

A CORPORATE RESPONSE TO

HUNGER IN AMERICA

PRESENTED AT THE

SYMPOSIUM ON POVERTY AND WORLD HUNGER

JANUARY 18, 1986

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CENTER FOR NONVIOLENT SOCIAL CHANGE, INC.

REMARKS BY

WILLIAM S. WOODSIDE

CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

AMERICAN CAN COMPANY

I DEEPLY APPRECIATE YOUR INVITATION TO ADDRESSES
THIS SECOND NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON POVERTY AND
WORLD HUNGER, IT IS MOST APPROPRIATE THAT
THIS SYMPOSIUM BE HELD AS PART OF KING WEEK --
FOR THE SOCIAL JUSTICE THAT DR. KING FOUGHT
FOR DOES MEAN AN END TO THE DEBILITATION OF
POVERTY AND HUNGER.

WORLD HUNGER HAS RECEIVED A LOT OF ATTENTION
THIS YEAR IN THE AMERICAN PRESS AND ON RADIO
AND TELEVISION. AND TODAY, YOU HAVE ADDED TO
THE EFFORT TO ALLEVIATE THESE PROBLEMS.

BUT, I AM AFRAID WE AMERICANS WHO RESPOND TO
THE DEVASTATION OVERSEAS STILL DO NOT PAY
ENOUGH ATTENTION TO THE HUNGER THAT EXISTS IN
OUR OWN COUNTRY.

WE SEEM TO ASSUME THAT BECAUSE WE ARE THE
RICHEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD,
HUNGER EITHER DOES NOT EXIST OR
THAT IT EXISTS ONLY AS AN
OCCASIONAL AND SHORT-LIVED
PHENOMENA,

THAT IS NOT THE CASE,

HUNGER NOT ONLY EXISTS IN THIS COUNTRY. IT INCREASES EVERY DAY. THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS REPORTS CASELOADS HAVE INCREASED 300 TO 400 PERCENT IN THE FOOD PANTRIES AND SOUP KITCHENS OF THEIR CITIES. SIMILAR RESULTS ARE REPORTED BY THE FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER, SECOND HARVEST AND THE PHYSICIANS TASK FORCE ON HUNGER.

E
C

C

BUT YOU CAN'T REALLY UNDERSTAND HUNGER IN
AMERICA UNTIL YOU LOOK BEHIND THOSE NUMBERS AND
THOSE REPORTS. THEN YOU FIND A WOMAN WHOSE DIET
CONSISTS PRIMARILY OF COFFEE AND CRACKERS TWICE
A DAY, SO HER CHILDREN CAN HAVE THE SMALL AMOUNT
OF NOURISHING FOOD THAT IS AVAILABLE TO THE
FAMILY,

YOU FIND A FAMILY THAT TRIES NOT TO SPEND ANY
MONEY ON FOOD ONE WEEK A MONTH SO THE CHILDREN
CAN HAVE SHOES AND CLOTHING AND THE FAMILY CAN
STAY OUT OF DEBT,

YOU FIND AN ELDERLY WOMAN WHO EATS A CUP OF
BEANS AND A SMALL SQUARE OF FRIED BREAD EACH
DAY -- AND NOTHING ELSE -- BECAUSE SHE IS TOO
EMBARRASSED TO ASK FOR HELP.

You FIND A ONE YEAR OLD BABY WHO WEIGHS ONLY
15 POUNDS AND CAN BARELY SIT UP,

You FIND PEOPLE WHO, R DEPRIVATION
AND CONSTANT STRL: INSIST THEY ARE
NOT SUFFERING FRON i-

THESE PEOPLE ARE YOUNG, MIDDLE-AGED AND
ELDERLY. THEY ARE WHITE, BLACK, HISPANIC,
ASIAN AND NATIVE AMERICAN. THEY LIVE IN
CITIES, SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL AREAS, THEY ARE
FOUND IN EVERY SECTION OF THIS NATION, THEY
INCLUDE THE CHRONICALLY POOR AND THE WORKING
POOR. FOR SOME, THE STRUGGLE FOR FOOD IS A
FAMILIAR STORY. FOR OTHERS, IT IS A NEW
EXPERIENCE.

BUT THOUGH THEIR SITUATIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES
ARE DIFFERENT, THEY ALL SHARE A COMMON BOND:
THEY ARE HUNGRY OR MALNOURISHED,

MENTION ALL PEOPLE BELIEVE

THE **HUNGER ISSUES ARE OVERSTATED OR OVER-DRAMATIZED**

IN THE U.S. THE SKEPTICS SAY THE FAMILY THAT

MISSES FOUR MEALS A MONTH HAS A DIFFERENT

LEVEL OF NEED THAN THE FAMILY THAT MISSES

TEN MEALS A MONTH. THEY SAY ONE SHOULD

NOT

COMPARE THE FAMILY THAT HAS BEEN UNABLE

TO PROVIDE ENOUGH FOOD FOR THEIR CHILDREN

FOR A

YEAR WITH THE FAMILY THAT HAS ONLY BEEN

IN THAT SITUATION FOR A FEW WEEKS. THEY

SAY DO NOT PLACE THE PERSON WHO DOES

NOT REGARD HIMSELF OR HERSELF AS A VICTIM

OF HUNGER IN THE SAME CATEGORY AS A

PERSON WHO DOES.

IN A NARROW SENSE, THESE CRITICS ARE RIGHT.

THE MILLIONS OF HUNGRY OR MALNOURISHED AMERICANS ARE NOT ALL IN THE SAME CIRCUMSTANCES. THEIR LEVELS OF NEED DO VARY. THEIR VIEWS OF THEMSELVES VARY. THEIR HOPES, EXPECTATIONS AND EXPERIENCES ALL VARY, SO DO THE BUREAUCRATIC OBSTACLES THEY OVERCOME IN ORDER TO OBTAIN FOOD FROM GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.

BUT HUNGER IS NOT A COMPETITION TO DETERMINE WHO IS THE MOST HUNGRY, THE MOST NEEDY, THE MOST DESERVING, IT IS NOT A CONTEST IN WHICH THE GOAL IS TO DEVISE A SCALE OF NEED AND THEN RIGOROUSLY DOLE OUT OUR COMPASSION AND ASSISTANCE TO THOSE WHO MEET THE APPROPRIATE CRITERIA.

DO WE WANT A STANDARD OF NEED THAT
SAYS ONLY THE DESPERATE SHOULD APPLY?

DO WE HONESTLY

BELIEVE THAT PEOPLE WHO HAVE MAINTAINED
THEIR PRIDE AND DIGNITY DO NOT FEEL THE
PANGS OF HUNGER OR THE PAIN OF BEING
UNABLE TO ADEQUATELY CARE FOR THEIR
FAMILIES? OF COURSE NOT.

THE ISSUES WE NEED TO ADDRESS ARE NOT
WHETHER FAMILY A IS HUNGRIER THAN FAMILY
B; MR. X MORE CAPABLE OF PROVIDING FOR
HIS CHILDREN THAN MR. Z; OR THE RATIO
BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE
WHO ARE CHRONICALLY HUNGRY AND THE
NUMBER WHO ARE EPISODICALLY HUNGRY.
THAT DEBATE HELPS NOBODY, THE ISSUES
WE NEED TO ADDRESS ARE:

FIRST, OUR INADEQUATE RESPONSE TO THE
HUNGER THAT EXISTS IN THIS COUNTRY TODAY.

SECOND, THE POVERTY THAT IS THE PRIMARY
CAUSE OF HUNGER,

THIRD, THE VERY REAL POSSIBILITY THAT WE ARE
BECOMING A TWO-TIERED SOCIETY - A SOCIETY
DIVIDED BY INCOME, LIVING STANDARD,
EDUCATION,

HEALTH AND OPPORTUNITY; A SOCIETY THAT
IS PERHAPS TOO COMPLACENT ABOUT
POVERTY AND HUNGER.

THE SHORTCOMINGS OF FEDERAL NUTRITION
PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN AMPLY DOCUMENTED
BY MANY DIFFERENT SOURCES. SOME \$12
BILLION HAS BEEN CUT FROM THESE
PROGRAMS IN THE PAST THREE YEARS --

\$7 BILLION FROM THE FOOD STAMP
PROGRAM AND \$5 BILLION FROM THE
SCHOOL MEAL PROGRAMS,

THE FEDERAL FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NO LONGER IS A
PROGRAM BASED ON HOW MUCH IT ACTUALLY COSTS
PEOPLE TO EAT. IT'S A PROGRAM DESIGNED TO
KEEP FEDERAL SPENDING FROM GETTING TOO HIGH, THE
"THRIFTY FOOD PLAN" WHICH THE PROGRAM
IS BASED ON IS THE CHEAPEST FOOD PLAN EVER
DEvised BY THE **U.S.** DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.
"THE THRIFTY FOOD PLAN," AS ONE
TASK FORCE NOTED, "IS AN EXAMPLE
OF BUREAUCRACY GONE
AWRY. **A** FEDERAL EXPENDITURE LEVEL
WAS SET, AND A COMPUTER WAS
PROGRAMMED TO DESIGN A FOOD PLAN
EQUAL TO THAT LEVEL -- IRRESPECTIVE
OF HUMAN NEEDS,"

C

C

C)

C

0

THE SECOND ISSUE WE HAVE TO ADDRESS IS WHY PEOPLE ARE HUNGRY OR MALNOURISHED, MANY REASONS CAN BE CITED: UNEMPLOYMENT, REDUCED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, BUDGET CUTS IN FEDERAL AND STATE "SAFETY NET" PROGRAMS, THE INCREASED TAX BURDEN PLACED ON THE WORKING POOR, INCREASED LIVING COSTS WHILE INCOME REMAINS STABLE OR DECLINES, AND INADEQUATE NUTRITIONAL INFORMATION, BUT THE BASIC REASON MOST PEOPLE GO HUNGRY IS THAT THEY ARE POOR, THEY JUST DON'T HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO BUY THE FOOD THEY AND THEIR FAMILIES NEED.

LAST FALL, YOU MAY REMEMBER, 'THE CENSUS BUREAU REPORTED THAT POVERTY HAD DECLINED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN SEVERAL YEARS, DROPPING FROM THE 15.2 PERCENT TGI.TF 1983 TO 14.4 PERCENT IN 1984 OF THE MOST SUBSTANTIAL DECLINES IN THE PAST 17 YEARS. SINCE THE POVERTY RATE TRADITIONALLY MOVES IN CLOSE TANDEM WITH THE ECONOMY, THIS DATA PROVIDED GROUNDS FOR SOME OPTIMISM.

EXCEPT THAT THE MOST SIGNIFICANT NEW DATA TO EMERGE FROM THE NEW CENSUS REPORT WERE NOT THE NUMBERS SHOWING A DECLINE IN POVERTY BETWEEN THIS YEAR AND LAST YEAR. THEY WERE THE NUMBERS SHOWING HIGH RATES OF POVERTY CONTINUING TO PERSIST OVER TIME IN SPITE OF THE FACT THAT UNEMPLOYMENT HAS BEEN STEADILY DECLINING.

THE IMPLICATIONS ARE STUNNING, BECAUSE THE
DATA SUGGESTS THAT DESPITE YEAR-TO-YEAR
SHIFTS IN POVERTY RATES, A DRAMATIC
INCREASE HAS OCCURRED IN THE BASIC
BEDROCK OF POVERTY, IN OTHER WORDS, A
SUBSTANTIALLY LARGER GROUP OF
PEOPLE IS RELATIVELY UNAFFECTED BY
IMPROVEMENTS IN OVERALL ECONOMIC
PERFORMANCE, WE HAVE, IT SEEMS, REACHED A
NEW PLATEAU OF POVERTY, AND IT'S A HIGHER
PLATEAU, NOT A LOWER ONE,
THIS BRINGS ME TO MY THIRD POINT,

a

D

FOR THE PAST FEW YEARS, WE HAVE WITNESSED THE
FULL DEBILITATING EFFECT OF POVERTY -- OF
HOMELESSNESS, HUNGER, UNEMPLOYMENT, ILLITERACY,
ISOLATION, LACK OF OPPORTUNITY; NOT NECESSARILY
ALL AT ONCE, BUT FREQUENTLY ENOUGH AND IN
COMBINATIONS THAT MAKE IT ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE
FOR LARGE NUMBERS OF PEOPLE TO ESCAPE FROM
THIS TRAP INTO WHICH THEY HAVE FALLEN,

Now, HOWEVER, I FEAR WE MAY BE WITNESSING
SOMETHING ELSE: A NATION ON THE WAY TO
BECOMING A TWO-TIERED SOCIETY: ONE AFFLUENT,
WELL-HOUSED, WELL-EDUCATED, WELL-FED, IN GOOD
HEALTH AND FULLY EMPLOYED; THE OTHER POOR,
INADEQUATELY HOUSED, INADEQUATELY FED,
UNEMPLOYED OR UNDEREMPLOYED, AND IN POOR
HEALTH,

a

THE NEW YORK TIMES TOOK NOTE OF THIS TREND
IN A FRONT PAGE ARTICLE ON POVERTY AND
YOUTH ON OCTOBER 20. "COMPLEX SOCIAL,
ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS ARE
CREATING A VAST NEW

(f)

CLASS OF POOR AMERICANS WHO ARE MUCH
YOUNGER, LESS EDUCATED AND LIKELY TO GIVE
BIRTH SOONER THAN RECENT GENERATIONS OF
THE POOR," THE TIMES NOTED,

THE ARTICLE POINTED OUT THAT 32
PERCENT OF ALL CHILDREN LIVING IN
POVERTY WERE BLACK

()

EVEN THOUGH BLACKS COMPRISED ONLY 15
PERCENT OF THE POPULATION; MORE THAN
HALF OF ALL POOR CHILDREN LIVED WITH
THEIR MOTHERS IN A SINGLE-PARENT HOME;
AND THAT POVERTY RATES NOW WERE
INCREASING AMONG TWO-PARENT

HOUSEHOLDS AS WELL.

THE REASONS FOR AND IMPLICATIONS ABOUT THE
DATA WERE NOT FULLY CLEAR. BUT THE TRENDS
WERE FRIGHTENING ENOUGH TO DRAW THE FOLLOWING
COMMENT FROM SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN:

"THE U.S. TODAY MAY BE THE FIRST SOCIETY IN
HISTORY WHERE CHILDREN MUCH WORSE OFF
THAN ADULTS. I REALIZED WE HAVE
A PROBLEM OF SIGNII-ICANT SOCIAL CHANGE UNLIKE
ANYTHING WE HAVE EXPERIENCED IN THE PAST,
AND WE ARE COMPLETELY IGNORING IT."

SO HOW DO WE AVOID THIS CHAIN OF EVENTS?

WE START WITH A CHANGE OF ATTITUDES.

O

AMERICA IN 1985 IS A COUNTRY THAT, ON THE WHOLE, IS PRETTY SATISFIED WITH ITSELF, MOST

OF US ARE IN GOOD FINANCIAL SHAPE, WE CERTAINLY HAVE MORE LUXURIES AND LEISURE TIME THAN WE

EVER EXPECTED TO HAVE, AND WE WANT TO PROTECT AND MAINTAIN ALL THAT WE HAVE ACCUMULATED.

THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH THAT. BUT

I WONDER IF TOO MANY OF US ARE

STARTING TO FEEL THAT THE ONLY WAY TO

KEEP WHAT WE HAVE IS TO MAKE SURE

NOBODY ELSE GETS ANY. I WONDER IF THE

EMOTIONAL GENEROSITY THAT ONCE WAS THE

O

HALLMARK OF THIS COUNTRY IS BEGINNING

TO GIVE WAY TO A MEAN-SPIRITEDNESS; A

SENSE OF I'VE-GOT-MINE-AND-THAT'S-ALL-

THAT-COUNTS";

A FEELING THAT IF YOU'RE POOR, IT'S

YOUR OWN FAULT; IF YOU'RE HANDICAPPED, IT'S BECAUSE YOU

DON'T HAVE THE WILL TO CHANGE,

- 17 -

WE USE WORDS LIKE "FAMILY," "COMMUNITY,"
"SHARING," AND "UNDERSTANDING," BUT THOSE
WORDS WILL HAVE LITTLE MEANING IF OUR PEOPLE
AND OUR INSTITUTIONS BECOME INCREASINGLY
DISCONNECTED AND ISOLATED FROM EACH OTHER,

ALL OF US WANT **OURSELVES WE ARE DOING**
MORE FOR OTHERS, WE NEED TO BE CAREFUL THAT
WHEN WE TALK THE LANGUAGE OF SACRIFICE,

WE DO NOT PRACTICE THE POLITICS OF SELFISHNESS,

PERHAPS OUR AWARENESS THAT THE ECONOMIC PIE,
ONCE CONSIDERED INFINITE, ACTUALLY HAS SOME
LIMITS IS THE REASON FOR THIS APPARENT SHIFT
IN NATIONAL ATTITUDES, WHATEVER THE REASON,
THE TASK BEFORE US REMAINS THE SAME, THIS
NATION NEEDS TO REDISCOVER THE SOCIAL VISION
IT HAS HAD IN YEARS PAST: A SOCIAL VISION
BASED ON SOMETHING MORE MEANINGFUL AND MORE
ENDURING THAN A DESIRE TO PROTECT THE PERSONAL
POSSESSIONS WE HAVE ACCUMULATED AND THE STATUS
WE HAVE ATTAINED IN OUR PRIVATE LIVES. WE NEED
TO DEVELOP A CONSENSUS BASED ON COMPASSION FOR
OTHERS, THAT LOOKS AT HUNGER, POVERTY AND LACK
OF OPPORTUNITY NOT AS ECONOMIC, MEDICAL OR EVEN
POLITICAL ISSUES; BUT AS HUMAN ISSUES.

I BELIEVE WE CAN REAWAKEN THAT SENSE OF
CARING AND COMPASSION.

MANY PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN ADVANCED THAT WOULD ALLOW THIS NATION TO COMBAT HUNGER, REDUCE POVERTY AND STOP APPARENT DRIFT TOWARD A TWO-TIERED SOCIETY. THE PROPOSALS THAT MERIT SPECIAL ATTENTION INCLUDE:

- 0 AN UNEQUIVOCAL PUBLIC COMMITMENT TO PROVIDE PEOPLE IN NEED WITH ACCESS TO A DIET THAT IS BOTH NUTRITIOUS AND AFFORDABLE,
- 0 JOB CREATION STRATEGIES THAT ENABLE LOW-INCOME PERSONS TO COMPETE MORE EFFECTIVELY IN THE JOB MARKET.

0 USING OUR TAX SYSTEM AS A MEANS OF
KEEPING PEOPLE OUT OF POVERTY,

0 NATIONAL MINIMUM BENEFIT LEVELS TIED TO
INFLATION FOR THOSE WHO WILL CONTINUE TO
NEED PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS SUCH AS
AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN,

0 AND YES, COALITIONS AND PUBLIC PRIVATE
PARTNERSHIPS THAT INVOLVE ALL SECTORS IN
THE EFFORT TO STIMULATE OUR ELECTED
REPRESENTATIVES TO SET APPROPRIATE
PRIORITIES AND ACT ON THEM.

WHEN THE CHAIRMAN OF A MAJOR AMERICAN
CORPORATION PROPOSES INCREASED FEDERAL
SPENDING FOR PROGRAMS DEALING WITH HUNGER AND
POVERTY, SOMEONE - - WHAT ABOUT
THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR? CLEARLY, THERE
IS A ROLE FOR VOLUNTARISM AND PRIVATE SECTOR
PROGRAMS AIMED AT COMBATING HUNGER AND POVERTY,
PRIVATE OR VOLUNTARY EFFORTS ARE FREQUENTLY
MORE RESPONSIVE TO INDIVIDUALS THAN LARGE
BUREAUCRACIES, AND THERE ARE ASPECTS TO THESE
PROBLEMS THAT DO NOT LEND THEMSELVES TO
POLITICAL OR PUBLIC POLICY SOLUTIONS,

I AM A BUSINESSMAN WHO WAS TRAINED
AS AN ECONOMIST, I KNOW THE DANGERS
OF DEFICIT
SPENDING, AND I STRONGLY FAVOR A PROGRAM
THAT REDUCES THE DEFICIT, I KNOW WE
NEED TO
SUSTAIN LONG-TERM, NON-INFLATIONARY
ECONOMIC GROWTH, I KNOW REDRESS OUR
STAGGERING TRADE.

BASICALLY, THOUGH, THE TASKS BEFORE US ARE
ONES IN WHICH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
MUST TAKE THE MAJOR LEADERSHIP ROLE,
THE PRIVATE SECTOR CAN HELP, BUT THE
BASIC LEADERSHIP, COMMITMENT AND FUNDING
MUST COME FROM GOVERNMENT, THERE

SIMPLY IS NO OTHER WAY, WE HAVE SEEN
HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF IN THE PAST FIVE
YEARS WITH THE INCREASE IN HUNGER AND
WE HAVE THE MODELS FOR AN EFFECTIVE
SOLUTION,

WE CANNOT BE DETERRED BY THOSE WHO
SAY THE FEDERAL DEFICIT IS OUR FIRST
PRIORITY,

BUT I AM UNWILLING TO PUT OFF
RENEWING OUR COMMITMENT TO THE POOR
AND THE HUNGRY UNTIL WE PUT OUR
ECONOMIC HOUSE IN ORDER. I AM
UNWILLING BECAUSE WE ARE SEEING MORE
AND MORE EVIDENCE THAT THE GAP
BETWEEN THE RICH AND THE POOR CAN
WIDEN EVEN WHEN THERE IS ECONOMIC
GROWTH. I AM UNWILLING BECAUSE
I THINK PROGRAMS TO ALLEVIATE POVERTY AND
HUNGER SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY NATIONAL
NEED, NOT THE OFTEN ABSTRACT AND
UNATTAINABLE CONCEPT OF
"DOLLAR AVAILABILITY." I AM UNWILLING
BECAUSE THE POOR AND THE HUNGRY HAVE
BEEN ASKED TO SHOULDER TOO MANY BUDGET
CUTS ALREADY.

O

O

CUTS IN SOCIAL PROGRAMS DEALING WITH
POVERTY AND HUNGER ONLY INCREASE
SUFFERING WHILE MAKING A TOKEN IMPACT
ON THE DEFICIT, IF WE REALLY WANT TO
MAKE A DENT IN THE DEFICIT, THERE IS
MORE THAN ENOUGH FAT IN THE DEFENSE
BUDGET TO SUPPORT DEFICIT REDUCTION AND
INCREASED SPENDING FOR THE HUNGER AND
POVERTY PROGRAMS I HAVE DESCRIBED, WE ARE
CONTINUALLY TOLD WE MUST CHOOSE BETWEEN
GUNS AND BUTTER. BUT THIS COUNTRY DOESN'T
NEED TO CHOOSE BETWEEN GUNS AND BUTTER.
THIS COUNTRY NEEDS TO STOP USING THE
BUTTER MONEY TO BUY GUNS. THIS IS
ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT AS WE GRAPPLE
WITH BALANCED BUDGET LEGISLATION, WE CAN
NOT ALLOW FURTHER CUTS IN HUNGER AND
POVERTY PROGRAMS.

FINALLY, WE NEED TO
REMEMBER THAT WE ARE NOT
JUST A PLURALISTIC
SOCIETY; WE ARE ALSO AN
INTERDEPENDENT SOCIETY.
AND NO SOCIETY, NO MATTER
HOW STRONG OR SECURE IT
FEELS AT ANY GIVEN MOMENT,
CAN SURVIVE IF ITS PEOPLE
LOSE

SIGHT OF EACH THEY EXIST APART FROM
EACH OTHER AND TO RESPOND TO EACH OTHER.

THAT IS THE DANGER BEFORE
US AND WHY, IN MY
JUDGEMENT, WE SHOULD PAY
PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO
WHAT FRANKLIN DELANO

ROOSEVELT TOLD US

MORE THAN 50 YEARS AGO. "THE
TEST OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY,
ROOSEVELT SAID, IS NOT HOW
WELL WE TAKE CARE OF OUR
AFFLUENT. IT IS HOW WELL WE
TAKE CARE OF OUR POOR."

THANK YOU.