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INTRODUCTION

American agricultural policy proposals are drawn up in a society in which the people of that society have not specifically defined the goals that are to be achieved by such proposals. In addition, these people have not precisely stated what means are to be employed to carry out specific proposals. Partly because of the fact that the American people have not specifically stated just what their government should or should not do in and for the agricultural sector of the economy, many agricultural policy proposals put forth by the government, at times, simultaneously receive opposition by some members of the public and support from others. Some members of the American public supporting a particular policy proposal and other members opposing it is one sign that the American people are in disagreement about what agricultural policy should be.

Disagreement over American agricultural policy is found in various forms. There are signs of disagreement manifested between the agricultural and the nonagricultural segments of the public. Policy disagreement exists, to some extent, within the nonagricultural group. For example, some consumers with low incomes are in favor of "direct payments" as a means of effecting price support programs; while other consumers with high incomes are opposed to such payments.

Disagreement over agricultural policy also exists within the agricultural group. Conflicting positions, in regard to some matters, are held by agricultural business groups on the one hand and co-operative groups on the other. Different commodity groups also manifest signs of disagreement. Farmers from different geographical regions have been
known to be in disagreement over agricultural policy proposals. Farmers of different income levels, at times, take different positions in regard to agricultural policy.

When farmers from different geographical regions, or farmers of different income levels, or farmers who represent different commodity groups disagree on agricultural policy proposals, the basis of such disagreement can readily be seen and understood. Disagreement of this type can, and is, in most cases, discerned as disagreement that is brought about because one group is only attempting to protect its interests.

Another type of disagreement that occurs within the agricultural segment of the American public is the disagreement that is found among the general farm organizations. Unlike other types of disagreement within the agricultural group, this type of disagreement does not have a basis that can readily be discerned. It is the general farm organizations who claim to speak for the farm public. Since the memberships of these organizations are geographically widespread, represent many commodity groups, and are composed for the most part of the higher income farmer, it is somewhat difficult to show that the basis of the disagreement is directly related to differences in geographical, income, or commodity group representation. It is likely that these factors do play a part in the disagreement but exactly what that part is can not be specifically stated.

This thesis is an attempt to answer the question: Why do the general farm organizations disagree on agricultural policy?

The term general farm organizations has specific reference to:
(1) The American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), (2) The National Grange, and (3) The National Farmers Union.

In order to answer the above question it will first be necessary to:

1. Indicate how beliefs, values, and valuations are related to action positions.

2. Construct a model capable of explaining an organization's policy position.

3. Identify the beliefs and valuations of the general farm organizations.

It will then be shown, how it is possible to predict, on the basis of the model, the policy position an organization will take in regard to specific policy proposals.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For the most part, treatises devoted to a discussion of the conflicting viewpoints of the three major farm organizations on agricultural policy are of relatively recent origin. Two reasons account for this. One reason relates to the fact that economists and political scientists have only recently become aware, as Brandow (8) points out, that a prerequisite for a long-run effective farm policy is agreement among farm groups: as farm groups will only support policies in operation when they are in agreement with them. Economists, aware of the fact that their proposals were not being accepted by all the farm organizations and beginning to realize that farm group acceptance is a prerequisite for an effective farm policy, have suddenly become concerned over the fact that different farm organizations do take different positions on agricultural policy proposals.

A second reason relates to the fact that the nature of the conflict among the farm organizations has changed markedly since the war. According to McConnell (16), the dispute before World War II was less concerned with the mass of agricultural policy and more concerned with the administrative structure. After the war, however, the interest of the farm organizations shifted from administration to policy.

Brandow (8) contends that an important reason farm organizations do not agree on farm policy is due to the fact that the organizations disagree on goals. Brandow relates goals to the values that farmers have, and considers the means to be used to achieve such goals. Four general areas in which farmers have goals are cited:
1. Income
2. Freedom
3. Efficiency
4. Farm population

Conflict is said to occur because different individuals have different goals and no means exist by which all goals can "be achieved at once— or even by which some can be achieved without impairing others."

Hathaway (10) states that the holding of different beliefs and values regarding the economic organization of American agriculture is responsible for the disagreement on certain policy issues. Hathaway lists:

1. The Family Farm
2. Vertical integration
3. The Free Market
4. Use of Direct Payments

as basic "elements of policy which are related to economic organization and which seem to be of key importance at the present time...." Hathaway cites the following values:

1. Democratic form of government
2. Economic freedom
3. Efficiency
4. Receiving just compensation for contribution to society, as underlying the policies relating to economic organization. The associated beliefs are said to be the following:

(1) Farm people are an important stabilizing force for a democratic form of government.
(2) Continued existence of democratic government rests upon the absence of government regulation of price levels for farm products.

(3) The owner-operated farm represents the maximum achievement of individual freedom in a modern industrial society.

(4) Owner-operated family farms are the most efficient form of organization for the production of farm products.

(5) Market price is the best determinant of a person's contribution to society.

Hathaway feels that a substantial amount of the disagreement that exists could be removed, if the organizations possessed the same beliefs and values.

Kaldor (12) indicates that some of the disagreement on farm policy within agriculture is caused by:

1. Conflicts of interests between different commodity producers.
2. Different farmers attaching importance or values to different policy goals or attaching different values to the same policy goals.
3. Disagreement over the "proper role of the government."
4. Differences in beliefs about the facts.

Facts, according to Kaldor, are important in policy-making decisions, i.e., they (the facts) indicate the problem, point out the causes, are used to design and select programs. If the facts are being interpreted differently and there is a difference in beliefs about what the facts are, it is said that different policy proposals will be suggested.

According to Wilcox (15), the basis for disagreement can be traced to beliefs about the efficacy of a market pricing system and the degree
of governmental involvement in the production phase of agriculture. Wilcox feels that the AFBF believes that the nation's economic welfare can be maximized, if economic activity is conducted by private traders in domestic and international markets. The AFBF is also said to feel highly confident that a free market economy can best cope with farm price and income declines. The AFBF admits that there may be short-run losses, but these losses, they claim, will be more than offset by long run financial gains that will accrue to farmers, if only farmers are allowed to make their own production decisions and the government does not become involved in the pricing process.

Wilcox states that the Grange's position is somewhat similar to that of the AFBF as it relates to governmental interference with and restrictions on production. However, the Grange is said to be somewhat dubious about returning to a free market situation for agriculture.

The Farmers Union, Wilcox feels, is less fearful of excessive governmental involvement in regard to production and in addition feels that reliance on a market pricing system will not bring about equity or justice in the economy.

Wesley McCune (15), in the process of pointing out the number of pressure groups and interest groups who shape American agricultural policy, inadvertently expounds a theory as to why farm organizations disagree on agricultural policy proposals.

McCune implies that an organization's policy position is determined by its relationships with other groups, its members, and its leaders. The most important factor, McCune claims, is the organization's relationships with other groups, McCune points out that organized agriculture has
been substantially infiltrated by many nonagriculturists—church groups, service clubs, processors, chambers of commerce, farm equipment suppliers, college professors, politicians, etc. Many of these nonagriculturists have interests that conflict with the interests of farmers. The amount of influence any nonagriculturist has in determining the policy position of a farm organization is not related to the nature of the nonagriculturist's interests, but to the type of relationship he has with the farm organization. Those nonagriculturists who have a warm, friendly relationship with a farm organization and have an interest in agricultural decisions take part in that farm organization's policy making deliberations. It would seem to follow from what McCune says that the more friendly a farm organization is to nonagriculturists who have interests that conflict with the interests of farmers, the less this farm organization will be promoting the farmer's interests and the more it will be in conflict with a farm organization which does not have a relationship with nonagriculturists whose interests conflict with the interests of farmers.

In regard to the three organizations being discussed, McCune says that the AFBF has catered to food processors and financial interests, in addition to recruiting them as members, and, as a result, "there is now a smooth working arrangement between the big, efficient organization (the AFBF) and all sorts of business groups." He feels that the Grange has not associated with business groups as closely as the AFBF, but that it "has allowed some flagrantly commercial enterprises to buy into its national operation and its good offices." The Farmers Union is said to be relatively free of nonagriculturist's control. Its leaders are said
to make a point of avoiding affiliation with commercial groups. The Farmers Union, McCune continues, allows only farmers to join and is not co-aligned with any group in agriculture, industry or business, although it is "friendly with labor."¹

McConnell's (16) discussion is chiefly centered on the AFBF; however, his discussion indicates the basis of some of the conflict over agricultural policy. McConnell relates to the reader three common interpretations non-members of the AFBF have of the AFBF. Two of these are of interest. One interpretation is that the AFBF is a weapon in the hands of a few mercenary leaders. The implication that follows from this assumption is that the officers of the AFBF in the process of creating a politically strong organization of farmers have simultaneously obtained "an irresponsible power which they offer for a price." The second commonly held view of the AFBF, according to McConnell, is that the AFBF is being manipulated by large business and industrial interests. It is through the AFBF that the "big-interests" operate and further their own ends. McConnell does not subscribe to either of these points of view, but tends to point out their shortcomings.

McConnell's position is the following: The AFBF is founded upon one strata of farmers. As an organization its growth has been substantially aided by the conflict between large and small farmers. The AFBF does not

¹It should be mentioned that Wesley McCune, from 1955 to 1962, served as editor of the National Union Farmer, a periodical publication issued by the National Farmers Union. Also, Prof. Talbot of Iowa State University has indicated to the author that McCune has a tendency to give minimum emphasis to the high degree of similarity that exists between organized labor on the one hand and the National Farmers Union on the other, in regard to ideology and policy.
select its members from all farmers but only from the most prosperous farmers. Since it excludes the poor farmer, it, as a result, does not act or speak for him. It does, however, seek a monopoly of organization in agriculture by reducing "all federal programs to a system of grants to be administered with the aid of locally drawn committees of farmers through the offices of county agents." Because it seeks a monopoly of organization in agriculture and because other groups have organized those individuals the AFBF has rejected, it looks on other groups as rivals. As a result, "the Farm Bureau has been antagonistic to the Farmers Union. It has, on the whole, been tolerant toward the Grange, since the latter has frequently served its purposes...."

Farm organizations have at times been classified by sociologists according to their political bias and the income level of their members. These classifications are at times used by others in an attempt to explain why the three major farm organizations disagree on agricultural policy.

D. Lindstrom (13, pp. 177-218) refers to the Grange as being "conservative." He calls the Farmers Union "leftwing or radical" and refers to the Farm Bureau as "the middle-ground organization."

Lowry Nelson (37, p. 532), in addition to Charles Loomis and J. Allan Beegle (14, p. 655), contrast the "liberalism" of the Farmers Union with the position of the Grange and the Farm Bureau.

E. D. Sanderson (38, pp. 509-518) indicates that the Grange's membership is composed of "the better-class farm families." He also believes that the Farmers Union's membership "represents the middle-class" and that the Farm Bureau's members are "mostly middle and better-class farmers."
Talbot (40) attempts to answer the question: How did the present intergroup schism come about? He says that historical, geographical, ideological and leadership factors all play a role in the disagreement between the three farm organizations. Talbot's comments point out the ideological and leadership differences. Ideologically, he says, the Farm Bureau is addicted to the belief that the law of supply and demand will take care of everything. The Farmers Union is said to be an organization "with a strong leaning toward liberal—to some extent, socialist—ideologies." He disposes of the Grange on the grounds that the Grange "has become so much a social and fraternal organization that it is difficult to analyze its political complexion."

In regard to the leadership of the organizations, Talbot feels that the AFBF leaders "have inclined toward the 'passion' of aristocracy." Leaders of the Farmers Union are said to have "been moved by the democratic 'passion'—the belief in human equality and the willingness to socialize in order to achieve that goal." The leaders of the Grange are said to be "pragmatic and not inclined toward the use of political weapons of scorn and derision."
BELIEFS, VALUES, AND VALUATIONS

Individuals, organizations, societies and nations all have ideas about the world of which they are a part. It can be shown that rational behavior--whether it be behavior that is manifested by an individual, an organization, a society or a nation--is a function of three types of ideas.

One type of ideas that determine behavior are expressed in statements that are termed beliefs. Beliefs have a truth value associated with them. By saying a statement has a truth value means: it is possible to objectively determined whether such a statement is true or false. Individuals, organizations, societies or nations when using a statement that is a belief or have ideas that are beliefs are in effect saying something about how a situation was, or how a situation is, or how a situation will be.

A second type of ideas that determine behavior are expressed in statements that are termed values. Values indicate which situation or situations are preferred when a choice must be made over alternative situations. They can best be thought of as preference indicating statements which point out "likes" or "dislikes", what one thinks is "right" or "wrong", and "good" or "bad."

A third type of ideas that give rise to behavioral patterns are expressed in statements that are termed valuations. Values are expressed in statements that are termed valuations. Values are

\footnote{For a somewhat similar but more expanded discussion on beliefs and valuations, cf. Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma, New York, N. Y., Harper and Bros., 1944, pp. 1027-1032.}
statements that have an "ought" or "should" connotation, i.e., the individual, organization, society or nation in expressing a statement of this type is in effect saying that a certain situation in the environment "should" or "should not be" or "ought to have been" or "ought not to have been" a particular way. A valuation is more times than not an expression of certain beliefs and values. It can also be argued that valuations are nothing more than logically derived inferences of beliefs and values. Valuations can best be remembered as being those statements which prescribe behavior or even thought of as "behavioral prescriptions."

In order to point out three characteristics of beliefs, values, and valuations that will be of pertinence in the forthcoming discussion, the following illustration is presented:

Beliefs:
1. Cigarette smoking causes cancer.
2. God is omnipotent.
3. God is love.

Values:
1. Not having cancer is preferred to having cancer.
2. God is preferred over the devil.

Valuations:
1. People should stop smoking.
2. Man should obey God's word.

Assume that these beliefs, values, and valuations form the totality of beliefs, values, and valuations that a certain individual has. In this case, it is seen that every belief is associated with at least one
value and one valuation. In reality this will not always be the case. Instances occur where individuals have beliefs without associated values or valuations. Instances also occur where individuals have valuations without explicitly stated beliefs or explicitly stated values.

A second characteristic to be indicated relates to beliefs. Belief number one, "Cigarette smoking causes cancer," does have a truth value. However, the truth value of the statement, for many people, has not as yet been determined conclusively. Some individuals do hold the belief nonetheless. Nondetermination of a statement's truth value does not then prevent it from being held as a belief.

A third characteristic of beliefs, values, and valuations is that some beliefs, values, and valuations are operationally meaningful only to the person who holds them. Belief number three, "God is love," and valuation number two, "Man should obey God's word" are a belief and a valuation that could mean several things to several people, depending on, how they define "God," "love," and "God's word." To determine whether the belief, "God is love" is true or false, one has to know what is meant by "God" and "love." And in order to obey "God's word" one first has to know what "God's word" is.

These three characteristics are inherent in most belief, value, and valuation frameworks. They present some problems, as will be shown later.

The beliefs, values, and valuations of individuals, organizations,
societies, and nations relate to practically everything: such economic matters as farm income, the rate of growth, the level of employment and governmental fiscal policy; such political matters as civil liberties, representative government, decentralization, and the role of government; such international concerns as the United Nations, underdeveloped nations, Russian agriculture, and foreign trade; such social considerations as education, racial integration, public health, and public assistance; and other matters ad infinitum.

On examining the belief, value, and valuation framework of different individuals, it is found that the following three relations exist.

1. Some beliefs, values, and valuations are held in common by everyone.

2. Some beliefs, values, and valuations are held by some individuals that are not at all related to the beliefs, values, or valuations held by other individuals.

3. Some beliefs, values, and valuations are held by some individuals that are repugnant to the beliefs, values, and valuations held by other individuals.

An illustration of the above three relations is shown by assuming a universe of two individuals A and B, who have the following beliefs:

A's beliefs:

(1) The earth is a sphere.

(2) Milk builds strong bones.

(3) Smoking causes cancer.

B's beliefs:

(1) The earth is a sphere.
(2) God is love.

(3) Smoking does not cause cancer.

An example of the first relation is seen on examining belief number one of both individuals. This is a belief held by all in the universe. An example of the second relation is seen by examining the second belief of both individuals. None of the two is in any way related to a belief of the other individual. Finally, an example of beliefs that are repugnant is seen by examining belief number three of both A and B.¹

The means-end continuum

Social scientists very often explain rational behavior in terms of "means" and "ends." Rational behavior is said to be maximizing behavior: behavior which makes an attempt to maximize the attainment of stated ends.

The means-end continuum is conceptualized as being a scheduling of the various desired ends. These ends are theoretically classified as lower order ends, intermediate order ends, or higher order ends. The lower order ends are at times referred to as the primary goals or ultimate means. The higher order ends are often referred to as the ultimate or near ultimate goals. Ranking in between the higher order and lower order ends are said to lie the intermediate ends. The lower order ends have value because they serve as a means to obtain the intermediate ends. Thus, the value imputed to the lower order ends is a result of their instrumental nature. The ultimate or near ultimate goals are valued solely for the satisfaction they provide when they are attained. The

¹Though the example was illustrated with beliefs, a parallel discussion is possible for values and valuations.
intermediate level goals have value because they serve as a means to achieve the ultimate or near ultimate goals. In addition, many intermediate goals are valued because they also provide direct satisfaction when they are attained.

If rational behavior can be explained in terms of the means-end continuum, and it is also said that rational behavior is a function of beliefs, values, and valuations; it would seem that beliefs, values, and valuations are somehow related to the means-end continuum. Such is the case. Beliefs indicate the relationships that exist among the various goals which are of the same order. They do this by pointing out whether the various goals are competitive, complimentary or otherwise. For example, the belief may indicate how much of one end, e.g., leisure activities, must be sacrificed in order to attain a given amount of another end, e.g., income; or the belief may indicate how one end, e.g., creative expression, is attained with the attainment of a second end, e.g., employment as an architect. Beliefs also indicate the relationships that exist among the various ends of different orders. In this manner, they point out the instrumental nature of the ends, i.e., they point out which ends serve as means for other ends. For example, the belief might indicate that one end, say, education, serves as a means to attain another end, say, higher income.

Values come into play when a choice must be made over competing ends. The choice is made with the criterion being that the choice should be the one which maximizes the amount of potential goal attainment. For example, if B and B' are two different ends and B will enable one to achieve desired ends C, D, and E while B' will enable one to achieve desired
goals C, and D, but not E, the rational choice would be to chose B. The value statement representing the rational choice would read, B is preferred to B'.

Valuations are simply a verbalization of the means-end continuum. They indicate the behavior that should be undertaken for the purpose of attaining desired ends.
CONCEPTS, DEFINITIONS, AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS

In a forthcoming section a theory is presented. This theory is explained with a number of terms which need to be definitively conceptualized. Therefore, at this point, definitions will be supplied for these terms.

**Consistency**

To say that a particular type of activity is consistent with a belief or consistent with a value or consistent with a valuation is to say that it is possible to say that the occurrence of the activity followed from the acceptance of the belief, value, or valuation.

**Example:**

Assume the following belief, value, and valuation exist.

1. It is going to rain.
2. People prefer being dry to being wet.
3. Everyone should wear a raincoat.

Let the activity be a man putting on a raincoat.

It is possible to say that the activity followed from the acceptance of the belief.

It is possible to say that the activity followed from the acceptance of the value.

It is also possible to say that the activity followed from the acceptance of the valuation.

In this example it is said that the activity is consistent with the belief, value, and valuation.
Inconsistency

To say that a particular type of activity is inconsistent with a belief or inconsistent with a value or inconsistent with a valuation is to say that it is possible to say that the occurrence of the activity would not have occurred had there been adherence to the belief, value, or valuation.

Example:

Assume the belief, value, and valuation used in the previous example exist.

Let the event be an individual walking in the rain without a raincoat.

It is possible to say that the activity would not have occurred had the belief, value, and valuation been adhered to.

It is said in this example that the activity is inconsistent with the belief, value, and valuation.

It is not necessary that the activity actually followed from the acceptance of a belief, value, or valuation or that an activity would not have occurred, if a belief, value, or valuation were adhered to, to say that the activity was consistent or inconsistent with a belief, value, or valuation. It is only necessary that it is possible to say that the activity followed from the acceptance of a belief, value, or valuation or that it would not have occurred had the belief, value, or valuation been adhered to.

When a given activity is neither consistent nor inconsistent with any beliefs, values, or valuations of an individual that activity is said
to have a neutral relation with that individual's beliefs, values, and valuations.

The "on-balance effect"

At times, a particular activity will be consistent with some beliefs, values, and valuations and inconsistent with other beliefs, values, and valuations simultaneously. If the beliefs, values, and valuations that the activity is consistent with are considered to be more significant than those with which the activity is inconsistent, the activity is said to be "on-balance" consistent with the beliefs, values, and valuations. On the other hand, if the beliefs, values, and valuations with which the activity is inconsistent are more significant than the beliefs, values, and valuations with which the activity is consistent, the activity is said to be "on-balance" inconsistent with the beliefs, values, and valuations. This process of judging whether or not an activity is consistent or inconsistent with the more significant beliefs, values, and valuations will for discussion purposes be termed the "on-balance effect."

Example:

Assume the following beliefs, values, and valuations are held.

1. Dirty teeth causes bad breath.
2. People do not like bad breath.
3. People should brush their teeth everyday.
4. Cyanide is poisonous.
5. People prefer life to death.
6. Cyanide should not be taken internally.
If the activity is an individual brushing his teeth with cyanide, the activity obviously is consistent and inconsistent with beliefs, values, and valuations simultaneously. The individual, if he feels statements 4, 5, and 6 are more significant than 1, 2, and 3, would judge that, on-balance, the activity was inconsistent with his beliefs, values, and valuations.

It should be noted that the importance or significance of the beliefs, values, and valuations is judged by the individual who is determining the on-balance effect.

Classification of beliefs and valuations

Beliefs and valuations will be categorized into three classes. For notation purposes, these classes will be designated: "Type I," "Type II," and "Type III."

Type I beliefs and valuations are beliefs and valuations of the highest order. Beliefs and valuations of this type transcend all other beliefs and valuations, take precedence over them and are those beliefs and valuations to which beliefs and valuations of lower orders are so orientated. For any given society these beliefs and valuations are universalistic in nature, i.e., they have implications for everyone in the society. Individuals who hold specific Type I beliefs and valuations desire that everyone in their society possesses the same Type I beliefs and valuations that they do, because every society is set up and its activity orientated around Type I beliefs and valuations. Type I beliefs and valuations have a shortcoming for the problem at hand. This shortcoming relates to
the fact that they are not always operationally meaningful. An example of two Type I valuations are:

1. We should have a communistic type economic system.
2. The U.S. should discontinue the testing of nuclear weapons.

It is seen that Type I valuations (the same holds for beliefs) do not have to be universally held; they only need to have universal implications for the society in which the individual who holds them resides.

Type II beliefs and valuations are particularistic in nature. They relate specifically to the individual who holds them. The implications from these beliefs and valuations are primarily for the individual who holds them. An example of two Type II beliefs and valuations are:

1. I am sick.
2. I am old.
3. I should no longer work.
4. I should start praying.

Type III beliefs and valuations relate to behavior. The way in which they are related to behavior is the following: They indicate behavior that is considered undesirable by the individual who holds them. The Type III belief indicates why the behavior is undesirable. The Type III valuation indicates that the behavior or activity is not desired. For example, consider the following Type III beliefs and valuations:

1. Racial discrimination is wasteful.
2. Capital punishment does not deter crime.
3. Racial discrimination should be declared illegal.
4. Capital punishment should be prohibited.

In this example both racial discrimination and capital punishment are considered undesirable. Notice the beliefs indicate why they are considered undesirable and the valuations indicate that they are undesired.

The reader may have noticed that there is nothing to prevent Type III beliefs and valuations from being classified as Type I or Type II beliefs and valuations. This is true. All Type III beliefs and valuations can also be classified as either Type I or Type II. However, for the purpose at hand, it is necessary to introduce this third classification. Thus, whenever a belief or a valuation relates to behavior or activity and this belief or valuation indicates that this behavior or activity is considered undesirable, the Type III category will have priority in the classifying of said belief or valuation.
A THEORY OF SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION

Concepts and terms developed in the preceding discussion will now be utilized in a theory which explains under what circumstances an individual will favor a particular type of activity and under what circumstances he will be opposed to a particular type of activity.

The theory is as follows:

An individual will be in favor of or support any activity that is consistent with his Type II beliefs and valuations and is not inconsistent with his Type I beliefs and valuations. An individual also will favor any activity that has a neutral relation with his Type II beliefs and valuations and is consistent with his Type I beliefs and valuations. An individual will be opposed to any activity that is inconsistent with his Type I or Type II beliefs and valuations.

The theory can be illustrated with the following:

Type I Beliefs and Valuations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type II Beliefs and Valuations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the illustration "C" stands for "consistent with," "I" stands for "inconsistent with" and "N" stands for "neutral relation with." An activity which is consistent with an individual's Type I beliefs and valuations and is consistent with his Type II beliefs and valuations
would be placed in the upper left-hand corner. Such an activity would receive support from the individual. Other combinations can be read accordingly.

In the theory no mention is made of statements which have been termed values. The justification for this is the following: A theory is wanted which explains an organization's policy position. It is desired that this theory be operational so that it can be applied to the real world. A theory which relies on values cannot be said to be operational. In the illustrative examples which have been provided in preceding pages, values have been used in cases that have been somewhat clear cut. In most cases, and especially those cases which are related to public policy, knowledge of an individual's values (preference statements) is somewhat lacking. People rarely state explicitly what their values are. For example: most people are not prone to say, "I prefer more income to less freedom," or, "give me liberty or give me death," or, "better Red than dead." They are more inclined to say, "give me income and freedom," or, "give me liberty and life." It, as a result, becomes impossible to say precisely what most people's values are. Therefore, while a theory which is based on statements which have been termed values may be theoretically sound, it cannot be used effectively in an operational sense.

It still cannot be said that value statements should be eliminated from consideration completely. It would be somewhat inconsistent to indicate—as has been previously done—that values are a determinant of activity and then not include them in a theory which shows under what conditions a given type of activity will be supported or opposed. However, it is not necessary to deal with values explicitly. Values can be
dealt with indirectly through beliefs and valuations. It was stated above that a valuation is more times than not an expression of certain beliefs and values. It was also stated that valuations can be logically inferred from beliefs and values. Two additional statements also hold. (1) The intelligibility of values (preference statements) rests upon assumptions (beliefs) that certain states of affairs exists. (2) Every valuation has embodied in it—however implicit—a value. It follows, then, that when one is dealing with beliefs and valuations, values are inherently inclusive in his discussion.

A final consideration

The theory as presented is not completely operational. It has been indicated that many Type I beliefs and valuations are stated in a highly general and operationally meaningless form. Because of their high level of generality and lack of definitiveness, it cannot always be stated unequivocally whether or not an activity is consistent or inconsistent with an individual's Type I beliefs and valuations; even if the Type I beliefs and valuations are known. However, whether an activity is consistent or inconsistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of an individual can be determined indirectly—and with certainty—by considering the individual's Type II and Type III beliefs and valuations.

The three types of beliefs and valuations an individual holds are related in such a manner that the following statements hold.

1. If an activity is consistent with an individual's Type II beliefs and valuations and it is also consistent with that individual's Type III beliefs and valuations, the activity will also be consistent with that
individual's Type I beliefs and valuations. The individual will be in favor of such an activity.

2. If an activity is consistent with an individual's Type II beliefs and valuations and it also has a neutral relation with that individual's Type III beliefs and valuations, the activity will also be consistent with that individual's Type I beliefs and valuations. The individual will be in favor of such an activity.

3. (a) If an activity is inconsistent with Type III beliefs and valuations, it is necessarily inconsistent with some Type II beliefs and valuations.

(b) From 3(a), it follows that if an activity is inconsistent with Type III beliefs and valuations and not simultaneously consistent with some Type II beliefs and valuations, the activity will be opposed.

(c) If an activity is consistent with some Type II beliefs and valuations and it is also inconsistent with Type III beliefs and valuations, it follows from 3(a) that the activity is inconsistent and consistent with Type II beliefs and valuations simultaneously. It will then have to be determined via the on-balance effect whether or not the activity is on-balance consistent or inconsistent with the Type II beliefs and valuations.

(d) If the situation in 3(c) arises and it is judged that on-balance the activity is inconsistent with the Type II beliefs and valuations, the activity will be opposed.

(e) If the situation in 3(c) arises and it is judged that on-balance the activity is consistent with the Type II beliefs and valuations, it must then be determined whether or not the activity is
inconsistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations. The activity is inconsistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations, if the Type III beliefs and valuations it is inconsistent with are more significant than the Type II beliefs and valuations with which it is consistent. Use of the on-balance effect is again necessitated.

Beliefs and valuations and the conflict over agricultural policy

The question to be answered is: Why do the three farm organizations disagree over agricultural policy proposals?

The answer to this question is: The disagreement manifested by the three major farm organizations relating to agricultural policy proposals occurs because the organizations have different belief and valuation frameworks.

The answer given to the question is based on the theory presented in the previous pages. It can be shown that farm organizations have Type I and Type II beliefs and valuations. The relation between a given activity and a farm organization's Type I and Type II beliefs and valuations is what determines whether the farm organization will be opposed to such an activity or in favor of it.

For a farm organization to be in favor of an activity, the activity must not be inconsistent with the farm organization's Type I or Type II beliefs and valuations. These are the same conditions presented in the theory and as a result a similar chart showing conditions of support and opposition is applicable for the farm organizations.
It follows from the theory that if two organizations have identical beliefs and valuations, they should never be expected to differ in their decisions to support a given type of activity or to oppose it, and they should always be expected to support or oppose the activity for the same reason.

Economists have developed a number of hypotheses as to why farm organizations differ on agricultural policy proposals. Before continuing, it will be shown how the theory of support and opposition as it has been applied to the problem at hand is a contribution to their analyses.

Differences in expectations

It has been stated by some economists that differences in expectations about what the results will be that follow the enactment of a particular policy proposal are a cause of the different positions taken by the farm organizations in regard to policy proposals. This is essentially a difference in beliefs. The organizations are in effect saying, "if this—the enactment of the proposal—occurs, the following—a specified result—will follow." The problem is said to arise because the different organizations are not agreed on what the "specified result" that
follows the enactment of the proposal will be. For example, let it be assumed that there are two farm organizations, organization "A" and organization "B". In addition, let it be assumed that a proposal is being suggested that will require farmers over 35 years of age whose yearly income exceeds $15,000 to give $1,000 of their income to farmers under 25 years of age with yearly incomes less than $3,000. Further, let it be assumed that organization "A" feels that farmers who receive the $1,000 will be so ashamed of receiving charity that they will work harder to increase their income, so as not to be eligible for the $1,000 hand-out. Also, let it be assumed that organization "B" feels that farmers under 25 years of age with incomes of less than $3,000 are not in the least industrious, and, as a result, will curtail their efforts, so as to be sure not to earn over $3,000, in order to be eligible for the $1,000 donation. This proposal, it is seen, produces two different views on what the consequences will be, as a result of its enactment. Organization "A" feels that farmers under 25 years of age with a yearly income of less than $3,000 will work harder. Organization "B" feels that farmers under 25 years of age with a yearly income of less than $3,000 will work less than previously. This is what is meant by saying that organizations disagree on what will follow when a particular proposal is enacted. This type of disagreement is suggested by some as the factor that underlies the disagreement over agricultural policy proposals.

_Belief differences_

In the example, it was pointed out that organizations "A" and "B" differed in their respective expectations of the consequences that would
follow the enactment of the proposal. This difference in beliefs about
the consequences of the proposal is a result of the fact that the two
organizations have different beliefs about the nature of farmers under
26 years of age who receive a yearly income less than $3,000. Organiza-
tion "A" believes that these farmers dislike receiving charity. Organ-
ization "B" believes that these same farmers are essentially free-loaders.
It is these underlying beliefs that gave rise to the difference in expecta-
tions of the consequences that would follow the enactment of the pro-
posal. It is these underlying beliefs which must be known, if the con-

clict over agricultural policy proposals, as it is a function of differ-
ences in expectations of the consequences, is to be understood. To indi-
cate that two organizations disagree on an agricultural policy proposal
because they differ in their beliefs about what will follow its enactment
provides no more than a surface understanding of the conflict.

To be more realistic: it is known that certain organizations feel
that a proposal which would allow farm prices to find their free market
level would in effect raise aggregate farm income; it is also known that
other organizations feel such a proposal would cause farm income to de-
cline. This again is a difference in expectations about the consequences
of a proposal. It is more than this, however. It is probably also a
sign that the farm organizations have different beliefs about the price
elasticity of demand for agricultural products. It should be apparent
that in order to understand why differences in expectations occur, it
is incumbent upon the investigator to determine what the organizations' 
underlying beliefs are.
Differences in values

Let it be assumed that the same proposal is being suggested. However, let it now be assumed that organizations "A" and "B" expect the same consequences. They both feel that farmers under 26 years of age will work harder. Let it further be assumed that both organizations agree that the enactment of the proposal will cause an increase in governmental activity in the agricultural sector. Finally, let it be assumed that organization "A" prefers less governmental activity in agriculture to increasing low-income farmers' income; and that organization "B" does not mind an increase in governmental activity, if it is accompanied by an increase in low-income farmers' income. Here the organizations have similar expectations of the consequences but different values. There are some economists who suggest that the cause of the disagreement among the farm organizations over agricultural policy proposals occurs because of different values (or preference statements).

Value differences

People or organizations do not just happen to prefer "more government" to less income or "less government" to more income without having certain beliefs about the role of the government, income levels or other cognate factors. Most value statements are a function of certain beliefs possessed by the individual or organization who holds those values. Therefore, in order to understand why different individuals have different values, it must be known what beliefs give rise to them.
Differences in valuations

Differences can also occur because the farm organizations have different valuations. Let it now be assumed, that organizations "A" and "B" are in agreement over the consequences of the proposal, and that neither of them disfavor governmental activity. However, let it now be assumed that organization "A" feels that farmers who have high incomes should be made to assist low-income farmers, and that organization "B" feels that farmers with low-incomes should not have their incomes increased at the expense of high-income farmers.

These different valuations could conceivably give rise to different positions taken on the proposal.

Valuation differences

Valuations are also a function of beliefs. When valuations differ, it can be expected that different beliefs are held. However, the beliefs that underlie many valuations that individuals or organizations hold are not always known, because the organization or individual does not state them. It, therefore, becomes necessary to consider valuations as they are stated rather than attempting to deal with them through beliefs.

All disagreement among the farm organizations over agricultural policy proposals is either a function of differences in beliefs, values or valuations that the organizations hold. When such disagreement is being analyzed in terms of goals, ends, means, conflicts of interest or the organizations' relationships with other groups, the conflict to be thoroughly understood must be traced ultimately to differences in beliefs, and valuations. This has not as yet been done and, understandably, the
true nature of the conflict has not as yet been understood.

The theory of support and opposition

In the theory, it is seen that beliefs and valuations are treated together. It is said, for instance, a proposal to be supported must be consistent with Type I and Type II beliefs and valuations. It should be pointed out that unless the beliefs and valuations are considered in a joint (associated) manner the theory becomes useless. Only when beliefs and valuations are considered in an associated manner is the theory able to indicate what beliefs or what valuations cause the organization to support or oppose the proposal. To illustrate: consider a previous example in which organizations "A" and "B" had different beliefs about the expectations of the consequences.

"A's" beliefs:
26 year old farmers will work harder.

"B's" beliefs:
26 year old farmers will work less.

Is knowing these beliefs about the expectations of the consequences enough to indicate that the farm organizations will disagree? No! If both organizations held the valuation: 26 year old farmers should work harder, "A" could be expected to support the proposal and "B" could be expected to oppose the proposal. However, "B" does not have to hold this valuation. "B" could conceivably feel: 26 year old farmers should work less. Then both organizations would be expected to support the proposal, even though they have different beliefs and valuations. What was crucial in this instance was the way in which the beliefs and valuations were
related.

To say an activity is consistent with a belief when only a belief is given is impossible. If the belief is held: it is going to rain, who can say the activity of a man putting on a raincoat is activity consistent with that belief? One must first know that this man prefers being dry to wet and that he considers he should not get wet. However, if he prefers being wet to being dry and that he considers he should get wet, the activity is inconsistent with the belief, it is going to rain.

Beliefs and valuations must be treated together, if the desire is to completely understand the nature of the disagreement over agricultural policy proposals. Too often in the past this has not been done; with the result being that the nature of the disagreement among the farm organizations is not thoroughly understood.

By utilizing the theory of support and opposition, it is possible to determine whether or not a given farm organization will oppose or support a particular policy proposal. Further, it is possible to state for what reasons—in terms of beliefs and valuations—the organization opposes or supports the proposal. As, the expectations an organization has concerning the consequences of the enactment of a proposal, the organization's goals, ends, and values, the means the organization wants to be employed in agricultural policy proposals are all a function of beliefs or valuations; if the desire is to express the disagreement in terms of one of these factors it can readily be done.

To apply the theory to a farm organization's position on an agricultural policy proposal, it is only necessary to determine whether or not the activity which follows the enactment of the proposal is consistent
or inconsistent with the farm organization's Type I and Type II beliefs and valuations.

(It should be recalled that to say an activity is consistent with beliefs and valuations is to say that it is possible to say that the activity followed from the acceptance of the beliefs and valuations, and that to say an activity is inconsistent with beliefs and valuations is to say that the activity would not have occurred had the beliefs and valuations been adhered to).

The desire is to be able to determine whether or not the farm organization will support or oppose the activity, before the activity takes place, in order to be able to predict whether or not the organization will support or oppose the proposal. The major provisions of the proposal indicate what activity will take place when the proposal is enacted. Therefore, the consideration will be: are the major provisions of the proposal consistent or inconsistent with the farm organization's Type I and Type II beliefs and valuations?

Farm organizations have many beliefs and valuations. In order to obtain accurate results with the theory, it is necessary that the beliefs and valuations attributed to a farm organization be only those beliefs and valuations it is known with certainty the organization holds. These beliefs and valuations will be referred to as "the expressed beliefs and valuations." In order to analyze the conflict over agricultural policy it is not necessary to list or know all of the farm organizations' expressed beliefs and valuations. Those expressed beliefs and valuations, of which it can be said, agricultural policy proposals have a neutral
relation with, can be omitted.

To say an organization has certain beliefs and valuations is not to say that those beliefs and valuations attributed to that organization are beliefs and valuations that each and every member of that organization possesses.

When one speaks of beliefs and valuations of individuals and then proceeds to group these individuals into a single entity and speak of the beliefs and valuations of the entity; if these individuals do not all possess exactly the same beliefs and valuations, quite obviously, an aggregation problem arises. This aggregation problem is solved by the farm organizations in roughly the following manner. Each individual of the organization who so desires is allowed to state those beliefs and valuations which he would like to see the organization hold. If a majority of the members of the organization feel that any belief or valuation stated by an individual member should be held by the organization as an entity, it becomes a belief or valuation of that organization.

In actuality, then, it should not be expected that each and every individual member of a farm organization holds the same beliefs and valuations attributed to that organization. It should only be expected that there is not a majority of the members who are opposed to any belief or valuation that is attributed to the organization.

As it was indicated previously Type I beliefs and valuations are many times operationally meaningless. This is not the case for all the Type I beliefs and valuations; some of them are quite exact. However, to insure accuracy, the major provisions and the Type II and Type III beliefs
and valuations should be considered, and the rules put forth on pages 27, 28, and 29 utilized in order to determine how the major provisions of the proposal and the Type I beliefs and valuations are related.

Final note

The types of beliefs and valuations were defined with an individual in mind. Because an organization is an aggregation of individuals, a modification of the definition is needed for the Type II category.

As a farm organization is, for the most part, an aggregation of farmers, Type II beliefs and valuations of a farm organization are those beliefs and valuations which have implications primarily for farmers—opposed to non-farmers.

The Type III and Type I beliefs and valuations of farm organizations have the same definitions given the two types for an individual.
EXPRESSED BELIEFS AND VALUATIONS OF THE FARM ORGANIZATIONS

This section of the thesis contains the expressed beliefs and valuations of the farm organizations. The beliefs and valuations listed have in most cases been derived from either the organizations' general programs or adopted resolutions. The listing does not exhaust all the expressed beliefs and valuations of the farm organizations. It does, however, include most of those which have had a bearing on agricultural policy positions in the recent past.

AFBF's Type I expressed beliefs

1 - Trade among nations is essential to the maintenance of freedom and peace. (4, p. 6)

2 - "It is in our national interest that nations upon whom our mutual security depends, import raw materials for defense, and maintain living standards to support political stability of their governments." (7, p. 9)

3 - "Our national and agricultural economies depend on exports and imports to prosper." (6, p. 8)

4 - "Other countries need United States farm products." (5, p. 17)

5 - "The maintenance of a high standard of living in the United States is dependent to a large degree on a high level of imports and exports." (4, p. 8)

6 - "Trade among nations contributes to friendly relationships and is a cohesive force for peace." (1, p. 22)

7 - "It is a sacred obligation of this generation to conserve our
national resources for future generations." (7, p. 25)

8 - "Through the free enterprise system the American people have produced abundant goods and services and provided widespread educational advantages and religious opportunities." (1, p. 5)

9 - "Efficiency of production and maximum per capita production are primary elements in determining standards of living." (1, p. 5)

10 - "The maintenance of strong, independent, and responsible state and local government is imperative to the preservation of self-government and individual freedom." (2, p. 8)

11 - "Responsibility for the preservation of our democratic form of government rests with the individual." (7, p. 5)

12 - "Over-centralization of government and lack of coordination of administration remain pressing problems." (7, p. 24)

13 - "Programs dealing with problems of national importance do not necessarily require federal administration." (7, p. 24)

14 - "Over-centralization of administration can be avoided by utilization of principles of federal-state-local cooperation on a grant-in-aid basis to the states." (7, p. 24)

15 - "Competition is a basic element in the spirit, the drive, the dynamic growth, the efficiency and the adaptability of American society." (7, p. 39)

16 - "Our greatest source of strength is the productive ability which we have developed as a direct result of a 'free choice' system that emphasizes individual incentive and reward based on the service rendered." (7, p. 12)

17 - "High employment, high production per man and high well-
distributed spendable incomes in the rest of the economy are important factors affecting farm prosperity." (6, p. 19)

**AFBF's Type I expressed valuations**

1 - Governmental programs should preserve the competitive principle, be consistent with the law of supply and demand, and insure our ability to feed an increasing population. (3, p. 6)

2 - The United States should improve the well-being of nations by extending credit in the form of food and the means for increasing economic productivity. (7, p. 6)

3 - Local currencies should be used for expanding international trade and increasing production. (5, p. 18)

4 - "Our economic system should be permitted to produce at the highest possible rate of efficiency." (5, p. 5)

5 - We should have a competitive economic system, in which property is privately owned, privately managed, and operated for profit and individual satisfaction, and in which supply and demand are the ultimate determinants of market price. (1, p. 5)

6 - Every man should have the right to choose his own occupation; to be rewarded according to his productive contribution to society; and to save, invest, spend, or convey to his heirs his earnings, as he chooses. (1, p. 5)

7 - "Proper public functions should be performed by that division of government closest to the people which can administer them effectively." (1, p. 9)

8 - "Our policies, domestic and international, must be intelligent
and have a moral purpose." (7, p. 5)

9 - "The government’s regulatory function should promote the interest of all and neither promote, protect, nor punish any special groups to the exclusion, benefit, or detriment of others." (6, p. 6)

10 - A person should be rewarded in accordance with his productive contribution to society. (6, p. 5)

The National Grange’s Type I expressed beliefs

1 - "Increasing populations intensify the health and educational needs of a nation." (35, p. 140)

2 - "All prosperity springs from the production of wealth." (35, p. 153)

3 - "The primary function of government is to protect its citizens from aggression, both economic and physical." (35, p. 153)

4 - "No nation has ever built or maintained a strong total economy on a depressed agriculture." (36, p. 126)

5 - "Economic freedom without equality of economic opportunity becomes economic slavery." (36, p. 126)

6 - Agriculture is an indispensable pillar of a strong economy. (35, p. 129)

7 - Prevention of low farm prices and a balance between supply and demand are important, if American agriculture and the national economy are to escape disaster. (26, p. 157)

8 - "Farm products have not reached the right markets and our nation has not given enough consideration to a better diet for our entire population." (26, p. 157)
9 - "As long as the agricultural economy remains weak, the overall economy cannot reach its maximum potential." (32, p. 123)

The National Grange's Type I expressed valuations

1 - "The compensation of each should be based on his contribution to the general welfare." (35, p. 153)

2 - We should have programs in cooperation with other nations to make surpluses available to less fortunate people of the world. (36, p. 127)

3 - Programs should assure the American people the abundance needed in a rising standard of living and provide to farmers an opportunity to share fairly in that rising standard. (36, p. 127)

Farmers Union's Type I expressed beliefs

1 - "Farm gate regulation of marketings...is practicable, effective, and completely consistent with the principles of democratic freedom and free enterprise." (20, p. 15)

2 - "The land belongs to all the people of the nation." (22, p. 1)

3 - "He who works the land today stands guard over it not alone for his own children but for the children of all Americans." (22, p. 1)

4 - Agriculture can best serve democracy, if it is made up of family farms entrusted to the care of families happy and secure in their stewardship. (22, p. 1)

5 - "The inherent rights of man can only be attained in a self-determining, self-restrained democracy." (24, p. 3)

6 - "Representative government is the best of all forms of govern-
ment that has been designed by man throughout history." (24, p. 3)

7 - "Democracy is the only kind of government which gives each
person an equal right to take equal part in making governmental decisions
through representatives of his own selection." (24, p. 3)

8 - "The family farm is the bulwark of democracy." (24, p. 3)

9 - "Our aims and aspirations can only be attained in an expanding
full employment economy." (23, p. 4)

10 - "Farm families on family farms are a balancing force in the
social and political structure that is vital to the stability, preser-
vation and improvement of representative government, of an efficient and
productive economic system, and of a satisfying world society." (23, p. 4)

Farmers Union's Type I expressed valuations

1 - The land "should be used and tended for the greatest good of
the greatest number both of those living and those yet unborn." (22,
p. 1)

2 - We should preserve and strengthen a genuinely free enterprise
system which adapts itself continuously to the common good. (22, p. 13)

3 - We should encourage private enterprise, particularly small
business, home, and family farm ownership. (22, p. 13)

4 - The "government should take whatever action is necessary in
the performance of those tasks for the common good which cannot or are
not being performed by private enterprise or by cooperatives." (22,
p. 13)

5 - "The healthy functioning of a genuinely free enterprise system
must remain our principal. ......." (22, p. 13)
6 - Governmental action, however drastic, should have as its ultimate aim the strengthening of the free enterprise system. (22, p. 13)

7 - "We assert the right and responsibility of each person to choose his own calling, to work for his own living, making his efforts count for the common good of all." (24, p. 2)

8 - "Food should be used as an essential part of foreign policy to promote earliest possible attainment of a permanent, honorable, and universal peace." (18, p. 25)

9 - "The United States should fully utilize its unique opportunity to use food and fiber to promote widespread and more rapid economic development to raise living standards in less developed nations." (18, p. 25)

10 - "A permanent program of Food for Peace should be enacted to authorize cooperation with long-range economic plans of recipient countries by means of sales for local currency; donations of food and fiber loans; barter; and subsidized sales at competitive prices." (18, p. 25)

11 - "We must work to ease and ultimately to end starvation... and all other threats to world peace." (23, p. 41)

12 - The United States should assist in the development of aid to relieve the hunger and the suffering of the democratic nations. (23, p. 42)

AFBF's Type II expressed beliefs

1 - The most important role of the government in regard to conservation is research and education. (6, p. 14)

2 - Adequate farm income is the best assurance that farmers will
assume their responsibility with respect to soil conservation. (6, p. 14)

3 - "Wise land management contributes to increased income." (1, p. 29)

4 - "The maintenance and improvement of our land resources are of basic importance." (3, p. 24)

5 - "Local units of self-government afford a desirable approach to the solution of soil and water conservation problems." (3, p. 24)

6 - "The encouragement of wise farm practices through education and demonstration is a sound public investment." (6, p. 22)

7 - "The most serious problem facing farmers today is that production of farm products is expanding more rapidly than markets." (1, p. 9)

8 - "Farm price supports are an appropriate and necessary protection against unreasonable price declines." (7, p. 19)

9 - "We are now in the situation of having a greatly expanded productive plant and shrinking foreign markets." (5, p. 9)

10 - "By stockpiling fertility in the soil, we shall build a 'soil fertility bank' as a reserve for use in national emergencies." (5, p. 13)

11 - "One of agriculture's basic needs is improvement in the efficiency of marketing." (5, p. 14)

12 - "In order to improve farm income, we must expand markets both at home and abroad, dispose of existing surpluses, and take steps to avoid the creation of new surpluses in the future." (1, p. 11)

13 - "In some cases allotments and quotas will have to be maintained for a transitional period." (1, p. 12)

14 - "Efficient production must be linked with efficient marketing
and distribution if both the producer and the buyer are to benefit." (6, p. 32)

15 - "The farmer's freedom and opportunity to make the best possible use of his individual resources is a determinant of farm prosperity." (5, p. 3)

16 - "Agricultural research and the application of its findings are vital to the economic well being of farm people." (1, p. 43)

17 - "Research to improve the efficiency and lower the cost of producing, marketing, and distributing food and fiber benefits the public as well as farmers." (5, p. 39)

18 - "Sound agricultural credit on a permanent basis is essential to the development and advancement of agriculture." (7, p. 29)

19 - "Adequate farm credit is necessary at the lowest interest rate consistent with the actual cost of money." (1, p. 46)

20 - Foreign countries have a shortage of dollars with which to purchase United States agricultural products. (5, p. 17)

21 - "The prosperity of American agriculture is greatly dependent upon the maintenance of a high level of United States agricultural exports." (1, p. 9)

22 - "The greatest amount of conservation with a minimum of cost will be achieved only when funds are placed on a grant-in-aid basis to the states." (7, p. 25)

23 - "A large portion of acres diverted from basic commodities has been made necessary by our loss of export markets." (1, p. 9)

24 - "It is good business for the United States to exchange surplus agricultural commodities for strategic and critical materials that are
in short supply and which we do not produce in sufficient quantities to meet our national requirements." (1, p. 24)

25 - Education and promotion directed toward upgrading the average American diet provides a great opportunity to increase the domestic consumption of agricultural products. (5, p. 10)

AFBF's Type II expressed valuations

1 - Policies should be adopted which will expand agricultural markets to a point where they balance our production. (5, p. 9)

2 - Governmental programs should promote efficiency in farming, insure ample research, provide economic opportunity for farm people, and stimulate market expansion. (3, p. 6)

3 - "National policies affecting farm production and markets must be coordinated to promote a realistic balance between markets and productive capacity." (5, p. 9)

4 - Governmental programs for agriculture should be designed to help farmers achieve full parity. (5, p. 10)

5 - "Agricultural programs must be broad in scope and must include much more than emphasis on price supports and production adjustments." (6, p. 20)

6 - There should be reasonable price protection through price support and storage programs. (6, p. 21)

7 - There should be authority to use marketing orders and agreements where producers can demonstrate that such programs are feasible. (6, p. 17)

8 - In order to assist in adjusting production to market needs and to provide for an orderly liquidation of governmental surpluses, we
support a program to adjust production through land retirement. *(3, p. 7)*

9 - Crop and livestock estimates should be made as accurate as possible. *(5, p. 15)*

10 - Research should emphasize lowering marketing costs, quality improvement, promoting better nutrition and expanding domestic and foreign markets. *(1, p. 49)*

11 - Investments in agricultural research and experimentation should be expanded. *(6, p. 33)*

12 - "Research achievements should surpass those of the past and should help develop a highly productive agriculture on a continuing basis." *(6, p. 33)*

13 - Soil conservation should be the primary responsibility of farmers who want to do the job. *(6, p. 14)*

14 - "Every effort should be made to further soil and water conservation through soil conservation districts where this is the desire of local people." *(3, p. 21)*

15 - We favor maintenance of a privately owned, sustained yield forest industry with the assistance of state and federal governments in essential services. *(1, p. 32)*

16 - "The maintenance and improvement of our soil resources should be promoted." *(6, p. 21)*

17 - "Surplus farm products that cannot be sold abroad for dollars should be offered for sale and export through private channels in exchange for local currencies." *(5, p. 16)*

18 - "...the CCC should encourage the movement of surplus commodities
directly into world trade through private channels before they become the property of the government." (4, p. 9)

19 - "We favor continuation of both the direct governmental loans and the insured loan program of the Farmers Home Administration." (3, p. 47)

20 - "Farmers should be able to obtain credit at interest rates comparable to those available to other segments of our economy." (1, p. 46)

21 - "The United States should enter into long term agreements to purchase basic materials to greatly expand our national security reserves." (4, p. 12)

The National Grange's Type II expressed beliefs

1 - The paradox of American agriculture is that the nation's largest, most productive and one of the most efficient enterprises, ranks lowest in the national economy in returns on labor, investment, and management. (36, p. 126)

2 - "The national tragedy is that agriculture is the victim of its own tremendous capacity and willingness to produce the abundance on which our unparalleled national prosperity is based." (36, p. 126)

3 - "The rewards of our unprecedented national prosperity are not being fairly or equitably shared by the economic group that has contributed as much as any other to that prosperity." (36, p. 126)

4 - "Non-farm prosperity has been at the expense of the primary producers of real wealth." (36, p. 126)

5 - "American farmers do not have economic equality." (36, p. 127)
6 - The real farm problem lies in the disparity of income. (36, p. 127)

7 - Farmers are paying the real costs of the farm problem. (36, p. 127)

8 - The return on the farmer's investment is probably lower than the return on money invested in any other major industry in the nation. (36, p. 127)

9 - "No agricultural program has over the years paid such high dividends to the national welfare as agricultural research." (36, p. 128)

10 - "Widely used in conjunction with other programs, a land retirement program can help to raise farm income through the reduction of burdensome surpluses, as well as storing soil fertility for future needs." (36, p. 128)

11 - "Price supports are essential for the prevention of a serious price collapse during development of self-help programs." (36, p. 131)

12 - "Agricultural research and extension are two of the major reasons why American consumers secure their food and fiber for a lower percentage of their income than is true of consumers in most other nations." (35, p. 130)

13 - Farmers' income can be increased by better processing, better packaging, and better merchandising practices. (26, p. 157)

14 - Farmers have not shared equitably the rewards of an increasingly productive and prosperous national economy to which they have contributed their full share of progress. (33, p. 136)

15 - There is no practical way of controlling the total production
16 - "Agriculture's tremendous gains in production efficiency and in enlarging productive capacity have backfired on farmers because they have not been accompanied by comparable gains in marketing and bargaining strength." (33, p. 136)

17 - "Unless effective ways are devised to adjust production to effective demand, the prospect of the future is that total available supplies will consistently exceed effective demand under normal conditions, even at lower prices." (34, p. 141)

18 - "American farmers can find no freedom in a 'free economy' which denies to them the bargaining strength which labor and industry claim as their just rights." (34, p. 142)

19 - Foreign markets are essential to an expanding and prosperous agriculture. (34, p. 145)

20 - "An actual, well-rounded program of research is essential to sound agricultural development." (34, p. 143)

21 - Farmers as sellers are at the mercy of processors, handlers, and consumers. (34, p. 135)

22 - The weak bargaining power of farmers has left them with a smaller and smaller share of the consumer's food dollar. (34, p. 135)

23 - Farmers are subsidizing the consumers of America. (33, p. 136)

24 - "There are no practical, realistic ways by which producers can effectively build up their economic position through non-governmental, strictly voluntary means." (33, p. 137)

25 - Crop insurance is a method of promoting agricultural stabilization and protecting farmers against the hazards of weather and other
conditions beyond their control. (26, p. 161)

26 - Marketing agreements have proved to be one of the most useful of farm measures. (27, p. 135)

27 - "Modern farming requires a considerable investment of capital often difficult to obtain." (35, p. 132)

The National Grange's Type II expressed valuations

1 - Marketing agreements should be used for all commodities on which they can be efficiently used. (26, p. 159)

2 - We should have a dual or multi-price system for all commodities that can use them. (26, p. 159)

3 - "We approve crop insurance under the auspices of the government, with such safe guards as are necessary to protect the public interest." (26, p. 160)

4 - A commodity-by-commodity approach should be followed in the development of farm programs. (34, p. 142)

5 - Practical ways must be developed and applied to influence the volume of supply going into the market. (34, p. 136)

6 - "We need to do a better job of adjusting our production to effective demand at fair prices." (36, p. 127)

7 - "We need to improve and strengthen our marketing system." (36, p. 127)

8 - We should preserve and strengthen the family-farm operation as the basis for our agricultural economy. (36, p. 127)

9 - Farmers should have a return for their labor, management, and investment, an income in reasonable relation to that returned for those
factors in other segments of our economy. (36, p. 127)

10 - We must emphasize adequate and intelligently directed research to increase both efficiencies in production and expansion in profitable market outlets at home and abroad. (36, p. 127)

11 - Programs should provide for preserving and improving our soil, water, and timber resources. (36, p. 127)

12 - We should establish a contingency reserve of foods and feeds for emergencies. (36, p. 127)

13 - We should make surpluses available to the less fortunate people of the world. (36, p. 127)

14 - Programs should provide opportunity to move progressively toward the obtaining of income in the market place. (36, p. 127)

15 - We should retire unproductive land. (36, p. 127)

16 - We favor: "Adequate appropriations for research, and urge that increased emphasis be placed on market development and new outlets for agricultural products." (36, p. 128)

17 - "The Grange supports the establishment of a reasonable and effective program of land retirement for crops in surplus supply and for preservation and improvement of our soil resources for future use as needed to assure our expanding population of needed foods, fibers, and timber." (36, p. 128)

18 - We should broaden and strengthen our program of a farmer-owned and farmer-managed agricultural credit system. (36, p. 129)

19 - Farmers should have equal economic opportunity with other segments of our economy. (35, p. 128)

20 - Farmers should have parity of income. (35, p. 129)
21 - "Responsibility for and the control of excess production should be in the hands of producers themselves." (27, p. 129)

22 - "The government should provide the framework for producer-managed commodity marketing programs, where necessary, to enhance producer-bargaining power and to deter the accumulation of price depressing stocks in the hands of governmental or other non-farm groups." (35, p. 129)

23 - United States exports should be expanded. (35, p. 129)

24 - Net farm income should be raised. (35, p. 129)

25 - Crash programs which will relieve the depressing effect of mounting supplies of storables upon our price structure should be developed. (35, p. 131)

26 - The total amount of price supports should be limited for any one producer. (36, p. 131)

27 - Appropriations to the Farmers Home Administration should be increased. (35, p. 132)

28 - Surplus commodities should be made available to county or state tax-supported, charitable institutions. (35, p. 132)

Farmers Union's Type II expressed beliefs

1 - "Farmers do not now have fair bargaining power under the existing market structure." (21, p. 10)

2 - "Lack of bargaining power makes it impossible for farmers to earn and to get a fair share of national income." (21, p. 10)

3 - Family farmers need and, in justice, deserve federal enabling legislation and positive programs. (21, p. 10)
1 - "Unlike businessmen and labor, farmers have not yet been ex-
tended the legal authorization and facilities to exercise similar
bargaining power." (21, p. 11)

5 - "Farmers must have enabling legislation to get needed bargaining
power." (21, p. 11)

6 - "Farmers are ready, willing, able and eager to accept the
responsibility and the individual and cooperative self-discipline required
to regulate their marketing and curb wasteful production." (20, p. 15)

7 - For each 1 per cent that farmers are allowed to regulate the
volume of domestic market supply, they will favorably regulate the price
at the farm gate by at least 10 per cent and thereby favorably affect
farm operator family net income by at least 25 per cent. (20, p. 16)

8 - Farmers want to improve their incomes by regulating market
supply through either holding the excess volume off the market or by
mandatory donation of it to augment the food supply of starving millions
in other lands. (20, p. 16)

9 - "If farm families are to produce a sustained abundance of the
food, fiber, and timber that the world wants and needs, they must be able
to maintain their land and water resources and earn sufficient income
above production costs to enable them to remain in farming." (21, p. 7)

10 - "Only through production payments can producers of perishables
receive equitable treatment." (22, p. 2)

11 - In order to obtain commodity bargaining power, it is necessary
that control over the supply and marketing of farm commodities be
obtained. (21, p. 10)

12 - Production payments are a means of maintaining a stable income
for agriculture. (22, p. 2)

13 - Expansion and continued improvement of programs is needed in the field of agricultural resource conservation. (24, p. 25)

14 - "...an ample supply of low cost credit is necessary for family-type farming." (17, p. 1)

15 - The Farmers Home Administration plays a vital role in developing adequate economic farms. (24, p. 16)

16 - "...there is an ever present need for the food and fiber we produce." (17, p. 1)

17 - An "Ever Normal Storehouse" for the nation's food and fiber supply will stabilize farm markets and protect farmers and consumers. (17, p. 1)

18 - There is a need for improving the efficiency and technology of family farms. (17, p. 1)

19 - Preserving family farms will help prevent inequality in the distribution of income. (24, p. 4)

Farmers Union's Type II expressed valuations

1 - "Farm operators should be encouraged and enabled to own the farms they operate." (18, p. 9)

2 - Federal farm policies and programs should be utilized to the maximum to insure that the farmers who operate family farms in any nation can earn and get a parity income. (18, p. 9)

3 - "Farmers must obtain control over the supply and the marketing of their commodities." (21, p. 10)

4 - "Authority to make use of marketing orders and quotas should be
authorized for producers of all commodities." (21, p. 13)

5 - "...progress should be developed for all commodities when producers are willing to adopt and enforce effective measures to keep market supplies in balance with demand." (20, p. 17)

6 - "The concept of income parity in federal farm legislation should be preserved as the major measuring stick of the program." (20, p. 17)

7 - "We shall support federal and State legislation and local laws to improve and protect the family farm." (19, p. 9)

8 - "The price of the commodity or the return to the producer should be protected at not less than the parity income equivalent level...." (19, p. 10)

9 - "All areas of expanding demand for farm commodities, consistent with good soil conservation practices, should be explored exhaustively, before we concern ourselves with production restrictions." (25, p. 9)

10 - "We should have enactment of mandatory federal farm income protection legislation at 100% of fair parity for the family farm production of all farm commodities. (25, p. 8)

11 - "All family farmers should be given equal treatment in terms of parity prices regardless of type of crop or livestock produced." (21, p. 12)

12 - "Minimum support prices and production goals should continue to be known well in advance of planting and breeding time." (21, p. 13)

13 - "The cost of undertaking the needed expansion of farm soil, water, and forest conservation and desirable farm land use adjustment should be shared between the individual farm family and the general public through the federal government." (25, p. 14)
14 - "Family farmers should be able to turn to the Farmers Home Administration to obtain fully adequate credit adapted to family needs and problem when such credit cannot be obtained from established private sources at rates of interest and on terms commensurate with the earning power of farm investment." (20, p. 26)

15 - "The Farmers Home Administration should be transformed into a complete yardstick family farm loan institution to supplement the services of credit unions and other cooperative credit institutions." (21, p. 15)

16 - "We stand for the family type farm." (17, p. 1)

17 - The ownership of land should be by the people who cultivate it. (17, p. 1)

18 - We should have an abundant production of farm crops. (17, p. 1)

19 - Fair exchange should be the basis for the farm price structure. (17, p. 1)

20 - We should have an orderly process of negotiation between producers and consumers in establishing farm prices. (17, p. 1)

21 - Farm families should be able to earn by their work, management, and property ownership incomes equivalent to those earned by people in other occupations. (23, p. 6)

22 - "Programs should be administered by farmers themselves through democratically elected farmer committees." (23, p. 21)

23 - "The bargaining power of family farms in commodity and credit markets must be balanced with the rest of the economy...." (18, p. 9)

24 - "Immediate action should be taken to solve the problems of rural poverty and low income farm families." (21, p. 15)

25 - Production control laws should provide a fair minimum to protect...
the small producers of any crop from having their incomes cut to intolerably low levels. (22, p. 4)

26 - "The national food allotment stamp plan should be put into operation on a national basis." (18, p. 19)

27 - "Federal school lunch and fluid milk programs should be expanded to a nationwide basis." (18, p. 19)

28 - "Sufficient food should be provided for adequate nutritional standards in public institutions...." (18, p. 19)

29 - "Research should be expanded to discover new economic industrial and other uses of agricultural products and to develop new crops and livestock products." (18, p. 16)

30 - Methods should be instituted to assist in closing the gap between what persons can afford to pay for the volume of food and fiber products and what it costs to maintain an adequate standard of nutrition and well-being. (21, p. 25)

31 - "The federal crop insurance program should be expanded and improved until it is available to farmers in every county in the U.S." (21, p. 15)

32 - The producer of any farm product should be given equal treatment with the producer of any other farm product. (22, p. 3)

33 - Minimum support and production goals should continue to be known well in advance of planting and breeding time. (22, p. 4)

34 - There should be a maximum acreage or quota for any one farm family. (24, p. 14)
AFBF's Type III expressed beliefs

1 - "Loss of export markets has resulted in increasing agricultural surpluses and has contributed to declines in farm incomes." (4, p. 9)

2 - Production payments are unsound and dangerous to our economic and political systems. (1, p. 9)

3 - Production payments would stimulate production, depress market prices, and make farmers dependent on Congressional appropriations for their net farm income. (1, p. 10)

4 - Production payments would encourage inefficiency in high real food and fiber costs. (1, p. 10)

5 - "Payment limitations would place a ceiling on opportunity and level individual farm incomes downward." (3, p. 9)

6 - "We cannot maintain a satisfactory level of production if we strangle our economy with unnecessary governmental controls." (7, p. 12)

7 - The government is not obligated to guarantee profitable prices to any economic group. (7, p. 19)

8 - "The volume that can be sold and the costs that must be paid are more important in obtaining parity than governmental support prices." (5, p. 11)

9 - "Real farm income cannot be protected by policies which draw excessive resources into agriculture, create unmanageable surpluses or cause artificial prices to be capitalized into land values." (5, p. 11)

10 - "Farm production cannot be balanced with effective demand by legislation as long as increased production is being encouraged by guaranteed prices." (2, p. 11)

11 - "With less interference from the government, the market system
will be freer to operate effectively and efficiently." (2, p. 11)

12 - "The trend toward increased centralization of power in the federal government, if left unchecked, will lead to socialism and thus to communism." (1, p. 6)

13 - "If the market system is to function satisfactorily, it must be protected from the dumping of surplus governmental stocks." (2, p. 12)

14 - "...we will increase our national strength faster, and serve the long-run interests of the American people better, if we minimize governmental interference with the things that have made our economic system the most efficient in the world." (7, p. 12)

15 - Centralization of power and authority in the federal government is among the greatest dangers threatening our republic and our competitive system of free enterprise. (1, p. 6)

16 - "Price supports tend to draw additional resources into agriculture and stimulate production of supported commodities." (4, p. 21)

17 - Multiple price and certificate plans transfer the surplus problem from one group of producers to another. (3, p. 9)

18 - A national marketing order for commodities will prove unworkable because it could not recognize differences in production and marketing conditions. (3, p. 55)

**AFBF's Type III expressed valuations**

1 - "Sales for foreign currency must not replace sales for dollars." (1, p. 25)

2 - "American agriculture must not become permanently dependent on governmental export programs." (1, p. 25)
3 - "We should avoid the perpetuation of programs which give away our farm products." (2, p. 28)

4 - "Policies which encourage rather than strangle foreign trade must be followed." (6, p. 20)

5 - The administration of all conservation programs should be decentralized. (6, p. 14)

6 - "We vigorously oppose any attempt to adopt production payments as a substitute for price supports or as a means of bringing income to agriculture." (1, p. 10)

7 - Governmental programs should not freeze historical production patterns, impede orderly marketing or shift adjustment burdens from one group of producers to another. (3, p. 7)

8 - The government should provide protection against extreme price declines without going to the extreme of governmental price fixing. (7, p. 19)

9 - We must guard against legislation or administrative action which would demoralize markets or create unfair competition for producers either at home or abroad. (6, p. 21)

10 - "The emphasis in farm programs should continue to be on adequate prices in the market place rather than on income subsidies." (6, p. 21)

11 - "We oppose minimum farm allotments." (2, p. 13)

12 - "We oppose sale, lease, or exchange of allotments." (2, p. 13)

13 - "We are opposed to multiple price or certificate plans." (3, p. 9)
14 - "We are opposed to poundage, bushelage and other quantitative limitations." (3, p. 10)

15 - Price support levels should not be based on arbitrary formulas nor left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. (1, p. 11)

16 - The use of public funds to increase the productive capacity of the nation's farms and ranches should be substantially reduced. (1, p. 11)

17 - "It is our desire to move in the direction of eliminating governmental regulation of the right to produce agricultural commodities." (1, p. 12)

18 - "Farmers should not be forced to compete with the CCC." (3, p. 8)

19 - Price supports should serve the interests of farmers at a greatly reduced cost to the taxpayer. (1, p. 10)

20 - "The government should refrain from direct participation in the marketing of farm products." (2, p. 12)

21 - "There should be no infringement by one branch of the federal government upon the constitutional prerogatives of the other branches." (1, p. 8)

22 - "We oppose the operation of commercial business by government in competition with private enterprise." (3, p. 6)

23 - Congress should use restraint in enlarging the powers of the executive branch of the federal government. (6, p. 6)

24 - "We shall reject communism wherever and in whatever form it may be found." (6, p. 6)

25 - "Every means should be used to eliminate the excessive
accumulation of surplus agricultural production." (1, p. 11)

The Grange's Type III expressed beliefs

1 - "Strong federal price programs to provide parity income or placing major dependence upon pricing programs regulated by Congress and financed by taxpayers would be a step toward peasantry for American agriculture." (31, p. 165)

2 - If all federal farm programs were abandoned it would mean bankruptcy for agriculture and economic disaster for the nation. (35, p. 129)

3 - "Surpluses are a chief factor causing present declines in farm prices." (31, p. 166)

4 - "Dependence on subsidies or production payments in lieu of a fair market price as a method of achieving parity income is unsound and would impose a burden on the whole American economy." (26, p. 157)

5 - Acreage controls are easily evaded by land selection, use of fertilizer, and special cultivation practices. (35, p. 132)

The Grange's Type III expressed valuations

1 - Measures which do not utilize governmental controls or funds should be used before those that do. (27, p. 135)

2 - Land retired from production should not be eligible for grazing or other income-producing uses. (36, p. 129)

3 - Governmental production controls should be removed. (35, p. 129)

4 - Governmental compulsion should be avoided except in the implementation of controls voluntarily imposed by growers upon themselves. (36, p. 130)
5 - We should prevent the import of a farm product, if such imports tend to destroy the effects of a price support program on domestic prices. (35, p. 131)

6 - "Excess of production in relation to current demand should not be permitted to set the price for total output." (35, p. 129)

7 - Government farm program costs should be reduced. (28, p. 107)

8 - We should have abundant farm production rather than producing only such quantities of farm commodities as may have an assured profitable market. (28, p. 106)

9 - Production payments should be used only when it is clearly evident that other measures cannot do the job. (26, p. 107)

10 - "We are opposed to direct production payments to farmers as a means of income or price support." (26, p. 160)

11 - Family-farm income should be rebuilt without dependence on governmental handouts. (26, p. 159)

**Farmers Union’s Type III expressed beliefs**

1 - Industrial-type agricultural enterprises exploit human beings. (28, p. 1)

2 - "Reckless dissipation by the U.S. of irreplaceable resources continues at an alarming rate." (22, p. 18)

3 - Farmers are the only segment of the economy subjected to the law of supply and demand. (23, p. 47)

4 - "Grave danger to democratic institutions would result if we allow our entire population, including agriculture and small business, to become divided into separate groups of owners, managers, financiers,
and workers." (4, p. 5)

5 - "The existing wrongful farm policies are based on a doctrinaire belief in the illogical and incorrect philosophy of fully flexible farm prices in unregulated and unprotected markets." (7, p. 13)

Farmers Union's Type III expressed valuations

1 - "Our nation should move rapidly away from absentee ownership of farms and industrial-type farm operation." (19, p. 9)

2 - "Concentration of farm land ownership and of farm operation into larger than family units should be discouraged." (18, p. 9)

3 - No farm family should be forced to leave the farm. (21, p. 15)

4 - "No person should be allowed to fall below an adequate standard of the necessities, conveniences, and comforts of life." (23, p. 2)

5 - The decline in farm income must be halted and replaced by an upward trend. (22, p. 13)
Up to this point, the discussion has been primarily concerned with developing a theory. This theory will now be tested in order to indicate how it can be applied to the problem at hand: The disagreement among the farm organizations over agricultural policy proposals. The theory will be tested by considering the positions of the three major farm organizations on three major policy proposals of the recent past. These proposals were:

1. The proposed Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949
2. The Agricultural Act of 1954 (S. 3052)
3. The proposed Agricultural Act of 1961 (H.R. 6400)

The key points which have been developed in the previous pages will be restated.

1. Farm organizations take different positions on agricultural policy proposals because they have different beliefs and valuations.

2. Beliefs and valuations can be divided into three classes. These classes have been designated "Type I", "Type II", and "Type III".

3. The position any farm organization takes on a particular policy proposal is determined by the way in which the organization's Type I and Type II expressed beliefs and valuations are related to the major provisions of that proposal.

4. The relationship between the major provisions and an organization's Type I beliefs and valuations must be determined indirectly by examining the relationship between relevant Type II and Type III beliefs and valuations and the major provisions.
In order to test the theory, the following procedure will be undertaken. The major provisions of a particular policy proposal will be stated. Inasmuch as these major provisions imply some type of activity, it can be asked: Are the major provisions consistent or inconsistent (consistent and inconsistent having the definitions given on an earlier page) with the organizations' beliefs and valuations? The theory indicates that if an activity is inconsistent with either the Type I or Type II beliefs and valuations of a farm organization, that activity will be opposed by that organization. Hence, if the activity implied in the major provisions of a proposal is inconsistent with a farm organization's Type I or Type II beliefs and valuations, that activity will be opposed by that farm organization; as will also the major provisions in which the activity is implied and the proposal in general of which the major provisions are a vital part. Alternatively, if the activity implied in the major provisions is consistent with either the Type I or Type II beliefs and valuations of an organization and not inconsistent with either the Type I or Type II beliefs and valuations of that organization, that activity will be supported. Then, it can be said that whenever the major provisions of a policy proposal are inconsistent with a farm organization's Type I or Type II beliefs and valuations that farm organization, according to the theory, should be expected to oppose the proposal.

After stating the major provisions and then determining whether or not the major provisions are consistent or inconsistent with the farm organizations' beliefs and valuations, the positions that the organizations could be expected to take, on the basis of the theory, will be stated. Next, the actual positions the organizations took on the various
proposals will be stated. The theory is tested by comparing the actual positions with the expected positions.

**The proposed Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1942**

The proposal consisted of four titles (I-IV). Titles I and II subsequently became known as the "Brannan Plan". Titles III and IV were re-enactments of the AAA of 1938.

**Major provisions of the proposal** Title I presented a list of definitions. It could be discerned from these definitions that consideration was going to be given to supporting the aggregate purchasing power of farm income. The key concept was the "income support standard". This was defined as the gross aggregate income from farm marketings that would be equal in purchasing power to the average purchasing power of the gross aggregate income from farm marketings "during a period consisting of the first ten of the preceding twelve years." The intent was to enable farmers to receive an aggregate income that would give them the same purchasing power they had had in the aggregate in a preceding period. Also defined was the "price support standard." It was determined by three variables: (1) income support standard, (2) price of agricultural products in the last ten years, and (3) the average actual level of farm marketings during the last ten years. Corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, whole milk, chicken eggs, farm chickens, hogs, beef cattle, and lambs would receive support at levels equal to the price support standard. Other commodities would receive support at the Secretary of Agriculture's discretion.
Price support of commodities would be achieved through loans, purchases, production payments and other operations. The suggested utilization of production payments (more commonly called direct payments and today referred to as compensatory payments) was at this time an innovation in agricultural policy proposals. The production payment would be a payment, to farmers who marketed supported commodities, equal to the difference between the market price for the commodity and the support price for that commodity times the amount of that commodity marketed.

In order to offset any stimulating effect on production the support guarantees might have, controls were proposed in the bill also. These controls took the form of acreage allotments and marketing quotas. The section dealing with the control proportion of the proposal sought to make controls in the form of acreage allotments or marketing quotas mandatory for tobacco, wheat, rice, corn and peanuts and "available for other supported commodities if necessary." This completes the major provisions of the proposal.

It will now be shown how the expressed beliefs and valuations of an organization can be utilized to determine the position that an organization will take on a proposal. The AFBF will be considered first.

The proposed AAA of 1949 and the AFBF's Type II expressed beliefs and valuations

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed belief of the AFBF.

Belief: #8.1 Farm price supports are an appropriate and necessary

---

1The numbers that precede the beliefs and valuations hereafter are those numbers under which the beliefs and valuations are listed in the belief and valuation section of the thesis.
protection against unreasonable price declines.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the following Type II expressed belief and valuation.

Belief: #15. The farmer's freedom and opportunity to make the best possible use of his individual resources is a determinant of farm prosperity.

Valuation: #5. Agricultural programs must be broad in scope and must include much more than emphasis on price supports and production adjustments.

This exhausts the number of Type II expressed beliefs and valuations that were related to the proposal.

Belief #15 is judged by the author to be more significant than belief #8; consequently, it is also judged that on-balance the major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF. The Farm Bureau seemed to make a similar judgment on the relative significance of the two beliefs as can be discerned from a statement made by the president of the Farm Bureau.

"...price goals of the plan, including direct payments to farmers, of course, are so high as to make for certainty of continuous and rigid controls over production and marketing. We are convinced more freedom of choice for farmers would result in a better allocation of resources..." (b2, p. 207)

Sufficient information has been provided to enable one to expect that the AFBF would oppose the proposal. It has been previously stated that an organization will oppose any proposal which is inconsistent with its Type I or Type II expressed beliefs or valuations.
The proposed AAA of 1949 and the AFBF's Type III expressed beliefs and valuations

The way in which the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF and the major provisions of the proposal were related will now be considered, even though, at this point, the AFBF could have been expected to oppose the program.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type III expressed belief and valuation of the AFBF.

Belief: #13. If the marketing system is to function satisfactorily, it must be protected from the dumping of surplus governmental stocks.¹

Valuation: #18. Farmers should not be forced to compete with the CCC.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the following Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

Beliefs:

#2. Production payments are unsound and dangerous to our economic and political systems.

#3. Production payments would stimulate production, depress market prices, and make farmers dependent on Congressional appropriations for their income.

#4. Production payments would encourage inefficiency in high real food and fiber costs.

#5. Payment limitations would place a ceiling on opportunity

¹A section of the proposal stated that the CCC would not be permitted to sell surplus agricultural commodities below the market price, except for stated special cases.
and level individual farm incomes downward.  

#6. We cannot maintain a satisfactory level of production if we strangle our economy with unnecessary governmental controls.

#7. The government is not obligated to guarantee profitable prices to any economic group.

#9. Real farm income cannot be protected by policies which draw excessive resources into agriculture, create unmanageable surpluses or cause artificial prices to be capitalized into land values.

#16. Price supports tend to draw additional resources into agriculture and stimulate production of supported commodities.

#10. Farm production cannot be balanced with effective demand by legislation as long as increased production is being encouraged by guaranteed prices.

#11. With less interference from the government, the market system will be freer to operate effectively and efficiently.

Valuations:

#6. We vigorously oppose any attempt to adopt production payments as a substitute for price supports or as a means of bringing income to agriculture.

#10. The emphasis in farm programs should continue to be on adequate prices in the market place rather than on income subsidies.

#17. It is our desire to move in the direction of eliminating governmental regulation of the right to produce agricultural products.

---

1A section of the proposal stipulated that 1800 commodity units would be the maximum amount on which price support could be received, by any farm, in any calendar year.
The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with some Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF and inconsistent with others. It is felt by the author that, under the circumstances, beliefs #2 and #3 were of greater significance to the organization than belief #13 and valuation #18. Therefore, it is said that, on-balance, the major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

The conclusion from belief and valuation analysis is that the AFBF should have been expected to oppose the proposal.

The National Grange and the proposed AAA of 1949

The belief and valuation framework of the Grange will similarly be related to the proposal.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange.

Beliefs:

#1. The paradox of American agriculture is that the nation’s largest, most productive and one of the most efficient enterprises, ranks lowest in the national economy in returns on labor, investment and management.

#3. The rewards of our unprecedented national prosperity are not being fairly or equitably shared by the economic group that has contributed as much as any other to that prosperity.

#5. American farmers do not have economic equality.

#6. The real farm problem lies in the disparity of income.

#8. The return on the farmer’s investment is probably lower
than the return on money invested in any other major industry in the nation.

14. Farmers have not shared equitably the rewards of an increasingly productive and prosperous national economy to which they have contributed their full share of progress.

14. There are no practical, realistic ways by which producers can effectively build up their economic position through nongovernmental, strictly voluntary means.

Valuations:

9. Farmers should have a return for their labor, management and investment; an income in reasonable relation to that returned for those factors in other segments of the economy.

14. Net farm income should be raised.

26. The total amount of price supports should be limited for any one producer.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with none of the Grange's Type II expressed beliefs or valuations. As a result, it can be stated unqualifiedly that the major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the Grange's Type II expressed beliefs and valuations.

If the major provisions of the proposal were also consistent with the Grange's Type I expressed beliefs and valuations, the Grange could have been expected to support the proposal. If the major provisions were inconsistent with the Type I expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange, the Grange could have been expected to oppose the proposal. To determine how the Grange's Type I beliefs and valuations were related to
the provisions, the Grange's Type III expressed beliefs and valuations
must be considered.

The proposed AAA of 1949 and the Grange's Type III expressed beliefs and
valuations

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with none of
the Type III expressed beliefs or valuations of the Grange.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the
following Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange.

Beliefs:

#1. Strong federal price programs to provide parity income or
placing major dependence upon price programs regulated by Congress and
financed by taxpayers would be a step toward peasantry for American
agriculture.

#4. Dependence on subsidies or production payments in lieu of
a fair market price as a method of achieving parity income is unsound
and would impose a burden on the whole American economy.

#5. Acreage controls are easily evaded by land selection, use
of fertilizer, and special cultivation practices.

Valuations:

#1. Measures which do not utilize governmental controls or
funds should be used before those that do.

#3. Governmental production controls should be removed.

#9. Production payments should be used only when it is clearly
evident that other measures cannot do the job.

#10. We are opposed to direct production payments to farmers
as a means of income or price support.
#11. Farm income should be rebuilt without dependence on governmental handouts.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the National Grange.

It must now be determined whether or not the fact that the major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange outweighs the fact that the major provisions of the proposal were also inconsistent with the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange. If it does, then, the major provisions of the proposal could not on balance have been inconsistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the Grange. However, if the fact that the major provisions were inconsistent with the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations outweighs the fact that the major provisions were also consistent with the Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange, then, the major provisions were also inconsistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the Grange (see: statement 3(e), page 28).

Based on the beliefs and valuations of the Grange that the major provisions were consistent with and those with which they were inconsistent, the feeling of the author is that the inconsistency of the major provisions with the Type III beliefs and valuations of the Grange dominates all other considerations. Type III beliefs: #1 and #14 are of greater significance to the Grange than any of the Type II beliefs of the Grange with which the major provisions were consistent. Also, Type III valuations: #1, #3, and #10 certainly predominate Type II valuations:
The Grange, on the basis of belief and valuation analysis, would have been expected to oppose the proposal. The reasons for opposition could be determined by examining those Type III beliefs and valuations of the Grange with which the major provisions were inconsistent.

The proposed AAA of 1969 and the Farmers Union's beliefs and valuations

The Farmers Union's position on the proposal will now be determined in a similar manner.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union.

Beliefs:

#9. If farm families are to produce a sustained abundance of the food, fiber and timber, that the world wants and needs, they must be able to maintain their land and water resources and earn sufficient income above production costs to enable them to do so.

#12. Production payments are a means of maintaining a stable income for agriculture.

#10. Only through production payments can producers of perishables receive equitable treatment.

Valuations:

#32. The producer of any farm product should be given equal treatment with the producer of any other farm product.

#33. Minimum support and production goals should continue to be known well in advance of planting and breeding time.¹

¹A section of the proposal stipulated that all price support levels would be made in advance of the marketing season.
The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with none of the Farmers Union's Type II expressed beliefs or valuations.

The major provisions of the proposal had a neutral relation with the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union.

As the major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the Type II expressed beliefs and valuations and had a neutral relation with the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union, the major provisions of the proposal are said to have also been consistent with the Type I expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union (see: statement 2, page 26).

The fact that the proposal was consistent with the Farmers Union's Type I and Type II expressed beliefs and valuations is sufficient information to expect that the Farmers Union should have supported the proposal.

The process of relating the proposed Agricultural Act of 1949 to the beliefs and valuations of the three farm organizations, in order to determine the position the farm organizations took in regard to the proposal, indicates that the AFBF and the Grange should have opposed the proposal while the Farmers Union should have supported the proposal.

The actual positions taken by the organizations

The AFBF:

"When Secretary Brannan first proposed the program last April 7, Mr. Kline, speaking for the AFBF, declared it to be unsound, a menace to the nation's farmers and a political maneuver designed to trap the unwary consumer as well as the farmer." (44)
The Grange:

"The walloping defeat of the direct subsidies plan in both Houses was a major victory for Grange policies. As is well known, the proposal was to support a number of non-basic products at fixed parity price levels by direct payments out of the Treasury of the United States. Both the fixed price support and the direct Treasury payments were in violation of Grange policies." (26, p. 133)

The Farmers Union:

"Such a proposal will benefit farmers; it will benefit labor. In addition, it will be of the greatest service to white-collar groups and to all consumers, as well as to farmers." (42, p. 234)

The basis of the disagreement

Differences in the belief and valuation frameworks of the farm organizations are of two types. It may occur that one organization holds beliefs and valuations that are repugnant to the beliefs and valuations another organization holds. It may also occur that one organization holds beliefs and valuations that are not repugnant and that are not similar to the beliefs and valuations a second organization holds. The class of beliefs and valuations an organization holds which are repugnant with the beliefs and valuations a second organization holds can be further subdivided into: beliefs and valuations which are simple contradictory and beliefs and valuations which are diametrically opposed to the beliefs and valuations of a second organization.¹

¹The distinction between a belief which is simply contradictory to another belief and a belief which is diametrically opposed to another belief is the following. A belief which is simply contradictory to another belief implies mere negation of the belief, or absence of something; while a belief which is diametrically opposed to another belief implies the opposite or reverse of that belief. As an example, consider the following three beliefs: (1) "A" is a man, (2) "A" is a woman, and (3) "A" is not a man (conceivably "A" could be a baby, a boy, a girl, or a woman). Beliefs (2) and (3) are both repugnant to belief (1). However, while belief (2) is diametrically opposed to belief (1), belief (2) simply contradicts it.
It is seen that the AFBF and the National Grange supported the proposed AAA of 1949 and that the Farmers Union opposed it. It is also seen that the contradictory positions taken by the organizations were due to the fact that they did hold different expressed beliefs and valuations. It is further seen that the beliefs and valuations of the organizations that were crucial in determining the organizations' positions, i.e., those beliefs and valuations with which the major provisions were either consistent or inconsistent, differed largely in the sense that one organization expressed beliefs and valuations that, while not repugnant to a second organization's beliefs and valuations, still, were not similar to that second organization's beliefs and valuations. For example, the AFBF's beliefs about production payments were the key factors in determining its position on the proposal. These beliefs indicate that the AFBF believes that production payments would be dangerous to our economic and political systems, stimulate production, depress market prices, encourage inefficiency in high real food and fiber costs, and make farmers dependent on Congress for their income. Further, it is believed by the AFBF that the use of production payments would necessitate stricter governmental controls and the AFBF has a valuation which indicates it feels stricter governmental controls should not be brought into existence.

The National Grange's position on the proposal was also largely determined by its beliefs and valuations about production payments. The National Grange believed that production payments would be unsound, impose a burden on the whole American economy and necessitate additional
governmental controls. The Grange also indicated by its valuations that it is opposed to the use of governmental controls and to the utilization of governmental funds as means to stabilize farm income. The similarity between the beliefs of the Grange and the AFBF as they relate to production payments is apparent. Their valuations in regard to governmental controls were also similar.

The Farmers Union supported the proposal not because it expressed beliefs and valuations which were repugnant to the beliefs and valuations of the Grange or the AFBF, but because it expressed beliefs and valuations about production payments that the AFBF and the Grange did not. Further, the Farmers Union did not express the beliefs and valuations that the AFBF and Grange did about production payments. The Farmers Union believed that production payments were a means of bringing a stable income to agriculture, and the only way producers of perishables could receive equitable treatment from governmental price support programs. The holding of these beliefs by the Farmers Union, taken in conjunction with its valuations, caused it to support the proposal.

The Agricultural Act of 1954

The second proposal to be considered was eventually enacted into law as the Agricultural Act of 1954. The proposal will be discussed in its original form and will be referred to as S.3052. The procedure followed in analyzing this proposal and the disagreement it generated among the three farm organizations will parallel the procedure followed in analyzing the proposed AAA of 1949. The major provisions of the bill will be stated, the relation of the proposal with the organizations'
expressed beliefs and valuations will be determined, and the position each organization should have taken according to the theory and the position they did take will be indicated.

**Major provisions of S.3052**

There were five titles to this proposal (H.R., pp. 1-6). Title I provided for the establishment of "set-asides" for certain agricultural commodities—wheat, upland cotton, cottonseed oil, non-fat dry milk, and cheese. The set-asides would not be available for current marketings nor would they be included in the computation of "carry-over" in the process of determining the price support level for these commodities. The ostensible purpose for the "set-asides" was to insulate surplus agricultural commodities from regular outlets.

Title IV authorized the adding of canned and frozen fruits and vegetables, dried fruits for canning or freezing, filberts, almonds, pecans, walnuts and vegetables to the list of commodities that are authorized to use marketing agreements and orders. Marketing research would be made available for commodities that use marketing agreements and orders.

Title II proposed changes in the support program for corn. The change would replace the sliding scale from which the price support level for corn was being determined under provisions embodied in the Agricultural Act of 1949 with a new scale which would slide twice as fast. It

---

1Within CCC inventories for certain commodities stated amounts of a commodity would be set aside. The name given to the quantity set aside was "set-asides."
was also proposed that tung nuts, honey and Irish potatoes be removed from the mandatory 90% parity provisions in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Title III would place, through a transitional parity process, all the basic commodities, except tobacco, under the 75% minimum scale price support provisions called for in the Agricultural Act of 1949, and in effect replace the existing mandatory support level of 90% of parity.

Title V proposed that funds be allocated, on a grant to the States basis consistent with a State's needs, to aid in conservation on farms where the land is diverted from commodities under acreage allotment programs. The abolishment of marketing quotas for corn was also proposed.

S.3052 as related to the AFBF's expressed beliefs and valuations

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

Beliefs:

#11. One of agriculture's basic needs is improvement in the efficiency of marketing.

#14. Efficient production must be linked with efficient marketing and distribution if both the producer and the buyer are to benefit.

#17. Research to improve the efficiency and lower the cost of producing, marketing, and distributing food and fiber benefits the public as well as farmers.

Valuations:

#6. There should be reasonable price protection through price support and storage programs.

#7. There should be authority to use marketing orders and
agreements where producers can demonstrate that such programs are feasible.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with none of the Type II expressed beliefs or valuations of AFBF.

The major provisions of the proposal are said to have been consistent with the Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type III beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

Beliefs:

#7. The government is not obligated to guarantee profitable prices to any economic group.

#13. If the market system is to function satisfactorily, it must be protected from the dumping of surplus governmental stocks.

#16. Price supports tend to draw additional resources into agriculture and stimulate production of supported commodities.

Valuations:

#5. The administration of all conservation programs should be decentralized.

#19. Price supports should serve the interests of farmers at a greatly reduced cost to the taxpayer.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with none of the Type III expressed beliefs or valuations of the AFBF.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with both the Type II and Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF. It follows that the major provisions were then consistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the AFBF (see: statement 1, page 27).
The AFBF could have been expected to support the proposal.

S.3052 and the National Grange

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the National Grange.

Beliefs:

#13. Farmers' income can be increased by better processing, better packaging, and better merchandising.

#24. There are no practical, realistic ways by which producers can effectively build up their economic position through non-governmental, strictly voluntary means.

#28. Marketing agreements have proved to be one of the most useful of farm measures.

Valuations:

#1. Marketing agreements should be used for all commodities on which they can be efficiently used.

#5. Practical ways must be developed and applied to influence the volume of supply going into the market.

#7. We need to improve and strengthen our marketing system.

#13. Programs should provide opportunity to move progressively toward the obtaining of income in the market place.

#25. Crash programs which will relieve the depressing effect of mounting supplies of storables upon our price structure should be developed.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with none of the Grange's Type II expressed beliefs and valuations.
The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type III expressed valuation of the Grange.

Valuation:

#3. Government production controls should be removed.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with none of the Type III expressed beliefs or valuations of the Grange.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with both the Type II and the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange. It follows that the major provisions were then consistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the Grange (see: statement 1, page 27).

The Grange could have been expected to support the proposal.

S.3052 and the Farmers Union

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II valuation of the Farmers Union.

Valuation:

#4. Authority to make use of marketing orders and quotas should be authorized for producers of all commodities.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the following Type II valuations of the Farmers Union.

Valuations:

#8. The price of the commodity or the return to the producer should be protected at not less than the parity income equivalent level.

#10. We should have enactment of mandatory federal farm income protection legislation at 100% of fair parity for the family farm production of all farm commodities.
All farm families should be given equal treatment in terms of parity prices regardless of type of crop or livestock produced.

Because it is judged that valuations #8, 10, and 11 are more significant than valuation #4, it is said that on balance the major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union.

The major provisions were not related to the Farmers Union's Type III expressed beliefs and valuations.

The Farmers Union could have been expected to oppose the program.

After considering the beliefs and valuations of the farm organizations, the conclusion has been arrived at that the AFBF and the Grange should have been expected to support the proposal while the Farmers Union should have been expected to oppose it.

**Actual positions of the organizations**

The actual position these organizations took in regard to the proposal can be discerned from the following statements:

**The AFBF:**

"The Agriculture Act of 1954 is a noteworthy example of a contest between the strength of the Agricultural Committees of the Congress and that of the administration or the Secretary of Agriculture. The administration, ...had the vigorous support of the officers of the Farm Bureau...." (46)

**The Grange:**

"For the most part, we feel as though much was accomplished in the second session of the 83rd Congress.... There was nothing basically wrong with the Farm Bill, the only problem being that it did not provide the new vehicle or mechanisms that we felt necessary to get at the root of the farm problem." (31, p. 99)
The Farmers Union:

"Existing farm price support legislation would be severely weakened in several respects by enactment of the Allen-Benson bill.... All of the proposals would require changes in the present law away from N.F.U. programs not toward them." (ii, p. 83)

The basis of the disagreement

It is seen that the beliefs and valuations that the AFBF and the Grange have that relate to efficiency of marketing, marketing agreements, marketing research, price support levels, and governmental surplus operations are what determined their position on S.3052. As the proposal was consistent with these beliefs and valuations they supported it. The Farmers Union did not express beliefs and valuations which were for the most part similar with those of the AFBF and the Grange. The Farmers Union had valuations which stipulated that every family farmer should receive price supports at a level which will provide them with 100% parity income. The proposal would not have done this. In fact, it would have lowered the price support level. The Farmers Union, understandably, opposed the proposal.

The proposed Agricultural Act of 1961

The last proposal to be discussed will be referred to as H.R.6400 (hi, pp. 1-24). This proposal was presented to Congress in 1961. H.R.6400 was composed of four titles. Because each of these titles was a separate program in and of itself, they shall be treated separately, as if they were wholes rather than parts of a whole.

One of the titles—Title IV—will not be analyzed. Title IV called for new cooperative legislation, extension of the Great Plains
Conservation Program and extension of the Special Milk Program for children. As the part dealing with cooperatives was merely a reaffirma-
tion of governmental policy rather than an action program and the
Conservation and School Milk Programs of the title were enthusiastically
derned by the three organizations, it is felt that analyzing Title IV
would add little to the discussion.

The discussion of H.R.6400 will commence with consideration of Title
I.

Major provisions of title I

Title I would have authorized the establishing of National Farmer
Advisory Committees. These committees would be established at the
Secretary of Agriculture's discretion. Two-thirds of each committee's
members would be producer nominated; the other third would be chosen
from the farm organizations. A separate committee would represent each
commodity (or group of commodities). Each committee would confer with
the Secretary of Agriculture and assist him in the devising of programs
for the commodity which it represented.

Title I would also have authorized marketing orders for all agri-
cultural commodities on either a national or regional basis and marketing
quotas on all agricultural commodities on an acreage, production units
or commodity units basis.

The Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to support any commodity
at a level determined by him not in excess of 90% parity and to use
commodity loans, commodity purchases, compensatory payments and diversion
payments to effect such support.
Congress was given sixty days to veto a commodity program submitted to it by the Secretary of Agriculture. A program not vetoed in sixty days would be submitted to producers in the form of a referendum. The program would become law, if producers approved it.

**Title I of H.R. 6400 and the AFBF**

The major provisions of Title I of H.R. 6400 were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

**Beliefs:**

- **#13.** In some cases allotments and quotas will have to be maintained for a transitional period.
- **#8.** Farm price supports are an appropriate and necessary protection against unreasonable price declines.

**Valuations:**

- **#7.** There should be authority to use marketing orders and agreements where producers can demonstrate that such programs are feasible.
- **#6.** There should be reasonable price protection through price support and storage programs.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the following Type II expressed belief of the AFBF.

**Belief:**

- **#15.** The farmer’s freedom and opportunity to make the best possible use of his individual resources are determinants of farm prosperity.

The on-balance effect will not be judged.
The major provisions of the proposal were not consistent with any of the AFBF's Type III expressed beliefs or valuations.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with the following Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

Beliefs:

#6. We cannot maintain a satisfactory level of production if we strangle our economy with unnecessary governmental controls.

#7. The government is not obligated to guarantee profitable prices to any economic group.

#16. Price supports tend to draw additional resources into agriculture and stimulate production of supported commodities.

#18. A national marketing order for commodities will prove unworkable because it could not recognize differences in production and marketing conditions.

Valuations:

#14. We are opposed to poundage, bushelage and other quantitative limitations.

#15. Price support levels should not be based on arbitrary formulas nor left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

#17. It is our desire to move in the direction of eliminating governmental regulation of the right to produce agricultural products.

Because of the difficulty involved in judging whether the major provisions were on balance consistent or inconsistent with the Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farm Bureau, no judgment was made. It is seen that the major provisions are inconsistent with the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF. The author feels: (1)
that the consistency between the major provisions and Type II belief #6 and Type II valuation #6 is more than offset by the inconsistency between the major provisions and Type III beliefs #16 and #7 and Type III valuation #15; (2) that the consistency between the major provisions and the Type II belief #13 is more than offset by the inconsistency between the major provisions and Type III belief #6, and (3) that the consistency between the major provisions and Type II valuation #7 is more than offset by the inconsistency between the major provisions and Type III belief #16. The author, therefore, concludes that the inconsistency between the major provisions and the Type III beliefs and valuations outweighs any Type II considerations. It follows, then, that the major provisions were inconsistent with the Type I beliefs and valuation of the AFBF (see statement 3(e), page 29). The AFBF could have been expected to oppose the proposal.

The Grange and title I of H.R.6400

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange.

Beliefs:

#11. Price supports are essential for the prevention of a serious price collapse during development of self-help programs.

#16. Unless effective ways are devised to adjust production to effective demand, the prospect of the future is that total available supplies will consistently exceed effective demand under normal conditions, even at lower prices.

#24. There are no practical, realistic ways by which producers
can effectively build up their economic position through non-governmental, strictly voluntary means.

#26. Marketing agreements have proved to be one of the most useful of farm measures.

Valuations:

#1. Marketing agreements should be used for all commodities on which they can be efficiently used.

#4. A commodity-by-commodity approach should be used in developing farm programs.

#5. Practical ways must be developed and applied to influence the volume of supply going into the market.

#6. We need to do a better job of adjusting our production to effective demand at fair prices.

#21. Responsibility for and the control of excess production should be in the hands of producers themselves.

The major provisions of the proposal were not inconsistent with any of the Grange's Type II expressed beliefs or valuations.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed valuations of the Grange.

Valuations:

#4. Governmental compulsion should be avoided except in the implementation of controls voluntarily imposed by growers upon themselves.

#9. Production payments should be used only when it is clearly evident that other measures cannot do the job.¹

¹Compensatory payments (production payments), if used, would be used as a means of price support only for commodities on a farm marketing quota under the AAA of 1938.
The major provisions of Title I were inconsistent with none of the Type III expressed beliefs or valuations of the Grange.

The proposal was consistent with the Type II and Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange. It follows, then, that the proposal was consistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the Grange. The Grange, it is concluded, could have been expected to support the proposal.

Title I of H.R.6160 and the Farmers Union

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union.

Beliefs:

#5. Farmers must have enabling legislation to get needed bargaining power.

#1. Farmers do not now have fair bargaining power under the existing market structure.

#2. Lack of bargaining power makes it impossible for farmers to earn and to get a fair share of national income.

#3. Farmers need and, in justice deserve, federal enabling legislation and positive programs.

#4. Unlike businessman and labor, farmers have not been extended the legal authorization and facilities to exercise similar bargaining power.

#6. Farmers are ready, willing, able and eager to accept the responsibility and the individual and the cooperative self-discipline required to regulate their marketings and curb wasteful production.
Valuations:

#3. Farmers must obtain control over the supply and the marketing of their commodities.

#4. Authority to make use of marketing orders and quotas should be authorized for producers of all commodities.

#5. Programs should be developed for all commodities when producers are willing to adopt and to enforce effective measures to keep market supplies in balance with demand.

#23. The bargaining power of family farms in commodity and credit markets must be balanced with the rest of the economy.

#32. The producer of any commodity should be given equal treatment with the producer of any other farm product.

The major provisions of the proposal were not inconsistent with any of the Type II expressed beliefs or valuations of the Farmers Union.

The major provisions of the proposal were not related to the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union (see: statement 2, page 26).

The Farmers Union could have been expected to support the proposal.

The belief and valuation approach indicates that the Farmers Union and the Grange could have been expected to support Title I and that the AFBF could have been expected to oppose it.

Actual position of the organizations

Each organization had a spokesman testify before the House Committee on Agriculture of the United States Congress, in order to present the
organizations views on Title I.

The spokesman for the Farmers Union made the following statement (41, p. 304):

"We urge the immediate use of Title I authority of the bill, reducing the time of getting additional programs into operation in order that producers may avail themselves of the assistance provided by the Act at the earliest possible time."

The spokesman for the Grange made a statement which referred to H.R.6400 in its entirety (41, p. 174).

"Our Grange executive committee met..., and endorsed the basic principles and objectives of H.R.6400... The proposed legislation would make possible the putting into action of many of the basic principles which have been developed and supported by the Grange."

The AFBF spokesman said (41, p. 250):

"...we are forced to conclude that the Cochrane--Freeman proposals relative to price supports, production controls, marketing agreements and orders, compensatory payments— which comprise Title I of H.R.6400—are unsound and unwise."

The basis of the disagreement

The basis of the disagreement over Title I can be traced to the differences in the beliefs and valuations that the different organizations hold. The AFBF's beliefs and valuations about price supports, nation-wide marketing orders, poundage and bushelage limitations, and the determination of price support levels are not shared by the Farmers Union or the Grange. The Grange and the Farmers Union while they do not tend to contradict the AFBF's beliefs and valuations do hold beliefs and valuations that caused them to take a position contrary to the position taken by the AFBF. The AFBF does not contend the Grange's beliefs or valuations concerning the level of price supports or the commodity-by-commodity approach
nor does it question the Farmers Union's beliefs or valuations concerning enabling legislation, fair bargaining power, or regulation of production, it just does not express them. The fact that the organizations do have different beliefs can be seen to have given rise to the different positions the organizations took.
TITLES II AND III OF H.R.6400

Titles II and III of H.R.6400 are analyzed for the purpose of pointing out that concord is possible.

**Major provisions of title II**

Title II proposed to amend and to extend for five years PL 480, 83rd Congress, the Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954. With the enactment of the proposal, national food reserves would be established in foreign countries. These national food reserves would be composed of U. S. produced agricultural commodities and would be available to the peoples of the country in which they were established, free of charge, in times of national emergency or national disaster. Title II also proposed that Congress continue to authorize: (1) sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies not readily convertible to dollars, (2) donations of food to friendly peoples in cases of famine or other urgent relief requirements, (3) grants to assist in economic development, (4) bartering of surplus CCC commodities for strategic materials, and (5) the providing of long-term supply commitments on a dollar credit basis.

**Title II of H.R.6400 and the Farm Bureau**

The major provisions of title II were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

Beliefs:

#12. In order to improve farm income, we must expand markets both at home and abroad, dispose of existing surpluses....
#20. Foreign countries have a shortage of dollars with which to purchase U.S. agricultural products.

#21. The prosperity of American agriculture is greatly dependent upon the maintenance of a high level of U.S. agricultural exports.

#24. It is good business for the U.S. to exchange surplus agricultural commodities for strategic and critical materials that are in short supply and which we do not produce in sufficient quantities to meet our national requirements.

Valuations:

#1. Policies should be adopted which will expand agricultural markets to a point where they balance our production.

#16. The CCC should encourage the movement of surplus commodities directly into world trade through private channels before they become the property of the government.

#21. The United States should enter into long term agreements to purchase basic materials to greatly expand our national security reserves.

The major provisions of Title II were inconsistent with none of the AFBF's Type II expressed beliefs or valuations.

The major provisions of Title II were consistent with the following Type III expressed belief and valuation of the AFBF.

Belief:

#8. The volume that can be sold and the costs that must be paid are more important in obtaining parity than governmental support prices.

Valuation:

#4. Policies which encourage rather than strangle foreign
trade must be followed.

#25. Every means should be used to eliminate the excessive accumulation of surplus agricultural production.

The major provisions of Title II were inconsistent with the following Type III valuation of the AFBF.

Valuations:

#3. We should avoid the perpetuation of programs which give our farm products away.

On balance it is judged that the major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF. Because the proposal was also consistent with the AFBF's Type II beliefs and valuations it follows that it was also consistent with the AFBF's Type I beliefs and valuations.

The AFBF could have been expected to support Title II of H.R.6400.

**Title II of H.R.6400 and The National Grange**

The major provisions of Title II were consistent with the following Type II expressed belief and valuations of the Grange.

Beliefs:

#19. Foreign markets are essential to an expanding and prosperous agriculture.

Valuations:

#13. We should make surpluses available to the less fortunate people of the world.

#23. United States exports should be expanded.

#25. Crash programs which will relieve the depressing effect of
mounting supplies of storables upon our price structure should be developed.

The major provisions of Title II were inconsistent with none of the Grange's Type II expressed beliefs or valuations.

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type III expressed valuation of the Grange.

Valuation:

#1. Measures which do not utilize governmental controls or funds should be used before those that do.

The proposal was also consistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the Grange.

The Grange could have been expected to support Title II of H.R.6400.

**Title II of H.R.6400 and the Farmers Union**

The major provisions of Title II were consistent with the following Type II expressed belief and valuation of the Farmers Union.

Belief:

#8. Farmers want to improve their income by regulating market supply through...mandatory donation of it to augment the food supply of starving millions in other lands.

Valuation:

#9. All areas of expanding demand for farm commodities, consistent with good soil conservation practices, should be explored exhaustively, before we concern ourselves with production restrictions.

The major provisions of Title II were inconsistent with none of the Type II expressed beliefs or valuations of the Farmers Union.
The major provisions of the proposal were not related to the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union.

The proposal was also consistent with the type I beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union. The Farmers Union as well as the AFBF and the Grange could have been expected to support the proposal.

Actual positions of the organizations

The AFBF thought a five-year extension of PL 480 would hurt foreign producers and also cause dollar markets to be lost; their spokesman told the House Committee on Agriculture:

"Farm Bureau supports a three-year extension of PL 480 rather than 5 years as proposed in the bill because (1) Congress would have the opportunity at least every three years to review and re-assess the PL 480 program; and (2) a long term extension would carry with it a strong implication that this is a permanent program. This would cause serious distortion of commercial world trade in agriculture." (41, p. 813)

For the AFBF to support the extension of PL 480 for three years rather than 5 years is consistent with the belief and valuation analysis, if one considers the fact that the AFBF thought that a three-year extension would disrupt world trade and their Type III valuation #9:

#9. We must guard against legislation or administrative action which would demoralize markets or create unfair competition for producers either at home or abroad.

The spokesman for the Farmers Union in testifying before the House Committee on Agriculture stated:

"We urge your support of Title II of the Cooley-Ellender Bill (H.R.6149). Farmers Union supports the extension of PL 480 and the expansion of the program as provided in this Title." (41, p. 759)
The Grange made no statement that referred to Title II specifically. Their endorsement of the entire proposal (H.R.6400) leads to the belief that they endorsed Title II also.

**Title III of H.R.6400**

Title III of H.R.6400 also obtained support from the three organizations. Title III was a proposal which, if enacted, would have the effect of consolidating and modernizing the Secretary of Agriculture’s authority to make loans to eligible farmers. Title III of H.R.6400 was a substitute for Titles I, II and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the Water Facility Act of 1937 and Public Law 38 of the 81st Congress which constituted the major authority for disaster loans.

Title III of H.R.6400 authorized loans to be made to family farmers who were unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere at reasonable rates. Loans could be obtained for the following reasons:

a. enlarging or improving farms  
b. land and water development  
c. refinancing existing indebtedness  
d. paying costs incident to reorganizing the family farming system for more profitable operation  
e. purchasing livestock, poultry and farm equipment  
f. meeting operating expenses  
g. loan closing costs  
h. victims of natural disasters

The F.H.A. was given the authority to administer the proposal, if enacted.
Title III of H.R.6400 and the Farm Bureau

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II beliefs and valuation of the AFBF.

Beliefs:

#18. Sound agricultural credit on a permanent basis is essential to the development and advancement of agriculture.

#19. Adequate farm credit is necessary at the lowest interest rate consistent with the actual cost of money.

Valuation:

#20. Farmers should be able to obtain credit at interest rates comparable to those available to the other segments of our economy.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with none of the AFBF's Type II expressed beliefs or valuations. The proposal was not related to the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the AFBF.

The AFBF could have been expected to support the proposal.

The Grange and title III of H.R.6400

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed belief and valuation of the Grange.

Belief:

#27. Modern farming requires a considerable investment of capital often difficult to obtain.

Valuation:

#27. Appropriations to the F.H.A. should be increased.

The major provisions of the proposal were inconsistent with none of the Grange's Type II expressed beliefs or valuations.
The major provisions were not related to the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations of the Grange.

The major provisions of the proposal were also consistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the Grange. The Grange could have been expected to support the proposal.

The Farmers Union and Title III of H.R.6100

The major provisions of the proposal were consistent with the following Type II expressed beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union.

Beliefs:

14. An ample supply of low cost credit is necessary for family-type farming.

15. The F.H.A. plays a vital role in developing adequate economic farms.

Valuations:

14. Family farmers should be able to turn to the F.H.A. to obtain fully adequate credit adapted to family needs and problems when such credit cannot be obtained from established private sources at rates of interest and on terms commensurate with the earning power of farm investment.

15. The F.H.A. should be transformed into a complete yardstick family farm loan institution to supplement the services of credit unions and other cooperative credit institutions.

The major provisions of Title III were inconsistent with none of the Type II expressed beliefs or valuations of the Farmers Union. The proposal was not related to the Type III expressed beliefs and valuations.
of the Farmers Union.

The proposal was consistent with the Type I beliefs and valuations of the Farmers Union. The Farmers Union could have been expected to support the proposal.

The actual positions of the organizations

The Farm Bureau spokesman when testifying before the House Committee on Agriculture had the following to say in regard to Title III of H.R.6400:

"Farm Bureau favors sound agricultural credit on a permanent basis because we believe it is essential to the further development and advancement of agriculture. Adequate sources of credit at interest rates and on terms adapted to farmers' needs become increasingly necessary as farmers adjust to technological change." (41, p. 639)

A letter from the Master of the National Grange to the House Committee on Agriculture contained the following statement:

"The Grange feels that Title III of H.R.6400 improves the statutory authority of F.H.A. and, as a result, will greatly improve its services to the American farmer." (41, p. 667)

The spokesman for the Farmers Union when presenting the views of his organization in regard to Title III of H.R.6400 made the following statement.

"...it is very encouraging to see in the Agricultural Act of 1961 (H.R.6400) provisions for consolidating agricultural credit under a single authority and adjusting and expanding the services with emphasis on family-type operations." (41, p. 657)

The functioning of leadership

In analyzing the proposals, it has been the author who has determined:
(1) the beliefs and valuations with which the major provisions were consistent
(2) the beliefs and valuations with which the major provisions were inconsistent.

For any proposal these factors are determined for the farm organizations by the organizations' leaders. Therefore, it is possible, even though the organizations have the same beliefs and valuations, that disagreement might very well occur because their leaders are not in agreement over whether or not the major provisions are consistent or inconsistent with the organizations' beliefs and valuations. However, the most that can be said for this is, that it is a possibility. This writer believes that the psychological inferring processes of the leaders is so similar that if the organizations had the same beliefs and valuations little disagreement would be caused by the functioning of the leaders. There are many who subscribe to the thesis that the leaders are at the core of the problem. The holders of this view seem to be unaware that the farm organizations' leaders operate within a given belief and valuation framework, and that the position of the leaders is determined by this belief and valuation framework. Those who hold to the thesis that the leaders determine the belief and valuation framework of their organizations are apparently not acquainted with how resolutions of the farm organizations are adopted.

It may very well be true, as Schickele (39, p. 9) claims, that the leaders shape and form the thoughts and feelings (beliefs and valuations?) of the members. They do not, however, determine them.
RESOLUTION OF DISAGREEMENT

Due to the fact that the basis of the disagreement manifested by the three major farm organizations, in regard to agricultural policy, can be traced to the differences that exist in their belief and valuation frameworks, it is possible to indicate how such disagreement can be resolved.

Four methods of resolving such disagreement will be considered.

They are:

2. Effecting compliance.
3. Adding additional beliefs and valuations to the frameworks.
4. Avoiding areas of conflict

Two of these methods have shortcomings. They will be considered because they are advocated by some individuals. The two remaining ones are offered as practical and feasible methods of resolving the disagreement manifested by the three farm organizations over farm policy.

Creating homogeneous belief and valuation frameworks

Hathaway and Wilcox (11, pp. 170-183) among others, subscribe to the thesis that an increase in the agreement about the facts would substantially reduce the policy conflicts in agriculture. This belief apparently rest on the knowledge that the organizations' beliefs and valuations are not all similar: As Wilcox states, "... I am chagrined at the great variance between what the opposing groups are saying to each other."

---

1 The distinction between a belief and a fact as the two terms are being used in the thesis is the following. A belief is either a "fact" or a "myth". If the truth value of a belief is false, the belief is a myth. If the truth value of a belief is true, the belief is a fact.
other and the relevant facts."

For sake of exposition, let it be assumed that all the facts become known. And, as a result of the knowledge of the facts, all beliefs disaffirmed beliefs (and valuations) are adopted. Two relations among the beliefs and valuations of the organizations would remain. Some beliefs and valuations would be held by all the organizations; and each organization would hold beliefs and valuations that were not related to the other organizations' beliefs and valuations. Therefore, let it also be assumed that each organization adopts all beliefs and valuations not held by them but held by other organizations. The resulting situation is that all the organizations have exactly the same beliefs and valuations and no disagreement between them should ever occur.

It seems to this writer that those who feel agreement on all the relevant facts is needed in order to resolve policy conflicts are saying in a roundabout way that the solution to the problem is to create similar belief and valuation frameworks. This would be an ideal solution to be sure, but it also smacks of utopianism.

It is true that disagreement on agricultural policy occurs because farm organizations do not have the same beliefs and valuations. However, it should not be said or even implied that the underlying cause of the disagreement over agricultural policy is due to the fact that the organizations have different beliefs and valuations. Those who feel that if only the farm organizations held the same beliefs and valuations, there would be no conflict, apparently do not understand the true nature of the problem. The problem is in large part caused by those factors that give rise to different belief and valuation frameworks. Therefore, to resolve
conflict by creating homogeneous belief and valuation frameworks implies the removal of all factors that cause the belief and valuation frameworks of the organizations to differ. If these factors cannot be removed, homogeneous belief and valuation frameworks are impossible.

An examination of the factors that cause the belief and valuation frameworks to differ shows that most of these factors cannot be removed. A word or two about two of these factors will substantiate this assertions.

Knowledge of the facts  It seems a fairly safe assumption to say that knowledge of all the relevant facts will never be known with certainty. To assume that they will assumes there will eventually be no open questions; that everything will be either black or white. There will always be some open questions; and where there are open questions there is usually diverse opinions. In short, as long, as there are questions such as: Does smoking cause cancer? or, more appropriate to our discussion: Is the family-farm the bulwark of democracy? we can expect people—and organizations—to hold different beliefs and valuations.

However, even if the facts all suddenly became known, there would still be a problem of getting individuals to accept them. People will not always drop disproved beliefs. Festinger, et al. (9, Chap. 1) indicate that there are "conditions under which we would expect to observe increase fervor following the disconfirmation of a belief." The conditions he refers to apply, in their entirety, to the farm organizations.¹

¹Those conditions are when: (1) a belief is held with deep conviction, (2) the persons holding the belief are committed to it, (3) the belief is sufficiently concerned with the real world, (4) disconfirmatory evidence must occur and be recognized, and (5) social support is given to the belief.
Different beliefs and valuations and environmental contact

As long as individuals live in different geographical locales, we can expect them to have different beliefs and valuations. As long as individuals have different sources of information—newspapers, friends, politicians, newscasters, magazines, school teachers—it is quite safe to say they will have different beliefs and valuations. As long as individuals have different incomes, different religions, different political affiliations, it can be assumed they will also have different beliefs and valuations. In short, as long as individuals have different environmental contact, it is somewhat fallacious to assume they will not have different beliefs and valuations.

Enough discussion has taken place to indicate that while the most ideal solution for the prevention of disagreement over agricultural policy by the farm organizations might be to create similar belief and valuation frameworks for the organizations, the possibility of doing such is more than doubtful.

Effecting compliance

A second approach to the problem of how to resolve areas of disagreement between the farm organizations is to effect compliance. There are two ways in which compliance can be effected.

One way is to impose punishments or penalties on those who do not comply. This method has, of course, been utilized in many agricultural proposals, e.g., reduction of the price support level to 50% of parity for farmers who exceed allotments. This type of compliance, however, does not reduce the disagreement over policy.
A second way to effect compliance is to offer rewards for complying with the proposal. It may be claimed that a reward foregone is the same as a loss sustained and there is essentially no difference in the two methods. This would be true for non-compliers. However, for compliers the methods are in effect different. If the reward to the complier is high enough, the magnitude of it may overcome any dissatisfaction he has about the policy due to disregarded beliefs or disregarded valuations. The reward, then, not only effects compliance but brings about accord.

Unfortunately, too much emphasis has centered on the first method of effecting compliance rather than the second. However, it must be added, the reward to be paid in order to get agreement through compliance, may be more than those who must pay the reward—U.S. taxpayers—are willing to pay, considering the fact that they (the taxpayers) are primarily interested in compliance and not in agreement.

There are two practical ways in which policy conflicts can be resolved. One is a long-run approach. The other approach can be utilized immediately. The long-run approach will be considered first.

Adding additional beliefs and valuations to the frameworks

It may be impossible to get homogeneous belief and valuation frameworks for the organizations, however, it is not impossible to introduce new beliefs and valuations into the existing belief and valuation frameworks of the organizations.

Introducing new beliefs and valuations implies broadening the viewpoint of the organization. This can be done only by exposing the organization to new matters, e.g., certain areas of foreign affairs. Exposing
the organization to new matters can only be done by supplying it with additional information. If an attempt is made to introduce additional beliefs (or valuations) into an organization's belief and valuation framework, and the beliefs (or valuations) which one is attempting to introduce are repugnant to the beliefs and valuations that organization presently holds, the new beliefs (or valuations) will not be accepted unless the organization feels that they are more important, i.e., on a higher level, than those beliefs and valuations with which they are repugnant. Therefore, to be able to introduce new beliefs (or valuations) into an organization's belief and valuation framework when those new beliefs (or valuations) are repugnant to presently held beliefs and valuations necessitates being able also to show that the new beliefs (or valuations) are on a higher level than those with which they are repugnant and should be accepted because they take precedence over them.

Introducing new beliefs and valuations into the organizations' frameworks is of value when two organizations have diametrically opposed beliefs or valuations. If a belief or valuation which is repugnant with one of the organization's views but is also on a higher level is introduced into both organizations' frameworks, agreement on more important matters can be obtained.

An example of this type of agreement is the following. In times of peace, pacifists argue that man should be pacifistic in thought and behavior. In times of peace, veteran groups maintain we should always be ready and prepared to defend our country. In times of war, a new valuation is introduced—"democracy must be saved"—and as a result,
pacifists and members of veteran groups are found fighting side-by-side.

That the government has been attempting to introduce new beliefs and valuations into the farm organizations' belief and valuation frameworks cannot be denied. However, the government's approach has emphasized introducing repugnant beliefs and valuations on the same level. In short, it is attempting to disconfirm already held beliefs. Instead of this approach—or at least, in addition to this approach—the beliefs and valuations to be introduced should be on a higher level when they are repugnant to presently held beliefs and valuations. For example, in addition to pointing out that the accumulation of foreign currencies is not getting "out of hand", greater effort might be made to show that the storing of excessive amounts of food in a hungry world is not only politically, economically and socially unsound—but criminal.

Avoiding areas of conflict

It takes time to introduce new beliefs and valuations into an organization's belief and valuation framework. Therefore, if the disagreement over agricultural policy shown by the farm organizations is to be resolved immediately, the resolution of such disagreement is dependent on the policy maker.

The policy maker's policy, if disagreement is to be avoided, must not be inconsistent with any of the organizations' Type I or Type II beliefs or valuations. It therefore becomes necessary that the policy makers become aware of the belief and valuation frameworks of the farm organizations.

Because of the nature of the belief and valuation frameworks of the
organizations there will be some things the policy maker cannot propose, if his intent is to avoid disagreement. As an example, the beliefs and valuations of the farm organizations in regard to price supports are the following:

Farm Bureau:
1. Price supports which guarantee profitable prices draw excessive resources into agriculture, create unmanageable surpluses. ... (4, p. 21)
2. Price supports should be determined by the producer's response in bringing supplies in line with effective demand. (1, p. 11)
3. Multiple price or certificate plans transfer the surplus problem from one group to another. (3, p. 9)
4. We are opposed to multiple price programs. (3, p. 9)

Grange:
1. Price supports are essential to prevent a serious price collapse during development of self-help programs. (36, p. 128)
2. Under a two-price system production controls would be greatly minimized and subsidies eliminated. (31, p. 166)
3. We recommend the use of two-price or multi-price self-financing measure for such commodities as can use them. (26, p. 159)

Farmers Union:
1. We are definitely and unalterably opposed to any proposed two-price or multiple price system. (23, p. 8)
2. We are opposed to any type of varied or flexible or sliding
scale price supports that brings lower support levels in response to more abundant farm production. (23, p. 8)

3. Existing legislation should be revised to provide 100% of full parity price support. (24, p. 13)

It seems inconceivable that any proposal dealing only with price supports or multiple price plans could be devised that would not be inconsistent with at least one organization’s valuations. Therefore, the policy maker must avoid utilizing only price supports. The farm organizations do not want prices supported as an end in itself but as a means to accomplish another end. This end for the AFBF and the Grange is to provide protection against price collapse. For the Farmers Union it is to provide 100% parity income. The policy maker must then find other means to provide protection against price collapse and other means of providing 100% parity income, if he desires to bring about agreement among the organizations. In this particular example the policy maker could, of course, find other ways to provide 100% parity income. He then would be able to utilize price supports for protection against price collapse to the satisfaction of all three organizations.

In summary, it is said that disagreement between the organizations will be resolved immediately only if the policy maker becomes aware of the beliefs and valuations of the organizations and does not disregard their Type I beliefs and valuations or their Type II beliefs and valuations.
RECAPITULATION

A listing of the key statements that have been put forth in the preceding pages will serve as a summarization of the discussion concerned with answering the question: Why do farm organizations disagree on agricultural policy?

1. Farm organizations disagree over agricultural policy proposals because they have different beliefs and valuations.

2. Because there are many open questions, because members of different organizations have different motivations, sources of information, and environmental contact, the holding of different beliefs and valuations by the farm organizations occurs.

3. At any given time we can examine the expressed beliefs and valuations of a farm organization.

4. Beliefs and valuations can be divided into three categories. (These were called for notation purposes "Type I," "Type II," and "Type III".)

5. Through the use of a theory it was shown that whenever a farm organization's "Type I" or "Type II" beliefs or valuations are disregarded by a policy proposal that organization will oppose the policy proposal.

6. Due to the fact that the disagreement of the organizations is a function of their beliefs and valuations, it was suggested that in order to resolve policy conflicts the introduction of additional beliefs and valuations into the organizations' frameworks should be the long-run goal. It was also suggested that the policy maker if he is interested in resolving policy conflicts must become acutely aware of the beliefs and
valuations of the organizations and must not devise policies which are inconsistent with the organizations' Type I or Type II beliefs or valuations.
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

The disagreement over agricultural policy proposals can be traced to differences in beliefs or to differences in valuations.

Examining beliefs

Differences in the belief and valuation frameworks of different farm organizations exist to some extent because one organization holds beliefs which are diametrically opposed to the beliefs held by another organization. If both organizations have the same underlying assumptions, then, one of them is wrong. For example, one organization may feel price supports will cause farm income to rise; another may feel price supports will cause farm income to decline. Only one can be correct, if they are both using similar assumptions. For differences of this type study should be undertaken to determine which organization is incorrect and to point out to that organization why it is incorrect. Many times, differences of this type occur because the organizations' conclusions are based on different assumptions. Therefore, study of differences of this type will, more than likely, entail the examining of the underlying assumptions (beliefs also) and determining which set of assumptions are more realistic (factual).

Differences also exist because one organization holds beliefs which, while not diametrically opposed, are negated by the beliefs held by another organization. For example, one organization may believe that strict governmental controls hinder individual freedom; another organization may hold that this is not the case. Differences of this type are somewhat
similar to those indicated above. However, these differences rather than being caused by different underlying assumptions are, in the main, caused by the organizations' use of operationally meaningless statements or terms. Study of differences of this type, then, would be directed mainly toward attempting to point out precisely what is meant by certain belief statements.

Differences also exist because some beliefs are held by one organization and are not the beliefs of a second organization—even when these beliefs are not repugnant to any other held beliefs of that second organization. For differences of this type study should be directed toward determining what the selective process is, i.e., why are some beliefs chosen rather than others. Most of the disagreement over policy proposals is caused by differences of this type in the belief and valuation frameworks of the organizations. Therefore, study of these type of differences and what gives rise to them would prove most fruitful.

Examining valuations

It is possible to ask the holder of a particular valuation, why he holds that valuation. The justification, he supplies, will be stated in the form of certain beliefs. Some beliefs taken in conjunction with certain values logically give rise to certain valuations. In this sense, the valuations can be thought of as being logical inferences of the beliefs. In other cases, the beliefs supplied, in order to justify certain valuations, may be a result of the valuations that are held, i.e., the

---

1See footnote, page 82.
valuations give rise to the beliefs, rather than the beliefs giving rise to the valuations. In this sense the beliefs serve as psychological rationalizations for the valuations.

Beliefs serve as rationalizations for valuations when the holder of the valuation feels that the beliefs and values that logically give rise to the valuations are too opportunistic to be stated and that a substitute set of beliefs should be supplied. The substitute beliefs (or rationalizations) usually have social support and are stated in a manner such that the valuations seem to follow from them. For example, livestock producers may believe strict governmental controls on feed grains will cause feed grain prices to be more than feed grain prices would be, if there were not strict controls. As livestock producers also prefer lower costs to higher costs, it follows that they should take the position that the government should not interfere with the production of feed grains. The livestock producers may feel that society, as a whole, might take a dim view of the reasons that they have for wanting nongovernmental interference. Therefore, they adopt a justification which has stronger social support. Thus, the livestock producers might say that governmental restrictions on production are contrary to principles of free enterprise. As a free enterprise economy is preferred over all other types, it is said to follow that the government should not place strict controls on feed grains.

Valuations are, at times, imposed on individuals by others in the society and are accepted because the individual who accepts them has faith in the imposing force. For example, many of us have said that man should not covet, even before we knew what the word covet meant. When valuations
of this type are justified, the individual who does the justifying may appeal to some power on a higher plane, e.g., "the state says so", or "God says so", or "the people demand it" or "the government knows what is best". It also occurs that individuals who adopt valuations imposed on them also find beliefs to justify them. For example, most youngsters between the ages of 12 and 15 can present a fairly convincing argument as to why agriculture should be set up on a family-farm basis. Rather than indicating that "dad or mom says so", they tend to point out that "it promotes democracy, efficiency, and the American way of life".

In undertaking a study to determine why the valuations of farm organizations differ, the following is suggested. Determine:

1. In what cases valuations are not being justified by the beliefs that give rise to them and indicate what the unstated beliefs are.

2. Those valuations imposed on the organization by other forces in the society and who those forces are, i.e., the church, the Constitution, the Republican party, etc.

In summary, then, future study should be directed toward:

1. ascertaining the truth value of the organizations' beliefs,
2. operationally defining all belief statements,
3. determining the factors that cause one organization to hold one set of beliefs and a second organization to hold a second set of beliefs (in some cases different sets of beliefs are stated because different valuations are held), and,
4. determining if the reasons the organizations supply in order to justify their valuations are the "true" reasons and to the extent they are not the "true" reasons, determine what the "true" reasons are.
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