

## Some REAL FACTS for Farmers Union Members

A tiny group which is opposed to United States support of the United Nations action in Korea and to foreign policies which strengthen the free world against possible Russian attack, is attempting to disrupt the Farmers Union.

The tiny faction has formed "splinter committees" into which it tries to enroll anyone who can be made dissatisfied with Farmers Union for any reason. The obvious strategy is to attack the national and state Farmers Union organizations on as many issues as possible, the truth notwithstanding, splintering off a few members wherever they can on whatever issue they can invent. They care not what wedge they use to pry a Farmers Union member loose and get him into one of their closely controlled splinter committees. It may be a commodity price complaint. It may be a lie about some action of a Farmers Union official. It may be a misrepresentation of Farmers Union policy. Their first step is to create disruption and dissatisfaction, alienating a few members. Then they enroll them in a new committee where they can be used to support the foreign policy line of the tiny faction.

Farmers Union has dealt and is dealing with this group in accordance with American and democratic procedures. Their right to disagree with National Farmers Union policy and to seek changes has not been abridged. They have been received and listened to by resolutions committees. Their resolutions have been given consideration. They have been permitted to speak before committees and conventions. And they have been overwhelmingly defeated in their policy proposals by convention delegates.

In order to advance their disruption, alienate Farmers Union members and, if possible, enroll disaffected members in their own committees, this group has resorted to slander and lies. There are numerous instances in the past. There are two current lies now being circulated. They are:

1. The charge that certain Farmers Union leaders are parties to a National Planning Association scheme to push 2,000,000 farm families off the land.
2. The charge that the Farmers Union convention in Dallas in March 1952, was undemocratically run and abandoned basic Farmers Union policy positions.

Both these allegations are untrue.

Both lies emanate from 39 Cortland Street, New York City, and have been circulated through FACTS FOR FARMERS, a mis-named monthly propaganda bulletin edited by Charles J. Coe, which basically is devoted to promoting the Russian foreign policy line.

Let's examine these two current lies:

Lie No. 1: That certain Farmers Union leaders have advocated pushing 2,000,000 farmers off the land.

This lie arises from the fact that President James G. Patton of National Farmers Union, Mr. August Dahme of the Farmers Union in South Dakota, and Mr. Obed Wyum of the Farmers Union in North Dakota, are members of the Agricultural Committee of the National Planning Association, which recently published a study on underemployment in agriculture. The study was written by Arthur Moore, former editor of Prairie Flower of Chicago, who is now with McGraw-Hill. It deals with the problems of more fully employing, and thereby helping to raise the production and the living standards, of 2,000,000 presently under-employed farm families.

The New York City bulletin, FACTS FOR FARMERS, headlined their story about this study with a question, "Should Big Farms Be Bigger?-- Two Million Farms Threatened." The IOWA UNION FARMER, edited by Richard Fallow for Iowa FU President Fred Stover, headlined the story: "Planners' Scheme to Plow Under 2,000,000 Farmers."

The Iowa Union Farmer for April, 1952, contains a lying description of President Patton as having "signed in favor of eliminating 2,000,000 farmers."

Both publications objected to a line in the National Planning Association study which said that "the United States can no longer afford underemployment of some 2 million farm families on American farms."

The Farmers Union has made that contention for years. It repeatedly and continuously has advocated programs which will provide farmers who lack credit, equipment, health facilities, educational facilities, land or other basic requirements to fuller employment and production, the things they need to become fully employed, fully productive and able to maintain a high standard of living.

The urgency of doing this, as a matter of providing real equality of opportunity, has repeatedly been argued by Farmers Union. The Nation's need for greater food production in World War II, in the present mobilization period and within the next few years (population will increase 25% by 1975) also have been pointed out to members, to citizens and to Congress as grounds for tremendous expansion of Farmers Home Administration and other programs which aid disadvantaged and underemployed farmers, benefitting both the nation and the farm families.

The National Planning Association pamphlet on "Underemployment in Agriculture" is NOT a plan to drive 2,000,000 presently underemployed farm families off the land or to make big farms bigger. It is a study of how they can be assisted to become more productive.

The pamphlet poses the problem of farms that are too small to provide a decent family living. It points out that "65 percent of the farms in the South have less than 30 acres," "about 20 percent of Southern Appalachian farms are under 20 acres and another 20 percent are between 20 and 49 acres." It points to similar situations in the Ozarks, the Southern Ohio-Indiana-Illinois area and in the cut-over areas in Michigan-Wisconsin-Minnesota. It then discusses numerous ways in which these small and undersized farms, not now supporting the families on them well, might be brought into greater productivity.

Take a few examples of what the NPA study suggests:

1. The Cutover Area. Farms in Wisconsin cutover counties average only 23 to 30 acres of cropland, compared to an average of 60 to 90 acres in the state's high-income counties. A third of farms in the northeastern Minnesota counties have 15 crop acres or less and nearly two-thirds have less than 30 acres.

Did the NPA study advocate shoving these people off the land? No, it suggested:

"Before production can be increased in the cutover land in about 70 or 75 counties in Michigan, Wisconsin and northeastern Minnesota, considerable clearing of the land is necessary in order to enlarge the size of farms. Additional livestock and equipment is needed. Increased productivity for the area could be achieved through good management of the timber lands..." This is not a proposal to make big farms bigger or drive farmers off the land but to make small farms adequate and help farmers stay on the land.

2. The Cotton South. Here 65 percent of farms have less than 30 acres. Author Moore suggests that "it may be possible in some parts of the cotton South to start a farm enlargement program by buying large plantations and breaking them up." He discusses the great need for capital, for new types of production, better production methods and other steps to keep as many people on the land as possible with decent standards of living. Here again, the object is to make small farms adequate and help the farm families stay on the land.

The availability of off-farm employment for those who cannot be made secure on the land is discussed in connection with each area, as one of eight different factors involved in improving the situation of these low income people. It is not proposed as a cure-all, nor is it anywhere suggested that any farmer be forced into industrial employment.

Any Farmers Union member confronted with Lie No. 1 should demand the full text of the NPA study and keep these two facts in mind:

1. President Patton, Mr. Dahme and Mr. Wyum approved the publication of this study - and not every detail, comma and period - because it again reminds the U.S.A. of its duty and need to improve the lot of these 2,000,000 farm families who have inadequate resources and incomes.



2. The charge that the study is a plan to "make big farms bigger" or "plow under" two million farm families is a straight Big Lie, floated to disrupt Farmers Union and splinter off a few members who might then join the splinter organizations set up and controlled by those who peddle the Russian foreign policy line.

Lie No. 2: That the Farmers Union Convention in Dallas in March was undemocratically run and abandoned sound FU policies.

This lie again stems from the New York City publication, FACTS FOR FARMERS, edited by Charles J. Coe.

Here are typical statements by Coe and the real facts:

#### Coe Reports:

"...the '52 Farmers Union Program...was adopted in less time and with less discussion than any other in the opinion of several old-timers... Many of the farmers had no copies of the draft program..."

#### The Real Facts:

The program committee met a full week before the convention, reviewed all state policy programs, all program suggestions sent to the National Farmers Union and drafted a suggested program. This was done so the proposed program could be given to delegates on the opening day of the five-day convention, as it was. A copy was supplied to every delegate, and more than 500 copies were supplied to non-delegate members attending.

After distribution of the suggested program, the committee met and heard criticisms, suggestions and new proposals from delegates and members, including proposals by the self-styled Rank and File for an immediate cease-fire in Korea, a proposal to bring U.S. soldiers home from Korea immediately and to transfer Korean truce negotiations to the U.N. Security Council where Russia has a veto. (The Committee considered and rejected these resolutions as contrary to Farmers Union support of the United Nations. Their authors subsequently failed to offer them from the floor.)

After four days of hearings and opportunity for study (there were more than 600 program copies in circulation) the program was taken up on the convention floor, read in full and then considered section-by-section. All speakers were heard,

all proper motions were put and the program was adopted overwhelmingly.

**"No Disavowel of Jimcrow"**  
(subhead in Coe's story)

Actually the convention asserted the "fundamental equality of all men." It added: "We recognize the need for government to protect the rights of expression; to ensure equality of opportunity... We assert the right of each person to an equal opportunity to work..." etc.

**"Sharecroppers Problems Left Out"**  
(subhead in Coe's story)

The convention said, "We reject the exploitation of human beings through industrial-type agricultural enterprise whether on large individual or corporate owned factories-in-the-fields or agricultural collectives imposed by totalitarian governments." This covers both sharecroppers and exploited labor on government collectives in some nations.

"Various delegates were shocked by what they regarded as a flagrant breach of the constitution, since they maintain that a two-thirds vote is required for any such constitutional amendment and that such a vote must be recorded by a roll call or by the distribution of ballots, neither of which was done."

The NFU constitution requires a two-thirds vote to amend the constitution of Farmers Union. It also provides that delegates, if any doubt as to the accuracy of a chair ruling on a voice vote, may call for a record vote. The vote in favor of proposed amendments to the NFU Constitution was so overwhelming that the chair ruled that they had passed by the necessary majority. No delegates challenged or asked for a roll call. There is no requirement that a vote requiring a simple majority, two-thirds majority, or even unanimous consent, be made by roll call, unless such record is called for from the floor.

There were numerous other equally blatant lies in FACTS FOR FARMERS, each intended to build up the Big Lie. One of the major complaints was against the nation's press, which, "the publication charged "asserted without foundation in fact, that the National Farmers Union Convention voted against a 'cease fire in Korea' after a 'bitter floor fight.'"

What the press actually carried was an Associated Press story which said: "A faction demanding immediate cease-fire in Korea lost a bitter convention floor fight at the N.F.U. fiftieth annual meeting today."

There was a self-styled "Rank and File" faction at the convention. The groups sponsored resolutions, before the resolutions committee, calling for an immediate cease-fire in Korea, for "bring the boys

home at once," and for turning Korean peace negotiations over to the U.N. Security Council (where Russia could veto.) The resolutions committee rejected all these resolutions, giving the United Nations full support instead.

This same tiny faction then staged a floor fight on some of the resolutions and constitutional amendments and "lost a bitter floor fight" so overwhelmingly that they did not even offer, on the convention floor, their resolutions which would leave South Korea helpless and undefended from the Communist forces (both North Korean and Chinese) on their border.

The Associated Press correctly reported that a faction demanding immediate cease-fire in Korea lost a bitter floor fight. There was such a tiny faction in the convention. It did make and lose a bitter floor fight. The AP might further have reported that the faction lost so overwhelmingly in the preliminary skirmishes that it did not even bring up the issue in which it is most intensely interested - abandonment of South Korea, and thereby abandonment of the United States in its first great effort to stop aggression and enforce peace.

The REAL FACTS are that a very few people in the Farmers Union, working closely with certain non-members in New York City to put over a foreign policy line, are using every sort of misrepresentation or outright lie to cause Farmers Union members to become disaffected and join one of the splinter committees in protest. It ~~is~~ matters not why the FU member joins the splinter group. Once in for any reason, he will then be polled on the side of pro-Russian foreign policy.

There were numerous other equally blatant lies in 1947 and 1948, each intended to bring up the old lie. One of the most common was against the Russian's power, which was completely exaggerated without foundation in fact. That the Russian's power was exaggerated was proved by the fact that the Russian's power was exaggerated.

That the press actually carried an exaggerated story which said: "The Russian's power is exaggerated" is a fact. The Russian's power is exaggerated.

There are a well-known "Mark and Bill" legend at the convention. The group opposing the Russian's power is exaggerated. The Russian's power is exaggerated.