

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.

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, DESPITE THEIR DEPRIVATION
AND CONSTANT STRUGGLE, INSIST THEY ARE
NOT SUFFERING FROM HUNGER.

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.

I MENTION ALL THIS BECAUSE SOME PEOPLE BELIEVE
THE HUNGER ISSUE IS 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 MUST 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 AT A MINIMUM. THE "THRIFTY FOOD PLAN" WHICH THE PROGRAM IS BASED 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."

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 FIGURE OF 1983 TO 14.4 PERCENT IN 1984 -- ONE 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.

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.

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
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 ARE MUCH WORSE OFF
THAN ADULTS. IT IS ONLY NOW THAT WE REALIZED WE HAVE
A PROBLEM OF SIGNIFICANT 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.

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
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.

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 TO DO FOR OURSELVES WE ARE DOING
MORE FOR OTHERS, BUT 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 OUR APPARENT DRIFT TOWARD A
TWO-TIERED SOCIETY. A FEW THAT MERIT SPECIAL
ATTENTION INCLUDE:

- O AN UNEQUIVOCAL PUBLIC COMMITMENT TO
PROVIDE PEOPLE IN NEED WITH ACCESS TO A
DIET THAT IS BOTH NUTRITIOUS AND
AFFORDABLE.

- O 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 IS - 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 WE NEED TO REDRESS OUR
STAGGERING TRADE DEFICIT.

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.

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 OTHER IF THEY EXIST APART FROM EACH OTHER AND FAIL 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.