Interview with Philip Bradshaw

#AI-A-L-2007-030

Interview # 1: November 14, 2007
Interviewer: Dr. Richard Hull

Hull: This is Dr. Richard Hull and I'm recording an interview with Philip Bradshaw. The location is at my farm at Griggsville and the date is November 14, 2007. Okay. Phil, your age?

Bradshaw: Sixty-eight. Born April 13, 1939.

Hull: Good enough. You were raised on a farm, is that right?

Bradshaw: Yes, out in here in Griggsville, Illinois. Just west of town one mile.

Hull: Particularly the Bradshaw family has had a history of living here for a long time. Is that right?

Bradshaw: My grandfather came from Kentucky in 1889 and settled in the Barry-Griggsville area. He was seventeen years old and actually walked up here.

Hull: While you were a young kid did you show any livestock?

Bradshaw: I showed hogs and pigs. I had Poland China pigs; most of the time I showed hogs. I showed at the Logan County Fair; I never did a show at the State Fair. Just never did go to state fair.

Hull: You were educated here in Griggsville?

Bradshaw: Went all twelve years of school because there was no kindergarten when I went to school. Went all twelve years here in Griggsville and graduated from high school in 1957. I graduated from Western Illinois University with a degree in ag and business. I took just as many classes in the College of Business as I did in the College of Ag.

Hull: You attended all four years at Western…

Bradshaw: At Western, yes. I had a think they called it a normal teacher's scholarship in those days. I had a scholarship that took care of all the tuition and college expenses. It didn't cover my room and board but it covered my tuition and college expenses and so I stayed there for four years.

Hull: Did you do any teaching?

Bradshaw: I started substituting in 1960. The ag teacher at Griggsville was Mr. Glenn Willard. He was working on his master's degree so he'd be gone in the summer. So before I even had my degree from Western, I would substitute for him while he was working on his master's degree in the summer. He was gone a couple a weeks in the regular school year working on his master's degree so I substituted for him then. After I graduated in 1961, I came back to the farm in 1963. From 1963 to 1966, I substituted for the ag teacher and a few times for the other classes. Then in either 1965 or the second semester – I think it was the second semester or the first half of 1966—I taught for one semester. Mr. Willard had left this school in the middle of the year and went to Dwight, Illinois. They didn't have an ag teacher so I came in. By that time I was farming full-time. Of course, I had one daughter and another on the way so I was pretty busy. I did substitute and I taught full-time for one semester.

Hull: But your main interest was to pursue a life of farming, is that right?

Bradshaw: Yes. You know I always took ag and I thought I'd do that. My grandfather who owned the farm passed away in 1960. Although he owned quite a few acres, there were a lot of children involved so I didn't know whether I'd have a chance or not. I got out of college in 1961 and started selling life insurance and mutual funds. I worked that job for about eighteen months and then I came up on the draft. I was going to be drafted. In January of 1962, I joined the U.S. Army Reserves. I went to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri for six months: April through October. I took my basic training and my advanced training. Then I served six years in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1962 to 1968.

Hull: Why did you decide to become a farmer?

Bradshaw: I grew up on a farm. Then I was selling life insurance and mutual funds when I had to go into the Army. Came back from the Army in the fall of 1962. I had an uncle who had two daughters who both graduated from the University of Illinois. One daughter had married a doctor of nuclear engineering and the other daughter had married a fella who had his master's degree in foreign economics. Both of them had no intentions of coming back until the son-in-law did.

Well, my uncle had a good farm where I live now. He—actually his wife—asked me to help him with his crop work for the spring of 1962. I'd always worked out there through high school and college. They asked me if I'd want to come out and help. So I did help a little bit in the spring of 1962. Then they asked if I'd maybe start farming. In the spring of 1963, I put in some of the crops and

started farming. I started buying in with the cattle and the hogs in the spring of 1963. That gave me the opportunity to farm.

In the meantime, my grandfather had died and my father had to buy his brothers and sisters out. My grandfather had twelve children—six boys, six girls—all two years apart. (I actually have first cousins that are ninety-something years old and I've never met them. That's kind of the family history there.) But anyway my dad had to buy out in order to get the farm operation that he'd been on all his life. He had to buy his brothers and sisters out. In the meantime, my mother had died. Dad sold that to my two brothers on a long-term contract. Later, my uncle sold the farm to me on a long-term contract. There just wasn't enough farm there at home given the circumstances for me. So when my uncle gave me the chance, that's when I started farming.

Hull: What type of farming was it?

Bradshaw: In those days, we had general grain, but we raised mostly corn. We had one field of soybeans and one field of wheat; the rest of it would be corn. But probably half the farm was in grass. We'd buy short yearling calves. They would be four-hundred-pound calves. We'd winter them, feed them on the grass and sell them fourteen to eighteen months later. Buy them at four hundred pounds; sell them at twelve hundred pounds. Common practice in this part of the country then. We did that for actually about four or five years. Then we started getting into hog business more.

Hull: I see. Then you eventually purchased that farm?

Bradshaw: Yeah. I actually I told my aunt and uncle in late 1962 and 1963 that I would not go out there unless they would be willing to sell me the farm. I said right up front that I don't want to be renting the farm all my life. I want to buy the farm. If you're going to sell it to me make it so I can buy it. I'll come out; we'll start farming but if you ain't going to sell it to me I'm not interested in doing it. In 1969 I had an opportunity to buy some other land. In 1969 we established a price and everything. My uncle wanted to wait until he was sixty-five. So he did not actually sell me the farm until 1972. But the price was established. The basic payments and everything was established in 1969.

Hull: When did you get involved with farm organizations? What was the first one that you really actually got involved with?

Bradshaw: I suppose it was clear back to 4H. I was president of 4H; I was President of Local FAA club back in high school. Then I came back and basically from 1963 to 1968, I didn't do anything but farm and go to Army reserve meetings. They were once a week and summer camp for two weeks in the summer. Then in 1968, they started the Illinois Pork Producers. They started a little earlier than that but it was called the Old Swine Herd Improvement Association early on. In the early sixties to the mid-sixties, they changed it to the Illinois Pork Producers [Association]. In

1968 they were going to start the voluntary check-off. Pike County, at that time, was the second largest producer of hogs of any county in the United States. It was second only to Henry County, Illinois. If I remember right, we were producing somewhere around 650,000 pigs outside on the hills in Pike County. Some of the fellas asked me if I'd be interested in help starting that organization. That was the fall of 1968. That's when I became president of the Pike County Pork Producers.

As soon as I became president of the Pike County Pork Producers, then state veterinarian Dr. Paul Dolby asked me if I would go on the State Hog Cholera Eradication Committee. I did. By going on that, that automatically got me involved with the National Hog Cholera Eradication Program. At the same time we started the voluntary—I think one of the first livestock check-off programs for commodities in the country. That was started by the Pork Producers. It was two counties in Illinois and two counties in Iowa. We did the voluntary checkoff. I got involved with that right off the bat. It was 1968 when I got involved.

Hull: Was the mission of the organization prior to the Illinois Pork Producers any different than the mission of the Illinois Pork Producers?

Bradshaw: Not really. Before the Pork Producers were started, the funding was always just strictly membership volunteer contributions and donations. We worked very closely with Farm Bureau and cooperative extension. The primary focus was on herd improvement through better genetics and better nutrition. A group of sixty-some got together in the Quad Cities; I think they met up in Moline or Rock Island. In 1963 I was not involved in this meeting even though I was involved with some of the earlier meetings. They decided they were going to start a national pork organization so they could promote their pork and their product as well as doing production research and advancement in the nutrition and genetics. That's when they started—in 1963. But prior to that, it had been primarily strictly directed at improving the genetics and improving the nutrition and the health of the animals. Of course that relates to food safety.

Hull: Were the same individuals involved with both organizations?

Bradshaw: Yeah, pretty well. It carried right over; a lot of them had been involved. The late George Brower, I know for one, had been involved. Dash Johnson here in the state. Russ Jeckel—there are a lot of the old timers. Gimp Frickey. A lot of these guys are gone now. Most of them are gone now. Willard Corsmar. A lot of those guys had been involved back in the Old Herd Improvement Association.

Hull: Then you became the president of the state…

Bradshaw: Yeah. It was in 1970. We had our state convention and at that convention I was nominated and elected to serve on the Illinois Pork Producers board. That's a six-year term. In 1971, my second year on the board, I was elected by one vote over another fine gentleman— Jerry King. He went on and became president later. I was elected president and served three years; I was the only president the Pork

Producers ever had that served three years. The reason I served three years was that we had an executive officer that didn't work out well for us and left. The board felt like I needed to stay as president another year until we got a new executive officer.

While we're talking about that, I'd like to go back. (I know when I say this, I'm going to miss some people.) In late 1967 or early 1968, a group of real true leaders in the pork industry—George Brower, Russ Jeckel, Jim Lucas, Ab Gillball, Bess Johnson—put up money to hire Chuck Bloomberg to be the first Executive Officer of the Illinois Pork Producers Association. I can't remember them all right now. Chuck Bloomberg was a senior at the University of Illinois, so he left the university and took this position. He did a great job. He was one of those fellas that never forgot anybody's name. That tells us about Chuck Bloomberg.

We had the first few meetings in our home. The Pike County Pork Producers was started around my dining room table. The first meeting where we invited a large group was at the community center in Pittsfield. Chuck Bloomberg came over to talk to the group. It wasn't a big group; I'm going to say thirty, maybe thirty-five people. Chuck Bloomberg came into the room and had everybody introduce themselves. We walked out the door and he called every one of us by name and was correct. There were around thirty of us in the room. That tells you a little bit about Chuck Bloomberg.

It was guys like Chuck Bloomberg and Roland "Pig" Paul on the national level that made this happen. These individuals—and I know I missed some and I apologize for missing them—put up their own private money to hire and guarantee Chuck a job. He worked out of Cornelia Hodges' house. Cornelia Hodges was the lady that had kind of a bookkeeping and record keeping business in her basement. That's where our records and everything was kept all the time I was president of the Pork Producers. Basically that was our office there in the west side of Springfield.

Hull: You've seen the Illinois Pork Producers—the progression that they've taken to a national level. You were involved with state and national level. Can you summarize how that has changed over the years?

Bradshaw: Yes, when we started of course it was strictly people who put up money. When we started the Pork Producers here in Pike County, it was dues. There wasn't very much—it was ten, fifteen, twenty dollars. I'd have to say the forerunner to the United Feed is here now. The King family—M.D. King and Clark King—owned the King Business. They were big helps to us. They had Don Sloan who was manager of their feed division. They did a lot of the mailings and a lot of that kind of stuff for us.

When I was president here in Pike County, it basically was all volunteers. The dues, I think, were either $5 or $10 a person. So it wasn't much money. That was

true in the state too. That's why in 1968 they just had to find some way to raise money. That's when we started the Nickels for Profit campaign. We started in two counties in Iowa and two counties in Illinois. We went around and got farmers to give us a nickel for every pig they sold. When they took the hogs into town and sold them at the order buyer and yards or wherever, they gave us a nickel. That's the way we got the money to pay Chuck Bloomberg and the staff. I've got us to give the late Jim Lucas a little credit. Early on, old Jim was handling a lot of feeder pigs. He gave us two cents a pig for his feeder pigs. That little bit of money from those two sources gave us a salary and expenses for Chuck Bloomberg and Cornelia Hodges.

In 1970, I believe, we decided to go nationally with the check-off. That's what Chuck Bloomberg's job was. He went all around to all the hog buying stations in the state. Then we had Roland "Pig" Paul on the national level. Every major hog producing state had an executive officer who went around to all the buying stations and asked them to ask the producers to have the nickel taken out when they sold their pigs. They asked the buying stations to send that money in to either the national or the state. That's the way it was; it was a nickel. Then later they went to ten cents, but it was very difficult.

When you'd ask people if they wanted the nickel taken out of their check, the natural reaction was to say, "No, I don't think I need to do that." So we went around and got everybody to agree to what we called implied consent. What that meant was, if you didn't tell you "no" they just took it out. That was one of the things that really made a big difference. This happened while I was president. That increased our check-off tremendously.

But we were never able to get much over 50 to 60 percent of the hogs checked off nationally. Here in Illinois, I think probably the highest it ever got was 60 percent. That's when they decided they'd go to a national referendum and have a mandatory check-off from the federal government. That was put in sometime in the eighties. I can't remember just when that did go in. But that was put in and now it is the mandatory check-off. Now I think the rate is nationally $40 to $50 million dollars. So it's really changed over the years.

Hull: Was that mandatory check-off hard to come by?

Bradshaw: It took a lot of work. A lot of people had to go out and down the road because you had to get legislation passed through the United States House and Senate and signed by the President. Then you had—I can't remember what it was—maybe fifteen or sixteen months until you had to have a referendum that meant half of the producers had to vote in support of the check-off. So it was a major undertaking.

Hull: You mentioned before that you were involved with the eradication of hog cholera through the Illinois Pork Producers and the national. Do you want to elaborate on that just a little bit?

Bradshaw: If memory serves me correct—I think I'm right—in 1972 it was decided that they would eradicate hog cholera, which is known as "swine fever" in a lot of the world. The USDA had just organized the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service. It actually had been a little different name than that prior to 1972. Dr. Frank Mullerns, one of the first administrators—along with the U.S. Animal Health Association and the old LCI which is now the NIAA, the National Institute for Animal Agriculture…

Hull: N.I., double A.

Bradshaw: N.I., double A. Those groups all went together and thought the best thing for the pork industry was to eliminate hog cholera. When I was in high school, my father and my uncle were in partners on six hundred head of hogs—which was a lot of hogs in the fifties – and they got hog cholera. They lost, I don't know, two or three hundred head of hogs or almost half of the six hundred. I remember Dr. Frank O'Connor, who was a veterinarian in the community for years, had just come to town. My dad and my uncle had him vaccinate every pig on the place for hog cholera—one of the bigger jobs he'd had. I can't remember but I think we vaccinated a thousand or some pigs. So, I suppose, even in high school I saw what disease could do. It had just devastated our income. I had seen the magnitude of the death of the animals. I suppose that probably pushed me a little this way.

Then I went on the cholera committee. I can really say I did very little to help with the eradication of hog cholera. I attended a lot of meetings and did some speaking. I tell this one story to show how it happens: the late Dr. Paul Dolby—state veterinarian—asked me to go with him to Knox County. So I went to Knox County with him. I think I actually drove up and just met him up there. At this meeting there was a lot of people. That was the time they were starting to talk about stopping vaccine. They were saying, "We're not going to vaccinate anymore." At that time, there was a modified live virus vaccine; some people thought it was spreading disease or could. So they decided to stop vaccinating.

There was a group of—I'm going to say—one hundred to one hundred fifty farmers in the room. Dr. Paul Dolby got up and said, "Come a certain date, we're going to stop vaccinating for hog cholera. It'll be illegal to buy vaccine in Illinois." They called that man everything but a white man—I won't say on the recording here—but there was a little profanity used at the good state vet that night. A few of us came to his rescue and maybe not as much, as I look back, as I should have in an open meeting. But in private conversations we did. The local pork leadership in the county stepped right up to the bat.

So we stopped our vaccination program here. Of course, in a few years we were declared hog cholera-free in the state. The nation was actually declared hog cholera-free, I think, in 1977. But I think Illinois was free in the early seventies.

Hull: You were involved with another disease at a national level and you served as the chairman of the National Pseudorabies Control board; how did you become involved with the pseudorabies program?

Bradshaw: Well, that's an interesting story how things are all needled together. I was President of the Illinois Pork Producers Association from 1971 to 1974. It was a pretty high profile thing, in the pork industry at least. Carl Cruisa from Scott County, which is just across the Illinois River just east of Pike County—I think he was president of the Scott County Pork Producers; I'm not for sure on that. Anyway he was in the Pork Producers organization and knew me. He called me one day and said, "I've got a disease they call pseudorabies. I'm losing 75 or 80 percent of my baby pigs. Pigs aren't any good. What are you going to do about it?"

That was about the time I was going out as the President of the Illinois Pork Producers. I left the Pork Producers' presidency in the winter of 1974 and 1975. So I called Dean Elmira Jones, the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Illinois. Actually Dean Jones and his wife came over to my house and we talked about this. He says, "Pseudorabies has never been a problem. It usually flares up and once they've got it, they've got a titer and immunity to it. It's not a big deal. We've had pseudorabies in this country since the late 1800s. It's not a big deal." So I call Mr. Cruisa up – who raised about a thousand or fifteen hundred pigs –and told him this. He was fine about it.

It was then, about a year or a year-and-a-half later, Vern Pillinger and Willard Corsmeyer's hogs got pseudorabies; they were raising four, five or six thousand pigs each. All of a sudden we all got concerned. Then southern Pike County, which still was a big hog producing area, had quite a few flare-ups. I didn't do anything for Carl Cruisa in Scott County. But we got it all worked up and had a special meeting on pseudorabies which I chaired or co-chaired, in Peoria in the spring of 1975. Carl Cruisa never let me forget the fact that when he had it, as a little producer, I didn't do anything. But when the big boys got it, we got right involved. There's some story behind that too. It still comes back to me once in a while in good spirit. Carl was always in good spirits about it but he always joshed me. We talk about some of my other activities. It all relates back to that.

Hull: That too. was successful; was that true?

Bradshaw: Yeah. You can write a whole book and I guess you and I both have written chapters for a book on this. I can write a book on it. But, yeah, it was. I will elaborate on that a little bit if you want me to. I'd already started going to meetings of the old LCI—it's now the National Institute of Animal Agriculture—while I was president of the Pork Producers. We decided to have a meeting in Peoria. Paul Zellman was the President of LCI at the time. We wanted to bring in researchers, university people, farmers, and USDA people to discuss what to do about pseudorabies because it become a very big problem for a number of producers across the country. We had this meeting. The late Al Laymand and I

chaired that meeting. We had a big crowd; I'm going to say three hundred or four hundred people showed up at this because it was the biggest issue that the swine industry had at the time.

So out of that we established a committee for LCI. They selected me as its first chairman. I chaired that committee for LCI for several years. One of the spinoffs from that was quite interesting: we did not have a vaccine; we didn't have any way of treating or anything to do for these pigs. Dr. Bob Crandall was running the animal disease laboratory at the College of Veterinary Medicine in Champaign-Urbana. He and Dr. Paul Dolby decided to go together and try to make an anti-serum that we could use in the baby pigs to see if we couldn't save some pigs.

We put together a group. Some others and I called a number of farmers and they all donated money. We got the money together to contract with a firm that turned out to be crooks. We'd contracted with a firm at the edge of Chicago to make us anti-serum. That was quite a project. The people that said they'd do it were in financial trouble and ultimately started to skip the country. We had to get a lawyer after them and we had to do a few things. But we got our anti-serum and we used it in half of the pigs. It was helpful, but not enough to really warrant care at all. But that was one of the first real major issues we had. We used that on them. Then Norton Laboratories developed a vaccine for pseudorabies. That was a modified live virus vaccine, is that right doctor?

Hull: Yes.

Bradshaw: That was a big turning point. But by that time the USDA—something a lot of people don't realize on this—and the state departments of agriculture, state veterinarians, had done some pretty good surveillance. They'd gone out and tested. We knew about how much pseudorabies there was in the swine herd across the United States. To his leadership, I will have to give Dr. Paul Dolby a lot of the credit for this although there was a lot of federal veterinarians who were involved at the time and who were very supportive of this. But we realized that the infection wasn't near as high as we thought it was throughout the swine industry. Probably it wasn't over 5 percent it would be in areas.

If you looked at Pike County, Illinois, it might have been up there at 20 percent. Or if you looked at certain counties in Indiana or Iowa, it might have been up to as high as 20 percent. But if you looked across the industry, it wasn't 5 percent. Given this vaccine and the fact that you could not tell the vaccinated animal from the animal that had the disease, once you started vaccinating you would not be able to know whether the disease was spreading. You would just not have the control of it.

The federal government said they didn't have the authority to do it. So almost all states—not all—but most states, said you could not vaccinate without the approval of the state veterinarian. It was that way basically, all the time Illinois

was going. Iowa did not do that. Iowa became the most infected state we had; they had the highest percentage of animals infected in the nation because the producers would not accept that kind of control on the vaccine.

Indiana producers wanted to just live with it; they said they had a vaccine. Indiana was a real tough one, too, thanks to their state veterinarian. It didn't have as stringent a control as Illinois, Missouri, Minnesota, Wisconsin and a lot of those states. But Indiana did have some control.

But the only state that didn't have control turned out to be a pretty big plus for us in the fact that we didn't have pseudorabies spread throughout the United States as widely as we thought it would. But that was the big loop.

In the meantime I served as chairman of the National Pseudorabies Committee through the LCI organization. We started a National Pseudorabies Committee and I was appointed to that one. That was by the USDA. It wasn't an official committee even then.

After we had our meeting in Peoria, the USDA put on a big symposium and meeting in Ames, Iowa. They brought pseudorabies authorities and people from all over the world. That was a big meeting; there were over a thousand people there. I kind of chaired that meeting also because the USDA didn't think they wanted to. I can't remember whether I was chairing it all or a part of it. But that was one of the first involvements the USDA had with pseudorabies. Then they established the committee and each state—most state veterinarians—established a committee on pseudorabies.

In the late-seventies and early eighties, there was always talk of eradication but never an official movement. But we all tried to keep it under control. Thanks to some of these state veterinarians and a few producers, we were able to keep it from getting quite out of hand.

Then we had a pilot project. Dr. Hull will tell you more about that. We started out to see if we could eradicate it. It was proved that we could eradicate it with the tools we had then. So then LCI had a meeting and it was again in Peoria, as I recall. Basically, we had anybody and everybody come in that wanted to come in and speak. We had a panel selected of those who supported eradication and those that didn't support eradication. I think there were seven of us on that panel. After a lot of fussing and wrangling, we decided we wanted to eradicate the disease. So we made the recommendation to the pork producers, the National/State Pork Producer Organization, the USDA and the U.S. Animal Health Association that we initiate an eradication program. That's the way it was started.

Hull: A sideline on the pseudorabies program: do you remember an interesting meeting that the Livestock Conservation Institute had where they discussed the gene-deleted vaccine? This was the first gene-deleted vaccine that was ever modified or produced anywhere. Do you recall that meeting?

Bradshaw: Yeah, very well. It was in Omaha, Nebraska in 1986. Dr. Saul Kipp from Baylor University, Texas came to that meeting with a gene-deleted vaccine for herpes viruses. I'm pretty sure I'm correct on this. I did an interview with the *New Yorker* magazine; they came to my farm. They did the article because it was the first gene-deleted vaccine. I think now they have a vaccine not quite as effective as this was with our pigs.

Pseudorabies disease is a herpes virus. They've developed some herpes vaccines now for humans but that was it. It was quite well-received but quite controversial too. This meeting in Omaha that we had was in April 1986. The USDA had approved the vaccine prior to that meeting. As soon as the publicity got out, people realized that you had a gene-deleted vaccine, which was some of the newest technology. As soon as that information got out, some of the advocacy groups went to the USDA and really threw a fit. They said, "What are you doing here? What kind of a monster thing are you doing here?"

The USDA actually pulled that vaccine license and that authorization to produce that vaccine off the market for a few months. They went back and had hearings. I went to some of those hearings in Washington and looked at their protocol to see if their protocol was going to work correctly for genetically-modified organs. Overwhelmingly, the evidence showed that their protocol traditionally produced vaccines and things would work equally well with gene-deleted or genetically-developed vaccines. They put it back on the market.

There were some demonstrations at the USDA. There were some few minor demonstrations at some of our meetings because people had some of the fears on this. But that's gone. That was really what made the eradication possible without massive slaughter and depopulations.

Later there were two gene-deleted vaccines. That was one of the more controversial things we had. One of them had one gene or part of a gene or however they do that. They had another part of the gene removed. It was going to have a differential test; we couldn't make a differential test for both. You'd have to run two tests on all of them.

This was one of the last major decisions I made as chair of the committee. I didn't make it but I chaired the meeting when the decision was made. We had a probably six-month debate in the USDA with their committee, the National Pork Organization's board and the United States Animal Health Association Committee. We had a big debate as to which one of those vaccines we would use. Finally, at the meeting all of the people involved—the USDA, National Pork Producers, U.S. Animal Health Association most all the state veterinarians who were involved in the room – we had a vote on which vaccine to use. To this day there are people that criticize that decision. But we had to make that decision collectively.

Probably sixty or seventy people in the room voted. The vote for which vaccine to use was a forty-sixty split probably. About 60 percent of them went with the—can't recall what it was called—the one gene-deleted vaccine over the other one. A lot of people said – and I think maybe history has said – that the other vaccine was probably a better vaccine. But that's the decision we made. The test was built and designed and established for that vaccine. It was the only vaccine that was legally used in the country for pseudorabies up until the eradication was completed.

Hull: In conclusion on the pseudorabies discussion: you chaired the National Pseudorabies Control Board. What was the function of that board?

Bradshaw: The National Pseudorabies Control Board was established because there were certain things that we did not like about the way the USDA was established. If you had an official eradication of pseudorabies by the USDA, it took hearings, legislation, secretarial approval and everything. We didn't have that. At the meetings, whether it was U.S. Animal Health and LCI, we came up with the idea that we would establish a Pseudorabies Control Board. That was six people:two from LCI, two from the United States Animal Health Association, and two from the National Pork Producers Council. These six people would review state programs and then they would say basically what you had to do to move pigs in or out of those states. The state veterinarians and most of the producers agreed with this establishment.

That was another thing we did that kept the spread down. In other words, we said you had to test every animal that came out of Illinois because they had a high rate of pseudorabies. We said that with Iowa. We said you had to do certain things with feeder pigs. But those programs were established by the states and we reviewed them. We did that until a formal national pseudorabies program was established. Then we became advisory. We did the same thing but we did it for the USDA in its early days.

Dr. Paul Lang was State Veterinarian in Iowa at the time. A little politics to that too. He was the first Chairman of the Pseudorabies Control Board. But he only served a little while because he left the job of State Veterinarian and went to work for the National Pork Producers Council. But he was the first chairman of that. By him being the first chairman, being in the largest pork producing state in the union, and it being the highest infected, it gave us some credibility right off the bat. We served in that capacity and I still—although we're on recess—serve as Chairman of the Pseudorabies Control Board. Paul Lang left that State Veterinarian's job. When he left that after only about six or eight months, they selected me their Chairman and I stayed in that position all the way up through. I changed and gave up the position as Chairman of the Pseudorabies Committee; LCI, when I decided to become involved in the officers of the U.S. Animal Health Association.

Hull: Is it not true that that Control Board had the power to establish a state free of pseudorabies or consider them an infected state?

Bradshaw: We basically approved every state program. If we did not think a state program was monitoring their pigs, if they weren't doing the vaccination the way they were supposed to, didn't have the kind of surveillance we needed or none of the program standards of the USDA under the agreement with the state veterinarians were being followed; if we said no pigs move, no pigs moved. Until you do this, this and this, we're going to recommend nobody buy your pigs. No pigs or no animals leave your state. We had some really tough decisions at times. Basically it was with producers and veterinarians. That really became a big issue because the six of us were right from industry. That was our job. You're right. We had the say-so on what pigs moved.

Hull: Have we missed anything on the pseudorabies program or Pork Producers?

Bradshaw: I can just say this. You look back on a lot of funny things. A friend of the Governor of Nebraska had pseudorabies in his herd. He didn't want it cleaned up. The State Veterinarian was an employee of the Governor so it was kind of interesting. I wrote some pretty tough letters to Nebraska Pork Producers and to the Nebraska State Veterinarianwho knew I was writing him. He kind of helped me write the letter and I'm writing them to him giving him hell. That was kind of funny. But we did get that herd cleaned up. The Governor and his friend, who was an ex-professional baseball player or football player… That was kind of a funny thing because the State Veterinarian couldn't do it and he needed the help.

The other one was in 1997 after Illinois and most of the Midwest had cleaned up the herds. That would be my wife's and my wedding anniversary. The Commissioner of Ag and State Veterinarian of North Carolina asked me to go to North Carolina and talk to the big integrators. They were the biggest pork producers in the word, you know. So I went down there one night. The late commissioner, Jimmy Grant was there. I sat right beside him and my wife was there with because it was our anniversary. I did not know the man. He was a big man and had been the Commissioner of Ag down there for a long time. I got up and the State Veterinarian in North Carolina introduced me as Chairman of the Pseudorabies Control Board. There were probably thirty or forty people in the room who were raising 25 percent of the hogs in the United States. I got up and spoke to these guys that were raising millions of hogs. I said, "Forty-two states have less than one percent infection. You folks who've got pseudorabies in your herds, it's running pretty rampant on you. Your program has not been working. With one percent infection, these states are not going to let your pigs come into their states and that's not very far away. The Control Board which I chair is going to recommend, at some point, that you test every one of those pigs before they go into those states or the states not accept them. That means you're going to be testing every pig that you send out of North Carolina. That's almost four million pigs a year."

I got through with my talk and sat down. Jimmy Grant, Commissioner of Ag for thirty-some years, got up and said, "You're a goddamned liar!" I was just taken aback; I didn't know the man. We had just met that night. I said, "Well just ask the feds." The Deputy Administrator for Veterinary Services was sitting right there. It was Dr. John Analdi. John Atwell, who worked with the program all the way, had been a DeputyAdministrator in Avis Veterinary Services prior to that. We're all sitting in the room. They knew I was right. What I didn't realize was the old commissioner knew I was right too. He went ahead right after. He said, "I blame Jack Blount for bringing this to me. You got that Senator Durbin up there. He took our tobacco away from it. Here have a cigar—smoke this little fella." (laughter) And we became good friends.

It was part of his show. He changed his pseudorabies committee the next morning. He changed state veterinarians. He changed the total pseudorabies committee. Nine months later that state was free of pseudorabies except they had a few breakouts. But for all practical purposes, in nine months he cleaned it up. I was really honored. At his retirement party some four or five years later, the state veterinarian asked me to speak. That was one of the things that really pleased me more than anything.

That was when I had jury duty—the one and only time I ever had jury duty. The old judge says, "How often do you go do these speeches?" I said, "I do it once in a while." He said, "If I let everybody out to do their routine things, I never would have a jury. You're going to have to prove to me there's some reason I ought to let you out." So I couldn't get off to go speak. But I became good friends with him. He was trying to prove to the people in the room I wasn't down there telling him what to do. But he was a good gentleman. I had a lot of fun with him. But of the funny things that happened, those were two of them.

(Pause)

Hull: Let's talk about national associations. Were you involved with the LCI—the Livestock Conservation Institute—or were you involved with United State Animal Health first?

Bradshaw: I started out with the LCI. It is the National Institute for Animal Agriculture now, but it was called LCI in those days. I got involved with the pseudorabies program while I was President of the Pork Producers. I got involved with that organization and served as Chairman of the Pseudorabies Committee which was the most active committee in the organization. Then from that activity, they put me on their board of directors and ultimately elected me as Chairman of the Board; I served for two years in the mid-eighties. LCI was involved with most animal health programs for both cattle and hogs in those days. Now it's expanded to other species. But basically when I was chairman, it was LCI. It was basically the swine industry, the beef industry and the dairy industry.

Hull: I think they said no feathers, no fur and—what was the other one?

Bradshaw: No equine—no horses. (unintelligible)

Hull: Yeah, those are the four F's.

Bradshaw: Yeah, four F's. You went ahead and become chairman of that board later; I can't remember when.Hull: Yeah, it was 2000 when we brought it from the Livestock Conservation Institute to the National Association…

Bradshaw: National Institute for Animal Agriculture…

Hull: Yes, I'm sorry.

Bradshaw: I have to say it out; I can't remember the initials. NIAA, that's what it was. But that was the background and a little bit for the record. LCI or NIAA, as it's called now, was primarily an industry organization. A lot of state veterinarians were involved because the state veterinarians were part of the industry. In our case we've talked about the industry. A lot of companies belonged to it. Norton Labs were part of it. Eli Lilly, Mentco was part of it. They were on the board. National Fats was an interesting one. They were involved somewhat. We called them the "garbage feeders."

There were a number of pork producer organizations which were there. That's who made up the board of directors. I served two years on that one. NIAA and the old LCI always met in the spring. It was industry. A much smaller group, usually around three hundred people, attended their annual meeting in the spring. We would go through the resolutions. Basically, in my lifetime, that's where all of the eradication programs pertaining to swine, beef and dairy and all the disease control programs started—with the industry group of LCI.

In the fall of the year, the United States Animal Health Association met. This is a much larger organization and involves all animal health, and to some degree, meat inspection, in those days. What we would do is carry the resolutions and motions from LCI in the fall to the large group of the United States Animal Health Association. Then they would confirm or modify them or whatever. They would make those recommendations to the proper authorities, be it USDA or FDA. In some cases it was other groups, but for the most part it was USDA that they would advise on what animal health programs to do.

Hull: Then your involvement with the United States Animal Health led you to probably the United States Secretary of Agriculture's Foreign Animal Disease and Poultry…

Bradshaw: In the seventies, when I was working as Chairman of the Pseudorabies Committee with LCI, I was also on the Pseudorabies Committee. I don't remember whether I was ever Chairman of the United States Animal Health Pseudorabies Committee or not. I wasn't chairman; I was vice president there for

a while. Then I became the Chairman of the Control Board, so I don't believe I was chairman there. But I was involved. This was a most active eradication program that the USDA had: our animal eradication program we had in the United States. That gave me somewhat of a high profile.

In 1984, the pork industry or the National Pork Council, nominated me to be an officer in the United States Animal Health Association. Here again we had an election. The election of that organization is all the allied industry members. Those in attendance were allowed to vote. It was seventeen members. We met in Fort Worth, Texas. There were seventeen people there. It took three votes to get me elected to the officer's position. But I went on to serve as Third Vice President of that organization. I served as President in 1989. That's when we started the Escrapia program.

One thing I would say about that time frame… We had some researchers. At the U.S. Animal Health Association meeting, we'd have a thousand people. Some of those were animal scientists and research veterinarians. There was a number of people who had concerns in what we call SE now—spongiform encephalopathy. A number of people had concerns as did the renderers. So while I was president in 1989, we changed the Escrapia program. Escrapia is a BSE—a bovine spongiform encephalopathy disease—and is very similar to chronic wasting disease in deer and mad cow disease in cattle. We changed that whole program.

We had an emergency rule-making. I testified before the House Committee and the Senate Committee on why we need to have emergency rules made. So they exempted the requirement for all the changes and the regulations having to be posted in the federal registry and all that. We were able to bypass that. We changed that Escrapia program because we felt like we needed to. As you look back in history, that was one of the more critical things that we did. In my mind, it's one of the big reasons that we do not have the problem that Canada has and as Europe's had and some of the other countries have had with mad cow disease. That was one of the big things while I was president in 1989.

Hull: Is there anything we needed to discuss on…

Bradshaw: While we're talking about animal diseases… I believe it was U.S. Secretary Ida Block who appointed me to the Swine Health Protection Advisory Committee. No, it was Dick Ling, Secretary Ling, who appointed me to the secretary's Advisory Committee on Foreign Animal Diseases. I stayed on the secretary's advisory committee as its president or chairman from late-eighties through 1993. Usually the chairman only served two years. It was two-year appointments. But Secretary Mike Espy came in and was unable to fill those positions because of his legal issues, and finally he left the office. So I got to serve an extra year. During that period of time, we built the new administrative building on Plum Island. I got to be the featured speaker at that. That was one of the big things in my career: to have a $7.5 million building up. That is Plum Island, where they do the foreign animal disease research. I got to speak at that as chairman.

Hull: Phil, what's the function of the Foreign Animal and Poultry Disease Committee?

Bradshaw: Basically, we advise the secretary on what actions he should take to keep foreign animal diseases out of the country. I was reappointed by Secretary Johanns two years ago in 2005. I am currently serving on that committee again now. There were some of us who have great concern about our protection of the borders and the protection of our food supply from foreign animal diseases, given the expansion and epizootic diseases and the number of animal agriculture products we're bringing into this country. Basically, we advise the secretary on what he should do or what we should do at the borders, what surveillance we should do within the country and what surveillance we should do outside the border.

Hull: Okay. Any other hard points you want to cover on animal diseases or agriculture?

Bradshaw: No. While we're on animal diseases I might just touch briefly on the fact that in 2001, the United Kingdom had this outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease. They were all into burning of the animals. It cost the UK about $16 billion for their outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease. We've not had an outbreak in this country since 1929. So I wrote some letters to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Ann Veneman saying that our risk of FMD (foot-and-mouth disease) was not from Europe, it was from South America.

At the same time Europe had their outbreak, South America had over twice as many cases. But they'd always had foot-and-mouth disease down there so the press didn't cover it. The press doesn't cover South America and some of the other countries like they do Europe. So I wrote a letter to Secretary Veneman right after she became secretary. Really didn't hear anything back. So I wrote a letter to the state department's division for USA aid to infant developing nations, saying that maybe they should leave their protection overseas of our industries on foot-and-mouth disease. Very quickly they got into it. The USDA got back into it.

Shortly after that, the USDA put on what they called the Houston Conference in Houston, Texas in March of 2004. Most of the secretary's administrators of agriculture in the western hemisphere were there, as well as the chief animal health officials from all the countries in the western hemisphere. They flipped what they call the Houston Declaration. They appointed a group of us and named us the Inter-American Group for the Eradication of Foot-And-Mouth Disease in the Western Hemisphere. They appointed me to represent North America from the private sector. Dr. Alphonzo Torres, who was past chief veterinarian for the United States or deputy administrator for veterinary services, was the chairman. We've been working on that project since. In January of 2007 in San Paulo, Brazil, members of the GEIFO Group selected me as their chairman. I'm now serving as Chairman of the Eradication Committee for Foot-and-Mouth Disease for the Western Hemisphere.

Hull: Okay. Moving on to the field crops. Your involvement with Illinois Soybean has been extensive, particularly in the recent few years. How did you get started in this and what involvements did you have in Illinois and nationally as well?

Bradshaw: Back in 1975 and 1976—right after I wasPresident of the Illinois Pork Producers Association… Former Secretary of Agriculture—he wasn't even secretary then – Clayton Yeutter, Nick Ling , and Bud Mitt got together and started the Meat Export Federation. I thought it was such a good idea to get all the groups together to promote meat sales overseas. I supported that effort. We looked around and looked for funds. It was strictly a volunteer organization. Where was the money? In 1974 when I was actually President of the Pork Producers, I had helped a group of soybean farmers get legislation passed to have a check-off for soybeans. We passed in 1974 a state referendum saying we would take one quarter of a cent from every bushel of soybeans sold and use that for promotion and research. when I got out of the Pork Producers organization, I was not involved in it. I looked at the soybean board but at that time the Soybean Association—the soybean check-off board, the program operating board as we called it in the old days—had a pretty good pile of money. The big issue for soybean meal has always been livestock. So I approached him about putting some money in the Meat Export Federation. They were promoting a lot of uses of soybeans but not really the livestock, especiallyin exports. So I had an opportunity to go on their board. I served on the soybean board from 1984 until 1990 as their president and chairman of that board 1988 to 1989. No, I think that's right—maybe it was 1987 to 1988.

Anyway, about the same time I was the president of the U.S. Animal Health Association, I was also the chairman of the soybean board in Illinois. We started funding the Meat Export Federation then. They fund it pretty heavily even to this day. I just served as chairman two years there. We had a lot of activities. One of the things we did while I was chairman of the board was that we got into aquaculture. Aquaculture was a big item. For the shrimp that people consume today, you must thank the Illinois soybean farmers. We paid out a sizable portion of our budget to Texas A&M to develop and perfect the breeding of shrimp in captivity. That technology came out of Texas A&M. They worked with King Ranch on this. This is now what makes it possible for us to have shrimp. There would not have been enough baby shrimp or shrimp larva in the oceans naturally to do that. We feed them soybeans. Aquaculture is a big consumer of soybeans today.

Then I dropped out for twelve years; I was really involved in little or no agriculture activities on the state or national level for almost twelve years. Then they came to me five years ago and asked me if I'd move back on the Soybean Board. I did and I served on the Illinois Soybean Board again since 2002. I served on the executive committee where you tie them in and served as the representative to Meat Export Federation again. I served earlier, back when I was on the board the first time, to the Meat Export Federation, and then I served again this time.

Three years ago, Secretary Ann Veneman appointed me to the United States Soybean Board. I serve on that now. In that capacity I serve as the Animal Ag Initiative Team Leader. I am responsible for animal agriculture initiatives for the US Soybean Board. We have partnered with the Pork Producers, the poultry people and the dairy and have done some work with beef. As chairman of that, we work with all these groups to promote our number one customer of the soybeans that we produce in the United States. Half of them are exported; the other half are processed here in this country. Eighty percent of that bean is meal. Of the meal we produce in the United States, 98 percent goes to livestock. If you look worldwide, it's 95 percent. If you count aquaculture, it's 95 percent. Ninety-six percent of all the soybean meal in the world goes to livestock, including poultry and aquaculture.

So I headed up that team. I'm also the vice-chairman of the International Marketing Committee of the U.S. Soybean Board. That means that Iwork with the staff in 25 or 30 countries to open markets, burst the other half, in soybeans worldwide. I'm also chairman of the World Soy Foundation and the Wish Program. This is a humanitarian project where we take soy protein, which is 50 percent to 90 percent protein, and we work with NGOs, [non-government organizations] PBOs and the U.N. [United Nations] World Food Program to get protein in the school lunch programs and to mothers who are weaning their babies. How do they get protein? We do those things. That's quite an adventure we've got. But that's my involvement with the soybean people.

Hull: Where does Illinois fit into the soybean in the numbers of bushels produced?

Bradshaw: We produce 22 percent of all the soybean produced in the United States. Iowa and Illinois together produce almost half the soybean produced in the United States. I can't tell you exactly how many bushels it is. I can do a little math and tell you it's a fourth of three billion, whatever that is. We are amazing soybean producers. We have the national soybean research labs at the University of Illinois. The soybean industry is the biggest supporter of research at the University of Illinois. We spend several million dollars a year in production research in animal nutrition and human nutrition.

Hull: There are check-off dollars for that as well?

Bradshaw: All check-off dollars. Every soybean farmer in the United States is mandated by law by the national programs to pay in one-half of 1 percent of the sale of soybeans. Beans are pretty high priced right now. It brings in $50 or 60 million a year nationally. Illinois has a budget of about $12 or $13 million a year.

Hull: (pause) Okay, Phil, in some of your other activities, what time you have left to devote to civic projects, one that was outstanding, and that was your involvement with AMPS. Can you tell us a little bit about what AMPS was and what their goal was.

Bradshaw: Basically, right after the Second World War back in the forties, people in western Illinois, whether it was Pike or Adams or Scott or Morgan counties, thought we had a need for a new road. U. S. 36 was a coast-to-coast road of two lanes. It wasn't the best road. I was not directly involved in the first hearings in the sixties. There was a group who promoted the road and getting the road built.

In 1980 the highway [Interstate 72] was going to be built. The alignment had been established and some of the land had been purchased. A brother and sister in Pike County, who lived southeast of Griggsville, filed a lawsuit to stop the construction of the bridges over the Illinois River. [They claimed the bridge would be detrimental to the migratory bald eagles traversing the river.] They got a federal judge in Chicago to put a temporary injunction against it.

I'm going back to my days in pork organizations and pseudorabies. The same man who had joshed at me about not getting involved because he was a farmer with little pseudorabies called me up—Carl Cruisa from Scott County. He said, "If they build this highway where these people wanted to build it and not where they're planning, it's going to cut my farm right half in two. An angle right across my farm and just cut up in two and when you come over into Pike County, it's going to angle again." The state had done a pretty good job of laying it out so it didn't hurt a lot of farms and didn't destroy a lot of farms. He asked me what I could do about it.

A lot of people were concerned because of the economic needs and the safety need. I always emphasize the safety. Highways are good for safety factors and economic development. But the main thing was safety factors in 1980 traffic. So when Carl Cruisa called me and asked me to see what I could do, I was doing business with Consolidated Grain and Barge in Naples. They built their facility there. Bob Crane started that business and founded that company. He'd built it there because he knew the highway was going to go close to it and the railroad was right there. So I talked to him. He was interested in doing something and of course he wanted the highway in the worst of ways.

Mr. Tom Oakley, who was the principal owner and president of the Quincy Herald Whig Corporation, which owns TV stations, papers and radio stations all across the United States, was interested in it. We had a meeting at the Farm Bureau Hall in Pittsfield in early 1981, I believe. That night the group proposed to form an organization to assist the state and the federal government in the lawsuit that had been filed. They brought the injunction around to see if we couldn't get it resolved and move the highway forward.

Out of that group we formed a not-for-profit corporation named AMPS—stands for Adams, Morgan, Pike and Scott County. They selected me as its president. I served as its president until the highway was completed to Hanover. It took a long time to do that. But it gave me an opportunity to get to know the governor. I got to work with Governor Jim Thompson and then Lieutenant Governor George Ryan and a lot of these people. But it was a real challenge.

We hired a law firm, as you well know. Dr. Hull, you were a member of the Board of Directors from day one of the AMPS group. We hired a law firm in Chicago. We hired Mary Brown & Platter out of Chicago. We worked with Wayne Wayland, who was a very prominent lawyer in the Chicago area who was married to Paula Wook. She became one of the chiefs of staff for Jim Thompson and went on to become a college president. Anyway we hired Mary Brown & Platter and Wayne Wayland was the attorney.

We filed an attempt to become an intervener in court. The judge would not let us do that. So we filed a friend of the court brief. Then we raised the money; thanks to all the directors we raised a pretty good amount to do this project. We started out, but it took us almost two years to get fully organized.

Once we got organized, Mary Brown & Platter knew immediately that the case against the federal government and the state government could not be wiped. They told us within a month to a month-and-a-half after we hired them they could not win the case. They can get our road built and the bridges built. They would do certain things; they could not win the lawsuit.

There were eight counts in the lawsuit. They had several environmental issues. The environmental groups were the people that encouraged and talked to the brother and sister into filing the waivers. They can't bring enough to the environmental issues. Basically there were no environmental issues that would ever hold up in court. The issues that we could not win on were two very simple ones. They were simple enough even this old farm boy from Pike County can understand them. They were using bridge replacement funds from the federal government and leaving the old Florence bridge. This highway was to replace Highway 36 so they were not moneys appropriated for new bridges. The money that was appropriated was for renovation of old bridges. Definitely can't win that. It's clear in black and white. Then there was another rule that was passed by the Congress and Senate into federal law that said you shall not take any public lands unless there's no other prudent feasible place to build the highway. Well, where they were crossing the highway, Governor Ogilvie, back when…

Hull: The river.

Bradshaw: Yeah, across the river there was the Pike County Conservation Area that Governor Ogilvie had bought years ago. I remember the conversation went very clearly: he bought that for money land, he didn't buy it for park land. So those two issues we couldn't win on. The fact that they said it disturbed the migratory birds, that it violated the treaty with Japan on migratory bird movement. It was damaging to the bald eagles' habitat. All those things were thrown out by the judge relatively quickly. These two issues were not winnable.

So the AMPS board decided to immediately to take their advice and go to Washington and get a bill passed authorizing the use of the money. That's what we did. We went to—Paul Zander is in there first and then Congressman Dick

Durbin was in there and Bob Michael, Paul Simon, and Chuck Corsey, I believe. I think that's the right ones. They introduced a similar bill in the House and in the Senate and passed them through. President Reagan signed it authorizing us to use the money to construct the bridges. That issue in the courts went away.

The other issue about 'no prudent feasible other place to build it' had all been documented but the papers had not been filed and signed by the right people. So we at the AMPS group encouraged and the state did it. They took all those papers together, did what they called a 4F study of why the bridge needed to be built there. We got that signed by all the authorities and took it back to the judge and he lifted the injunction. The bridges were built. The sad thing about that was that the people who filed the lawsuit got only $1,000 to my knowledge. But the law firm that held up the bridge for five years got in excess of $300,000. That's kind of the story of AMPS. But we got our highway built.

Hull: Okay, you ready to go. Radio. Radio. (pause) Okay.

Bradshaw: You're going back on the Interstate 72. It was always called the Central Illinois Expressway. Before they designated it 72 it was a replacement for Route 36 which was an ocean-to-ocean highway; it was pretty well-used. That's what it was for. Basically, when it got started with moving along and progressing after many years of planning it was stopped by this lawsuit. That's when we started the AMPS group as I talked about a while ago. I cannot remember all the accounts. One of the things that was interesting was something I mentioned a while ago. I'll elaborate on it a little bit if you want me to.

You got to hand it to David Aider who was the attorney, a very sharp man; a very hateful turn, you got to hand it to them. He found all these points. He knew that the law said that if you win a suit against the federal government, the federal government has to pay your attorney fees. He knew he could win on day one because of the two counts I mentioned—one on bridge replacement money and the one of the 4F not going through state-owned or publicly-owned land. So he knew he could win but he wanted to make sure that he had all bases covered. So he had all these environmental issues that he tacked on. That's what they talked about in public. They really talked very little about the two issues that he'd really won on. The interesting thing about the Japanese treaty was (I've not read the treaty but I read the court transcription and do remember the conversations) that basically it says migratory birds' fly patterns may not be disturbed. Some migratory birds that go south to the United States go south to Japan. That's what the treaty was all about. The judge threw that right out as he did all the environmental issues. But he threw the 4F document out very quickly.

I will tell you another one of the other interesting things about this whole endeavor. The highway had always had pretty good support but it had been when they couldn't seem to get it out of the litigation. The courts just weren't moving on it; it was obvious the state and the federal governments weren't making great progress. AMPS put on a big PR campaign. We raised the support for the

highway in the alignment I-72 is built on today. We raised the support in our polls from about 65 or 75 percent up to 90-something percent with some billboards and this PR material. One of the first things we did is we had a young attorney by the name of Stuart Zimlast. He was the attorney for Bob Crane's Consolidated Grain & Barge who worked for him in his office in St. Louis. He assigned his attorney to work with our AMPS group. He helped us select the attorney in Chicago and all that.

Stuart Zimlast and I sat in one of the hearings in Judge Will's office. One of the things that we arrived at was that David Aider was, as I said earlier— a pretty sharp attorney. He made sure that he filed his suit at the right time that it came before Judge Will. Judge Will had a little bit of a history, at least we all felt like he had a history, of being pretty pro-environment or anti-construction and development. So he was able to get this before Judge Will. We think that was pretty shrewd. I thought Judge Will, as you looked back on it, handled it fairly and honestly. But it was delayed and delayed. It was in David Aider's monetary interest to keep it delayed and keep it active as long as he could because he knew he was going to get paid by the federal government. I think he actually was very successful.

But Stuart Zimlast and I went to Chicago and sat in on one of the hearings with Judge Will. I really kind of felt sorry for a couple of young attorneys from the Illinois Attorney General's office who were before Judge Will in the front of the room trying to rebuff what David Aider was saying. I do not remember their names. They were young attorneys and very capable. I'm not criticizing them at all. But David Aider had practiced before a federal judge for many years. He knew what he was doing. He filed his suit and he knew the issues. This was probably one of his biggest cases. One of his most high-profile cases for sure. The young ladies were just out of their league.

That's when we came back and advised AMPS to hire an attorney and try to become an intervener.

The interesting quirk in the whole thing was that Taye Fainer, who was then attorney general, had been an attorney with Mary Brown & Platter. We were working in conjunction with the attorney general as a friend of the court who was a member of their law firm. When some of the partners in the law firm realized this, they thought that was just not really an ethical thing to do. So in support of people of west-central Illinois, of the AMPS group and of their former employee, Taye Fainer,; they donated the rest of their services from that day on. So it cost very little to have this legal advice. We actually went to Taye Fainer when he was Illinois Attorney General and asked him to hire – can’t think of the name – a real sharp young lawyer. Hull: Okay. You've been involved with the Illini Hospital located in Pittsfield here in Pike County. Can you tell us a something on your involvement with that hospital and the outcomes?

Bradshaw: I served on the hospital board from 1974 to 1981. I think I was chairman a couple of years. The interesting thing about that one was that we built an addition on the hospital at that time. It was a privately-owned hospital by the local people. It was built in 1942 with grants and added on in 1958. When I was chairman, we added on a new emergency room and actually downgraded the number of beds. We upgraded the rest of the facility.

The gentleman who was chairman ahead of me affiliated the hospital with Memorial Medical Center in Springfield. They actually were the management over our hospital. They were very involved. Of all of our governors I have to say Dick Ogilvie was probably the most progressive and the most innovative governor that I've had the experience of being around and to know. As you all know, he started some universities. Governor Ogilvie started Southern Illinois Medical School in Springfield. I think that's been a tremendous asset to rural America and rural Illinois.

As part of that, when I was chairman of the hospital board, they were looking at how they could have training for doctors in small hospitals—internships—and how can it feed into that institution and make the Springfield Memorial Medical Center a better institution. One of the things that I really take great pride in was that he appointed me to the corporate body. I was one of a hundred and some who got together. We selected the executive committee right in the hospital. We had a management relationship with Memorial while I was on the hospital board. I think that's one of the things that people have to realize: Governor Ogilvie had some real good insights when he established that center. I can remember talking with Governor Ogilvie on this. He felt like it was important to have a downstate medical center. That's one of the reasons he went with Southern Illinois University instead of the University of Illinois Circle Campus. He wanted this to be for training doctors for downstate Illinois. That's why it's Southern Illinois University and not the University of Illinois at Springfield. My involvement with Illini Hospital got me there. I thought we might touch on just briefly. Of course the hospital here has been sold to Blessing.

Hull: That's Blessing in Quincy, Illinois.

Bradshaw: Yes, Quincy, Illinois. That change happened long after I was out of there. When I was in there, we started Illini Health Services. We started a pharmacy that we bought. I served as chairman of that Illini Health Service, which was a for-profit corporation that ran a pharmacy and ran the durable goods supply. We made beds available and machines. They ran that up until Blessing bought it a few years ago. That organization belonged to the community. Even though it was a for-profit, it belonged to the community.

That's part of why it was the Pike County Health Foundation today. Part of the money they have is from that and some other activities. They give scholarships. I also served as one of the co-chairs for the fundraiser to build the new $5.5 million

addition that Blessing put on the hospital a few years ago. I didn't do a lot on it. I won't take a lot of credit on it. I did early-on support…

The community did not want to support Blessing after the hospital was forced to sell. They sold the hospital to Blessing. But we have a nice hospital here with good facilities. I think it was the thing to do. Blessing's doing a good job.

Hull: While you were involved with the hospital as president, what changes did you see there?

Bradshaw: In the meantime, along about this same time, Governor Jim Thompson appointed me to Rural Affairs Task Force; there were twenty-two of us. George Ryan, thenLieutenant Governor, chaired it. We held twenty hearings across the state of Illinois. It was one of the more fun things we ever did. Former governor George Ryan and I joked about it. We had these hearings all across the state of Illinois about problems in rural Illinois. We asked, “What could we do to help?” You'd have average citizens come in. There were twenty-two of us on the group that did it. You didn't know that more than six or seven ever showed up at a hearing. I went to most of them. There were a number of people who testified in those hearings that summer. It took us about six or seven months to have all these hearings.

One of the things that really came forward was the fact that a number of hospitals were in financial trouble. I think we identified eight or ten hospitals we thought were going to go broke in downstate Illinois. Illini was not one of them. One of the reasons I bring this up is that, when I was chairman of the board in 1988 or 1989, the board voted to renovate the hospital. We voted to build a new emergency room, helicopter pad and laboratory and to move the surgery from its present location. We wanted surgery and OB in the same location; there was some savings to that. We voted to do that.

We had been about an eighty-bed hospital. In this process we're going to take it from eighty-bed down to about a forty- to fifty-bed hospital. It was very controversial in the community. A lot of people just thought, "Well what are you going to do if you have a big major problem?" We know some things end up covering that. But we actually shrank the hospital for in-patient activity. I'm just the guy that happened to chair a meeting. But that turned out to be a very good decision. I think it made our hospital much more viable. The reason the hospital got in financial trouble later, if you ask me, is that the board just turned the management over to a management company. Consequently, the community sued the management company and got a large settlement. But the management company just ruined the hospital.

(Pause in Recording)

Hull: Phil, you've been involved with other civic projects—one is being a director on the Farmers National Bank here in Griggsville. What year did you go on?

Bradshaw: I actually went on the board in 1981. Dr. Hull, you can tell this story better than any one. You, of course, were chairman of the board. If everybody remembers the eighties with the high interest rates, it really hit the rural communities hard. Farmers went broke; unemployment went up. We had an especially bad thing. As you remember, we had a local construction company that built hog buildings that went broke; the bank had lots of their employees borrowing money. So the bank was seeing some problems. You and I bought the old locker plant together, you remember? You and I bought the farmer-owned cooperative on a little local locker plant in Barry. It went defunct; the bank held a mortgage against it so the bank got it. I remember that you, being a director of the bank and president of the board, had to get special permission for us to buy it. You and I owned it for nineteen-and-a-half years. It turned out to be more of a community service than it did a profitable venture, as you remember. But it provided employment for six to eight people for many years.

So we were on the bank. Many banks were being bought up by different people in the community. As you remember, Doc, we decided we didn't want to do that. The examiners were saying that we needed to do something. That's when we went to St. Louis and met with Boatmen's Bank which was our correspondent bank. Boatmen's laid out a plan. If memory serves me right, George W. Bush's uncle was the president of that bank. They helped us. We now have a very strong viable community bank.

Dr. Hull and I are still on the board. I served as chairman for a while. When Dr. Hull left as president, we changed the board structure and made it chairman of the board. We made an internal officer of the bank president. I think it was very representative of what happened in the eighties to rural America. Agriculture's very capital intensive. So when interest rates went from 8 percent to 18.5 percent or 20 percent, farmers couldn't pay their bills. One of the biggest banks in the county—the First National Bank of Pittsfield—was sold to Mr. Dierberg. Pleasant Hill Bank was sold to Mr. Dierberg. Dr. Richard Hull and I and the board members that were there had a meeting. They did not want to do that. So they asked if I would go on the board. We had a pretty hard time; a lot of people looked like they thought it was crazy. We're now in three locations and we have seventeen employees. We have a very profitable bank.

A lot of these stockholders responsible for these small banks sold out during that period of time just to get their money. Not many of them lost money but, had they just held on to those banks, I believe they would have come out much better off economically. But it was a challenging time, to say the least. Big banks thought they could come out and buy them. It really never worked out for them. Our small community banks are still doing much better than the national or international banks.

Hull: Do you see any difference in your borrowers now than you did back in the eighties?

Bradshaw: Oh yeah. As you remember, most of the loans of the bank in the seventies or the early eighties were made quickly and easily. You would just come in, sign a note and walk out the door with the money. Very few loans today are made that way now. Prior to 1980, most of the banks of rural America took very low security on farmers. Farmers had been borrowing for years. Farmers had quite a high equity in their land. When you had land values go down 50 percent, the value of that equity on that land disappeared. So today you really have very few unsecure loans. In any case the big difference is the paperwork today. Everybody has a file in the bank of several pages or some up to a hundred pages. You have income tax statements, cash flow statements, financial statements and credit checks that are recorded with the credit bureau. So you have all those things. Some of the recording procedures have been tightened up. Of course the Enron thing… Even though our small bank's not under the Osborne Soxon Act, we abide by it. Most of banks do. Then the 9/11 terrorist attack made us have to file many more reports and do a lot more things. But our bank and most small banks are much stronger at the national position now and eminently better capitalized.Hull: So your loans, are they large? Do you see larger loans like you did…?

Bradshaw: Oh yeah, we see a lot larger loans. Actually now, compared to when you were there, Dick, we sell a lot of loans. We are proud of our little bank—the Farmers' National Bank of Griggsville and Milton and Mt. Sterling. We sell about as many USDA guaranteed home loans as any bank in the state. Basically those loans are USDA guaranteed. The money goes out from the private institution—our bank or somebody else. It's low down payment and low interest. Not real low interest. It's still basically what the bank would do: they make it possible for people to do it with home ownership. We sell a lot of those. We just get a fee for selling them. We don't have to put them on our books or anything.

That's been a big one. Of course farm and house values have all gone up. We're about 40 percent when you talk about real-estate ag and our farm-operating loan machinery. We're about 40 percent or considerably low on private loans for cars, houses, furniture, motorcycles and that sort of thing. Then the other 20 percent we list as commercial.

Hull: Would you say that differs from the 1980s?

Bradshaw: Probably a little more on the consumer end. Probably more house loans and more car loans than what we had then. We give pretty diverse portfolios. We run it around 90 percent loans all the time which is a excellent for the millery. If things went back to where they were in the eighties, you wouldn't get that high of a loan. We've got everything secure with real estate, farms and other loans. Five of our loans are real estate or farms, at least. They're only 40 percent or 50 percent value. So farmland would have to go down to half price before we lose. We don't want to take any farms back, but it would have to go down pretty soon. So I think we're in good shape.

Hull: What got this whole thing started?

(Pause in Recording)

Hull: Okay, Phil let's kind of change pace just a little bit. West between Griggsville and Barry, there was once a little village by the name of New Philadelphia. Since you have been involved with the New Philadelphia Project, can you tell us something about that?

Bradshaw: It's like everything; it spins off of something else. When I was president of AMPS, we were getting into the highway bill. We judged it out; the judgment was where we could build a highway. A well-intended group went to the press and local legislatures. They wanted a rest area and a turnoff to be built at New Philadelphia. New Philadelphia is perceived as an African-American community. It wasn't; it was never over about 30 percent black.

Anyway, a gentleman by the name of Free Frank McWorter came up here from Kentucky in 1831 and had it surveyed. He had it incorporated as a town, New Philadelphia. He sold the lots in that town to primarily white people to buy the freedom for his fourteen children. He had bought the freedom of his wife and himself from his master. They had made it possible for him to buy his own freedom. He came up here and he went back on several occasions at great risk for the family. They had burned his papers and sold him back into slavery. He went back at great risk to Kentucky and he sold these lots in this town which was active from 1830s to the 1880s. The railroad went north of New Philadelphia and some believe that was the demise of it. The railroad went to Barry and to Bayless and not to New Philadelphia.

Some people say it was racially motivated; I don't believe it was. This was one of the first communities in Pike County. It was out in the wilderness and formed by a black man. We believe, and no one's proven us wrong, that it was the first and only town in the United States that was surveyed and incorporated by a black man prior to the Civil War. Even though this was a free state, there were laws that prohibited him from doing certain things. So Free Frank McWorter was not able to actually go before the proper authorities to incorporate his town. But he hired people—lawyers and professional surveyors. In essence, he did do it. But his name may not appear on a lot of the documents because of certain laws that were in effect in Illinois at the time. But that's the story of Free Frank McWorter and New Philadelphia.

Now let me tell you how I got involved. We were promoting the highway across there. They got up and they talked to our legislators and talked to the press on TV and things. They wanted to build a turnoff. People in western Illinois had been almost forty years trying to get a major highway through western Illinois. Two state senators, Mr. Tom Oakley, who was chairman of the highway committee in Quincy, and I, met and decided we did not think that it was in the best interest of the citizens of western Illinois to support building a turnoff, rest area or visitors center in New Philadelphia. Interstate 72, Central Illinois Expressway—we called it—went right south of New Philadelphia. It bowed a

little bit so it would not hit this historically significant location. It went just south of it.

I actually went on TV before the press and had a little press conference. My statement was, at that point in time, the AMPS board and political leaders of the area did not think it was in the best interest of west-central Illinois and the people to do anything that would delay the highway one more day or cost the taxpayers one more dollar. I said I personally would pledge to do whatever I could to assist New Philadelphia in getting the recognition that we all felt like it needed once the bridge over the Mississippi River to Hannibal and Interstate 72 was completed.

They were kind enough to have me up on the stage when they dedicated the bridge over the Mississippi River at Hannibal. I believe it was September of 1996. Lieutenant Governor Bob Kustra and the late governor Merrill Carnahan were on the stage with me. I believe Tom Oakley was standing there too. As soon as we got through with that, I jokingly said that once the highway was completed, I'd visit New Philadelphia.

The late judge, Cecil Burrows, who was a circuit judge in the county for many years, was the first one I called, because he'd been one of the more prominent people that had wanted to do something at the New Philadelphia site for many years. He'd been a Second World War veteran and was kind of a friend of mine through the years. Charlie Brigsby, who ran the cheese factory here and actually owned the site for a period of time at New Philadelphia, was another one that I approached. But he had since sold his cheese business and moved away and was becoming quite elderly. He gave us some money and supported our work with New Philadelphia but he did not become involved.

Judge Burrows retired. He set up a not-for-profit corporation. He also helped us get started on our 501©3 status with the IRS so we could make tax-deductible contributions. Unfortunately, Judge Burrows passed away before we got our 501©3, so we went ahead and completed it.

We talked to many universities and archeological groups. We finally arrived at the University of Maryland—Dr. Paul Shycomb and his group—to do archeological work out there. They've had a three-year school in New Philadelphia. They've found something over twenty thousand artifacts out there over three years of archeological digs. We got involved with the University of Illinois at Springfield and the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. They co-partnered on this.

We're in the process now of raising the money to buy the land. There's only one house there. It was built in 1942. We purchased this house known as the Verdict Center. The Verdict family, who were a white family, had lived and owned property continuously longer in New Philadelphia than any other family.

One of the things about New Philadelphia is that the 1855 census shows that about maybe 40 percent of the people were black and the rest were white. But it's remembered as being a black community. We do not believe it was ever, even in its heyday, more than 35 or 40 percent black; the rest were white. But they lived there in what appears to be relativeharmony. Do any human beings all live in total harmony? No. When you throw in the race factor and the Civil War that went on during it… You know it wasn't all harmony.

The McWorter family has really embraced this project. We've had some difficulties but right now on our board we have two fifth generation McWorters. Gerald McWorter's on there. Sammy McWorter's on our board of directors. The rest of them are local people from Quincy, Springfield, Hannibal and Pike County. We are now named as a national historic site. We have a lady who's working on her doctorate at the University of Maryland who's working on the application to become a historic landmark,nowthe next step.She has those papers, as part of her doctorate work, just about completed—the 5-O's with the Department of Interior and the Park Service. Hopefully, they will rule in favor of us and we'll have that designated as a national historic landmark.

Hull: What are your plans on funding this project?

Bradshaw: We've got $125,000 raised. President Jones, president of the Illinois Senate, and our state senator, Deanna Demuzio, have helped us. We paid for the house. The Quincy Foundation has been a large contributor; they have given us ten or twenty thousand dollars. Of course, the National Science Academy—I hope that's the right name—pays for the archeological digs. Numbers of local people have given us one or two hundred dollars. Banks have all given us a little money. The County Board gave us some money. Most of the towns in the community have given us some money. We're now in the process of trying to raise more money. The University of Illinois archeology department has now applied for a grant to continue the archeological work out there. Hannibal Grange College has helped us some; they provided the vans for the students. There have been a lot of people contributing. But it's like all projects like this—it takes quite a little money to do it.

Hull: Where do you envision this project going?

Bradshaw: I think the ultimate goal is for the site to become a state or national park. I think we'd probably get the state to take it over now by pushing legislation through because we do have President Jones' support. Just today I called up Illinois state senator Jacqueline Collins who represents the district from the south side of Chicago and she wants to be involved.

It's going to happen. We're now developing several volumes. They hired Gerald McWorter. He's a doctor of history and was on the staff at Toledo University. He has now transferred to the University of Illinois. He is spending quite a little time there at the university putting together volumes of material

about New Philadelphia. Not only about the history of New Philadelphia but a little of the history of our group in the last eleven years: that this started and how we've moved forward. We're going to put these volumes together and our plan is that we're going to give those to the DuSable Museum and to the Lincoln Library at Springfield. Senator Collins, Senator Demuzio and President Jones want to be involved with that effort. They also want to help us raise the money to buy the property and to develop it. It's our desire first to get it to be designated as a national landmark and ultimately for it to become a public park or a museum area.

Hull: In all summation here, Phil, can you give a little synopsis on what were some of those changes in agriculture in the state of Illinois since the 1960s when you first started to become involved with farming, and where you think it's going to go?

Bradshaw: In 1963 when I went to the farm where I now live, own and my son's farms, we had a yield of corn of about eighty bushels per acre and my uncle thought that was pretty doggone good. This year, 2007, we were down on corn. The last year we had a yield of around 190 bushels per acre. Now that's the same land, But in those days you tilled the land, plowed it, disced it, harrowed and all that. Today we do very little to it. A minimum amount of tillage: that's part of the change. You preserve your moisture better, you don't pack the soil as much. Then we've had an improvement in genetics to go up almost two-and-a-half times production; that's the big change. Agriculture has always come for increased efficiency, not in price. We got high priced corn right now. I think $3 and something for corn back in the eighties. We're talking about $4 corn means that's a great thing today. But I had corn almost at $4 in the eighties. I remember one time I sold some hogs for thirty cents a pound and I bought corn for $3.90 a bushel. I was losing about $40 or $50 per pig I was selling. So a lot of people talk about high priced corn now.

But that's the big one; we went from a thousand pigs to actually ten or twelve thousand pigs on our farm over those periods of time. That's the big difference in the production.

The next one is, food safety is driving a lot of things that happen in agriculture as much as economics. We've always had safe food but people always expected to prepare it. You went into the store, bought your food, took it home and you cooked it. Your mother and everybody in the family knew how you prepared food. Today people think anything they buy out of the store is ready to eat. You open a bag up and you eat it right out of the bag, so all of our agriculture products have to be safe to consume without any preparation. That has, in my opinion, forced the integration of poultry investors and the integration of pork industry. It will ultimately force the integration of grains and other commodities.

Because of the food safety issue, there has to be some type of traceability back to the farmer, back to the soil and back to the sea. The best way to do that is to have a totally integrated system. Farms have gotten bigger, of course. That's my personal feeling of what's happened.

The other one is, people just like to live better; people don't want to work. When I raised hogs, I laughed and said that all these things I've done have kept me feeling a little unusual. Basically, there's only been two Christmases in my married life that I haven't worked; those were two Christmases I didn't have livestock. In the early-nineties, I was so afraid that there were going to be some changes. It happened a little later than I thought it would. In 1998 hogs went to eight cents. That was lower in price than they were in 1932 in the Depression. Many of my friends my age lost their life savings and everything. I didn't realize it'd be that magnitude.

I was afraid, so in the early nineties I basically got out of the pig business and turned it over to my nephew. He contracted it and changed our whole structure into an integrated system. But I think that's the big one. I think you'll see nothing but continuation of the integrated system. When I started farming, the 550 acres I started out farming was a pretty good sized farm. Today if you don't have two thousand acres, you're not a very big farm. I believe, in the years ahead, you'll see farmers farming much more than that. I've even made some predictions. I might not see it in my lifetime, but I think you'll see the time when four or five operations—or whatever you want to call them, four or five firms or families—will farm a whole county. It will all be tied back to end-user food safety. People have gotten used to having everything ready for instant use. So they buy ground hamburger, take it home and eat it raw. That's a tremendous strain on the food system. Bagged lettuce is four times more dangerous that head lettuce—true fact. I was just at this food safety meeting in Washington last week thinking that everybody wants chopped lettuce. You chop it up, you put all the bacteria and diseases on the outside of the head of the lettuce all the way through it. You grind hamburger or pork or poultry, you mix them, all of a sudden you have to let it cook through.

Hull: We see a lot of pressure from consumer groups and from environmentalists. Do you see that that's going to change the way that agriculture is done in the future?

Bradshaw: Yeah, I think part of this end you're seeing is pressure. But I'm a great believer in as long as we keep our form of government and our freedom, these groups can't push us to the point where they will run us out of business unless they are right. On the food safety issue, I think they are right. I think American people, whether you agree or not, are not going to go back to the old days of having to spend two hours in the kitchen preparing a meal. They are going to want this and the way they are going to do it is they are going to work with the industry to do it. I think a lot of the consumer groups are actually looking at working closer with the industry now than they were eight to ten years ago.

Hopefully because of some things agriculture's done and some general things, they are beginning to realize that the only way to have safe food is for everybody to work at it. The way you get safe food is to have the right checks and balances. You have the right protocol in place to guarantee that. That goes from the farm to the dinner table. Whether it is transportation or processing in a livestock

processing facility, or whether it is in a lettuce processing facility or a grape processing facility in Chile—a lot of our grapes come from Chile—they've got to have the same thing. We've got to be willing to go over there and inspect it. They've got to have the same… heck, everything because they are coming into our food system. I'm just sure that the American consumer and the American people, when they are given the facts, the right decision is probably going to be more traceability and more testing. That is going to force a lot of the changes back on the American farm.

Hull: Thank you, Phil, for those insights. I always save the toughest question for the last. That one is: of all of these contributions you made to agriculture and to the country and the state of Illinois, what do you consider the most significant contribution you have made to Illinois agriculture?

Bradshaw: (laughter) That is hard. I don't know. (pause) I'd say probably the one I had the least to do with. I suppose that the Meat Export Federation, which I never served as an officer in. I served on the board two different times. I served on the executive board actually for a couple of years. But I never was a big leader, really.

I think if you look at the numbers of livestock that we produce and the number of jobs the livestock industry has, if you're looking at feed manufacturing, the soybean farmer, the corn farmer that feeds the livestock; transportation, the feed companies, the banks that loan all the money on the farm buildings and all that, I believe you would have to say probably that is the biggest contribution—getting the soybean farmer and the corn farmer and people who realize the importance of livestock and then getting the Meat Export Federation started. Now I think it is that we are selling about 17 percent or 18 percent of our pork that we produce in the United States overseas. I think about 25 or 30 percent of our pork producers put only about 15 percent of—well, we're down because the BSE and some problems with meat—but basically we are going to be selling close to 10 or 15 percent of our beef overseas. That is exchange for all the American people. But the big thing is, it is rural development at its best.

Talk about everything else you bring in. But livestock in rural Illinois is the best economic development you have. Is it partly due to you veterinarians? Are the veterinarians, yourself included, making a living tending to livestock out here?

We need a balance of trade. We just want something we can produce so our exports of meat remain strong. The realization about the grain farmer and people in rural America that livestock production is important. I think that is probably the biggest thing and the most important thing.

(End of Interview