaven knows what else. These practical considerations should be applied in evaluating the Government's field audits on which the claims are filed. That evaluation should not use the high United States standards of practice as the norm for comparison, but, rather a standard of practice which can reasonably be applied in the overseas areas of distribution.

Recommendation No. A-8. Existing P.L. 480 priorities should be restudied and adjusted.

Discussion. At present sales for foreign currencies (Title I) take priority over foreign donations (Titles II and III).

The Task Force is not convinced that in all instances such sales should, in fact, take rigid priority over donations. Situations could readily arise when a departure from the sales priority could better serve current and projected United States objectives abroad. There is no intention on our part to downgrade the value of Title I sales programs. The importance of acquiring foreign currencies in this manner and using them to pay United States bills and to promote economic development is fully recognized. On the other hand, there are now at least eight countries, including some of the largest takers, such as India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic, where our foreign currency holdings are in excess of foreseeable United States requirements. In these so-called "excess currency countries" and in others which may later fall into the same category, it seems preferable to us, at least while the excess currency condition exists, to give priority to grant and donation programs. Moreover, it is the opinion of the Task Force that in all other areas sales for foreign currencies and foreign donations (including those administered in cooperation with registered United States voluntary agencies) should enjoy equal priority, with our national interests the deciding factor

whenever the question of a choice between them may come up. This conclusion is based on the assumption that it is the United States Government's intention to upgrade foreign donations programs substantially, and to use them as a major tool in accomplishing the recently announced United States international assistance objectives (President Johnson's February 2, 1966, foreign aid message to Congress requesting funds to fight hunger, disease, and ignorance).

(B) VOLUNTARY AGENCY ACTIVITIES

Recommendation No. B-1. Continue to build up the quality and quantity of field staffs (United States citizen and local hire) adequate to the fulfillment of the responsibilities undertaken.

Discussion. More than 800 United States citizens are now employed in overseas posts by registered voluntary agencies to administer food and related voluntary aid programs. Working side by side with these Americans are approximately 6,700 non-United States-citizen staff members and employees, plus an uncounted number of volunteers. This in itself is a tremendous contribution, which, when measured in dollars and cents, represents a very significant savings to the United States Government (assuming that if the voluntary agencies did not underwrite this activity, the Government would maintain the same level of operation and carry its total cost). The administrators of the

United States Government program must be keenly aware of this, and we are confident they will not let it slip from their minds. Even so, a greater effort in this direction will need to be made by the voluntary agencies as they move into stepped-up self-help food for development program requiring, as may be expected, closer supervision, more manpower, revised procedures, and greater know-how. If the President's desire, as expressed in his 1966 State of the Union Message to introduce "new and daring" measures to combat hunger, poverty, and ignorance is to reach full flower, there must be continued reliance upon substantial help and full cooperation from the United States private sector. From the hitherto proved willingness and ability of the voluntary agencies to meet past challenges of this kind comes a confidence in them not easily shaken.

Recommendation No. B-2. Each voluntary agency should carefully consider and decide whether it wishes to be a part of this program, and then proceed accordingly.

Discussion. It is now, always has been, and should continue to be the prerogative of the individual voluntary agency to determine whether it should accept Government subsidies and thereby become a working partner in the Government's assault to reduce the effects of hunger and other privations abroad, and to eliminate their causes. There is no room for lukewarm participation in this partnership. The challenge

we face in the next two decades to close the hunger gap calls for all-out effort, with maximum freedom from inhibiting factors. The enormity and critical aspects of the task insist upon this.

Recommendation No. B-3. Voluntary agencies must be prepared to show how and to what extent their own private resources, melded with Government subsidies, have, in fact, had the intended multiplier effect.

Discussion. We are quick to recognize that voluntary agency overseas services cannot be measured solely in terms of dollars and cents. There are, of course, a number of benefits of an intangible nature which cannot be realistically assessed with a dollar sign. However, neither the Legislative nor the Executive Branch is lacking in scrupulous officials who are more easily and surely convinced by the tangible rather than the intangible argument. Moreover, it was the clear intent when the first substantial subsidy, ocean freight, was authorized that this would conserve voluntary agency cash resources, which could, in turn, be plowed back into other services. The subsidy was not intended as a substitute for the agencies' cash resources. Nor was it intended to diminish the agencies' own efforts to employ to the fullest the fund raising potential within their own constituencies among the American public.

Recommendation No. B-4. Tool up for and place even greater emphasis on initiating self-help, community development, and works projects type programs. As an important corollary to this, take a more active role in programs designed to increase agricultural production in the less developed countries.

Discussion. The voluntary agencies have done much in pioneering self-help activities. The philosophy of helping people to help themselves is a basic tenet of voluntarism. A number of registered voluntary agencies urged the use of foods as an incentive to self-help works projects as long as ten years ago, well before that authority was written into the law. Now that the authority is there, and the principle has been enthusiastically accepted by the Government, a major push in this direction should be made.

Recommendation No. B-5. In evaluating on-going food programs and in planning new ones the voluntary agencies should ask themselves the question: "What is this program going to do for these people ten years or more from now?"

Discussion. It may be that until now we have been so concerned with emergencies and immediate needs that we have not been able to look very far ahead in evaluating what our present efforts really mean in terms of the recipients' future. Emergencies will recur, and the pressure of meeting immediate needs will continue. These must be met.

Yet more effort must be placed on long term planning -- bringing the total available services to bear in improving the socio-economic condition of the individuals being served, and projecting the measure of their worth to these individuals in the next ten, fifteen, or twenty years.

(C) LEGISLATION

Recommendation No. C-1. Predicate the Food for Peace program upon the same broad national policies as those of the foreign economic assistance legislation generally.

Recommendation No. C-2. Shift the program from one of distribution of whatever food happens to be on hand and available to one of meeting the nutritional needs of hungry people, with appropriate directions for commensurate domestic agricultural production, and with adequate authority and positive mandate for purchase by the Government of the required items.

Recommendation No. C-3. Provide authority for and give primacy to material and technical assistance in food production, processing, and distribution in the recipient areas.

Recommendation No. C-4. Tie the food program more firmly to works projects and economic development, the more to induce expanded self-help.

Recommendation No. C-5. Combine present Title II and Title III donation authority, and facilitate full use of the experience and capabilities of voluntary agencies.

Recommendation No. C-6. Place with the Department of State and AID all the authority needed for administering the program abroad, including the power of decision on place, size, and type of program, related, as the program is, to considerations of foreign policy.

Discussion. As we said at the outset, the assignment of the Task Force was primarily to make a study of voluntary agency participation in the Food for Peace program, with a view to making some suggestions, hopefully constructive, on the operational aspects of the subject. Although not specifically told to do so, it was inevitable that we should find ourselves thinking in the direction of new legislation. We could not have made some of the recommendations contained on the preceding pages, nor justified some of the things we said in the respective discussions, if we did not take into account the public announcements of the President and others in executive authority of the urgent food needs of the world and the resolve of the United States to do something big about it, and, as well, the proposals already contained in bills introduced on the independent initiative of influential members of Congress. Indeed, some of our recommendations on operational aspects of the program look to legislative revisions to make them appropriate and effective. The six

recommendations we have made on new legislation are intentionally general in their terms, but we consider them to be basic to what we earnestly feel is needed to be done.

It is more than likely that before the Advisory Committee has time to consider this report and decide what to do with and about it, the President's promised message and legislative proposals on the problem of world hunger will have been sent to the Congress. The members of the Advisory Committee may later wish to address themselves directly to them, either individually or as a Committee, or, on the other hand, may choose to ask this Task Force to deal with them in an addendum to this report. We await the Committee's word in this regard. Otherwise, our work as a Task Force is finished.

V. CONCLUSION

We close this exercise by thanking the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid for having allowed us to play this part, relatively small though it be, in the advancement of a program so dedicated to human needs and so meaningful to our country and its people.

"The Food for Peace program is one of the most inspiring enterprises ever undertaken by any nation in all of history; every American can be proud of it, without regard to partisanship or political persuasion."

— Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965

"We must narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near starvation abroad. Humanity and prudence, alike, counsel a major effort on our part. We make a grave mistake if we regard Food for Peace as merely a program for disposal of surplus commodities instead of an opportunity to utilize our agricultural capacity to encourage the economic development of new and developing nations. Food for Peace is an increasingly important tool of American foreign policy."

— John F. Kennedy, 1963.

"It (using food for peace) is more than surplus disposal, more than an attempt to foster ties and sympathies for America. It is an effort that I consider in full keeping with American tradition — that of helping people in dire need who with us are devoted to upholding and advancing the cause of freedom. It is an undertaking that will powerfully strengthen our persistent and patient efforts to build an enduring, just peace."

— Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1959

Respectfully submitted:

UGO CARUSI

GORDON M. CAIRNS

JOHN B. FAEGRE, JR.

GEORGE N. LUND

February 8, 1966