

P R O C E E D I N G S

CARDINAL DEARDEN: We will call the Meeting to order. We will begin with a prayer that will be offered by Archbishop Baum.

ARCHBISHOP BAUM: The Lord be with you.

RESPONSE: (Chorus of "And also with you.")

(Pause.)

ARCHBISHOP BAUM: Father, we thank you for the gracious blessings that are our's, especially for the things that have been granted to this Nation for these 200 years.

Help us today to see in the light of the Gospel how we might serve our beloved Country and the whole human family. Help us to understand that all men are called to oneness in Your Holy Spirit.

And this we ask in Christ Jesus your son who presented Himself to become one of us, who is one with you in commune with the Holy Spirit, God forever and ever.

RESPONSE: (Chorus of "Amen.")

ARCHBISHOP BAUM: In the name of the Father, the Son and the Spirit.

CARDINAL DEARDEN: We begin by giving a welcome to those that were not here with us yesterday.

Yesterday the principal thrust of the presentations and the questioning focused in the area of theological foundations of the social morality. It was clearly the theme

that needed to be addressed at the beginning so that we can put what we are going to say into the christian context.

Today our presentations will focus principally on two themes: "The World Food Situation" and "Women in Society". It should be understood that the character of these presentations and the probing of the Panel is not expected to be an exhaustive and complete treating of the subjects that we are addressing.

These are rather models that bring to the fore the dimensions of some of the issues with which this Committee will need to cope over these coming months. But what is presented here, and the discussions as well, will be part of the record, and will be drawn upon by those who plan the Bicentennial Conference a year from next October.

We are faced with very tight time limitations this morning, and I hope that you will be understanding if I must hold rather tenaciously to the schedule.

But with that understanding, I would like to begin with our first presentation this morning by Father Theodore Hesburgh, University of Notre Dame.

FATHER HESBURGH: Thank you, Your Eminence.

Excellency<sup>ies</sup>, Fellow Priests, Dear Brothers and Sisters in Christ, 200 years after the Declaration of Independence, America and the rest of the World need a Declaration of Interdependence.

One of the perennial needs of mankind, no less evident today than in 1776 is to find a workable rationale for ~~a~~ continuity in times of change. And today the workable rationale for ~~a~~ conceptualizing continuity ~~and~~ <sup>in</sup> change is bound up in the notion of interdependence.

It is a notion relatively new in our World Lexicon, but suddenly it has appeared in almost every recent article or book one reads on World Politics or Economics. Interdependence is involved in every current discussion of World Development, or Trade, or Monetary Policy.

No one even attempts to analyze or prescribe for the present world problems of food or fuel, or environment, without focusing on the concept of interdependence. It haunts the current ~~de~~ <sup>e</sup> ~~tante~~ between the great powers, the search for lasting peace in the Middle East. Even the Poets have alluded to it. "No man is an island" the inspiring theme of John Donne.

Interdependence is a thought and a theme that runs counter to many of our ~~Chivalrous~~ <sup>shibboleths</sup> of the past: nationalism, ethnocentrism, rugged individualism, empire, cold war, East and West with never the twain meeting.

How did interdependence so suddenly emerge as an idea whose time has come? Partially, I believe, it came as a response to new and unprecedented challenges that have burst upon the world scene in recent years. More fundamentally, it

represents a kind of Capernacan revolution that involves a new way of looking at our World.

I have been impressed by the fact that this new look is a fallout of the Space Age, whose most important result was not closeup pictures of the Moon, but a new look at the World from afar.

*new H*

*There it whirls*  
 "Varied worlds in the black void of space, brown and blue and flecked with white clouds", in the words of *Lady* Lennie Jackson, Barbara Ward, "Our Spaceship Earth." In the past our vision of the Earth was dominated, even in the age of exploration, which was an opening of men's minds as well, as a World of immense distances, of infinite resources, the treasures of the Indies, and of Cathay, *a* *of* the widely different varieties of mankind, of flora and fauna, and a World of immensity and variety and difference.

*Now,* When asked what impressed him most on viewing the Earth from the Moon, one Astronaut said, "I can put up my thumb and blot out the whole Earth."

Viewed as a small space craft, the passengers as crew, it is not a large step to understand their interdependence in all they do, living together interdependently on a planet with limited resources and growing needs. In fact, there are very few serious human problems today whose impact and significance are not Global, requiring therefore a Global Solution as well.

no FF  
11

population,

I offer you a list; war and peace, human development, pollution, food, energy, unemployment, trade and commerce, communications, crime, arms control, drugs, environment, literacy, the use of the seas, the resources of the seabed, atomic technology, monetary systems, agriculture, and sea transport health.

air

Every one of these problems is interdependent in its sweep and in its solution. In every one of these items Global considerations are needed to describe the full reality. And in each of them we have a concrete example of the modern interdependence of Nations and Mankind globally.

In the past each of these problems or opportunities would have been viewed solely in the National or Local Perspective. Today, any local or national response to any one of these realities would be both inadequate and largely useless.

For example, in the distant past an Arab-Israeli war over was for a few miles of barren sand waste in the Sinai and some rocky hills in the Golan Heights would have been largely a tribal struggle. In our times, however, it involved billions of dollars of the most sophisticated military equipment on Earth, provided to each side by the two mightiest military powers.

The tensions that it generated risked sparking a global conflict, and did indeed precipitate an oil embargo which in

turn threatened the whole Atlantic Alliance <sup>1</sup> nearly ruined Japan's economic miracle, dislocated fuel prices to an extent that will involve massive shifts of World Capital Balances, aggravated the emerging fertilizer and food crises worldwide, ~~the~~ possibly will mean massive starvation <sup>in</sup> of the developing World, and the consequent political and economic chaos among the Third World's ~~millions~~ <sup>billions</sup> of people. <sup>15</sup>

The geography involved was only a few hundred square miles of poor land, but the repercussions were ~~Worldwide~~ <sup>Worldwide</sup> and of almost cataclysmic proportions. The Earth will be reverberating <sup>at</sup> from these crises for years yet to come. All of the <sup>se</sup> concatenated developments both illustrate <sup>at</sup> and are illuminated by the notion of interdependence.

As is the case of other great seminal ideas, this notion of interdependence is useful only if translated into the world of reality to help understand real problems, to elaborate real <sup>istic</sup> solutions, to change mentalities and to cast world views into a more meaningful perspective for a better world.

We do, in fact, have an interdependent world. What is needed is to recognize the fact and to shape world policy accordingly. For this reason, it would be helpful for the purposes of this discussion to translate global interdependence into terms of a specific and urgent modern problem, which like <sup>all</sup> other such problems, both illustrates <sup>the</sup> the reality of

interdependence in a graphic way, and provides a frame of reference in which to demonstrate how interdependence ~~at all times~~ can bring hope to an otherwise hopeless situation.

In turn, this exercise involves a totally new <sup>perspective</sup> prospective for life on Spaceship Earth, a <sup>ev</sup> prospective that is applicable to other global problems.

I would like to focus now on the global food problem, not because it is the most important problem facing Mankind -- man does not live by bread alone -- but because it is present, urgent, and itself interdependent on other global problems, such as human rights, development, population, fuel, pollution, agriculture, trade, monetary balances, and a host of others relating totally to the future of life on this planet.

The food situation on this planet has always been difficult, but never more precarious than at present. Food was, of course, the almost total concern <sup>for</sup> of primitive man, so much so that early man is characterized as a hunter or gatherer.

But never before has the whole matter of sufficient food for survival been cast <sup>o</sup> in such monumental world proportions as at present. Food demand is up 50 percent since 20 years ago, while the world food stocks as of last summer stood at 27 days of world need, compared to a 95-day world supply 15 years ago.

Climate has complicated the situation. With some perceptable cooling in the Northern Polar Latitudes due to the expansion of the Circum-Polar Vortex -- those are the winds swirling around the top and bottom of the World -- there has occurred a series of floods in the United States, Pakistan, the Philippines and Japan, with unusual drought conditions North and South of the Equatorial Line from Nicaragua through the Sahelian Belt of Sub-Sahara Africa, through the <sup>Wallo</sup> ~~Wallo~~ Region of Ethiopia <sup>and</sup> into India's Maharashtra Province, and Chinese <sup>a's</sup> Yangtze Valley.

This climatic change has had disastrous effects on World food production. In 1973, I visited some of the Sahelian Countries in Africa where the Sahara Desert is moving South at about 30 miles a year. In the refugee camps around Nouakchott, <sup>SPR</sup> Timbuktu, and Gao, one sees hundreds of thousands of Tuaregs who have lost all of their herds, some six million head, and are despondently thus dependent upon a minimal amount of rice and wheat and corn flown in daily on military airlifts.

It is like attempting to feed an elephant with a teaspoon. In those incredibly torrid and sandy spots, one sees the face of hungry desperation and realizes that human suffering transcends the grim statistics. People starve and die, not numbers.

As this is happen<sup>ing</sup> in the Underdeveloped World,

we in the Developed World are consuming almost a ton of food grains annually per person, while the poorest barely subsist on 400 pounds of food grains a year.

We consume only 150 pounds of our grains directly as bread and pastry products, the rest going into the production of meat and milk and eggs. The poor consume all of their grain directly in bread, ~~chapates~~<sup>chapatties</sup> or tortillas. Affluence has doubled meat consumption during the past 20 years in America and Canada.

Since it takes seven pounds of grain to produce one pound of beef, more grains are fed to animals in America than are consumed directly in the poor nations, thus further complicating the food crisis.

~~The Chicago Paper~~<sup>Newspaper</sup> just yesterday ~~has~~<sup>had</sup> an interesting statistic when it ~~says~~<sup>reported</sup> that, "The protein in the pet food fed to 71 million household dogs and cats in this country is sufficient to meet the daily requirements of 122 million people."

Now the face of interdependence begins to appear. For example, a quarter of a pound less of beef a week per person in the United States would free over 10 million tons of wheat a year for the hungry world, and contribute to American Health, too, with ~~a~~<sup>the</sup> lowering of cholesterol intake.

Only three countries are exporting substantial

amounts of food grains today, the United States, Canada and Australia, who together export about 100 million tons. As it is, America's export of food grains to ~~the~~ poor nations under Public Law 480, the Food for Peace Program, has dropped from 18 million tons in 1965 to nine million in 1971-72 to 3.4 million or less today -- probably less -- closer to three.)

Two-thirds of the present distribution is for political-military rather than for humanitarian motives. In the past, America kept about 60 million acres of farmland in reserve, mainly to stabilize prices. Now it is practically all in cultivation.

At this point <sup>in 1973</sup> ~~last year~~ the oil crisis arrived. I should say "last year" in this sense being 1973. In the -- As a further indication of interdependence, we had an immediate fertilizer crisis.)

Several developments are worthy of mention. Japan, the supplier of one-third of the fertilizer to South Asia, had to decide during the oil shortage to concentrate on producing automobiles for export or fertilizer. Autos won.)

The United States was in the midst of a price control program and quietly to maintain lower prices at home, in October of 1973 put an embargo on new export contracts for fertilizer. To complete the picture one must realize that while oil and natural gas convert to nitrogenous fertilizer on a one-to-one basis, one pound of fertilizer used with the new

genetic strains of food grains converts to 10 pounds of grain grown and harvested in the developing countries.

As a result of these interdependent developments, India, for example, is almost a million tons short of fertilizer this year, which translates into a short fall of 10 million tons of grain. And while this is happening, three times more fertilizer than India needs is being used on lawns and golf courses, and, ironically, cemeteries here at home.)

In the underdeveloped nations, always short of capital, increased food and fuel prices probably cost an extra 15 billion dollars this year, just about twice the amount of the total assistance (some eight billion) they receive annually from all sources.

In the past, interdependence was seen in political terms as the Third World was wooed by the Western and Socialist countries with various assistance schemes. Now that <sup>e</sup> detente has arrived among the great powers, that motivation must be replaced by a new sense of interdependence.)

Some call for self-interest since we are moving into an age of shortage of industrial materials that mostly come from the Third World, oil being only the tip of the shortage iceberg.)

Now the Banana Countries, the Copper Producers, the Auzite Group are beginning to follow the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries' -- OPEC -- example in

forming cartels to raise prices so that they can pay for their spiraling costs of food and fuel.

These interdependent developments have given rise to a new category among the 115 countries of the Third World, namely the 35 to 40 countries who have nothing with which to bargain, neither raw materials nor industrial potential. Countries such as India, Bangladesh, <sup>Sri</sup>Free Lanka, Pakistan, the Sahelian countries of Africa, and some Caribbean <sup>nations</sup> countries.

This is the new, so-called "Fourth World," comprising almost a billion people who, ~~went without an additional three billion -- that's a mistake in the text here --~~ <sup>dollars</sup> without an additional three billion in aid will certainly not make it during the coming year.

Norman <sup>Borlaug</sup> Borlaug, winner of the Nobel Prize returned some months ago from India where he saw farmers with containers waiting, not hours, but days, for non-existing fuel with which to operate their fuel pumps -- their well pumps. Without this pumped water, their crops died.

For us in the developed world, fuel shortage meant inconvenience waiting for gasoline. For those in the Fourth World, it means death.

If we viewed the world as truly interdependent, and all men as brothers, we would not allow this to happen. Some will say there is not enough money to help, but this rings false in a world that spends over two hundred ~~billion~~ -- in

fact, 240 this coming year -- billion <sup>dollars</sup> for armaments each year.

Others will say that the OPEC countries should help, and indeed they should. But we must approach the problem globally, not piecemeal.

What would interdependence suggest to aid this dire food and fuel disaster for the Fourth World? We might begin by recognizing that the United States and Canada and Australia are in the same relationship to the devastated Fourth World vis-a-vis food as the OPEC countries are regarding fuel.

The OPEC countries will have at least 50 billion dollars surplus of income over import costs this year, and the food grain countries will have greatly increased income from the export of higher priced food. The least that either group could do in a truly human and interdependent world would be to make a concessional grant of food and fuel to these countries of the Fourth World which are put into a life-and-death situation by the tripling of prices for food and fuel.

A long range solution would, of course, be for the surplus countries to aid these hungry countries in becoming more self-sufficient in their own food production despite the drought.

As we in this country prepare to observe our 200th birthday, we are witnessing a whole spate of pessimistic and doomsday predictions. The "Club of Rome's" computer study

predicts either zero to minus growth or <sup>of</sup> world wide catastrophe, politically, humanly, socially.

A much-discussed recent study in America, "An Inquiry into the Human Prospect" by Robert <sup>Heilbroner,</sup> Heilbrunner asks in the first paragraph of the book, "Is there any hope for ~~Man~~?" And, <sup>and</sup> by ~~the~~ large, the answer throughout the book is "No."

Now I have not indulged in this discussion of food and interrelated problems to scare the audience, but to underline the proposition with which I began, namely that we must urgently develop a new <sup>Weltanschauung,</sup> (~~Weltanschauung~~) a world <sup>perspective</sup> ~~prospectus~~ based on the interdependence of all mankind on this relatively small space <sup>craft</sup> with very finite life resources and growing needs.

<sup>Micauber</sup> I am not a prophet of gloom and doom, <sup>neither</sup> am I a ~~nausea~~ <sup>nausea</sup> who believes that somehow everything will come out all right. It will get better, I believe, but only if we change profoundly, only if interdependence passes from an idea to a fruitful and operative reality on the political, economic <sup>social</sup> and ~~social~~ life of the planet.

As one who has worked for more than a decade with the Rockefeller Foundation on the Green Revolution, I can assure you that the ~~World~~ world can feed itself if it really decides to do so. <sup>of</sup> A population growth will have to level off because a net addition of 70 million people a year puts an intolerable burden on possible and probably <sup>agricultural</sup> <sup>productivity</sup> productivity.

advances.

Actually, every developed country in the world controls its population so that development and population strategies must go hand in hand. This can be done if mankind determines to do it. Actually, it is much less difficult than putting a man on the moon, and we have done that.

We in the West began this century, theologically speaking, with strong Pelagian tendencies. With the Scientific and Technological Revolution spurring us on, we believed that we could do all things of ourselves, out of our own selfish and insensitive terms, whatever the consequences to others.

We created, in short order as history runs, a world of incredible global discontinuities and injustices. For example, one could always sense racial prejudices, but today billions of people are automatically and uncontrollably suffering geographic prejudice whatever their race.

If a child is born in the Northern Hemisphere of this globe, he or she faces an ever lengthening life characterized by increasing health, education, economic and social well-being. If born in most of the Southern parts of our globe, he or she will face a short life, illness, illiteracy, hunger, abominable housing, hopelessness.

We in the Northern part of this globe worry about overproducing Ph.D.'s. Many children in the Southern Hemisphere

Pelagian

SPRT

SPRT

SPRT

SPRT

SPRT

SPRT

never enter a school room. We speak of heart and kidney transplants; they never see a doctor from birth to death. Half of the children already born in the poorest countries will die before the age of five.)

We are over fed and overweight; they are under-nourished from birth, often suffering brain damage therefrom. We speak often of second homes; they live in cardboard or mud and wattle huts. We travel <sup>any</sup> everywhere on Earth, now super-sonically, in hours; They are trapped for a miserable lifetime in urban or rural slums.)

We spend more annually on foolish armaments devilishly devised to destroy life than they have annually available to maintain life. (And yet we are all fellow travelers about a common space craft ever more intimately interdependent on one another.)

The decision of an Arab Shiek regarding oil prices, or a Japanese Industrialist deciding what to make, fertilizer or autos, or an American Government Bureaucrat who decides not to export fertilizer, leaves these people without irrigation water and fertilizer, and consequently without food. And then they die.

A decision between the Great Powers to end the Cold War removes the one foolish reason that motivated a substantial part of the aid that they used to receive. So aid starts diminishing drastically just when the need is greatest.

I should add parenthetically that America still did more than the closer European ~~Nation~~<sup>S</sup> in providing and transporting food to starving Africans, about 600 thousand metric tons of food grains at a cost of about 150 million dollars.)

And, of course, we've had a long tradition of humanitarian aid, having given about 85 percent of all food aid since 1945. But we must talk about the situation today, where this program, as I mentioned earlier, has been dropped by five-sixths, <sup>and</sup> of the sixth that is left being spent two-thirds, ~~this is now~~, not for aid for peace, but aid for war.

After several generations of foolish <sup>Relagian</sup> ~~paligen~~ optimism had created this present cruel world scene we are now in the face of world wide crises, inflation, shortages, unemployment, depression, pollution, trade imbalances, et cetera, seeing a new swing to pessimism; again, theologically a recrudescence of Manichaeism that sees man as essentially evil and capable <sup>of</sup> mainly of destroying himself and his world.

One is always in danger of over simplifying when casting world views in definite categories. But I think that whether or not one likes the theological characterizations of <sup>Relagianism</sup> ~~paligenism~~ and Manichaeism, there is little doubt that pessimism rather than optimism is the order of the day.

If I had to characterize my own position, it would be one of Christian and cautious optimism. Theologically, I

I have good reason for Christian optimism. It is my reading of the unwillingness of the affluent and powerful of this World to change, to begin to think interdependently that makes me cautious.

It is my hope that if we develop a new World View, really understand our present situation on this troubled Planet, we will begin to create a better approach to a better World as America's 200th Birthday, and the Earth's Second millennium come upon us.

I would hope that we might indeed create new interdependent World Wide Socio Economic relations, and new Political ones, too. Heilbroner makes the case Heilbrunner makes the fact that we are not going to make it as a Human Race because we are locked into our Socio Economic relations, and our Political relations. I would respond that we create those relations, and we can change them.

Rather than simply looking at the difficulties and limitations of our capacity for response, I would prefer to look at the new opportunities and the creative responses that interdependence would suggest.

Human ingenuity in the face of great crisis has been one of Mankind's greatest glories. I am not blind to the evil and greed in man, but there is, with God's grace, something which is never mentioned in all of these studies, an enormous reserve of goodwill to be mobilized. However, I also believe

that God's grace both proceeds and follows upon some effort of our own to create a new world where justice and equity are the prelude to peace. And I pray daily for this grace.

Sometimes a picture is worth a million words. Take a view of the Earth from the Moon, which reduces the size of our space craft Earth. Instead of ~~three-point six~~ or four point billion people, difficult to imagine, think of a crew of five persons each representing a segment of humanity.

The person representing us and our world, mostly Judeo-Christian, White, Western, Affluent, has the use of 80 percent of the life resources and amenities aboard our space craft. The other four crew members must share the 20 percent that is left.

This situation, although iniquitous and unjust, is still deteriorating. Our crewman is increasing his share to 90 percent at the moment, leaving two and a half percent for each of the other crew members.

Now I ask you, given the fundamental interdependence of a space craft's crew, which is ourselves, can you imagine such ~~much~~ lasting peace or order or good life <sup>aboard</sup> about this space craft? The other crew members are not just uneasy and frustrated, they are outraged, as well as hungry and hopeless, since our person seems also to have the only lethal weapon aboard.

If our person -- we ourselves -- does not begin to

perceive the utter injustice of the situation and begin to organize the use of these finite resources in a more just and humane fashion, he will ultimately, inevitably be overwhelmed by some manner of violence.

It is no chance affair that one of the most troubled nations of all, India, has just developed the atomic bomb. My thesis is that we have every theological, philosophical and humane imperative to change, to respond. And we can find creative ways of doing so, and we must, if we wish peace as well as survival.

What we need is some of the moral vision and the inspiring leadership which has informed the history of our country, and which makes us pause at the end of 200 years to ponder Lincoln's assessment of us as an "almost chosen people".

Thank you very much.

CARDINAL DEARDEN: Thank you, Father Hesburgh, for the fruit for abundant reflection.

I would invite the members of the panel to question Father Hesburgh.

Father Henroit?

FATHER HENROIT: Father Hesburgh, yesterday the news indicated that President Ford had made a decision regarding food and aid that would be given in the next couple of months. I wonder in light of the plea that you made just before

Thanksgiving that there be more humanitarian aid, and in the light of the fact that in the announcement it was indicated that Senator Humphrey has -- is working to allow a good deal of this humanitarian aid to go to Southeast Asia -- Vietnam, particularly -- what, do you feel that there is a momentum that will really answer some of the kinds of questions that you raised in your testimony at this time, or whether we still have a long ways to go?

Do you have an appraisal in the light of President Ford's decision and the efforts that you've been making in the past couple of months?

FATHER HESBURGH: Well, I'm happy about the decision to increase our aid because we've been pushing for it since before Thanksgiving. And if we don't get it on the ships pretty soon, as Bishop Swanstrom can tell you, it won't get there in time.

The real problem is going to be before the ~~Spring~~ Harvest in February -- this ~~Month~~ -- March, April, and especially in Southeast Asia.

I think that the next question that one asks once we get more aid, is, "Where is it going?". And we have to keep insisting that the "Food for Peace Program" began on a completely humanitarian basis, although there were overtones of cold war activity involved in it. <sup>In contrast, the</sup> ~~and that the lists that~~ I have seen that have gone to the President ~~for~~ for the

distribution of this food, some of them, at least, show more going to South Korea than goes to Bangladesh. Some show more going to Indochina than goes to India.)

And, of course, there is an increased allotment to Chile which at present is not exactly <sup>observing</sup> being human rights as we would like to see.

So the point that I would like to make is that it's a move in the right direction, and I applaud the President's action in doing so. I think that we should always applaud virtue. You don't get many points in <sup>Washington</sup> ~~this Town~~ for doing anything.

But in addition to that, I think that we should <sup>up</sup> keep the effort to see that it's going to be a humanitarian move. I would like, if I could on the basis of this question, Your Eminence, <sup>to</sup> mention something else that we are hoping to do here in Washington.

Every time that one goes to a Congressman or a Senator and talks about foreign aid, or food, or peace or disarmament, or almost <sup>anyone</sup> anything of the subjects that I have been referring to this morning, he says, "Yes, I agree with you but where is the constituency? There are no votes for it; there is no pressure for it."

And this has been a long-standing problem which existed also for ~~as all of you know,~~ for domestic political problems, <sup>such as</sup> ~~the~~ civil rights and other areas. The moment we

build a constituency for civil rights, we got the legislation and the action that we needed to start moving towards progress.

But in the case of the ~~Interdependent~~ World, there are all kinds of people interested in peace and justice and food and development, et cetera, but it's very hard to get the constituency together.

As you know, the domestic constituency was brought together very quickly and quite effectively by Common Cause under the leadership of John Gardner. And we are thinking very strongly this month of trying to put together a global lobby, if you will, comparable to the domestic lobby of Common Cause, that will work for justice and peace, <sup>for</sup> and the hungry of the world, <sup>for human</sup> and <sup>in</sup> development of the world.

We don't even know what it would be called; something like "Global Lobby" <sup>or "World Action"</sup> I suppose. But we are, ~~going to~~ hopefully <sup>in</sup> this next month or two, <sup>going to</sup> launch such an effort, so when people say, "What can I do?", we will say, "Send a few dollars to this lobby, and we are going to work for the things that you are most interested in."

CARDINAL DEARDEN: Yes, Dr. Dominguez?

DR. DOMINGUEZ: Yes, I would like to ask you on a subject that you touched briefly upon in your answer, which is food aid to ~~countries~~ such as Chile, or food aid to countries like South Vietnam.

One can argue that indeed there are people there

who could use the food, they could use the food in part because of the policies of the Governments of those countries that have created the conditions where internal problems of food have worsened.

And then it seems to me that one has to make a cruel choice of whether one provides food that may help a government which is of itself part of the problem, or whether one refuses aid and perhaps allows a condition of suffering in that country to continue further.

I wonder if you could reflect on that?

FATHER HESBURGH: Well, I'm for feeding hungry people under whatever regime they might live. I mean, ~~hungry~~ you can't argue with hunger, you feed ~~it~~ or you let a person die.

*new H*  
 And I don't think that we can walk by the person even though he may be under a politically repressive regime. But I think that we can talk consistently about the way that we give this help. If we give it, for example, to a Cambodia, *which* ~~who~~ then puts it in a market place and sells it, sometimes at profiteering prices, and uses it to buy more arms to keep a war going, you might want to argue with that system.

On the other hand, if it's given to Catholic Relief Service or World Relief Service, or some groups that altruistically go out and give it to the people *who* ~~that~~ are hungry and don't sell it and don't make profit out of it, but just try to

alleviate hunger, that's a different situation.

I would personally think that the tradition of our country in the past of letting millions of tons of this aid go through ~~the~~ people <sup>who</sup> ~~that~~ can be depended upon to give it to the hungry is better than giving it to governments ~~who either~~ <sup>who</sup> use it for ~~other~~ means for which it was not intended -- not for peace, but for war ~~and~~ <sup>⊗</sup> This is the kind of decision that one would make.

But if you want my opinion, I think you feed the hungry wherever they exist. But you find an effective way of doing it; you don't feed them in a way that <sup>will</sup> ~~you are trying to~~ bolster injustice.

CARDINAL DEARDEN: Ms. Acevedo?

MS. ACEVEDO: Yes, I have a question.

Very often the Catholic Church <sup>is</sup> participation in giving food to foreign countries <sup>has</sup> ~~have~~ become a victim of participating in the United States Foreign Policy.

How do you see this problem, especially <sup>when</sup> ~~we~~ are called paternalistic, and <sup>when</sup> ~~we~~ help the bandaid problem without solving the real problems?

FATHER HESBURGH: Mr. Butz at the World Food Conference said that food, like anything else is, a ~~if you will~~ <sup>will</sup> → an arrow in our quiver, or a means of foreign policy implementation. And while that is simply true in ~~any kind of~~ a view of ~~reale politique~~, and always has been, I go along the <sup>real politik</sup>

line of Father Hehir, who could say this better than I, that food isn't just like any other commodity.

You can certainly use certain commodities the way copper producing companies use copper, and the way oil producing companies use oil for political purposes. They all do it.

But copper and oil are not the staff of life in the sense that food ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup>. You can live without copper and oil if you absolutely have to, <sup>but</sup> you can't live without food. Therefore, food is a completely different kind of commodity, if you will. And you can't play games with people's lives or with their hunger.

And I think that one has to have a very altruistic purpose for being concerned about food. You say, "Well, why should we be concerned about it?" First, because we control the market, about 85 percent of it. And secondly, because it's the right thing to do, to feed hungry people.

It's always been interesting to me that when the Lord speaks of judgement, the first thing that he speaks of, <sup>is</sup> "I was hungry and you gave me to eat." It's interesting that in giving himself to us in the most visible tangible way possible, the Lord does it with food.

Food is in a very special kind of category no matter how you look at it, culturally, ~~the~~ anthropologically, or economically. And I would hope that in the present crisis

we take care of people who otherwise will starve, but I hope that food becomes so important a matter in our agenda that we really do the long range thing as well, which is provide for these people to become more self-sufficient in food.

And that is possible with some imagination and with modern technology. I don't know if I answered your question, Mrs. Acevedo.

MS. ACEVEDO: I'm unclear -- my question, I think, was ~~do you think~~ do you think that it's true that the Catholic Church <sup>is</sup> participating in helping distribute food, <sup>does</sup> help American ~~policy~~?

FATHER HESBURGH: No, no. I think they are helping hungry people.

But you may want to say something, I don't know.

I think they are helping hungry people. I -- you can get political about a lot of things, but food is not a very good instrumentality of politics, ~~I don't think.~~

CARDINAL DEARDEN: Thank you, Father Hesburgh.

We would like to pursue this further because this is interesting and instructive, but we are under extremely tight time pressures.

FATHER HESBURGH: I understand that.

CARDINAL DEARDEN: Thank you deeply for what you have presented to us.

(Applause.)