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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Origin of Study

In this Upper Midwest area, there have been a number of key figures in the various agrarian movements that have swept across the Plains and in the numerous farm organizations that have been formed to address farm needs. Conspicuous names in the agrarian protest of the 1930s were Milo Reno, head of the Farm Holiday movement, Governor Floyd B. Olson of Minnesota; and Governor William "Alfalfa Bill" Murray of Oklahoma.¹ In South Dakota, a key agricultural figure was Emil Loriks, whose career in this state's politics began with his election to the South Dakota Senate in 1926.² He was to serve in the legislature until 1934, spending one term as chairman of the Joint Appropriations Committee after his party captured control of the legislature in a Democratic sweep of 1932. In 1934, Loriks resigned his Senate seat to become president of the South Dakota Farmers Union (SDFU), a post he held until mid-1938.

While in the South Dakota legislature, Loriks was active in the Farm Holiday Association, an agrarian protest movement, serving as its executive secretary. This protest movement had as its main purpose the prevention of farm
foreclosures and the marketing of low-priced farm products. The Holiday Association's leadership in South Dakota included a broad range of farm and business interests.

While Loriks was president of the SDFU, he became known as one of the "Gold Dust Twins" (along with fellow Democrat and state representative Oscar Fosheim) for his successful effort in leading the Farmers Union lobbying campaign in the 1935 legislature to get a gold severance tax enacted against the Homestake Gold Mine of Lead, South Dakota.

In 1938, Loriks ran in the six-man Democratic primary for the First District Congressional seat. He emerged as the primary winner that spring and then resigned his SDFU post to run against Republican Karl Mundt that fall for Congress. Loriks lost to Mundt by a margin of 46 to 54 percent.

After his defeat by Mundt, Loriks spent a time as South Dakota's, and then, regional, head of the Farm Security Administration, and concentrated his leadership efforts in farm organizations, notably the regional grain marketing cooperative, the Grain Terminal Association (GTA) based in St. Paul, Minnesota. As state president of the Farmers Union, Loriks, along with other Farmers Union state leaders, had been instrumental in organizing the GTA. Beginning in 1940, he served on the GTA board of directors,
and became its president in 1957, serving in that capacity through 1967.

Not surprisingly, having a public career devoted to political and farm organizational activities meant that Loriks was involved in numerous persuasive efforts—both spoken and written. He delivered numerous speeches and prepared many reports. Many of these speeches have been saved by Loriks himself while others are on file at the headquarters of the organizations he served.

There is precedent in the speech discipline for rhetorical studies of individual communicators. National political leaders have long been the topic of rhetorical study. For example:


There has also been scholarly research of regional political communicators, some of whom closely relate to developments in the area of agriculture. A few of these include the following:


In addition, in recent years there has also been scholarly study of the rhetoric of various South Dakota political figures, at least some of whom were important on the national level as well:


Trent, Judith S. and Jimmie D. "The Rhetoric of the Challenger: George Stanley McGovern," Central
Given this considerable precedent of scholarly study in the area of rhetorical criticism, it seemed that Emil Loriks' communicative efforts were worth studying. There is an accumulation of data for this current study of the inventive components of Loriks' persuasive efforts during the years he was an agrarian leader in the South Dakota Farmers Union.

**Purpose of the Investigation**

The purpose of this inquiry is to determine the effectiveness and effect of Emil Loriks' agrarian Farmers Union rhetoric from 1934 to 1938, during the time he was SDFU president. Effectiveness is here defined as how well the persuader's rhetorical choices match established rhetorical criteria. Effect refers to both the immediate and long-range response to rhetoric.

To accomplish the stated purpose, an attempt was made to answer the following questions:

1. What was the historical, economic and social background of the agrarian protest movement in the late 1920s and 1930s, with particular reference paid to developments in South Dakota?
2. What were the developments in agriculture and agricultural policy during the 1930s, when Loriks was president of the SDFU?

3. What were the inventional components in the selected speeches?

4. What were the immediate and long-range effects that these speeches had in terms of audience response?

Methodology of the Investigation

1. The first step taken in this study was to determine what other scholarly studies have been made of Emil Loriks, of either political-historical or rhetorical interest. A review of the following guides revealed that no other thesis on either the political-historical or the rhetorical significance of Emil Loriks had been completed:


The following communications index was checked for scholarly articles, and none was found about Emil Loriks:

The following South Dakota magazine was surveyed, and again, no articles were found:


There have been two studies made of Loriks' 1938 campaign against Karl Mundt:


Miller, John E. "McCarthyism Before McCarthy: the 1938 Election in South Dakota," unpublished m.s., 1982 (available from Dr. Miller at the SDSU History Department).

At the time this thesis on Loriks was being completed, Loriks' papers were being surveyed and organized by Dr. Larry Roberts of the South Dakota State University History and Geography Departments. These papers are now housed in boxes at the Heritage House Museum in Oldham, South Dakota.

There has been only one known study of Emil Loriks' persuasive efforts. This paper was completed by the writer as a special project in the Department of Speech at South Dakota State University, in the fall of 1982:

Williams, Elizabeth Evenson. "Emil Loriks: A study in Persuasive Practices," (available from the author or from Dr. Wayne E. Hoogestraat).
2. The next step was to locate texts of Loriks' speeches given during his tenure as South Dakota Farmers Union president, 1934-1938. A total of thirty-three WNAX radio addresses (Yankton, South Dakota), one National Broadcasting Company (NBC) address (made in Chicago), and four South Dakota Farmers Union state convention presidential addresses were found. (All, with the exception of two speeches, as noted later in this study, were found at SDFU headquarters in Huron, South Dakota.) The addresses are as follows:

WNAX radio addresses
(all printed in South Dakota Union Farmer)

"Leadership in America," April 4, 1934.

"Farm Problem One of Balance," May 2, 1934.

"Severance Tax Sought on Ore Mined in State of South Dakota," May 16, 1934 (note that it was broadcast May 7).


"Hopes Are Still Held for the Passage of Real Frazier Bill," July 25, 1934 (broadcast July 16).

"Loriks Carries Fight for Ore Tax into Black Hills Region," August 8, 1934.

"Loriks Urges Farmers to Help Each Other Over Trying Winter," August 22, 1934.

"Membership Will Reach 50% Increase by October 9th, Says Loriks," October 3, 1934.
"National Convention Next on Schedule," October 31, 1934.

"Loriks Seeks Information on Cost of Freight in S. Dak."
November 14, 1934.


"Emil Loriks Talks on Doings and Happenings in Legislature at Pierre During Present Session," February 6, 1935.

"Farmers Union Scores Distinct Victory in Legislative Session, Declares Loriks in Broadcast," March 20, 1935.


"Farmers Union is Figure in Saving More Than Million," May 29, 1935.


"Must We Have Revolution with Bloodshed Before Independence for Farmer is Made Possible," July 24, 1935.

"Cooperatives May Be Means of Driving an Indicted Capitalism to Terms," August 7, 1935.


"Loriks Wants Governor to Call Special Session of Legislature to Establish Old Age Pension," December 11, 1935.


"Every Citizen Has Special Duty to Perform in Upholding Share of Responsibility," March 4, 1936.

"Loriks Reviews Tariff Question and Asks Revision in Fairness to Agriculture," March 18, 1936.

"Loriks Commended Membership; Predicts Unprecedented Growth in Farmers Union Cooperatives," May 13, 1936.


"Six-Point Issues of Farmers Union Given to Parties," June 10, 1936.


"Emil Loriks in Last Broadcast as State President; Continues Support of Farm Union Program," July 20, 1938. (Loriks' working copy of this speech was also found in his private papers at Oldham.)

(The South Dakota Union Farmer is on file at SDFU headquarters in Huron. The dates given, unless otherwise noted, are the dates the speeches were printed.)

National radio address
(found in Loriks private papers, Oldham)

"Farmers Union Radio Hour Broadcast," NBC, Chicago, April 23, 1938.
The following three addresses were selected for detailed inventional evaluation:

Convention addresses

1. Presidential address to 1936 convention, Sioux Falls, October 13-15. (This address not only contains an appeal to Farmers Union membership to practice the cooperative approach to marketing, but calls on the members to help build a "new economic order." The speech contains several strong attacks on capitalism, and makes a particularly strong critique of "Hearst-Homestake" interest, the target of the successful SDFU effort the year before, in 1935, to get the South Dakota Legislature to enact a gold severance tax against the Homestake Mine of Lead.)

2. Presidential address to 1937 convention, Huron, October 12-14. (This address begins by noting the gathering war clouds around the world, and then goes back to detail the founding of the national Farmers Union twenty-five years before, and the SDFU, twenty-two
years before. There is a strong attack on capitalism
and an indictment of the profit system. The speaker also
cites the accomplishments of the SDFU and outlines future
goals of the organization.)

Radio address

1. "Farmers Union State President Pays Tribute
to Huey Long Who Was Genuine Friend of Humanity," South
Dakota Union Farmer, September 18, 1935. (This address
not only pays tribute to the assassinated Long, but com­
pares him to such other figures as Lincoln. There is
also an emphatic anti-war statement and an attack on those
who would profit from war.)

These three speeches were selected because they
provide a sampling over the years Loriks headed the SDFU
and because they provide a broad sampling of the widely
varying subject matter he dealt with. An arbitrary
decision was made not to select speeches which dealt with
purely internal Farmers Union matters, or speeches which
did not relate to basic agricultural and political policy
matters--such as the speech urging farmers to help each
other during the coming winter. In other words, the judg­
ment was made to choose speeches covering substantive
issues.

An effort was made to select speeches that did not
all deal with the same topics, such as the ore tax battle,
which was a major concern in 1934 and 1935. The three speeches selected provide a sampling of diverse subject areas.

Finally, there was also an attempt made to include both state and national policy concerns and the role of the Farmers Union in addressing those concerns.

3. The third step represented an effort to determine the textual accuracy of the available speeches. This was difficult as the speeches were not reprinted in general circulation newspapers where they could be compared with the available texts. Nor are there recordings available to use to make comparisons. Minutes and records of the South Dakota Farmers Union were consulted as a guide, however, and Loriks was asked about his speeches. In addition, suggestions that Thonssen, Baird and Braden make in *Speech Criticism* were utilized where possible.³

Despite these limitations, the speeches as preserved in the Farmers Union minutes and newspaper do represent what the speaker either actually said or wished to say. Inasmuch as this study dealt with the inventive components of the Loriks speeches, it can be assumed that these components—the basic ideas and support—would be close to what was actually said. Perhaps only in the area of emotional proof, and in particular, the speaker's
use of loaded words, might there have been much difference between the available printed texts and what was actually said.

4. The fourth step was to study and analyze the historical data surrounding Loriks' persuasive efforts in order to answer the first question raised under the "Purpose of the Investigation" section.

5. The fifth step was to identify the components to be analyzed in the study, to define these components and to justify their selection. The inventive components of logical proof, emotional proof and ethical proof have been selected. As the speech scholar, Charles Sears Baldwin, noted nearly sixty years ago, invention refers to "investigation, analysis, and grasp of the subject matter."\(^4\) Thonseen, Baird and Braden point out that many writers--Aristotle among them--give more attention to invention than to the other parts of rhetoric. In sum, invention is "the concept of the status, and the modes of persuasion--logical, emotional and ethical--in all their complex interrelations."\(^5\)

In arriving at a working definition of logical proof, Thonseen, Baird and Braden in their discussion of the "integrity of ideas," or of logical proof, note that one needs to "determine how fully a given speech enforces an idea; how nearly that enforcement conforms to the
general rules of argumentative development; and how nearly the totality of the reasoning approaches a measure of truth adequate for purposes of action."\(^6\) In short, "the integrity of ideas can be judged through three principal means: determination (1) of the intellectual resources of the speaker, (2) of the severity and strictness of the argumentative development, and (3) of the 'truth' of the idea in functional existence."\(^7\)

Emotional proof, as the three authors say, "is designed to put the listener in a frame of mind to react favorably and conformably to the speaker's purpose."\(^8\) Thonssen, Baird and Braden continue, "The basic consideration, then, is adaptation, or adjustment to the variables of human behavior as found in a specific group of hearers."\(^9\) Looked at another way, as an earlier thesis writer at South Dakota State University noted, "Emotional proof is also the ability of the speaker to touch the feelings of the audience with what he has to say."\(^10\)

When it comes to ethical proof, Thonssen, Baird and Braden admit that the lines between ethical and emotional proof are not clear. "Despite the apparent indivisibility of appeal, this difference seems to stand out: ethos refers chiefly to what the speaker chooses to do; pathos, to what the listeners' reaction is."\(^11\)
The authors list the elements of ethical proof as character, sagacity and good will of the speaker.\textsuperscript{12}

The inventive components of logical, emotional and ethical proof were selected for this study for several reasons. Evidence has already been given as to the importance of invention relative to the other canons; that is, that the substance of a speech is of paramount concern. In addition, the relative importance of invention can be attested to by the fact that Thonssen, Baird and Braden devote a chapter apiece to the three components of invention while dealing with the other canons in a chapter each.

There are various limitations which preclude the analysis of the other canons in this study. Because there are no recordings of Emil Loriks' speeches available, it would have been nearly impossible to analyze the canon of delivery. The difficulties already mentioned in determining textual authenticity of the available texts would have made an analysis of style somewhat difficult. Then there was the ever present limitation of time available to do this study; arrangement was omitted for that reason, and the decision was made to deal with only the inventive components.

6. The sixth step was to establish criteria to be used in evaluating the inventive components in each of
the selected speeches. For logical proof, the lines of reasoning were detailed and the major assertions of each speech were isolated. The following questions were asked during the analysis of the selected texts:

a. What kinds of reasoning did the speaker use, and were they the best choices?

b. What were the forms of support, and were they the best choices?

c. Was the evidence sufficient to justify the speaker's generalizations?

d. Was the speech logically reasoned?

e. Were the lines of reasoning the best choices?

f. Were there any internal inconsistencies?

Thonsen, Baird and Braden suggested these questions for the analysis of emotional proof:

a. To what extent did the speaker choose words designed to convey an emotional appeal?

b. How well did the speaker analyze his audience?

c. How well did the speaker make the necessary adjustments to his audience in order to bring about a favorable response to his ideas and purposes?

d. How, and to what extent, did the speaker seek to identify his message with his audience?

e. To what extent did the speaker demonstrate social intelligence, or the ability to select the proper ideas and the proper appeals for the occasion?

In considering the component of ethical proof, criteria were established for each of the constituents--
character, sagacity and good will. For character, Thonssen, Baird and Braden suggest the following criteria:

Did the speaker focus attention upon the probity of his character by—
(1) associating either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated,
(2) bestowing, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause;
(3) linking his opponent, or the opponent's cause, with what is not virtuous;
(4) removing or minimizing unfavorable expressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponent;
(5) relying upon authority derived from his personal experience; and
(6) creating the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking? 

The criteria for sagacity, as suggested by the three authors, were these:

(1) Did the speaker use what is popularly called common sense?
(2) Did the speaker act with tact and moderation?
(3) Did the speaker display a sense of good taste?
(4) Did the speaker reveal a familiarity with the broad interests of the day?
(5) Did the speaker show through the way he handled his speech materials that he was possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom?

Finally, good will was analyzed through the following criteria, as suggested by Thonssen, Baird and Braden:

(1) Did the speaker capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience?
(2) Did the speaker identify himself properly with the hearers and their problems?
(3) Did the speaker proceed with candor and straightforwardness?
(4) Did the speaker offer any necessary rebukes with tact and consideration?
(5) Did the speaker offset any personal reasons he might have had for giving the speech?
(6) Did the speaker reveal, without ... exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth?  

7. The next step was to make a composite judgment about Emil Loriks' inventional choices and the effectiveness of these choices, measured against the criteria cited. The texts were analyzed in detail to arrive at this judgment.

8. The eighth step represented an attempt to determine the immediate and long-range responses to Loriks' persuasive efforts. Such matters as the tenure and consequences of Loriks' leadership in the SDFU were considered. In addition, the publications of the SDFU and a history of that organization were utilized in determining responses to Loriks' persuasion and leadership.

9. The final step was to draw conclusions concerning the effectiveness and effect of Emil Loriks' agrarian Farmers Union rhetoric, 1934-1938.
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CHAPTER II

THE SETTING FOR EMIL LORIKS' FARMERS

UNION AGRARIAN RHETORIC

Before analyzing the selected Farmers Union speeches of Emil Loriks, it is necessary to examine the historical environment. The 1930s, when Loriks made these speeches during his term as Farmers Union president, were a time of widespread depression not only for farmers, but for the country as well. The 1930s were also a time of protest and the events and protests of the Great Depression had their roots in earlier developments.

The Great Depression

1920s Background

The United States

While the nation as a whole, and farmers in particular, had prospered as a result of the increased economic activity caused by American involvement in World War I, this war-induced prosperity did not last. As historian Arthur S. Link has written:

The prewar American economy was stimulated from 1914 to 1917 by an extraordinary European demand for food and war materials and from 1917 to 1919 by continued European purchases, enormous war expenditures at home, and a concomitant expansion in bank
credits. There followed . . . a dizzy postwar period of inflation and intense economic activity, stimulated chiefly by a further increase in exports and a high domestic demand for clothing, household goods, automobiles and housing.

Actually, the postwar boom of 1919-1920 was more apparent than real, except in agriculture . . . Yet the decline during 1920 was not precipitous in manufacturing or trade, nor was it marked by a large number of business failures. The greatest shock was the collapse in farm prices that began in the late spring and reached panic proportions during the autumn. By the spring of 1921, the recession had become a full-fledged depression.¹

Agricultural historian John L. Shover provides some graphic evidence of the situation for farmers during this time:

Using the 1910-14 base as 100, farm prices in 1919 stood at an unprecedented 213, more than double the 1915 returns. In the optimism of new-found prosperity, land, equipment, and buildings were mortgaged to buy more and more farmland. Land prices rose to 160 percent of the prewar average.

The fair-weather economic climate disappeared as quickly as it had come. The swollen war market contracted as foreign competitors returned to production; inflated prices dwindled to prewar levels.

The artificial stimulus of wartime demands dissipated a harmony that had prevailed for nearly two decades. The collapse of the foreign market after 1920 had its most pronounced effect on wheat and hogs.²

Shover goes on to say that the decreasing overseas demand for American farm products, coupled with the enactment of high tariff legislation during the 1920s (which choked sources of foreign exchange in the United States and made sales of agricultural surpluses abroad a virtual impossibility) spelled trouble for the farmer. "Had consumer demand grown in the twenties or had purchasing
power markedly risen, the market lag could have been accommodated. Since this was not the case, farmers were confronted with a serious problem of diminishing real prices throughout the entire decade."\(^3\)

Nor was it just a matter of a drop in real prices for American farmers during the 1920s. These declines were serious, Shover writes, "because of too easy credit and too eager speculation in the war period."\(^4\) However, "the price break of 1920 sent tremors through the shaky structure of farm finance, but did not initiate a serious collapse."\(^5\)

Many country banks were in trouble because of the over-speculation. "Forty-eight percent of the nation's bank failures in the twenties were in Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas and the two Dakotas."\(^6\)

While the situation was generally difficult for the farmer during the 1920s, for the overall economy, things were much better until 1930. As Link explains, "Recovery set in at the beginning of 1922 and was steady on all fronts until 1927, when a slight recession was followed by an intensification of economic activity that continued until 1929."\(^7\) Overall, Link goes on to describe the 1920s as a time of increased productivity for American workers, of a rise in such new industries as automobiles, radio broadcasting and motion pictures, or an era of big business, and of a rapid expansion in banking and finance.\(^8\)
There were also social and cultural changes during the 1920s. Link says that there was a change in moral standards, a rise of new faiths among intellectuals and the flowering of a literary revolt. "The significant fact was that a large segment of the molders of thoughtful opinion repudiated traditional values and thereby destroyed the ideological unity of the prewar period."\(^9\) The era was marked by ideological conflicts over the teaching of evolution in schools, the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, the imposition of nationwide prohibition, and ongoing labor disputes. As Link says:

The clash of scientific materialism and materialistic evolution with religious orthodoxy produced a remarkable fundamentalist counterattack. Patriotic organizations revived the strident nationalism and intolerance of the war period and inflamed religious prejudices.\(^10\)

Against this backdrop of general prosperity, the farmers continued to suffer. As Link says:

The most important domestic problem in the 1920s was the agricultural depression that began in the summer and fall of 1920 and continued intermittently until 1935. Most of the farmers' troubles were caused by over-extension, inflation, and too much spending during and immediately following the war.\(^11\)

Although there was some recovery of farm prices between 1921 and 1929, they "never reached a level that made agriculture a really profitable enterprise . . . . Farmers received 16 percent of the national income in 1919 and only 8.8 percent a decade later."\(^12\)
These adverse conditions stimulated the creation of the so-called "Farm Bloc" in the Congresses of the 1920s. The "Farm Bloc" was an alliance of Midwesterners and southern Democrats. The congressional elections of 1922 strengthened the Farm Bloc, and as Link writes, "The Farm Bloc took control of agricultural policy between 1921 and 1924 and pushed through Congress the most advanced agricultural program in American history to that time." 14

In 1921, the Bloc had succeeded in: getting passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act, aimed at preserving competition among packers and regulating commission merchants and stockyards; getting passage of the Grain Futures Act to give the Secretary of Agriculture sweeping control over the grain exchanges; increasing the lending operation of the Federal Farm Loan system; adding an agricultural representative to the Federal Reserve Board; and exempting farm cooperatives from the prohibitions of the anti-trust laws. 15 The Agricultural Credits Act--an important law which established credit banks financed by the U.S. Treasury to make loans to organized groups of farmers, was passed in 1923.

Then came the McNary-Haugen Plan. As Link explains:

The objective was a "fair exchange value" for farm products, which would be achieved by segregating the exportable surplus so that the domestic market would not be governed by world prices.
As historian Arthur M. Schlesinger explains, "There would be a two-price plan for American farm output: a protected price for the American market, and a world price for the surplus thrown on the world market." The surplus would be "dumped" on the world market while the domestic segment would bring a "fair exchange value." The loss to the government would be made up through an "equalization fee" assessed on the owners of the commodity benefited.

The McNary-Haugen Bill was first introduced in Congress in 1924, but even after widespread agricultural support had been exerted, was not to clear both houses until 1927, only to be vetoed by President Coolidge. Passed again in May 1928, the Bill was again vetoed. Schlesinger says that the McNary-Haugen approach "ignored such long-range problems as reduction of costs, technical reorganization and soil conservation. But it did offer a mechanism that would prevent the surplus from toppling the whole structure of farm prices." In addition, "It would have probably been difficult to administer, and, worst of all, it had no means of stopping its higher prices from creating even greater surpluses."

The Farm Bloc's attention turned to other approaches after McNary-Haugen's final veto in 1928. A new plan, called "voluntary domestic allotment" by one of its authors,
John D. Black of the University of Montana, was advanced. 24

As Schlesinger explains:

It was based on the principle of allotments to individual producers of rights to sell the domestic part of their crop in the domestic market at the protected price. Since output beyond the allotment contract would not receive price protection, the probable effect, it was argued, would be to discourage surpluses. . . . The farmer, in short, would receive a subsidy in return for a tacit agreement to limit his output. 25

The Hoover years also brought the 1929 Agricultural Marketing Act, which created a nonpartisan Federal Farm Board and gave it the use of a revolving fund of $500,000,000 to be lent to agricultural marketing cooperatives, to enable them to market products efficiently, build warehouses, and hold farm products in the event of a price decline. 26 But by late 1932, the Board had major problems in that there was a shrinking of foreign markets, there was dumping by other nations on the world market, and there was no authority to limit production to achieve domestic price stability.

The other development of agricultural concern during the Hoover years was the enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Bill of 1930. Link writes, "As a device for supporting domestic agricultural prices, it was futile." 28

In assessing the impact of the Farm Bloc in the 1920s, despite the failure of McNary-Haugen, Link writes:

Organized farmers . . . by 1929 . . . had scored one of the most important victories in the history of American progressivism. They had succeeded not only in uniting farmers throughout the country into a
solid front; but, more important, they had compelled the conservative majority in the Republican party to approve a federal farm program that included strict control of grain exchanges, stockyards, and packing houses, support for agricultural cooperatives, and credit facilities on every level. From this advanced program there would be no turning back; in fact, the pathway of progressivism pointed straight ahead to other advanced measures built upon the foundations laid during the 1920s.

Progressivism refers to a broad program of legislation at all levels of government, that include agrarian, social justice and labor concerns. Link describes progressivism as "essentially a faith in the middle way, in regulation and intervention on behalf of disadvantaged classes, rather than in socialistic ownership of the means of production." 30

The 1920s, beginning with the election of Warren G. Harding as president in 1920, were a time of Republican presidents and Republican-controlled Congresses. Calvin Coolidge, Harding's successor, was elected in his own right in 1924, and was succeeded in 1928 by Herbert Hoover. Link describes the 1928 election:

The truth was that the prevailing prosperity, more than the liquor and religious issues, was the decisive factor in the election. There was still acute unrest in the farm areas, especially in the western Middle West. In Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Wisconsin and Washington, insurgent Republicans who violently opposed the conservative leadership of their party were elected by large majorities. These were signs for the future, to be sure.
On the eve of the Great Depression, which began in 1929 for almost all Americans not already affected, there were contradictions. Link says:

On the surface, the American people had never seemed so economically healthy. And yet their prosperity was so unevenly divided that it would not long continue without some readjustment. This was true primarily because such an increasing share of the national income was going to industry and finance that workers relatively lost ground and farmers suffered an absolute retrogression. . . . The result was that by the end of the decade, such a large portion of the national income was being funnelled off at the top by receivers in restricted geographical areas that the producers who worked on America's assembly lines and farms were finding it difficult to purchase what they had produced. 32

The beginning of the Great Depression is usually dated from the October 29, 1929, crash on the stock market. Although the market had dropped out of the bottom before this date, J. P. Morgan Company and other large banks had moved to prop it up by forming a large money pool to buoy the market; but this time they did not. Link writes:

Nearly 16,500,000 shares changed hands in the wildest trading in the Stock Exchange's history, and the average price of fifty leading stocks declined almost forty points under the pressure. During the remaining weeks of 1929 and afterward, rallies alternated with declines, but always the declines were greater than the subsequent advances, until it seemed as if there were no end but a final smashup of the entire financial system. 33

Link writes that there were multiple causes for the Depression. They included the unstable nature of the international economy, the long-standing depression in agriculture, and an unfair distribution of income that meant
that 26 percent of the national income went to the top 5 percent of income receivers in 1920.34

The farmers felt a dramatic impact in 1929. Shover says, "The crash of 1929 sent prices falling faster and further than any period in the history of American agriculture."35 Federal data shows that:

The market prices of a bushel of wheat sank from $1.03 in 1929 to 67 cents in 1930 and a low of 38 cents in 1932. This was below the price during either the Greenback or Populist periods. Hog prices fell even more, from $11.36 per head in 1931 to $6.14 in 1932 and $4.21 in 1933. These were the lowest prices since the 1890s.

The impact of the Great Depression was long-lasting. It is remembered not only for "the havoc it wrought," as Link says, "but also for the impetus it gave for completion of the metamorphosis in popular attitudes regarding the role of government in the economy."37 These demands for government involvement will be discussed when the program of the Farmers Union is examined later in this chapter.

South Dakota

As an agricultural state, South Dakota suffered during the farm depression of the 1920s. South Dakota historian Herbert S. Schell provides statistics to tell the story:

The postwar deflation which began during the latter part of 1920 made its impact upon the South Dakota economy throughout the decade. The sharp decline in farm income and a shrinkage of property values made it difficult for farmers to fulfill
obligations assumed during a period of high prices, and bank crisis was in the making by the end of the McMaster Administration (1925). Although there was only one bank failure during 1921, nine state banks closed their doors in 1922, and thirty-six in 1923. ... By 1925, 175 state banks had closed their doors. 38

South Dakota in the 1920s was not only marked by agricultural depression, but also by the continuing Rural Credits financial crisis and scandal. As writer Robert Karolevizt explains:

Among the state's liberal statutes were the bank depositors' guarantee and rural credits laws, each of which involved the government intimately in private financial affairs. The former offered insurance to individual savers against bank failure, while the latter was a farm loan program. Beginning early in the 1920s, when the first small banks began to close their doors because of mortgage defaults, the guaranty fund was put under heavy pressure. By the time Governor Gunderson was inaugurated, depositors of 175 insolvent institutions had wiped out the available money, and certificates of indebtedness were issued to those who came later. By the end of 1926, the fund was in arrears by 43 million dollars.

That first crisis was resolved (but not happily) when the legislature amended the law, and the Supreme Court, in effect, declared the guaranty fund bankrupt. Private citizens were left holding almost 40 million dollars in worthless certificates. ... The problems of the guaranty fund also caused the legislature to become concerned about the rural credits system, and it ordered a special investigation of the program's operation. It was discovered rather quickly that funds from the sale of the loan organization's bonds were invested in banks that had suspended operation, the largest amount being in a Pierre depository managed by A. W. Ewert, who just happened to be the treasurer of the rural credits board. Ewert was convicted of embezzlement and sentenced to eleven years in the penitentiary.

The financial scandal ... rocked the state and added to the distrust building up among the citizenry. 39
South Dakota had Republican governors until the election of 1926, when conservative Democrat William Bulow defeated incumbent Governor Gunderson and became the state's first Democratic governor. He was re-elected in 1928. Karolevitz sums up the decade for South Dakota:

Throughout the nation there was a general feeling of prosperity as the prices of stocks rose to record levels. South Dakotans were not particularly bad off, but the effects of the rural credits and guaranty fund fiascoes, plus continued bank failures and depressed prices for farm commodities, made the state's situation a little edgier than that of other areas.

By the close of 1929, both the United States and South Dakota were in deep depression, with considerable suffering in the agricultural sector.

1930s Developments

United States depression

As the 1920s closed, the entire nation, farm and non-farm, was in deep depression. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., describes these difficult times:

By the spring of 1930 at least 4,000,000 Americans were unemployed. Breadlines began to reappear in large cities for the first time since 1921. Across the country the dismal process was beginning, ushering in a new life for millions of Americans. Now came the slowdown—only three days of work a week, then perhaps two, then the layoff. And still unemployment grew—from 4,000,000 in March 1930 to 8,000,000 in March 1931. And more and more, the community found the relief problem beyond its capacity to handle. And so, through the winter of 1931-32, the third winter of the depression, relief sources, public and private, dwindled toward the vanishing point.
For farmers, the situation was especially grim:

The shadow fell over the cities and towns, it fell as heavily over the countryside. Farmers had already drawn extensively on their savings before 1929. The Wall Street explosion only made their situation worse by diminishing even more the demand for farm products. And, where industry could protect its price structure by meeting reduced demand with reduced output, farmers, unable to control output, saw no way to maintain income except to increase planting.

The burden of agricultural adjustment thus fell not on production, but on price. The figures were dramatic. Between 1929 and 1934, agricultural production declined 15 percent in volume, 40 percent in price; industrial production 42 percent in volume, 15 percent in price. The ratio of the prices the farmer received to the prices he paid plunged from 109 in 1919 (in terms of 1910-1914 prices) and 89 in 1929 to 64 in 1931. Net farm income in 1932 was $1.8 billion--less than one-third what it had been three years earlier. And while the farmer's income fell by 64 percent, his burden of indebtedness fell a mere 7 percent. The southwestern drought only intensified the sense of grievance.

Saloutos notes selected prices at the beginning of the farm strike in 1932:

Farm prices were reported as follows: eggs, 22 cents; oats, 11 cents; butter, 18 cents--all of which were far below the cost-of-production levels named by the Farmers Union. The average Iowa farmer, operating a 160-acre farm, in order to receive these returns (needed for cost-of-production) had to receive 92 cents per bushel on corn, 49 cents per bushel on oats, $11.25 per hundred on hog, 35 cents for eggs, and 62 cents for butterfat.

Shover says that Iowa farm prices in 1933 were half of those of the year earlier--hogs at 3 cents a pound, cattle at 5 cents, and corn at 10 cents a bushel.
According to Link, there was also the even more serious situation of the threat of foreclosure.46

As the nation stood on the eve of the inauguration of Democrat Franklin D. Roosevelt in March 1933, there was widespread despair. Schlesinger provides this description:

The national income was less than half of what it had been four short years before. Nearly thirteen million Americans--about one-quarter of the labor force--were desperately seeking jobs. The machinery for sheltering and feeding the unemployed was breaking down everywhere under the growing burden. And a few hours before, in the early morning before inauguration, every bank in America had locked its doors.47

Despite Roosevelt's hopeful words that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself," there was to be continued suffering by American agriculture.

The first Agricultural Adjustment Act, enacted in May 1933 (and which will be discussed later along with other New Deal farm legislation), was passed too late to have much impact until 1934.48 Schlesinger continues:

Moreover, in the early fall, farm prices which had shot up in June as a result of speculative buying began to decline, at just the same time that the farm implement manufacturers and the mail order houses, responding to the National Recovery Administration drive, started to put their prices up. What good was an increase in farm prices if the ratio of farm to industrial prices was beginning to rise?49

South Dakota hog prices ranged from $3.50 to $4.35 in early June and dropped to $2.10 to $2.80 in late December. Sioux Falls cattle prices remained about the same from June to December. Minneapolis cash wheat was about
$.05 higher in December. Corn prices in December were $.07 above June levels. Oats in December were $.07 above June levels.\textsuperscript{50}

Saloutos observes that:

This rise in nonfarm prices caused the administration no end of trouble. . . . Facts substantiated the complaints of farmers that nonfarm prices were rising faster than those for farm products. . . . Briefly, agriculture failed to make the progress expected in reducing the disparity between agricultural and non-agricultural prices.

The farmers also faced severe drought in the summer of 1934, sharply limiting the help they might get from AAA. As Saloutos writes, "Perhaps nothing better demonstrated the barriers that faced the AAA than did the severe drought of 1934, which blanketed nearly three-fourths of the country and was described as being of unprecedented proportions in the history of the nation."\textsuperscript{52}

And it was the Upper Great Plains that were hardest hit:

The western Middle West was in the very midst of this. The first stage of the drought centered about the Dakotas and Minnesota and was the nadir of a series of downward trends in the rainfall of the area. . . . By the late fall of 1934, the wheat crop was only half the average size, the corn crop was the smallest in forty years, and the production of oats, rye and buckwheat the smallest in more than half a century.\textsuperscript{53}

The weather was to cause problems in 1935, too, with an outbreak of black stem rust in the spring wheat area in July, which reduced the prospective crop by more than 100 million bushels.\textsuperscript{54}
Schlesinger writes that due to the combination of weather factors and the smoothness of the AAA's administrative operation, there was a reduction in surpluses and an increase in prices and a need for the United States to import wheat by 1935-1936. He goes on to say:

Between 1932 and 1936, gross farm income increased 50 percent, and cash receipts from marketing, including government payments, nearly doubled. Even more important was the striking improvement in the farmers' terms of trade. The ratio between prices the farmers received and the prices they paid, including interest and taxes, rose steadily from 55 in 1932 to 70 in 1934 and 90 in 1936. All of this was accompanied by a decrease of a billion dollars in the size of the farm debt. The degree of agricultural recovery was all the more remarkable at a time when income and employment in the general economy remained low.

Though 1936 was also a drought year, the following two years brought favorable growing conditions, with resultant surpluses and low farm prices.

New Deal farm legislation

There were several key pieces of New Deal farm legislation. Link relates the laws that were enacted in spring 1933, right after Roosevelt became President:

On March 27, 1933, Roosevelt consolidated all federal agricultural credit agencies into the Farm Credit Administration; shortly afterward Congress provided abundant new credit. Moreover, in response to radical farm demands, Congress on June 28, 1934, adopted the Frazier-Lemke Farm Bankruptcy Act, which enabled farmers to recover lost property on easy terms.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act [an outgrowth of the Domestic Allotment Plan already discussed] was signed into law by Roosevelt May 12, 1933. It
was easily the most ambitious agricultural legislation in the history of the country, but all its major features had long been discussed and advocated by important farm groups.

The purpose of the Act was to establish and maintain such a balance between the production and consumption of agricultural commodities that farm income would have the same relative purchasing power that it had enjoyed during the stable period from 1909 to 1914. To achieve the so called "parity" prices, the Act authorized the imposition of various production controls on the major staples. The money to finance the program would come from the taxes levied on the processing of agricultural products and from customs duties on certain enumerated commodities.

To reduce the expected bountiful crops of 1933, cotton was plowed under and pigs were slaughtered. 58

The Commodity Credit Corporation was established in the fall of 1933 by the AAA to enable cotton and corn producers to borrow against their crops and hold them until prices would rise to higher levels. 59

Link observes that through these various measures, "the AAA worked an almost economic miracle until the Supreme Court called a halt in 1935." In addition, "Whatever the cause, farmers were well on their way toward stability and parity by the end of 1935." 60

Further New Deal farm legislation details are provided by Schell:

In February 1936, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act replaced the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 which had been declared invalid because of the processing tax. The new legislation emphasized soil conservation rather than production adjustments. . . . Two years later a new Agricultural Adjustment Act retained the soil conservation features of the 1936 law and
re-established the principle of acreage allotments as a means of adjusting crop production. 61

The Frazier Lemke Bill, already mentioned, which had passed Congress in 1934, was overturned by a unanimous Supreme Court in 1935. It was then repassed by Congress, and in 1937, was sustained by the high court. 62

The Bankhead Jones Farm Tenancy Act of 1937, termed by Link as a "landmark in the development of federal policy," 63 had as its basis:

To turn back the tide of increasing farm tenancy, . . . the act reorganized the Resettlement Administration as the Farm Security Administration, with authority to lend money to enable enterprising tenants to become landowners, refinance and rehabilitate farmers who were in danger of losing their lands, promote withdrawal of submarginal land, and extend assistance to migratory workers. . . . The Bankhead-Jones Act became law on July 22, 1937. 64

Even though the Supreme Court in January 1936 declared the AAA unconstitutional, this did not end the farm problem, which was still, in the words of Saloutos, "very much alive and kicking." 65

Despite all the difficulties with New Deal farm programs, Roosevelt won a landslide victory over Kansas Republican Governor Alfred Landon in farm states in 1936. 66

Saloutos explains that the 1938 AAA Act, the "ever-normal granary bill," established a system of storing surpluses of cotton, rice, tobacco, corn and wheat during abundant years for use in lean years. 67 He further explains:
The passage of the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act marked the third stage in the adjustment program. Administration spokesmen referred to it as occupying a sort of middle course between the AAA of 1933 and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936. The 1938 measure embodied the idea of "surplus control," that is, control of marketing in interstate commerce, in place of the "production control" approach of the original act. It was likewise believed that setting up the marketing and storage provisions for control of surpluses strengthened the conservation program that had been built up under the act of 1936.

South Dakota depression

South Dakota's agricultural plight during the 1930s has been reflected in the national data already presented. John L. Shover presents a chart to show the numbers of farms changing ownership by foreclosure of mortgages and bankruptcy, for each 1,000 farms, for various middle western states, and for the nation as a whole:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>West North Central</th>
<th>South Dakota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>78.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure was the second highest in the nation, falling only behind Iowa with a 78.3 rate.

These excerpts from Robert Karolevitz's book pinpoint the suffering caused by the Depression in South Dakota:

In South Dakota which had a population of 692,894 in 1930, the situation was further aggravated by the extended period of depressed farm commodity prices which had wiped out what little savings rural residents might have accumulated.
It also reduced their purchasing power, an unhappy fact which was soon felt by small town merchants. After Republican Warren Green was elected, economy became the byword at the state capitol as the obligations arising from the rural credits venture added to the internal problem.

M. Q. Sharpe, the attorney general, uncovered serious irregularities in the state's banking department, and when the investigation was completed, Superintendent Fred R. Smith was arrested and confessed to embezzling more than a million dollars he had transferred to a Platte bank in which he had an interest. Just when it seemed that no further ills could be inflicted on the state, an unprecedented natural disaster administered the crowning blow.

In July 1930 temperatures soared above the 100-degree mark and persisted until crops shriveled in the fields. The intense heat began to take its toll of fat hogs and cattle, too, so farmers rushed them to market in a shipping flurry which forced prices downward an additional notch. That was the beginning of the drought cycle which was to plague South Dakota for the greater part of a wearying decade which came to be known as the "Dirty Thirties."

In 1932, Tom Berry, a Democratic rancher from Belvidere, became governor while his party took control of both houses of the legislature for the first time.

Governor Berry in South Dakota called for rigid economy in government as tax delinquencies mounted, more banks failed and mortgage foreclosures increased. The state got out of the hail insurance business and sold its unprofitable coal mines. Of all the state owned ventures envisioned by the earlier progressives, only the cement plan proved to be a sound investment. After a modest small grain and hay crop in 1932, the drouth returned with intensified fury in 1933 and 1934, and South Dakotans became part of the great Dust Bowl of middle America.

Many farmers had become involved in the Farm Holiday movement (to be discussed later), which was no holiday at all, but a militant effort to stop mortgage foreclosures and to reverse the disastrous price trend.

With farmers having no money to spend, the depression spread quickly to the towns and cities, too, and by the end of 1934, the number of South Dakotans on relief rolls reached 39 percent of the total population, the highest figure for any of the 48 states.
According to Schell:

The state owned business ventures that were part of the state's progressive movement began in 1915 with a bank depositors' guaranty law and were followed in 1917 by enactment of a rural credits law, of a workmen's compensation and of a mothers' pension. Following voter approval in the 1918 election, lawmakers enacted a state hail insurance law, a state cement plant, and a state owned coal mine.

By the mid 1920s, state cement production was underway and the state went into the retail gasoline business. An adverse Supreme Court decision ended the state gasoline business in late 1925, and the state started to move away from most of its other state owned ventures. There was considerable questioning of the economic soundness of rural credits and the rest of the business ventures that had saddled South Dakota with the highest per capita state debt in the nation.71

Schell also paints a graphic picture of the Great Depression in South Dakota. "A combination of disasters, including grasshopper infestations, drought, crop failures, and an unduly severe winter season, harassed the state." He continues:

These adverse conditions weakened still further the state's economy, which had remained in the doldrums following the deflationary crisis of the early twenties, thus making it highly vulnerable to the impact of the national depression by the summer of 1932. A decade of heavy debts, relatively low prices, expanding production, and shrinking export markets had left South Dakota agriculture in particular unprepared for the depression of the thirties. Prevailing low prices of farm commodities accentuated the distress.72

After describing the Democratic electoral gains in the 1932 election, Schell goes on to describe the Depression in South Dakota:

Signs of economic trouble were everywhere. Real estate values had decreased 58 percent between 1920
and 1930. The average value of farm land had fallen from $71.39 an acre in 1932 to $35.24 in 1930, and dropped to a low of $18.65 within the next five years. The price of wheat on June 1, 1932, ranged from fifty to fifty-five cents a bushel, while oats and corn were selling at twenty-two and twenty-nine cents respectively. Hogs commanded a price of $2.68 on the Sioux Falls market.

(A check of prices in the Sioux Falls Argus Leader for June 1, 1932 showed the Sioux Falls hog market ranging from $2.65 to $2.90 and the heifer price ranging from $5 to $5.50. Chicago market grain prices that day were wheat at 55 1/2 and corn at 29 to 29 1/2, described as "new lows" in the headlines.)

Schell continues:

The low prices underlined the fact that the farmers' share of the national income had dropped from 18 percent in 1917 to 7 percent in 1932, while no corresponding reductions had taken place in the farmers' fixed charges. . . . The cash income from South Dakota crops decreased from $17,000,000 in 1929 to $6,000,000 in 1932, while the income from livestock declined from more than $150,000,000 to less than $45,000,000 for the same years.

Farm foreclosures which had reached a high during 1924 and 1925 were again on the increase by 1932. During the period from 1921 to 1932, a total of 34,419 farm foreclosures were instituted. . . . Nearly a third of these foreclosures occurred during 1931 and 1932. Farm tenancy had risen from 34.9 percent in 1920 to 44.6 percent in 1930.

The instability in agriculture definitely weakened the banking structure. . . . Between 1920 and 1934, about 71 percent of all the state banks had failed. . . . By the time the depression had run its course, the tax delinquency rate was ranging from 25 to 50 percent in a number of counties.

Schell continues his narrative of the South Dakota situation in early 1933:

The farming interests were heavily represented in the 1933 legislature. The membership included a number of persons actively identified with the Farm Holiday movement, as well as the Farm Bureau,
The importance of the AAA to South Dakota is underscored by Schell's statement, "The government payments received by South Dakota farmers during the 1930s represented a substantial portion of their income. During 1934 and 1936, the AAA benefit payments virtually amounted to crop insurance for many who had suffered complete crop losses from drought and grasshopper infestations."\(^80\)

South Dakota farmers were also directly affected by the second phase of the New Deal program, the farm credit component. From May 1933 to July 1938, the Farm Credit Administration loaned a total of $83,378,000 to South Dakota farmers.\(^81\)

The New Deal program was also concerned with individual relief measures. Both federal and state funds, the South Dakota share of which came from a tax on beer passed in 1933,\(^82\) were used.

South Dakota's high percentage of persons on relief has already been mentioned. By December 1934, more than half of all farmers in the state were receiving emergency relief.\(^83\) Other New Deal programs which placed emphasis on work relief, like the Works Progress Administration, the Public Works Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, also had a direct impact on South Dakota, according to Schell.\(^84\)
In 1937, a new agency, the Farm Security Administration was formed to replace the earlier Resettlement Administration, and had as its objectives the promotion of farm home ownership through long term amortized farm mortgage loans to selected tenants for the purchase of family sized farms; the rehabilitation of distressed farm families through supervised short term loans for equipment, livestock and supplies such as feed, seed, and fertilizer; and the purchase of tracts considered submarginal for farming as a means to promote a more efficient land utilization pattern.  

In 1936, South Dakota voters endorsed Roosevelt for President, but denied Governor Berry a third term, electing instead Republican Leslie Jensen. During his term, the depression remained a paramount concern as both business and farm income were running low. Schell sums up the decade, "By the end of the 1930s, the depression had generally run its course."  

In sum, depression started for American farmers early in the 1920s, while it was not to deeply affect the balance of the country until 1929. With the coming of the New Deal in 1933, there was a vast array of governmental effort to assist farmers in their efforts to achieve greater economic well-being. But other factors such as drought and continued surpluses at least partially mitigated the effects of the
farm legislation and farmers continued to suffer throughout the 1930s. The creation of the "Farm Bloc" in the 1920s and continued farm group efforts in the 1930s were reflections of rural concerns in getting their interests before the nation.

**Agrarian Responses to the Depression**

**General Rumblings**

The Middle West played a lead role in expressing farm concerns during the 1920s. Saloutos notes that the region produced a number of leading agricultural spokesmen, including Arthur Capper of Kansas, Henrik Shipstead of North Dakota, Lynn Frazier of North Dakota, the LaFollettes of Wisconsin, George Norris of Nebraska, and Peter Norbeck of South Dakota. 89

Again, according to Saloutos, there were two schools of thought for farmers in the 1920s. One, the conservative group, led by the American Farm Bureau Federation, transcended party lines, and placed emphasis on political action by having the Farm Bloc thwart the efforts of the stalwarts to adjourn congress without passing legislation to help farmers. A second group, drawn from liberals, progressives and elements of the Farmers Union, the Equity, and the Nonpartisan League, wanted to build a new party committed to a broad new program. The new alignment (as the
Progressive Party) went down to defeat in the 1924 election, "but only after it amassed the largest third party vote on record."\textsuperscript{90}

By the end of the 1920s, as economic conditions worsened for an increasing number of Americans, there were general rumblings of discontent to be heard across the land. After the spring of 1931, Link writes, church groups and businessmen as well began to question such long held beliefs as the profit motive. Labor, in the form of a statement from the American Federation of Labor in October 1931, said that the prime cause of the depression had been the unequal distribution of wealth and income.\textsuperscript{91} Link describes these early 1930s protests, "more a reflection of the important ideological upheaval that was transforming popular attitudes toward government and the economy than manifestations of outright social discontent."\textsuperscript{92}

The only major outbreak of trouble came when a group of unemployed and homeless veterans were expelled from Washington, D.C., by the government. The "Bonus Marchers" had come to the capitol to demand passage of the Patman Bill to provide immediate and full payment of the veterans' bonus. The Congress and the President refused their demands and in July 1932 a riot occurred when a police force attempted to clear a demonstration area and two veterans were killed.\textsuperscript{93}
The developing agrarian discontent had its main origins in the Upper Middle West. Saloutos says that this is the area where "numerous agrarian movements of reform have been born, here they have lived out their short spans of life, and here they have died. The western Middle West has behind it a long history of agricultural discontent." Many major farm organizations and movements like the Grange, the Populists, the Farm Bloc, and the Progressives as well as much of the New Deal farm policy had their origins in the Middle West. Moreover, from this region came seven of the nine secretaries of agriculture who held the office during the first four decades of the 20th century.

The Farm Holiday Movement

National Farm Holiday

Perhaps the best known of the 1930s agricultural protest activities was the Farm Holiday movement. The general thrust of the Holiday is explained by these words from Saloutos:

The farm strike--short lived, dramatic and unsuccessful--was another episode in the expression of agricultural discontent. . . . The opposition had two stages: first, the farmers resisted the state veterinarians who tested cattle for tuberculosis; and then as conditions worsened, they applied the principle of the "bank holiday" to agriculture, hoping that this would encompass the nation unless relief was forthcoming to them soon. The strikers sought to restrain their members from shipping goods to market--first, by persuasion, if possible, and then, if that failed, by using force. But in these
and other efforts they were no more successful in alleviating the burdens of the farmers than the Federal Farm Board had been. If it accomplished anything, the strike helped dramatize the plight of the farmer as few events did.  

Commenting about the farmers' resistance to the TB testing of cattle, Shover comments, "Grass roots opposition to testing was unscientific and perverse, but granting this, the farmers' complaints were not entirely baseless." He continues, "As it was, in the depression year of 1931 when state veterinarians, strangers in the county, appeared to conduct a test in which farmers had no confidence and which could result in the loss of several hundred dollars which a farmer could ill afford, the interlopers were greeted with sticks, stones, and mob resistance." As far back as 1927, Farmers Union leader, and eventual Farm Holiday head Milo Reno had opposed the TB tests.

Schlesinger points out that Reno, also in 1927, "had suggested that if justice could not be obtained by legislation, no other course might remain than 'organized refusal to deliver the products of the farm at less than production costs.' Depression gave this notion of a farmers' strike new cogency. By the spring of 1932, it began to seem to some the only way of stemming the price collapse."

Schlesinger also pinpoints the Farm Holiday's basic dilemma:
The Holiday movement made little economic sense. If mass withholding from the market might temporarily keep prices up, then release of the withheld produce would drive them down again. And only a minority of farmers, in any case, were prepared to take part in the movement. What the farm strike did was to throw into sharp relief the dilemma of a system incapable of using the plenty it produced, condemning millions to hunger because it lacked the will to bring together the abundance and the need.

Saloutos describes Milo Reno as "the militant president of both the Iowa Farmers Union and the [national] Farm Holiday Association and aggressive advocate of 'cost of production' as the basis for the farmer's price." 103 Reno's pre-Holiday background had included support of the McNary-Haugen plan and opposition to the Federal Farm Board "in a manner that few farm leaders could duplicate," according to Saloutos. 104 Reno also had strongly attacked agricultural colleges and their professors, saying that they "were controlled by exploiters." 105

Reno's "farm strike" idea was not new, having been attempted with "limited success during the first decade of the 20th century by the Equity and the Farmers Union," Saloutos says. 106 The Iowa Farmers Union convention in 1931 adopted a resolution calling for a strike. 107 The strike was called for July 4, 1932, with these words:

Let's call a "Farmers Holiday"  
A Holiday let's hold  
We'll eat our wheat and ham and eggs  
And let them eat their gold. 108
Saloutos continues:

By the fall of 1932, state units were in existence in Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, Iowa, and other states. At no time was it [the Holiday] a cohesive, well directed effort. From the start it appears to have been nothing more than a mob affair which first sought to keep farmers from marketing their products by peaceful means but next assumed the aspect of a group of angry, resentful men who wanted revenge against those of their kind who marketed their goods while they "picketed and struck." 109

After an angry incident in 1932 in Sioux City, strike activities quieted down and on March 12 and 13, 1933, less than ten days after Roosevelt took office, the Holiday assembled for a national convention in Des Moines. 110 The cost of production and other resolutions were accompanied by a threat to strike unless the administration met the group's demands by May 3. 111

Also in early 1933, the Farm Holiday retreated from the farm strike formula in favor of attempts to stop farm foreclosure eviction sales and to enact moratorium legislation. 112 As part of this anti-foreclosure activity, what was perhaps the most violent Farm Holiday incident occurred at LeMars, Iowa, on April 27, 1933. Saloutos describes the incident:

Some six hundred persons broke into a courtroom and demanded of the presiding judge that he sign an agreement not to execute any more foreclosure sales. "When he refused, his assailants dragged him out of his courtroom. Upon continued refusal, he was blindfolded, taken to a crossroads, severely beaten, and threatened with death. He did not sign the agreement." This outbreak placed the county under
martial law. The assailants were arrested and sentenced, and no further serious outbreaks were reported.\footnote{113}

Various states, including South Dakota, enacted legislation in response to the Farm Holiday's demands. Saloutos explains that in South Dakota, "a tax was enacted not on net, but gross income; grace was extended in the payment of taxes; the general levy for 1934 was eliminated; and the assessed valuation of properties was reduced by over $144,000,000."\footnote{114}

The farm strike called for May did not happen because on the eve of the strike, Minnesota Farmer Labor Governor Floyd B. Olson advised Milo Reno that:

It would create more unfavorable sentiment toward relief than favorable. After some deliberations, Holiday leaders finally agreed to call the strike off with the note that farm prices appeared to be rising, that the farmers were too busy with spring planting to give much attention to it, and further, that there was a "sagging of interest" among the farmers. However, the leaders announced that they would closely watch the actions of the Roosevelt administration.\footnote{115}

\textbf{South Dakota Farm Holiday}

The Farm Holiday movement spread from neighboring Iowa into South Dakota in 1932.\footnote{116} Robert Thompson, in his history of the South Dakota Farmers Union, described the leadership of the closely related Holiday movement in South Dakota:

The Farm Holiday in South Dakota never became well organized in the strict sense of the word at
any level, local, state or regional. It was made up from, and supported by, five separate state organizations. From each one of these organizations came one member to make up the board of directors of the South Dakota Farm Holiday. The membership included the Farmers Union, the Grange, the Farm Bureau, the South Dakota Chamber of Commerce, and the Bankers Association. Emil Loriks, who was vice president of the South Dakota Farmers Union at this time, was selected by the directors to be the executive secretary, a post he held until he became president of the Farmers Union.

Taking the board of directors as a whole, the membership and the organizations they represented comprised a somewhat conservative element. The conservative blending showed itself in many ways in the activities of the South Dakota Farm Holiday when compared to the movement in other states. Except for a few isolated cases in South Dakota, it was more conservative than one would expect from such an organization. 117

Thompson goes on to quote Emil Loriks as saying that in South Dakota, the Holiday was even asked by some merchants to come to their counties to organize as a way of directing and controlling farm discontent in a disciplined manner. 118

Schell feels that the South Dakota Farmers Union "generally dominated the movement." 119 A rival farm group, the United Farmers Organization, which was frequently confused with the Holiday, was much more aggressive and radical, but was limited to the northeastern corner of the state. 120

Thompson also addresses the question of the relationship between the Farmers Union and the Farm Holiday movement in South Dakota:
In theory, and probably in fact, the South Dakota Farm Holiday was a separate organization from the South Dakota Farmers Union. There is a difference of opinion among persons who were active in one or the other, or even active in both organizations.

Some maintain that, although the two were separate in organization, they were in reality the same. This opinion is based on the assumption that the South Dakota Farmers Union maintained its separate identity because it was subject to liability in court since it was incorporated, whereas the Holiday Association was really a voluntary association and had no legal status.121

Thompson quotes Loriks as believing that the two groups were entirely separate.122 Thompson goes on to observe that the close ties that the Farmers Union had with the Holiday were of direct benefit to the Union, because there were membership gains. "Many farmers in this area, prior to the advent of the Farm Holiday, had not been members of any farm organization. It was natural that a large number of these would turn to the Farmers Union after the Farm Holiday ceased to exist."123 Thompson concludes that, "It may be stated that the Farmers Union served as a moderating influence during the period of the Farm Holiday. . . . It also received a direct benefit from its connection with the Farm Holiday through a large increase in membership after 1933."124

There are a few incidents and developments of the Farm Holiday's South Dakota history that bear relating. The first has already been mentioned, the February 4, 1933, blocking of roads leading into Sioux City, Iowa. One
farmer who was attempting to run the Holiday blockade on Highway 77 in South Dakota was killed, and an Iowa farmer was given a three-year sentence in the South Dakota penitentiary for man slaughter in connection with that death. And in the fall of 1932, there had been a brief strike that had lasted for three days in the Sioux Falls area, one which Schell describes as being "poorly organized."

The South Dakota Farm Holiday decided not to follow the recommendation of the national leaders for a farm strike in May 1933. As Thompson says, "At this time, South Dakota leaders were hoping for the speedy enactment of a favorable farm program by the federal government." As already noted, the national strike was called off at the last minute.

By the fall of 1933, however, South Dakota Farm Holiday leaders had a change of heart and called a strike in the state to start at midnight, November 2. Thompson tells the story of this strike:

The Watertown and Sioux Falls areas felt the greatest effects of this strike. On Monday the livestock receipts at the Sioux Falls market fell off 80 percent. At Watertown, Swift and Company received no livestock because four roads were blockaded by the farmers. Some sections of the state reported no change at all in normal marketing. . . .

On Friday, November 10, 1933, Governor Berry refused the request of the state Farm Holiday for a South Dakota farm embargo. He stated, however, that he had sympathy for the strike. . . .
The strike began to die out by Saturday, November 11, 1933. A short time after this, the strike was over in South Dakota in spite of agitation to carry it on. The farm program of the New Deal did much to end such pressure from farmers for withholding crops.

The Farm Holiday, both nationally and in South Dakota, was short-lived. As Shover says, after 1934, there were only two state units left—-Iowa and Minnesota—and in South Dakota the last convention met in 1934. According to Thompson, the Holiday was passing out of existence in South Dakota by 1935 and 1936.

The Holiday died, because, as Thompson says, "Farm conditions by this time had started to improve . . . due to better crops and higher prices induced by the federal farm program. As conditions improved, there was less interest in, and less agitation for, such organizations." Schell agrees, saying, "The federal policies of farm relief under Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal administration were diverting attention from the Farm Holiday program of direct action. Benefit payments were reaching the farmers by this time.""132

The Farmers Union

National organization

The Farmers Union, which was to play an important role in both the nation and South Dakota during the Great Depression, had its origins early in this century.
Agricultural historians John L. Shover and William P. Tucker both relate that the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union was founded in 1902 in Texas by newspaperman Isaac Newton (Newt) Gresham. Shover continues that the Union was initially strong in the South, but that by 1928, it had decreased there but had its principal strength, instead, in the Upper Midwest area, including South Dakota. Founder Gresham had been active in both the Farmers Alliance and Populist movements before starting his new organization. The Farmers Union became a national organization in 1905. In 1906, when Gresham died, Charles S. Barrett became president, a post he was to hold for twenty-two years.

The Farmers Union was organized in South Dakota in 1917. During the years of World War I, the Union organized cooperatives and by the 1920s these cooperatives became especially strong in the north central states, including South Dakota. This approach included cooperative purchasing and terminal grain and livestock marketing.

As already mentioned, the Farmers Union fought for the McNary-Haugen farm bills of the 1920s, and was an active participant in the Corn Belt Committee, a federation of many farm interests that lobbied for farm legislation from 1925 to 1930.
After membership losses in the early 1920s, the Union posted gains after the middle 1920s, "due to its merger with the National Producers Alliance and the American Society of Equity, and its leadership in the affairs of the Corn Belt Committee," Tucker explains. He also describes South Dakota as being "one of the strongest Union states," by 1928.

Tucker goes on to describe several changes in the Farmers Union after 1929. Barrett was no longer president, there was increasing emphasis given to cooperatives and legislation, and there was dissension within the organization. He says that in 1932 and 1933, "The Union was responsible for one of the most picturesque 'farm revolts' in American history--the Farm Holiday movement." (This movement has already been discussed.)

There seems to be some disagreement among scholars who have studied the Farmers Union about its degree of support of New Deal farm legislation. Tucker writes, "The Agricultural Adjustment Administration and subsequent New Deal agricultural legislation met a mixed reception from Farmers Union leaders." However, Tucker does say that Union leaders of the spring wheat area, which included South Dakota, "supported the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and prepared the first commodity program under it, namely the one for wheat including a crop
insurance feature." \textsuperscript{146} On the other hand, Shover writes, "The Union, although still more than any other agricultural organization the voice of the small farmer, was a firm supporter of the AAA." \textsuperscript{147}

An important thrust of the Farmers Union, which continues to this day, is its grain marketing efforts. Its Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul is "the nation's largest cooperative grain marketing agency," according to Tucker. \textsuperscript{148}

South Dakota Farmers Union historian Robert Thompson divides the stages of growth of the national organization into three:

The first, 1903 until 1926, were years of experimentation. It was during this first stage that the Farmers Union began its work in cooperatives. The second stage started with the agricultural depression of the 1920s and extended until 1936. During these years the power of the Farmers Union shifted from the southern states to the states in the Northern Plains region. The interests of the Farmers Union during this period began to shift from educational work and cooperative activities to that of legislative and political action. . . . During the third stage, new leaders appeared in the Farmers Union, many of them younger men. The emphasis shifted again to cooperative and educational programs. \textsuperscript{149}

Saloutos also speaks of the "split personality" of the Farmers Union. He says that one group:

had pinned its faith on the power of the farmers to work themselves out of the agricultural dilemma by encouraging the growth of cooperative marketing and purchasing associations and by seeking what legislation was necessary to insure the cooperatives a free hand. The other group saw the value
of cooperatives, yet felt the ramifications of the farm problem were so gigantic that it would be impossible to rehabilitate agriculture without federal assistance; the power of the federal government had to be utilized to stabilize farm prices and to protect cooperatives against unfair discrimination.

Although the ideology of the Farmers Union will be more fully detailed later in this chapter, it is significant to note just what its positions were in the 1930s, the time frame of this thesis. Saloutos offers this description of the Farmers Union program of 1937:

The delegates affirmed their belief that "we, as an organized group, must unite upon a militant program of action—that we must adopt a positive rather than a negative attitude toward the solution of problems confronting our industry." Unless a program of positive action is adopted, "America will become the victims of facism and dictatorship, the prey of war lords and munition makers; a shackled and Desecrated Ghost of Democracy." The farm problem was only a part of the larger economic problem which confronted the nation and which was bound to become more serious. "A profit system must be predicated upon the theory of scarcity, which necessitates controlled production and controlled distribution for the specific purpose of price fixing." The sole hope for the maintenance and safeguarding of democracy was the building of "a system of cooperative business, owned by producers and consumers," that would strive for potential abundance of all, instead of "controlled production and controlled distribution for the specific purpose of price fixing."

Saloutos says that the Farmers Union could claim partial credit for some New Deal Farm legislation, namely, crop insurance, a drought area cattle buying fund, helping to save the Resettlement Administration, and support for the
Commodity Exchange Act and the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1938. 152

_The Farmers Union in South Dakota_

There seems to be some dispute about just when the Union started in South Dakota. Thompson dates its beginning in 1914, having been started by "farmers who had moved into the state from Nebraska." 153 During the development years of the 1920s, there was the same split in the state group as in the national—as to whether the emphasis should be on cooperatives or on a political and legislative program. 154 Thompson adds that the line was not clearly drawn between the factions, "as there were many who favored a combination of both. 155 He continues:

In South Dakota those who favored a primary emphasis on legislation held control of the state organization until about 1933. From that time on, the cooperative movement generated more interest and gained more support within the Farmers Union. This development, however, was not achieved without a steady struggle between the two factions throughout the late 1920s and the early 1930s. 156

Besides the legislative and cooperative concerns, Thompson writes that the Farmers Union has long carried on an educational program for both adults and youth. The Union also publishes a newspaper twice a month, the _South Dakota Union Farmer_. 157

The chief aspects of the 1930s South Dakota Farmers Union beliefs can be gleaned from the _Union Farmer_. In
January 1937, the Farmers Union met with other progressive organizations to formulate a common program. Among the items in this program were:

- securing the maximum federal aid possible for South Dakota,
- higher taxes for higher income brackets, a tax on out of state corporations doing business in the state; a tax on large gifts, inheritance and undivided corporate profits;
- increase in the ore tax; opposition to further sales taxes; ratification of the child labor amendment; support for civil liberties; adequate aid for public schools; soil conservation; and support of a nonpartisan primary law. 158

In an issue of the Union Farmer in the spring of 1937, there was an article describing various South Dakota Farmers Union legislative accomplishments. Among laws for which the Union claimed credit were an increase in the gold levy against the Homestake Mine, an improved foreclosure moratorium law, a better deficiency judgment law (relating to mortgage foreclosure procedures), and support for old age pensions. 159 (The ore tax battle and other South Dakota Farmers Union legislative concerns will be highlighted later in this chapter.)

General Farmers Union ideology

A few hints have already been presented about Farmers Union ideology, but a more detailed summary is now in order. Several Farmers Union historians and scholars have attempted to analyze the organization's ideology and style. Tucker offers this description:
Throughout its history, the Farmers Union has been the general farm organization most closely identified with militant agrarian reform since the days of the Farmers Alliance, of which it is a spiritual descendent. There have been various schools of thought within the Union on the relative emphasis to place on cooperatives and legislation, but all have agreed on the need for raising rural living standards. Varying emphases have, therefore, been placed on cooperatives, agricultural credit, tariffs and other trade barriers, taxation, and the relationships of government and business. As one aspect of continuing the Populist tradition, monopolies and middlemen have been consistently opposed, while maintenance of the family-type farming system has been a basic objective.

Saloutos also traces the development of Union ideology:

The Farmers Union, like the Equity, passed through several stages before it placed main stress on cooperative marketing and purchasing. All the while it tried to put floors under prices by setting levels below which its members were asked not to sell; it advocated production controls and the construction of a system of warehouses to store products and to finance its minimum price efforts. Many members gave lip service to the formula of "cost of production plus a reasonable profit." Its program was buttressed by an educational program which revolved around such topics as farm credit, land tenure and marketing.

The Farmers Union appears to have suffered greatly from the want of cohesion. No doubt other farm groups had the same trouble, but these difficulties seldom broke into the open as often and as melodramatically as they did for the Union.

Saloutos also details some of the particular stands of the Union during the 1920s and 1930s. He writes that the typical Middle Western Union member "displayed a belligerent attitude toward the existing agricultural colleges, toward the daily press, and toward professional
politicians." He cites Milo Reno as being particularly outspoken in his attacks against the colleges. "Equally violent was the Union opposition to the county agents and the Farm Bureau." Saloutos also observes that "Union antagonisms toward existing economic institutions resulted in orgies of emotional denunciation." On balance, however, the Union was perhaps not as belligerent as it may have appeared. As Saloutos says:

It is evident that despite the earlier "apostolic" and at times doctrinaire zeal of its leaders, the Union was by no means the radical organization that its language made it out to be. It sought, with a limited degree of success, to teach farmers that they could live within the capitalistic system. The emotional and strongly phrased language employed in condemning the existing order was but a means used by the Union for selling itself to depressed farmers who did not respond to other appeals. This enabled it to enroll members in areas where other groups had failed.

Political scientist John A. Crampton has studied the positions of the Farmers Union as they have evolved over the years. He offers these observations:

The Union's liberal, agrarian ideology has been the most important, although not the only, factor influencing the organization's program and structure throughout its history. . . . On the face of it, the Farmers Union has not been particularly successful. On the crucial matter of membership, it lags behind both the aggressive and powerful Farm Bureau and the relatively apolitical Grange. In shaping national farm policy the Farmers Union has been a marginal influence. The Farmers Union has not been without influence in Washington, but it has been neither the maker nor the breaker of national farm policy. In the twenties it fought for the McNary-Haugen bills vetoed by successive presidents. The Farm Bureau, not the Farmers Union, lobbied the major New Deal
farm programs through Congress. . . . Yet despite its size and despite the traditional conservatism of rural America, the liberal Farmers Union has not only remained a going organization for more than half a century, but it has grown. Today, it is probably the sole effective voice of the old agrarianism.

Crampton also describes the Farmers Union style as being "marked by belligerence and by optimism. The Union's casual rhetoric bristles with the language of struggle. The organization calls itself, 'militant, agressive, hard hitting, ongoing, vigorous, outspoken, the vanguard.'" He adds, "The Farmers Union is a protest organization; it seeks a gadfly role," and continues that the Union has always drawn heavily upon the prevailing tone of each generation's liberalism. "It has always been ready to adopt as its own the current progressive reform and dissent."

Crampton isolates four strands in the Union's ideology--the sense of disadvantage, pacifism, cooperativism, and the family farm ideal.

In speaking of the first strand, the sense of disadvantage, Crampton says that the Union has always maintained that farmers best understand farm problems and therefore farm leaders should have rural backgrounds, "or better, be dirt farmers." The farmers' sense of disadvantage is reflected through the organization's attitudes toward wealth and poverty, the financial system, the monopolistic corporation and direct political action.
"There is no more time hallowed object of farm grievance than the middleman . . . an abstraction, a composite of those who handle the farmer's produce from farm gate to consumer." Crampton views the Farm Holiday movement as "the Union's most extreme expression of the farm sense of disadvantage." The Union has long attacked the economic bases of concentrations of wealth, and has had as its symbols for farmers, the cost of production and parity.

Of the Union's pacifist stance, Crampton says, "The common factor is the enduring pacifism. Farmers who believed that isolationism would secure peace in 1921 and 1937 may feel that internationalism will do so today." After an earlier isolationist stance, the Union did support the League of Nations in 1919, but in the 1920s, returned to its previous isolationist position. Crampton continues, "As the thirties waned and war was again probable, the Union backed all of the isolationist proposals," but this stance changed once war became imminent.

The Farmers Union's case for cooperativism, its third major thrust, was first made on the grounds of efficiency and self-interest, Crampton writes, and by the 1920s and 1930s, as a result of the farm depression, "the case was more often made on ethical-moralistic grounds. Compared with capitalism, cooperativism inculcated Christian values such as service to others, unselfishness
and the brotherhood of man." Crampton continues that while some Farmers Union leaders, like John A. Simpson, appeared to be attacking the very system of capitalism itself, "the Union's belief has usually been against the abuses of capitalism. The Union would keep the system." 

Preservation of the family farm has been a long-standing Union concern. Crampton writes:

In defending the family farm, the Union leans heavily on the rural myth, taken here to include reverence for and attachment to the land (which is seen as the ultimate value), respect for the stability arising from property ownership and a close-knit hierarchical family, high valuation on work, rigid morality, individualism, the view that the farmer makes the best citizen of a democracy, and a consciousness that in all of these areas the farmer is set apart from (and above) the city man.

Of the Farmers Union in the 1930s, Crampton says, "It did not favor with enthusiasm the New Deal farm programs it later came to support wholeheartedly. . . . However, its remedies were more, not less, radical than the New Deal programs. In most nonfarm issues (such as enlargement of the Supreme Court), the Union did support the New Deal."

Other Responses to the Depression

It was not only in the agricultural sector that there were manifestations of protest and rebellion during the Great Depression. Link writes, "The First New Deal coalition of businessmen, workers and farmers came apart at the seams in the spring and summer of 1934. . . . By
January 1935, it was evident that the administration must undertake measures to allay the forces of discontent or else run serious risk of being overwhelmed by those forces. The government's response was "The Second New Deal, the full flowering of social justice progressivism." 

Revolt on the right

There was revolt against the New Deal from both left and right, Link says. One conservative manifestation was the formation of the American Liberty League in August 1934. This group was a combination of conservative lawyers and Democratic politicians like Alfred E. Smith, allied with big business interests like the DuPont family. The Liberty League championed states rights, "free enterprise," and "the American system" of the open shop, Link says.

Revolt on the left

According to Link, the revolt on the left was probably of greater concern to the Roosevelt administration. One of the first movements on the non-Communism left was muckraking novelist Upton Sinclair's plan to end poverty in California. Sinclair ran for the California governorship in 1934, advocating a plan of high state income tax and inheritance taxes and a payment of $50 per month to the needy.
Sinclair's movement faded away, but a more important movement soon emerged from California--the Townsend Plan. Dr. Francis E. Townsend of Long Beach proposed that the federal government pay $200 a month to all unemployed persons over sixty. By 1935, Link says that there were thousands of Townsend clubs across the country. 186

Another key figure in anti-New Deal revolt was the Roman Catholic priest, Father Charles E. Coughlin. Fr. Coughlin had started discussing politics and economic issues in his radio sermons in 1930. He was in favor of socialization of industry and credit and was at first a New Deal supporter. 187 But he came to oppose the New Deal and in 1935 turned his National Union for Social Justice against it. 188

Fr. Coughlin became directly involved with the agrarian protest in 1936 when he actively backed the Frazier-Lemke farm mortgage financing bill. Coughlin then moved to support Congressman Lemke's third party presidential bid under the name of the Union Party. 189

The Farmers Union got directly involved with E. E. Kennedy, national secretary and editor of the Union's national newspaper, became an open supporter of Fr. Coughlin's efforts. Shover writes that Kennedy's actions produced a split within Union ranks. 191
A third threat from the left was Huey P. Long of Louisiana. Link terms him a "dangerous menace to American democracy." Long served both as governor and a United States senator, and Link says that his national significance "lay in the way in which he emerged as the chief agitator of lower class protest against the First New Deal compromise." Like Fr. Coughlin, Long had initially supported the New Deal, but in 1933, he changed tactics and sought to capture control of the Democratic party from Roosevelt. Long's platform promised to "make every man a king by giving every family a homestead worth $5,000 and an annual income of $2,500, and by confiscating large fortunes to provide money to the poor." Long was killed by an assassin in September 1935.

The Great Depression produced major agrarian responses, most of which originated in the Middle West. The most colorful of these was the short-lived Farm Holiday, which sought to raise prices by withholding crops and livestock from the market, and which sought to prevent farm foreclosures. The Farmers Union also enjoyed at least limited influence during the Great Depression, and in South Dakota, especially, was closely allied with this state's Farm Holiday movement. The Union has long emphasized the farmer's sense of disadvantage and has represented the voice of agrarian protest. In addition to agrarian protests
against the Depression, there were also general threats to the New Deal from both right and left, although it was the radical left which was of greater concern to the Roosevelt administration.

Emil Loriks' Involvement in Depression Issues

Emil Loriks' public career began with his election as a Democrat to the South Dakota senate in 1926, when he was just 31 years old.\textsuperscript{195} When elected, he was the youngest member of the legislature, and his election was termed "the election surprise of the state," by the Republican Sioux Falls Argus Leader.\textsuperscript{197}

In speaking of his motivation for entering politics, Loriks said in an interview in 1982 that he sensed "the lack of representation that agriculture had." He added, "As a farmer, I knew what their needs and their gripes were." Loriks felt that this sense of identification with farm needs led him into politics. "I had the feeling that farmers weren't adequately represented and that they had an inferiority complex."\textsuperscript{198}

Loriks served in the state Senate until 1934, when he resigned to become president of the South Dakota Farmers Union. During the 1933 legislative session, he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee as the Democratic party had gained control of the legislature in the 1932 elections as the result of the Roosevelt sweep.\textsuperscript{199}
In 1932, Loriks was offered the support of Democratic party regulars to run for governor but turned the offer down, thinking that the odds against a South Dakota Democrat were too great, even in 1932, to justify mortgaging his farm to raise money for a campaign, according to Paul O'Rourke's study of New Deal politics in South Dakota. The "draft" effort is further corroborated by a campaign circular that Loriks has saved, and by an editorial from his hometown newspaper, the Arlington Sun, which referred to that campaign circular. The unsigned ad read in part, "Draft Emil Loriks for Governor. Mr. Loriks is not only an honest to goodness farmer, but he is also a large owner of South Dakota town and city property. Emil Loriks, who has never represented any faction."

During the administration of Democratic Governor Tom Berry, elected in 1932, O'Rourke explains that the generally conservative Berry was often opposed in the legislature by the progressive wing of the Democratic party, led by Loriks and other farm leaders like Oscar Fosheim, a Democratic member of the House.

Farm Holiday Leader Loriks

While Loriks was in the legislature, he was also serving as state executive secretary of the Farm Holiday movement, whose activities and program have already been outlined. After serving as vice president of the
Farmers Union, he became state Union president in 1934. Early in his Farmers Union tenure, according to the South Dakota Union Farmer, he was criticized by some Union members for keeping his Holiday post while serving as state Farmers Union president. In an article in the Union Farmer, Loriks explained to Union members that he turned his Holiday work over to its state board as soon as possible, "so as to give my official position in the Farmers Union undivided attention." In a 1978 interview in the Union Farmer, Loriks looked back on the Farm Holiday and noted that while some of its tactics would not have been considered legal, they were "the only expedient way to dramatize the farmers' plight so that the nation would be aware of the seriousness of the situation."  

Farmers Union Leader Loriks

Emil Loriks succeeded to the presidency of the South Dakota Farmers Union in 1934. Thompson relates the following information about Loriks' background:

Emil Loriks was well qualified for the position of president. Shortly after World War I, he joined the Producers Alliance in Kingsbury County, where he was farming. This group was absorbed by the Farmers Union about 1919. Loriks was probably a member of the Farmers Union for a short time after the Producers Alliance joined the Farmers Union, but he did not take an interest in it at this time. His interest for the next two or three years was with the Farm Bureau.
It was during his first term in the state Senate that Loriks really came in contact with the Farmers Union. He watched with interest the activities of President Batcheller and the Farmers Union and agreed with most of their legislative objectives. From this he was led to believe that the Farmers Union had great possibilities for the future.

Loriks joined the Farmers Union in 1930 and began to organize Farmers Union locals in Kingsbury County. In 1933 he was elected state vice president and became state president in 1934.

Thompson says that "the faction that favored cooperatives had the complete support of President Loriks (1934-1938), and it is probably correct to say that it was during his administration that the cooperative groups were recognized by the leadership of the Farmers Union program in South Dakota." However, as Thompson writes, Loriks was the Farmers Union president responsible for introducing a change of tactics in dealing with the state legislature "the introduction of a vigorous legislative program. . . . Loriks began to work for more harmony by supporting desirable legislation and actually formulating a legislative program." Thompson attributes this "to his experience in the legislature as well as to contacts he had with various legislators."

It is of at least passing interest to note South Dakota Farmers Union membership figures for the years Emil Loriks served as president. Thompson writes that from 1929 to 1931, the numbers had remained about constant, with a major decline of 1,470 members in 1932. The total loss
for the three years, 1931-1933 was 3,034, "reflecting the adverse economic conditions existing in South Dakota during these years," according to Thompson.213 The first two years of Loriks' tenure, 1934 and 1935, brought gains of 1,486 and 617, respectively, for a total of 6,763 members in 1935.214 Thompson credits these gains to the influence of the Farm Holiday Association.215 Nineteen thirty-six brought a loss of 1,152 and 1937 brought a loss of 1,149 members, while 1938 brought a leveling off of membership, with a small gain of 32 for a total of 4,430.216 Thompson says that these losses "once more reflected the economic plight of the farmers. Part of the decline is attributable to the drifting away of many of the new members who had joined in 1934 and 1935, but who soon lost interest in the organization."217

Thompson credits Loriks with changing the legislative tactics of the South Dakota Farmers Union from negative action to a "constructive program of farm legislation."218 Thompson also credits Loriks with developing a "more mature viewpoint" in Union dealings with the Farm Bureau. In 1919, the Farm Bureau had, by law, become part of the agricultural extension program. The opposition of the Union toward the Bureau had continued as the Union had hoped to destroy the State College Extension program and the county agent program, "all for the purpose of ending the favorable
advantage to the Farm Bureau. But its attempts to damage
the Bureau failed and only intensified the bitterness.°219

Thompson continues:

Emil Loriks handled the Farm Bureau problem in
a more positive and constructive manner. Instead
of continuing the fight to destroy the extension
and county agent program, Loriks solved the Union's
problem through an effort to separate the Farm
Bureau from the State College extension program.
This was accomplished by legislation in 1935. This
legislation removed much of the friction that had
existed between the Farm Bureau and the Farmers
Union prior to 1935.220

An undated and untitled newspaper clipping that
Loriks has saved from the time he was elected national
Farmers Union secretary in the 1940s praises him for
accomplishments as state president:

During the many years Loriks was state president
of the South Dakota Farmers Union, he never chose
the easy, negative road of blind denunciation and
fault finding. He did not waste his time merely
talking about our problems. Loriks is a positive
personality, a builder, a man of action. He led
the fight against the powerful Hearst interests,
resulting in an ore tax of over a million dollars a
year for the state of South Dakota collected from
the Homestake gold mine. Other legislative victo-
ries followed, resulting in lower taxes and lower
interest rates, all designed for the benefit of the
family type farmer.

Acting in harmony with his convictions, he
launched a most ambitious program of building coop-
erative oil companies during 1934, 1935 and 1936,
just at the time our people were hardest hit by
drought, grasshoppers and hard times.221

Emil Loriks was deeply involved in responses to the
Depression in South Dakota. His public career began with
election to the legislature in 1926. This was followed by
a stint as executive secretary of the Farm Holiday movement in South Dakota. In 1934, he became president of the South Dakota Farmers Union. Speeches that he gave during his Farmers Union presidency will be the object of analysis in this thesis.

The South Dakota Farmers Union Responses to Great Depression Issues

The Homestake Ore Tax Battle

Perhaps the one issue for which the South Dakota Farmers Union was most noted in the 1930s was its successful effort to have a severance tax enacted against the Homestake Gold Mine of Lead, South Dakota. Robert Karolevitz explains why the idea of taxing gold mine revenues was even advanced:

On January 30, 1934, the Gold Reserve Act was passed, establishing the price of the precious metal at $35 a troy ounce. . . . The ensuing economic maneuvers which affected national and international finance could be reduced to a simple promising fact in South Dakota; it meant that the production of the Homestake Mining Company would be purchased by the government at a guaranteed premium price.

Contradictorily, while the rest of the state was struggling through the bleak period, the situation at Lead and elsewhere in the vicinity of the mines was strangely reversed. An air of prosperity prevailed as the work force was expanded at the Homestake. In 1934 the Company sold sixteen and a half million dollars worth of gold, and its corporate stock reached $430 a share from a pre-depression level of $50.

It was an incongruous circumstance. With the economy so seriously depressed everywhere else, the legislature turned to the most potential source of tax revenue, the underground wealth of the Black Hills' most productive lode. In 1935 a four percent
ore tax was levied, and the $750,000 collected from the Homestake provided a third of the state's operating budget.

The story of the South Dakota Farmers Union involvement with the enactment of the ore tax is related by Thompson:

Perhaps the Farmers Union had outside assistance in the enactment of the ore tax legislation. The fact remains, however, that the organization was very active in carrying this issue to the people, and developed the strength necessary to enact the ore tax bill. It should also be noted that during the 1930s, a larger proportion of the state legislature was affiliated with the Farmers Union than at any other time.

The ore tax bill was introduced in the Senate by Emil Loriks during the 1933 session. Oscar Fosheim introduced an identical proposal in the House. Although neither bill was enacted, Farmers Union officials were determined to secure an enactment at the next legislative session and continued their campaign to that end. . . . Loriks insisted that the mining interest had removed over $300,000,000 from South Dakota in gold mining but had never paid one cent of tax on this production. He insisted that the state legislature was controlled by "Special Interests," which thus far had made the enactment of ore tax legislation impossible. When the legislature refused to enact an ore tax measure, the Farmers Union carried the fight to the people to arouse the electorate to action. The Union members circulated an ore tax petition which proposed an initiated bill if the legislature should again fail to enact an ore tax law. . . Legislative members closely identified with the two major political parties hesitated to assume any leadership for ore tax legislation but the Farmers Union kept the issue before the public.

Representative Oscar Fosheim, then vice president of the South Dakota Farmers Union, introduced the ore tax bill again in the 1935 legislative session. This time, after a long and bitter fight, the measure was enacted. . . . Under provisions of the measure, gold, silver, tin and all other minerals in the state were taxed on the basis of four percent on the value of the ore mined. . . .
During the session of 1937 the tax was increased to 6 percent.

Other Farmers Union Concerns

The South Dakota Farmers Union had other concerns during the Depression. The group worked for legislation to lower interest rates and backed revision of House rules in 1933 to lessen committee domination of proposed legislation. Thompson also credits the state Farmers Union for being "largely responsible for a reduction of $2,500,000 in appropriations in the 1933 legislative session." As already indicated, the South Dakota Farmers Union, as well as the national organization, supported at least portions of the New Deal farm legislation.

Another major part of Farmers Union work over the years in South Dakota has been its cooperative ventures. Thompson explains that since the early 1920s, the South Dakota Farmers Union had been in cooperative businesses, and had associated itself with cooperative organizations that were active even before the 1920s. There have been four types of Farmers Union cooperatives in South Dakota—cooperative insurance companies, livestock commission firms, grain elevators, and a wholesale retail brokerage business.

Thompson terms this program of cooperative businesses, "just as important to the organization as its
legislative activities. . . . By its nature the cooperative work has received less general publicity than the legisla-
tive work." 228

Thompson offers this summary about the Farmers Union in South Dakota:

Since its organization in South Dakota, the Farmers Union has remained an important farmers' organization. Its activities have created both friends and foes outside its own membership. This will continue as long as the Farmers Union remains an important farm organization and practices its philosophy with the same vigor it has exhibited in the past. 229

Summary

The Great Depression, which was to produce notable agrarian response, and which was to be the setting for Emil Loriks' Farmers Union speeches, had its beginnings for farmers in the 1920s. Despite widespread prosperity in most of the rest of the American economy, agricultural prices were greatly depressed in the 1920s. Bleak agricultural conditions spawned the creation of the Congressional "Farm Bloc," which although not totally successful, did unite diverse farm groups and result in some legislation to aid farmers.

For the country as a whole, the Great Depression started in late 1929 with the collapse of the stock market and quickly developing and widespread unemployment and deprivation. South Dakota, where difficult economic times
had begun in the 1920s because of its reliance on agriculture, was the scene of suffering and hardship in the 1930s. New Deal farm legislation was at least partially successful in aiding South Dakota farmers, although it was not until the end of the 1930s that conditions really improved for the state's farmers.

The Great Depression produced significant agrarian responses, including the Farm Holiday movement, a short-lived protest effort that sought to withhold farm products from the market to secure a better price and which also sought to stop farm mortgage foreclosures. The Farmers Union was also active in responding to events of the Depression. The Union supported some, although not all, aspects of New Deal farm legislation. In South Dakota, the Union claimed credit for the enactment of a severance tax against the Homestake Gold Mine of Lead, South Dakota, in 1935. The Farmers Union ideology stressed the sense of deprivation of farmers and also attacked many practices of capitalism.

Emil Loriks' public career started with his election to the South Dakota Senate in 1926. He was a leader in the South Dakota Farm Holiday in the early 1930s, and in 1934, resigned his Senate seat and his Holiday post to become President of the Farmers Union. Speeches selected from his
1934 to 1938 tenure as South Dakota Farmers Union president will be analyzed in the next chapter of this thesis.
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CHAPTER III

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INVENTIONAL COMPONENTS
OF SELECTED FARMERS UNION SPEECHES

As indicated in the initial chapter, three speeches—one radio address and two South Dakota Farmers Union presidential addresses—were selected for a rhetorical analysis of their inventional components. Each speech has been analyzed separately before summary statements were offered. The three components of logical proof, emotional proof and ethical proof were considered. (Copies of the three speeches are found in Appendixes A, B. and C.)

September 9, 1935, Radio Address

The Setting

This speech was printed in the South Dakota Union Farmer on September 18, 1935, having been broadcast over WNAX in Yankton on September 9. It was titled, "Farmers Union State President Pays Tribute to Huey Long Who Was Genuine Friend of Humanity." At the time Loriks spoke, Huey Long had been shot but was still clinging to life. By the time the Union Farmer was published, Long was dead. The South Dakota Farmers Union radio addresses were 15 minutes in length, and Loriks explained that he prepared all these
president's radio talks himself, using as a basis the news events of the day. He drove to Yankton every other week to make these broadcasts.\(^2\)

According to Jerry Oster, WNAX operations manager, WNAX at that time had a night-time power of 1,000 watts and the station frequently got reports of night-time listening from as far away as Chicago, Texas and the Rocky Mountains. Oster said that at that time the station had a night-time statewide coverage of South Dakota.\(^3\)

**Logical Proof**

Thonsen, Baird and Braden refer to logical proof as "the integrity of ideas," and say that in order to determine logical proof, one needs to "determine how fully a given speech enforces an idea; how nearly that enforcement conforms to the general rules of argumentative development; and how nearly the totality of the reasoning approaches a measure of truth adequate for purposes of action."\(^4\) The questions to be used in analyzing logical proof include determining the lines of reasoning and whether they were the best choices, isolating the forms of support and judging whether or not they were the best choices, determining whether the speech was logically reasoned, determining the kinds of reasoning and whether or not they were the best choices, determining whether the evidence was sufficient
to justify the speaker's generalizations, and determining whether there were internal inconsistencies.

**Lines of reasoning**

Loriks prefaced his talk by saying that he had thrown away his previously prepared text to talk about Huey Long. He added, "I feel I would be derelict in my duty as President of the Farmers Union if I did not at this time comment on the extraordinary qualities of the great champion of the common people who is at this moment fighting for his own life, against odds." Loriks then compared Long to such other murdered figures as Socrates, Christ and Abraham Lincoln, saying, "The task of emancipation is a bigger one today than in Lincoln's time."  

The speaker went on to say that Long was a special friend of the Farmers Union, and that the Union had lost a number of other allies in recent months. A major portion of the speech was then devoted to reading testimonials from other groups and persons that praised Long.

Loriks left a direct discussion on Long and pointed to the gathering war clouds in Europe and to Mussolini's probable invasion of Ethiopia. He linked pro-war feeling with the financial interests of the nation by asking, "Will America again send millions of the sons of American mothers thousands of miles across the water to pull chestnuts out of the fire for our financial interests?"
Lorik's said that those who had opposed World War I, like Senator Robert LaFollette, Sr., had been "persecuted, misrepresented and maligned because of . . . opposition to human slaughter." The speaker concluded by saying that he hoped that American boys would not again "be sacrificed to safeguard American capital on foreign soil, under foreign flags."

The lines of reasoning appeared to have been good choices on Lorik's part as he moved from the specific news event of Long's being shot to a tribute to Long. The subject matter was then expanded to encompass a discussion of the increasingly warlike situation in Europe. The speaker then ended with an anti-war plea.

Assertions

This radio speech contained five main assertions. The first was that Huey Long should be compared with other murdered figures like Socrates, Christ, and Abraham Lincoln. Another assertion was that Long and the Farmers Union were mutually supportive of each other. The third assertion was that Long was worthy of admiration because of his support from diverse sources. The subject matter of the speech then shifted to the fourth assertion that war clouds were hovering over Europe. The final assertion was that the United States must not again go to war.
Methods of development

Assertion I

In support of the first assertion, that Long should be compared with the other murdered figures, Loriks gave the examples of Socrates, Christ and Abraham Lincoln. In presenting this assertion, Loriks reasoned inductively by giving the specific examples of the other men on which to base his generalization. He was also employing analogy or comparison. Loriks went on to describe Long as "the outstanding friend of the downtrodden, the exploited, the destitute [who] lies at death's door, the victim of the bloody hand of an assassin."11 There was no support offered to demonstrate that Long was "outstanding" as a friend of the named disadvantaged groups. In a further statement, also unsupported, Loriks said Long was "the most misrepresented, maligned and persecuted of statesmen today because he dared to attack the evils at their source."12 The speaker then attempted, again with no documentation, to paint Long as Lincoln's equal by saying, "Lincoln liberated the negro, the chattel slaves of his day," while, on the other hand, "The task of emancipation is a bigger one today than in Lincoln's time."13 The forms of support for this first assertion, to the degree it was supported, were to offer examples which provided a basis for analogy.
Assertion II

In support of the second assertion that Long and the Farmers Union were mutually supportive, Loriks said that Long made "an unequivocal stand for Farmers Union and Labor Union legislation together with his 'Share the Wealth' program." Citing Arthur Brisbane, whom Loriks quoted as having said, "One hundred million American citizens have nothing to lose but the economic chains holding them in slavery," Loriks said that Long attracted support from those who had "nothing to lose but the economic chains holding them in slavery." Long fought economic interests, Loriks asserted, and Long "asked for no quarter, and he gave none."

In further developing his assertion about the common interests of Huey Long and the Farmers Union, Loriks said, "The history of the past six months are [sic] heavy with the tragedy of loss of fighters for the Farmers Union." Loriks then cited the examples of Senator Bronson Cutting of New Mexico, killed in a plane crash while flying back to Washington to vote on a bill, and Congressman Truax of Ohio, who "died in the harness, fighting for the Frazier-Lemke Bill."

In developing this assertion, Loriks again employed the inductive method, moving from specific examples to a general statement. Loriks also again made use of analogy,
by comparing Long with the other political leaders who were regarded as friends of the Farmers Union program. He did not develop specific data for his statement that Long "always stood face to face with the powers of iniquity and fought the forces of darkness and injustice even though singlehanded sometimes." 19

Assertion III

The third assertion, that Long was worthy of admiration because of his support from many others, was developed quite simply by citing the others who had expressed support. These sources of support included the late John Simpson, former president of the national Farmers Union; John Everson, then the national president of the Farmers Union; a quotation from Plain Talk magazine citing Long's "100 percent record all the way around for public interest;" commendations from the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and a commendation from Labor, the paper of the railroad brotherhoods. 20

The evidence used to develop this third assertion is essentially testimony—that is, others who were expert in the field said it was true; therefore, it must have been so. Loriks chose to ignore those who might have testified on the opposite side of the question, as he did in developing an earlier assertion.
Asking whether "his [Long's] death would spur the living on to achieve the task for which he gave his life." 21 Loriks established his fourth assertion—"Black war clouds are hovering over us--The Gods of War are thundering and ominous signs point to the impending catastrophe. WAR IS IN THE AIR!" 22 In support, Loriks cited the example of Mussolini's being ready to move into Ethiopia as a way to expand his territory. Loriks then asked rhetorically, "Have we not been guilty of the same sin?" 23 Loriks finished this point by saying, "We had hoped that civilization was ascending to a higher plane; yet, today, the members of another military conflagration are aglow." 24

With this assertion, the method of support was to employ the example of Mussolini's probable attack, with the implied cause-effect relationship that this would lead to larger conflict. In addition, Loriks used the comparison of the United States, Britain and France also having moved for territorial aggrandizement. Again, the support and reasoning could have been stronger had Loriks provided more examples on which to base the inductive generalization.

Assertion V

The final assertion was that the United States must not again send its sons to war. Loriks used a rhetorical question, and supplied his own answer. "Will America again send millions of the sons of American mothers thousands of
miles across the waters to pull chestnuts out of the fire for our financial interests? Those of us who served in the last WORLD WAR will answer most emphatically, NO!" 25 Saying that England would move into Africa to protect its investments, Loriks asserted, "IT WILL BE A CAPITALIST WAR!" 26 Further support of this fifth assertion came when he said, "LET US NOT FEEL TOO SECURE BECAUSE OF OUR REMOTENESS FROM THE SCENE OF ACTION!" 27

Loriks again employed analogy, comparing the 1935 situation with that of World War I, by saying:

LET US NOT FORGET 1917. Let us not forget how the press of the country and other agencies of publicity were prostituted by powerful financial interests seeking to protect their financial interest, propagandizing our people into a war frenzy against our good German neighbors across the sea. 28

Another means of developing this last assertion was for the speaker to cite examples of those who had opposed American involvement in World War I and to tell how someone like Senator Robert LaFollette, Sr., "was persecuted, misrepresented, and maligned because of his opposition to human slaughter." 29

Loriks offered in support of this final assertion testimony by General Smedley Butler who had said, "In all the wars in which he had ever served he had simply acted as a bill collector for the House of Morgan. BEWARE DOLLAR DIPLOMACY." 30 Loriks added, "The recently reported investment of American and British capital in Ethiopian Oil
Concessions appears to us the most brazen attempt of Capital to drag the United States into another World War."\(^{31}\)

**Assessment**

In answer to the question as to what type of reasoning the speaker used—there were no recognized instances of deduction; rather, the approach was inductive. The speaker appeared to have made prudent use of specific examples as a basic for drawing generalizations.

As to whether the evidence was sufficient to justify the speaker's conclusions, the answer would have to be that this was not consistently so. For instance, in developing the assertion that Long should be compared with other murdered figures, Loriks did not provide support. The speaker also did not deal with the considerable sentiment, expressed even at the time Long was alive (and certainly by scholars since then) that Long was a dangerous demagogue.

(Historian Arthur Link has described Long as "a dangerous menace to the American democracy," who, along with his supporters, was "immensely corrupt."\(^{32}\) Arthur M. Schlesinger expressed similar sentiments, saying of Long, "As a national leader he was plainly a demagogue, appealing to the threatened lower middle classes; it was no coincidence that his program for the nation made much less sense than his program for Louisiana."\(^{33}\))
Loriks also did not deal with arguments that would have tended to support American involvement in the escalating warlike situation in Europe and Africa. For instance, some observers would have wanted American involvement as a means to defend American and European freedoms. Instead, Loriks chose to oppose involvement in the war by saying that it was the capitalistic interests that were producing the war.

There was also a failure to acknowledge opposing viewpoints in the development of the assertion that Long was worthy of support because many others had expressed admiration. Loriks did not present opposing views. Perhaps it could be said in the speaker's defense, however, that the time constraints inherent in a 15-minute radio talk might have precluded the use of multiple examples and opposing viewpoints. However, the suggestion could then be made that the speaker perhaps tried to develop too many major assertions in a short time span.

Loriks' support was mainly that of examples as a means to develop analogy, which in some cases, was overdrawn. There was also citation of testimony from others who had praised Long. As to whether the speech was logically reasoned, the answer would be mixed. There were some examples offered and there was some testimony. But one could well ask if the persons who formed the basis for the
analogenes were indeed comparable to Long. And one could ask whether the pre-World War I and pre-World War II situations were analogous.

There was one internal inconsistency. Loriks spoke of the situation in Ethiopia and of a "Roman dictator igniting the flame of facism and starting this conflagration," and then said, "ALL THIS IN THE BIRTHPLACE OF CHRISTIANITY--WHERE THE PRINCE OF PEACE WALKED OVER NINETEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO."34 Christ walked in the Middle East, not in either Rome or Ethiopia.

As to whether the forms of support--in the main, example, analogy and testimony--were the best choices; one must say that in some ways they were. The problem lay in the fact that there was not enough support and that the speaker did not refute counter-arguments. These analogies employed were not proven to be truly comparable; that is, Long was worthy of comparison with other murdered figures, and the two pre-war situations were the same. The speaker also did not prove that World War I was caused by selfish interests and that the same thing would happen again. As far as the forms of support went, they were perhaps appropriate, but they did not go far enough and were not sufficient.
Emotional Proof

As already established in the introductory chapter of this thesis, emotional proof "is designed to put the listener in a frame of mind to react favorably and conformably to the speaker's purpose." The questions to determine the speaker's emotional proof include analyzing to what extent he chose words designed to convey an emotional appeal, how well he analyzed his audience, how well he made necessary adjustments to his audience, how and to what extent he sought to indentify his message with his audience, and to what extent the speaker demonstrated social intelligence.

Loaded words

Loriks employed a number of emotionally tinged words. An early phrase referred to Huey Long as "the great champion of the common people." (As an aid to understanding, the writer has underscored the apparent loaded words.) This was followed almost immediately by the sentence, "Is the assassin's bullet, the cross, or the hemlock ever going to be the reward for faithful service to humanity?" Loriks the offered these words to describe Huey Long:

TODAY, the outstanding friend of the downtrodden, the exploited, the destitute, lies at death's door, the victim of the bloody hand of an assassin. Senator Juey P. Long of Louisiana, most misrepresented, maligned and persecuted of statesmen today by the powerful interests that rule this nation because he dared to attack the evils at their
source, has been shot down in cold blood by the reeking, smoking pistol in the purpled hands of an assassin.

There were also additional words that appeared to convey a strong emotional appeal. The speaker said that Long had "a reputation as a fighter for the people, second to none. He asked no quarter and he gave none." Loriks continued:

He always stood face to face with the powers of iniquity and fought the forces of darkness and injustice even though single handed sometimes.

Undoubtedly there was a premium on his life, a price for his scalp. He was not entirely unaware of the dangers lurking in his path for this was not the first time that an attempt had been made on his life.

Loriks also offered this quotation from Abraham Lincoln as part of his case of sympathy for Long, "It is for us the living to dedicate ourselves to the carrying out of the unfinished task before us." Before mentioning the gathering war clouds in Europe and Africa, Loriks said, "The handful who own America perhaps are rejoicing and gleefully hoping that his lifeless body will soon be lowered into the inhospitable grave."

In his discussion of the ominous sings in Europe, Loriks observed, "We had hoped that civilization was ascending to a higher plane, yet, today, the members of another mighty military conflagration are aglow."
Then came a loaded question, "Will America again send millions of the sons of American mothers thousands of miles across the waters to pull chestnuts out of the fire for our financial interests." The emotional tone is further exemplified by the statement, "Will the youth of today be led forth to another slaughter?"44

Then came the emphatic statement, "IT WILL BE A CAPITALISTIC WAR!"45 Loriks said that in World War I, the American people had been propagandized into "a war frenzy against our good German neighbors across the sea."46 He warned of "war mongers," who would "again seek to stampede America into war."47

Then came an epithet against the "House of Morgan,"48 and finally, these concluding paragraphs:

Let us hope that never again will the sons of American mothers be sacrificed to safeguard American capital on foreign soil, under foreign flags. May God keep this Nation through the dangers of the coming year. May the lustre of Old Glory never be soiled or stained by future war, anarchy or internal strife. May it never advance save to bring freedom, liberty, self-government and equality of opportunity to all.

It can be seen that in this speech Loriks made extensive use of words that conveyed an emotional appeal. The speaker appears to have wished to derive maximum emotional impact, as in referring twice in the address to the "sons of American mothers" going to war.
Audience analysis

How well did Emil Loriks analyze his audience?

The audience for this radio broadcast, made on a Monday evening at 8:30 P.M. was probably mostly farmers and farm families. (This time slot was perhaps selected by the Farmers Union for its regular broadcasts because farmers would be in from the fields by that time and able to listen.) As has already been pointed out in the sections of this study that dealt with the program and ideology of the Farmers Union, this Loriks oratory would have fit right in. The Farmers Union members were generally the smaller, less affluent farmers, and the organization found much about capitalism to criticize. As was explained in the South Dakota Union Farmer, Huey Long had been scheduled to speak at the South Dakota Farmers Union convention in October 1935. That Loriks regarded the Farmers Union and Long as allies has already been pointed out in the logical proof section.

Chapter II also detailed the isolationist stance of the Farmers Union. Crampton points out that in both the 1920s and 1930s, the Union's sentiment was isolationist, even as late as 1940. This, however, changed, when James G. Patton became Farmers Union head in 1941. According to Robert Thompson's history of the South Dakota Farmers
Union, Loriks underwent a similar change of view prior to American entry into World War II.53

By his use of the many loaded words, already cited, Loriks had perhaps accurately analyzed his audience as being anti-capitalist and strongly independent. The Farmers Union also placed a great emphasis on the family farmer, so his references to the sons being sent to fight a war might have had a particular appeal.

Adjustments to the audience

How well did the speaker make adjustments to his audience? In a radio speech, of course, the speaker cannot gain the immediate feedback that he can in a face to face speech where he can in turn fashion his remarks to fit that feedback. But the analysis just presented above suggests that Loriks did tailor his speech to meet what he perceived would be the expectations of his audience. As noted by the speaker, the news of Long's shooting had come only a few hours before he was scheduled to speak. He said he had discarded his prepared text in favor of a new speech.54 It seems likely that with the Long shooting being in the news, the audience might well want to hear about the incident, especially since the speaker asserted that Long and the Farmers Union were political allies. In no major way did Loriks' thinking appear to be at odds with the current Farmers Union thinking.
There were a few instances in this speech where Loriks made classical or historical references that would appear not to have been in the common knowledge of his listeners. Although the audience could certainly relate to Christ and Abraham Lincoln as bases of comparison, they might not have been familiar with Socrates, cited by Loriks early in the speech. Likewise the audience might not have been familiar with Arthur Brisbane, quoted by Loriks early in his speech.

**Identification with the audience**

The fourth question concerned the degree of speaker identification with his audience. There was not any obvious attempt by the speaker to employ first-person attempts to identify himself with his listeners. But there appears to be some subtle attempt to establish this link. Loriks identified Long with the South Dakota Farmers Union members by saying that Long had been invited to speak at the state convention later that fall. And by identifying himself with Long's "Share the Wealth" program, Loriks appears to have been trying to strike a responsive chord in his audience, which would probably have been inclined to believe in redistribution of wealth. The use, twice in the speech, of the line about "sons of American mothers," suggests that Loriks was trying to establish a strong personal link with his audience. It could be argued that
this appeal about "sons" could have fit any audience that was comprised of family members, but the fact that the Farmers Union was largely composed of family farmers suggests that this kind of rhetoric could have been a means of identification of the speaker with his audience.

The speaker also attempted to establish audience identification by citing testimony in support of Long from persons and sources that would have carried weight with his Farmers Union audience. Loriks quoted two national presidents, John A. Simpson and John Everson, as well as the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Social intelligence

The final question was to what extent the speaker demonstrated social intelligence, or the ability to select the proper ideas and the proper appeals for the occasion. This is directly related to audience analysis and audience adaptation, already discussed. In the examples already cited, it can be seen that Emil Loriks chose appeals and ideas that would be fitting for this occasion--delivering a eulogy to Huey Long. Loriks early established Long's direct link to the South Dakota Farmers Union by saying that he was to have been a convention speaker, and then compared the assassinated Long to such other martyred figures as Socrates, Christ and Lincoln, thus appearing to have attempted to establish his subject as a martyr for a cause.
It made a stronger appeal to be able to say that his subject was a martyr, rather than to say that he had just died, or just been murdered.

Assessment

Loriks made significant use of loaded words in this 1935 radio address. This extensive use of loaded words appeared to have reflected the speaker's audience analysis, his adjustments to the audience, his sense of identification with that audience, and his demonstration of social intelligence. The background presented about the Farmers Union program and ideology suggests that the speaker related to that pattern of thought.

Ethical Proof

There is an uncertain line separating ethical and emotional proof, but as Thonseen, Baird and Braden say, "Ethos (ethical proof) refers chiefly to what the speaker chooses to do; pathos (emotional proof), to what the listeners' reaction is." For a determination of character, the questions include whether the speaker focused attention on the probity of his character by associating either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated; by bestowing, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause; by linking the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous; by
removing or minimizing unfavorable expressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponent; by relying upon authority derived from his personal experience; and by creating the impression of complete sincerity.

The criteria for sagacity include whether the speaker used what is popularly called common sense, whether the speaker acted with tact and moderation, whether the speaker displayed good taste, whether the speaker revealed a broad familiarity with the broad interests of the day, and whether the speaker showed through his handling of speech materials that he had intellectual integrity and wisdom.

The questions to consider good will include whether the speaker captured the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience, whether the speaker identified himself properly with the hearers and their problems, whether the speaker proceeded with candor and straightforwardness, whether the speaker offered any necessary rebukes with tact and consideration, whether the speaker offset any personal reasons he might have had for giving the speech, and whether the speaker revealed without exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth.
Character

Association with virtue

The first question under character was whether the speaker associated either himself or his message with that which is virtuous and elevated. The answer is that while Loriks did not intrude himself directly into the situation, such as using "I" in the speech, he certainly appears to have associated his message with that which was virtuous. In the initial comparison made of Long to Socrates, Christ and Lincoln, Loriks sought immediately to put his message into a virtuous category. Likewise, the speaker's references to Long as a champion of the common people had a similar effect. At the end of the speech, the speaker also aligned himself with virtue by linking his cause to God and to Old Glory, and by pleading for "freedom, liberty, self-government and equality of opportunity for all."

Praise for cause

The next question was closely related; it deals with whether the speaker properly bestowed praise upon himself and his client. Again, the speaker did not place himself directly into the speech, but he certainly bestowed praise upon his client and his client's cause. He was copious in praise of Huey Long, as the excerpts already cited have established. In trying to establish Long as a friend of
the people, Loriks was also bestowing praise upon his client and his cause. The lines cited immediately above, about "freedom" were also an example of bestowing praise on his cause, as was the link established between his views and God and Old Glory.

Opponent's cause not virtuous

The other side of these first two areas was whether the speaker linked his opponent and his opponent's cause with what is not virtuous. The answer to this is yes. Loriks said early in the speech that Long was "maligned by powerful interests that rule this Nation because he dared to attack evils at their source." 56 Thus, Long was put in the position of opposing the evil forces that controlled the nation.

A further example came when Loriks spoke of Americans being held "in the economic chains of slavery," 57 again implying that the status quo, against which Long fought, was evil.

The discussion in the latter part of the speech about the impending war in Europe was a clear illustration of how Loriks appeared to identify those who would go to war with evil interests. As already noted, Loriks contended that it was capitalistic interests that had made the nation go to war in 1917. This device of portraying the opposition as evil, of course, related closely to the emotional proof
employed by the speaker, which has already been discussed. For it was through the use of the many emotional words and phrases that Long sought to portray his opponents' cause as evil and his own cause as virtuous.

Minimizing attacks on cause

The next question asked whether the speaker minimized unfavorable expressions of himself or of his cause previously established by his opponent. It does not appear reasonable to deal with any attacks that may have been made on the speaker, but rather to deal with the attacks that had been made on his subject, Huey Long. Loriks dealt with Long's opposition in an emotional way, glorifying Long, and attacking those who had attacked Long. But Loriks did not directly refute the widespread feelings of many that Long was a demagogue. Instead, he dealt with unfavorable expressions toward Long by seeking to identify him as a martyr, attacked by evil and greedy interests.

While Loriks did not deal with any attacks that might have been made on him, he did confront the attacks made on his cause, Long, by using emotional words to praise him and to denigrate Long's opponents.

Speaker authority

A further question was whether the speaker relied upon authority derived from his personal experience. As
noted earlier, Loriks said that it was his own knowledge and appraisal of news events that provided the basis for his speeches. His authority as a speaker was stated directly only once, when he said he would be derelict in his duty as Farmers Union president if he did not talk about Long. Otherwise, the authority in this speech is expressed indirectly, as when Loriks affirmed his belief in the Farmers Union by saying that Long and the Farmers Union were closely related.

The speaker in this radio talk presented a direct reliance on his authority only once, at the beginning, when he referred to his role as Farmers Union president. Otherwise, the reliance on authority was indirectly stated.

Apparent sincerity

The final question asked whether the speaker gave the impression of being sincere. On the basis of the evidence presented, it would appear that Loriks was sincere. He appeared to have believed in what he was saying. There was no reason for him not to say the things that he was saying in this speech, given the situation. (As already noted, some of these beliefs were later to change, as has already been seen from Robert Thompson's statement that Loriks abandoned his isolationist stance by the time the United States entered World War II.) But from all
indications, Loriks believed in what he was saying about Huey Long and war in Europe in 1935.

**Sagacity**

**Common Sense**

The first question in this section was whether the speaker used common sense. Mainly, he did. There was no observable lack of common sense. Of course, to those who did not like Huey Long, Loriks' praise of Long would not have appeared to be sound practical judgment, and in light of what scholars since Long's day have had to say about him, one might questions Loriks' common sense on this issue. But if Loriks is put into the framework of his day and of his probable audience, his comments in favor of Long and against pro-war interests would appear to have demonstrated common sense.

**Tact and moderation**

Closely related to common sense was whether or not the speaker acted with tact and moderation. Loriks' comments were generally tactful; there are no observed examples of any words that appeared to be an affront or embarrassing to his audience. The comments, as already have been cited, related the audience's probable frame of reference as far as support of Huey Long and isolationism are concerned.
One might, however, argue whether Loriks was completely moderate in this speech. He presented rather strong attacks on Long's opponents, saying that they had been "misrepresented, maligned and persecuted by powerful interests that rule this Nation," Loriks was likewise emphatic in his attacks on those who opposed his isolationist views, as in telling his audience to "BEWARE DOLLAR DIPLOMacy," and in asking, "Will the youth of today be led forth to another slaughter?" These points might have been more moderately stated. However, when one considers such other speakers of the day as Long, himself, and Father Coughlin, perhaps Loriks does not seem excessive in his rhetoric. On balance, the answer to the question would be that Loriks did act with tact and moderation, when one considers the ideology of his audience and some other rhetorical efforts of the day.

Good taste

The third question asked whether the speaker displayed good taste. There were no observable instances of poor taste or vulgarity in this speech. Rather, Loriks' references to higher beings and patriotic symbols like the flag would appear to demonstrate his wish to practice good taste.
Familiarity with interests

Fourth, reference was made to whether or not the speaker revealed a broad familiarity with the general interests of the day. The answer to this question was that he generally did, for in his many references and examples, Loriks demonstrated not only that he had studied the past, but also that he knew the present. After all, the major thrust of his address was Huey Long, who had been shot, and the situation in Europe and Africa. Loriks cited specific persons who were friends of the Farmers Union; he cited specific examples of comparison in Socrates, Christ, and Abraham Lincoln; and he cited specific opponents of World War I such as Senator Robert LaFollette.

Intellectual integrity

Finally, the question was asked whether the speaker showed that he possessed intellectual integrity and wisdom. This is closely related to the previous question in that intellectual wisdom would be at least in part dependent on a familiarity with issues of the day. There was the one instance, already cited, where Loriks referred to the "Prince of Peace" having walked in a particular place, when, in fact, He had not. This would not appear, however, to be basic, contrived intellectual dishonesty, but rather a simple lack of knowledge or faulty reference. The balance of the speech
would appear to have been an honest attempt to show intellectual integrity.

**Good will**

Balance in praise

The initial question to be analyzed concerning the speaker's good will was whether he captured the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience. In this speech, there were no direct examples of the speaker praising his audience. This was perhaps true because this was a radio speech and not a "live" presentation where there would be more audience rapport, and thus more reason to offer his praise to his audience.

Any audience praise was indirect. About the only connection that could be made to answer this question is that Loriks noted the affinity between Huey Long and the Farmers Union and also referred to the losses the Farmers Union had suffered in the deaths of Senator Cutting and Congressman Truax. Given that most of the audience was probably Farmers Union members, this might be an example of indirect audience praise. On the whole, however, this example probably provides a better illustration of emotional proof than of ethical proof. There appeared to have been a balance between too much and too little audience praise.
Identification with listeners

The second question used to determine good will was whether the speaker identified himself properly with his listeners and their problems. Again, this relates to both emotional and ethical proof. It would seem, though, that Loriks did identify himself with his listeners and their problems through such devices as saying that Long was a "champion" of the common man, and therefore, their friend, and stating his opposition to impending war by referring to "the sons of American mothers" being sent to fight.

There is another side to this question however. As already noted, some of Loriks' references, such as to Socrates and Arthur Brisbane, might not have been in the common knowledge of many of his listeners. So one might ask whether Loriks was fully identifying himself with his listeners.

So the overall answer to this question is that while Loriks showed some identification with his listeners, he did not in every instance.

Candor

The third question asked whether the speaker was candid and straightforward. The answer to this would appear to be that he was, as there seemed to be no instances where he was attempting to mislead his audience. Loriks did not, however, answer counter-arguments to the positions he was
taking, as in not dealing with the attacks made on Huey Long and with arguments in favor of American involvement in the war situation overseas. But this would not appear to indicate a basic lack of candor.

Rebukes

The fourth question asked whether the speaker offered any necessary rebukes with tact and consideration. Again, the approach was indirect, for Loriks was not directly rebuking his audience or anyone else. Rather, the rebukes were of third parties, or against those who had opposed Long, or who wanted the nation to get involved in war. These statements were strongly made, but were, nevertheless, indirect.

Offsetting personal reasons

The fifth question asked whether the speaker offset any personal reasons he might have had for giving the speech. He was running for re-election as Farmers Union president that October, and Huey Long was to have been a convention speaker for the South Dakota Farmers Union. So there would have been at least some reason for Loriks to align himself with Long, as he was to have been the convention's principal speaker.
Messenger of the truth

Finally, the question was asked whether the speaker revealed, without exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth. The answer is that the speaker perhaps did exhibit exhibitionism. His farm audience would have known about Christ and Lincoln, but they might not have been likewise familiar with Socrates and his cup of hemlock. Likewise, his audience might not have been familiar with the words of Arthur Brisbane or General Smedley Butler, quoted by Loriks. It would appear that some of these references are an indication of a limited degree of exhibitionism on Loriks' part.

Assessment

In this speech, the speaker made major use of emotional proof, primarily through the use of many loaded words. His audience analysis and identification were reflected through the use of these emotionally tinged words. This emotional proof also suggests the component of ethical proof, in that the speaker was attempting to identify his cause with that which was virtuous and his opponents' cause with that which was evil. The opponents' cause was largely described with the use of loaded words.

The logical proof consisted of inductive reasoning—the use of specific examples as basis for generalization. In many cases, however, the examples were not sufficient,
and Loriks did not refute the arguments of his day that were being made against his assertions. An important part of the speaker's logical proof stemmed from testimony, and from analogy, which at times was overdrawn.

The extensive use of emotional proof was perhaps effective, as was that of ethical proof. One can strongly question, however, how effective the logical proof was.

October 1936 Farmers Union Presidential Address

The Setting

This Emil Loriks speech was given to the South Dakota Farmers Union twenty-first annual convention in Sioux Falls, October 13-15, 1936. The major speaker at the convention was national Union president E. H. Everson of St. Charles, South Dakota, who, according to both the Argus Leader and Evening Huronite, spoke to more than 1,000 delegates at the opening session, and "was given a tremendous ovation." The Farmers Union publication, the Union Farmer, said in its convention coverage that more than 4,000 attended the second day session of the convention. In its October 14 (Wednesday) issue, the Argus Leader gave only a two-paragraph summary of Loriks' presidential speech, but there was no mention of whether he spoke Tuesday or Wednesday, nor was there any estimate of how many persons listened to his report.
Loriks was "overwhelmingly re-elected president" on Wednesday (October 14) afternoon, his only opponent being Fred Root of Powell, South Dakota.62

It is recorded in the Union Farmer that before Loriks gave his speech, his five-year-old daughter, Ruth Ann, sang a Farmers Union song which was broadcast over KS00.63 The same source did not indicate whether the address was also broadcast.

Logical Proof

Lines of reasoning

In this speech, Loriks pleaded with his listeners to remember the organization's preamble, which contained the words, "In order to obtain a better and more direct market for all products of the farm and to eliminate unnecessary expenses in buying our supplies, we have organized the Farmers... Union..."64 The speaker went on to criticize the American economic system and to discuss the three components of the Farmers Union strategy--education, cooperatives, and politics.65 A significant segment of his speech dealt with the "Hearst-Homestake Mining interest," against which the Farmers Union had done battle the year previous.66 He ended the speech by listing both the legislative goals of the Farmers Union and internal suggestions for running the organization.67
To develop his positions in this speech, the speaker began by referring to the Farmers Union preamble, which was a basis for his later remarks critical of the capitalistic system, and for a listing of the Union's legislative goals and the internal needs of the organization. This topical plan of organization appears to have been a good choice.

Assertions

There were two major assertions in this 1936 speech. The first was that the economic system had failed and was thus being transformed to a new step of evolution—cooperation. In support of this assertion Loriks offered three subassertions, keyed to the Farmers Union approach. These subassertions were that education came first, that cooperatives were being organized, and that political or legislative solutions were being offered. (The assertions were not all developed as they were presented, as there were two areas of the speech in which the speaker dealt with the educational activities of the Union, and the development of the political-legislative point did not come until late in the speech."

The second major assertion was that "those who own America" had only the profit motive in mind.

The conclusion of the speech, which perhaps could be labeled as a third assertion, was that the organization
should remind itself of the fundamental principles upon which it was founded.

Methods of development

Assertion I

In support of the first assertion that "Democracy has not failed. It is our economic system that has failed," and that it "is now in the process of transformation to the next step in its economic evolution, namely COOPERATION," Loriks spoke of the three components of the Farmers Union program, Education, Cooperatives, and Politics.

To develop his sub-assertion that much was happening on the educational front, Loriks stated, "As the name implies, education comes first! 1936 has been a red letter year in our Educational work." In support of this statement, he referred to three junior camps in the state, two educational meetings of Farmers Union cooperatives--one at Watertown and the other at Sioux Falls, radio addresses that had dealt with cooperatives, and distribution of literature.

The examples of support for the education point were not all made in one place in the speech. Near the end of the speech, he talked about the establishing of a headquarters and exhibits at the State Fair. The speaker also mentioned the "success" of the junior camps, and the
cooperation of the Northern States Cooperative League with
the Farmers Union, and also cited a need for "cooperative
education," saying, "The Farmers Union must never permit
itself to be swallowed up by some Consumer Movement. We
must sponsor and promote both consumer and producer
coop eration and maintain a balanced system."73

In developing his second sub-assertion about orga-
nizing cooperatives, Loriks said, "In this year 1936 we
have not only talked cooperation. We have gone out in the
field and built Farmers Union Cooperatives."74 He explained
that the cooperatives (not named in the speech) were
affiliated with the organization's central brokerage company
at Sioux Falls, Sioux City, Watertown and Mitchell.75 These
cooperatives were organized "so far without one cent of
cooperative finance from the government," Loriks said, and
he explained that the cooperatives were federated, purchas-
ing cooperatively through "our own Cooperative Wholesale."77

Loriks also offered an analogy to Scandinavia's
cooperatives in developing his material about American
coop eratives. In fact, he did this twice in the speech,
the first time in the introduction, when he said:

We behold in Northern Europe, on the Scandinavian
Peninsula, a race of people who have developed the
cooperative principle to such an extent that it has
elevated living standards to the highest, banished
slums and illiteracy, provided social security.
They are building a new social and economic order
within the old structure of capitalism and doing
a beautiful job of it. They are doing it without violence, without bloodshed or the sacrifice of human lives.

Later in the speech, Loriks also cited the example of Scandinavia:

Today, the eyes of the World (a World torn by economic dissolution and international strife) are on the Scandinavian Peninsula. There we behold a Cooperative Commonwealth of the highest order. There we behold a race of people who have secured "The Greatest Good for the Greatest Number," where they have practically banished unemployment, illiteracy, slums and poverty. Where living standards of the common people are high and human welfare receives first consideration.

To further develop his point about cooperatives, Loriks said, "South Dakota being chiefly an agricultural state, it is obvious that the Farmers Union should sponsor both consumer and producer cooperatives and that is what we are doing. We are essentially producers and we are also the chief consumer." Reasserting the point made later in the speech when he dealt with education, Loriks said:

Would it be logical to abandon our Farmers Union and producer cooperation and simply join some Consumer Organization? It would seem obvious that the Farmers Union should develop both types of cooperation and seek to balance the two. When we surrender our bargaining power, we likewise surrender our economic power.

After mentioning political parties as "serving the dominant economic interests," Loriks goes on to conclude:

We must build a new economic order through cooperation. We can build this right within the present structure, without violence, without bloodshed and without the sacrifice of human lives . . . .
Cooperation must be carried on clear through. We must have a vision, a clear perception of the final objective, an understanding of what we hope to accomplish.

To illustrate his point about vision, Loriks told the story of three men who were working on a large building and were asked what they were doing. One said he was mixing mud, another said he was wheeling bricks for $3.00 a day, and the third said he was building a cathedral. "That man had vision," Loriks said. "The cooperatives who think in terms of building a new economic order are possessed of vision. They are the ones who will ultimately change society," Loriks said.

The speaker then made a personal reference to himself as a "buck private in the cooperative movement," who will do all his marketing and buying through the Farmers Union. Loriks cited, as a successful example of cooperatives, the Scandinavian countries.

The need for political effort was referred to briefly as the speaker developed his ideas about cooperatives, but was not developed in detail until near the close. After saying that "the political parties have been, in my estimation, a curse to our democratic form of government," the speaker went on to deliver the following attack:

Political patronage under our system of political parties has promoted a form of "gangster" government with rival gangs contending for the
privilege of looting the public treasury. It becomes principally a fight for the "spoils" of office.

The speaker then gave specific examples of legislation that the Farmers Union was promoting—a nonpartisan primary law, a graduated land tax to discourage large holdings of land, a test of the constitutionality of various court decisions as the South Dakota Union had done the previous year in petitioning the national Farmers Union convention to challenge the constitutionality of the Federal Reserve and the National Bank Act, national monetary reform legislation, and enactment of the Sims Bond Currency Act in South Dakota to provide small denomination bonds that would serve as an additional medium of exchange. Loriks also referred briefly to the upcoming November 1936 elections, saying that it was the support of "you folks back home" that "made it possible for the Union to win."

To support the first assertion that the economy, which had failed, was evolving into a new system, Loriks cited the specific examples of Farmers Union efforts in education, cooperatives and legislation. The educational subassertion was supported by multiple examples of Farmers Union efforts. In dealing with the cooperatives, Loriks made brief reference to cooperative ventures, and then offered an analogy to cooperatives in Scandinavia. The supporting material about Farmers Union legislative efforts
came near the end of the speech, rather than at the point where the assertion was presented. There was also an assertion, not supported, that political parties had promoted "gangster" government.

Assertion II

The second assertion that those who owned America supposedly had only the profit motive in mind was tied by the speaker to both his political and cooperative sub-assertions already presented. In laying his groundwork for the assertion that those who controlled the nation had only the profit motive in mind, the speaker said:

We must run our own business and operate it at cost. The service motive to replace the motive for profit.
And remember this--Dominant political interests have always controlled the political machine regardless of political party.

The speaker had said earlier in this speech, "Capitalism has been compared to the slot machine. He who plays the slot machine long enough will inevitably go broke. The profit system has already busted most of us. It has put us down the economic gutter." 

Loriks continued, "You and I (the 90 percent of the people) should be dominant but we can never become that so long as we play the capitalistic slot machine, so long as we patronize the exploiting system."
The speaker then was ready to state his assertion:

Those who own America (the Morgans, the Hearsts and the Mellons) are the dominant economic interests and they also control politics. They are the exponents of the profit system. They make laws, they declare war—ANYTHING FOR PROFIT. 94

The speaker then developed his assertion by citing the example of the "Hearst-Homestake Mining interests" in South Dakota. 95 Terming Hearst as "America's Fascist No. 1, with the largest newspaper empire in the World to promote the selfish avaricious cause of a decadent capitalism" 96 Loriks said that "Hearst is leading America on the road to Fascism, to capitalistic dictatorship." 97

The speaker then localized his assertion about Hearst-Homestake, by saying that the mine was "sucking $18,000,000 to $19,000,000 out of South Dakota annually, more than Jefferson paid Napoleon for the entire Louisiana Purchase." 98 Loriks then referred to the legislative battle the year before, saying "You were fighting the biggest menace to democracy in America today. Your fight was just a skirmish on one front." 99

Referring to "the gas barrage emanating from this world's largest newspaper empire and radio broadcasting chain" Loriks said, "These are the weapons with which dominant economic interests control politics plus millions of campaign contributions." 100
The second assertion was mainly supported by sub-assertions, and by an analogy comparing capitalism to a slot machine. Just as those who play the slot machine go broke, so would those who are in a system of capitalism go broke. The Farmers Union approach of cooperatives and legislation was presented as a way out of the problem.

Assertion III

The last major assertion of the speech is this, "LET US CONTINUE TO REMIND OURSELVES OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES FOR WHICH THE FARMERS UNION WAS FOUNDED." The speaker urged a united front by the Union and suggested that "for economy, efficiency, and service and to coordinate the work of the Farmers Union, I would recommend that as soon as expedient, we consolidate our various Farmers Union Offices and activities in one place."

Assessment

The type of reasoning in this speech was inductive, as was true in the 1935 radio address. There were no recognized instances of deduction.

Loriks provided multiple examples to support his three sub-assertions dealing with education, cooperatives, and legislation, in the development of the first assertion about the failure of the capitalistic system and the transformation of that system. The speaker cited specific
educational projects of the Union. He also referred to the establishment of cooperatives, although not by name, and explained how these cooperatives were affiliated. The speaker also listed specific legislation and political activity that the Farmers Union was involved in.

The evidence cited seems sufficient to justify the conclusions reached in the three sub-assertions. But this is not true for other parts of the speech. Loriks did not prove the initial part of his first assertion—that the economic system has failed. That was offered as a "given." The second part of the assertion, that the system was being transformed, was much more adequately supported through the speaker's examples about education, cooperatives and politics.

The second major assumption about those who own America having only the profit motive in mind, was likewise not adequately supported. Instead, the speaker offered further assertions—that the dominant interests had controlled politics, that capitalism was like a slot machine, that the system was exploitive. He did mention the names of Morgan, Hearst and Mellon, but did not specify just what they had done that was wrong. There was some evidence given about the size of the Homestake Operation in South Dakota, and a basis of comparison made of that operation to the cost of the Louisiana Purchase.
The final assertion, or conclusion, and perhaps it should just be labeled as that, was a plea for the Union audience to remind themselves of the organization's principles and to reorganize the group's offices and activities. Again, this assertion was not supported by any specific evidence.

On the whole, then, except for the multiple examples given to support the three sub-assertions under the first generalization, there was not sufficient evidence for Loriks' case.

As was true in the first speech, Loriks also did not deal with counter-arguments that could have been offered in refutation. What about those who believed that the economic system was good and had accomplished that which it was supposed to? If he had offered more examples in support of his viewpoint, Loriks would probably have been able to deal, at least indirectly, with counterarguments to his case.

Loriks made major use of examples in this speech—with the specific citations of Farmers Union activity. He also had the one illustration of how vision could be described, using the story about the three men working on the large building. There was also one instance of analogy, when the speaker cited the development of
cooperatives in Scandinavia as a reason why they should be developed in the United States.

The evidence used to support the three sub-assertions provided for a logical development of that part of Loriks' case. However, one could question whether the rest of the speech had a logical development because there was so little evidence offered. And one could also ask whether the situation in the Scandinavian countries and the United States was truly analogous.

There were no apparent inconsistencies presented in this speech. All of the evidence the speaker chose to use supported his points; he just did not deal with the counter-arguments. And there were no examples of factual error as there was in the 1935 radio speech.

As to whether the forms of support were the best choices, it would seem that the multiple examples given in support of the point about the Farmers Union program probably were. The members should have been familiar with the educational and cooperative activities as they should have touched the lives of a number of Farmers Union members. The members likewise should have been familiar with the various pieces of legislation cited by the speaker.

Probably the Homestake Mine situation was familiar to the audience as the organization had, in 1935, been
largely responsible for the enactment of an ore tax against Homestake.

The forms of support may not have been the best choices in the instances where the assertions were largely unsupported. The speaker needed more adequate proof for much of his speech. How had the economic system failed, who was hurt and how were they hurt, for example. And in the conclusion, the speaker might have offered specific evidence to support his plea for consolidating the Union office and activities.

Emotional Proof

Loaded words

In this presidential address, Loriks again used a number of loaded words. In the introduction, he said, "As mankind evolved from Savagery to Barbarism to Slavery to Feudalism to Capitalism, it is now in the process of transformation to the next step in its economic evolution, namely COOPERATION!" 103

As the support for the educational and cooperative activities of the Union was given in a neutral manner, there appeared to be no further examples of loaded words until Loriks made the transition into the second assertion. But in preparing to develop his assertion about those who
own America having only the profit motive in mind, the speaker said:

The time is here—the hours has struck, when we must decide what to do. . . . Shall we flounder aimlessly on the drift with the current until we are engulfed in the swirling current of fascism? Capitalism has been compared to the slot machine. He who plays the slot machine long enough will inevitably go broke. . . . They make the mistake of thinking that some human Messiah is going to lead them out of the wilderness; then [sic] the truth is—the job is ours.

The second assertion was stated in these emotional words:

Those who own America (the Morgans, the Hearsts and the Mellons) are the dominant economic interest and they also control politics. They are the exponents of the profit system. They make laws, they declare war—ANYTHING FOR PROFIT.

He further elaborated:

We have had a taste of it in South Dakota—how the dominant economic interest (The Hearst-Homestake mining interest) situated in one county has dominated our State for half a century.

Today we behold Hearst in the role of America's Fascist No. 1, with the largest newspaper empire in the World to promote the selfish avaricious cause of a decadent capitalism. Hearst is leading America on the road to Fascism, to capitalistic dictatorship.

South Dakota is helping to nourish this beast whose tentacles reach into every corner of our land. Do you know that they are sucking $18,000,000 to $19,000,000 out of one Gold Mine in South Dakota annually? . . . Do you know this gold is helping to nourish the Hearst Octopus to finance his poison propaganda to be spread through the columns of the largest newspaper empire in the World plus a large national chain of broadcasting stations Hearst owns?

You members of the Farmers Union, when you fought the Hearst-Homestake interests, were not fighting just a local enemy—you were fighting the biggest
menace to democracy in America today. Your fight was just a skirmish on one front.

Do you have the courage to face such a formidable enemy or will we succumb to the gas barrage emanating from this world's largest newspaper empire and radio broadcasting chain?

The speaker also used some loaded words in dealing with the Farmers Union involvement in politics, first by attacking political parties. Distinguishing between legislation and "politics," he said:

The political parties have been, in my estimation, a curse to our democratic form of government.

Political patronage under our system of political parties has promoted a form of "gangster" government with rival gangs contending for the privilege of looting the public treasury. It became principally a fight for the "spoils" of office.

In discussing the need, as perceived by the Farmers Union, for a graduated land tax, he said, "We cannot believe that God Almighty created this World to be owned by Insurance and Loan Corporations and that our people should be homeless serfs, share croppers and tenants."

The speaker did employ loaded words in this presidential address, but they were mainly confined to his assertion about the allegedly greedy economic interests and to his comments about politics. He used straightforward language in developing the sub-assertions about educational and cooperative activities of the Farmers Union.
Audience analysis

The question then was asked as to how well Emil Loriks analyzed his audience. The audience consisted of Farmers Union members from the state attending the convention in Sioux Falls. Presumably, most of the members would have subscribed to the Farmers Union program and ideology, as described in the second chapter. Loriks' speech related to this program with its attacks on capitalism, and its praise of the Farmers Union program of education, cooperatives and legislation. This speech also contained a reference to farm tenants; a key Farmers Union belief was in family farm ownership. Loriks' use of loaded words also probably exemplified his audience analysis. These would have been words that the speaker perhaps felt would appeal to his audience, for there can be more of an impact if things are said in an emotional way, rather than in a neutral way.

Adjustments to the audience

The next question dealt with how well the speaker made adjustments to his audience. It must be emphasized that Loriks was, at this convention, running for re-election as state president. There was one opposing candidate. In the final rundown, Loriks was overwhelmingly re-elected, of course, but he quite possibly had the election in mind as he gave his speech.
Again, the use of loaded words would appear to be part of the adjustment to the audience process. So also was the speaker's use of examples that should have been common knowledge to his listeners. In this category are the educational and cooperative examples he used, as well as the listing of legislation, and the analogy of the United States cooperative movement to that in Scandinavia. There appeared to be no references that his listeners might have found obscure.

Identification with the audience

The fourth question dealt with the degree of speaker identification with the audience. Much more so in this speech than in the 1935 radio address, Loriks used personal references to establish a link between himself and the audience.

Early in the speech, in speaking of the Union, he said, "We are of age."\(^{109}\) This was followed immediately by, "I am sure we all love that name, FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION."\(^{110}\)

Another example of identification came with, "Sometimes I think we are long on speech making and short on actual accomplishment."\(^{111}\) This was followed by another use of the first person plural:

We will have to travel a great deal faster in the future than we have during our entire
past history if we are going to save civilization. We are not traveling an uncharted course.\textsuperscript{112}

In speaking of the Farmers Union building cooperatives, Loriks said, "Despite the most unprecedented drought and crop failure in the history of our state, we have started two Farmers Union Cooperatives. We have started to build a NEW ECONOMIC ORDER..."\textsuperscript{113}

Also in his material about cooperatives, Loriks spent several sentences in establishing himself as a user of cooperatives, which would also provide audience identification:

As a buck private in the cooperative movement, I have always adhered to this philosophy, call it blind unreasoning loyalty if you will, that I will market through my coop and buy my supplies through my coop regardless of chiseling tactics of the opposition. I will never chase the penny sucker bait laid out for me by the exploiting interests. My aim is to market all my grain through the Farmers Union, all my livestock through the Farmers Union and to purchase my supplies so far as possible through the Farmers Union. Personally, I am able to do this to the extent of several hundred dollars per month... I am helping to build a New Economic Order.\textsuperscript{114}

Another example of the speaker's identifying with his audience is found in this statement, "You and I (the 90 percent of the people) should be dominant..."\textsuperscript{115}

A number of personal pronouns were employed in the section about Hearst economic interests:

We have had a taste of it in South Dakota... Today we behold Hearst in the role of America's Fascist No. 1...
Do you know that they are sucking $18,000,000 to $19,000,000? . . .

You members of the Farmers Union, when you fought the Hearst-Homestake interests, were not fighting just a local enemy--you were fighting the biggest menace to democracy in America today. Your fight was just a skirmish on one front.

Do we have the courage to face such a formidable enemy or will we succumb to the gas barrage? . . .

You and I have surrendered these weapons to the enemy. Our job is to regain them.\[116\]

Most of the material about Farmers Union legislation was phrased in terms of "we." For example, "We believe individual home ownership is a guarantee of stability of any government," and "we will renew our efforts at the coming National Convention to have this carried out."\[117\]

The speaker also put the Farmers Union effort to enact gold tax in 1935 into personal terms, as a way of identification with the audience?

We are not unmindful of the fact that since the smoke cleared from the last Session and the Farmers Union march to victory, the opposition has never left one stone unturned in their efforts to eliminate our members in the Legislature. After November 3rd, we will know our strength, however. Our success depends chiefly upon you folks back home as it did in the last session. It was your support that made it possible for the Union to win.\[118\]

The conclusion contained these words, "LET US CONTINUE TO REMIND OURSELVES OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES FOR WHICH THE FARMERS UNION WAS FOUNDED."\[119\]

To a great extent the speaker appeared to have employed personal pronouns as a means to identify himself with the audience. Another aspect of his identification
with the audience was his use of the multiple examples, already cited, about Farmers Union work in education and cooperatives, examples to which the audience should have been able to relate.

Social intelligence

The final question in evaluating emotional proof was the extent to which the speaker demonstrated social intelligence, or the ability to select the proper ideas and the proper appeals for the occasion. As already established, Loriks did present assertions and examples proper to this occasion. After all, he was trying to "sell" his audience on the merits of the Farmers Union and its program, so it would be proper to use audience-centered examples. A presidential address could be expected to offer a summary of what has gone on before and an inspiring note for what lies ahead. Loriks' address fulfilled these two requirements.

Assessment

In this presidential speech, Emil Loriks again made effective use of emotional proof. While there were perhaps fewer instances of loaded words in this speech than in the radio address of 1935, there were still many instances of the use of loaded words. This extensive use of emotionally-tinged words was an important element of the
speaker's audience analysis, his adjustments to the audience, his identification with that audience, and his demonstration of social intelligence. Moreover, in this speech, an important aspect of Loriks' identification with the audience lay in his extensive use of personal pronouns to establish a link between himself and his listeners. The speaker's use of familiar examples and the analogy to the Scandinavian countries was also a means of establishing audience identification and also showed adaptation and adjustment to the audience.

Ethical Proof

Character

Association with virtue

The first question was whether the speaker associated either himself or his message with that which is virtuous. There is one clear example of this when Loriks invoked the deity, in saying "We cannot believe that God Almighty created the World to be owned by Insurance and Loan Corporations. . . ."**120**

Another Loriks technique to associate his message (and indirectly himself) with virtue, was found in his recitation of a segment of the Farmers Union preamble at the beginning of the speech, and then a subsequent
reference to "carry out the Preamble and Purposes of the Farmers Union set forth in our Constitution."\textsuperscript{121}

Another aspect of linking his message with that which was virtuous was the citing of the multiple examples of the Farmers Union work in education and cooperatives. Presumably, these programs were of direct benefit to members, so this listing would help build the idea that what he had to say was virtuous.

Still another link to virtue may have been provided by the two references to Scandinavia, and its supposed prosperity as the result of its program of cooperatives.

Praise to cause

The next question was whether the speaker properly bestowed praise upon himself and his client. The examples of education and cooperative building by the Farmers Union would appear to demonstrate that the speaker was bestowing praise upon his cause. In the speech, Loriks recited the accomplishments of the Union in education, cooperatives and legislation, and also looked to the future by challenging his audience to do more. Implicit in all this was the assumption that what the Farmers Union was doing was good, and therefore, should be continued, and even expanded.
Opponents' cause not virtuous

To look at the other side of these first two questions, the question was asked whether the speaker linked his opponent and his opponent's cause with that which is not virtuous. While he did not deal directly with those who might have been opposing the Farmers Union organization as such, he did deal emphatically and negatively with the capitalistic interests which the Union was opposing. The loaded words used to describe the Hearst interests have already been cited, as was the statement that those who owned America were the dominant interests and did "ANYTHING FOR PROFIT." The Hearst gold mine was compared to an octopus whose tentacles were sucking up the money of South Dakota. Hearst was accused, moreover, of using "poison propaganda to be spread through the columns of the largest newspaper empire in the world." Almost all of the Loriks loaded words used in conjunction with the capitalistic interest appeared to have the effect of portraying his opponents negatively.

Minimizing attacks on cause

The next question asked was whether the speaker minimized unfavorable expressions of himself or of his cause previously established by his opponent. The only direct opponent that there might have been in this context was the man who was running against Loriks for the Farmers
Union presidency, but no records have been provided as to what this person might have said, and Loriks did not, even indirectly, refer to this election contest. Nor does it seem reasonable to deal with any attacks that might have been made on the Farmers Union, for one does not know what these may have been.

So this question does not seem to apply to this speech as there were no direct, or even, indirect, references to any previous unfavorable expressions.

Speaker authority

A further question was whether the speaker relied upon authority derived from his personal experience. It has already been noted that Loriks based his speeches on his own knowledge and appraisal of news events. In connection with one of the references made in this speech, that to cooperatives in Scandinavia, it can be noted that Loriks had devoted a February 1936 WNAX radio speech completely to that topic. In this radio speech, Loriks said he was basing his comments on a report, published in The Cooperative Builder of Superior, Wisconsin, by Pastor L. V. Kofod, who had recently toured North European Cooperatives. So there may have been an indirect reliance on authority on the speaker's part, in that he had presented an entire broadcast on Scandinavian cooperatives earlier in the year, and this broadcast might well have been heard by a number of
the members of the 1936 convention audience. But the speaker did not directly invoke this authority.

Another indirect reliance on authority might have come in the speaker's reference to being a "buck private" in the cooperative and the statement that he sought to do his marketing and buying through the Farmers Union. The implication might well be that if the president does this, then the membership ought to do this as well.

So the reliance on authority in the speech was indirect.

Apparent sincerity

The final question is whether the speaker gave the impression of being sincere. On the basis of the available evidence which has been cited so far, it would appear that he was. The theme of the critique of capitalism was repeated in others of Loriks' speeches, so there would appear to be a consistency, and also sincerity, demonstrated in these remarks. And as president of the Union, he would have had a genuine and sincere pride in the accomplishments, cited in the speech, of his organization.

Sagacity

Common sense

The first question used in analyzing sagacity is whether the speaker used common sense. The answer to this
would appear to be that he did. The strongest stand taken in the speech was in the section critical of capitalism and those who had benefited from it, like the Hearsts and the Mellons. These attacks might seem extreme to some, but to his audience, these remarks would have been an indication of common sense. Taken in the context of the audience he was addressing, the Farmers Union, and the time in which he spoke, the Great Depression, the remarks would appear to have been of the common sense variety.

Tact and moderation

Closely tied to common sense is the question of whether or not the speaker acted with tact and moderation. Loriks' comments were tactful; there were no observed examples of words that were an affront or an embarrassment to his audience.

The comments citing the accomplishments of the Farmers Union in education, cooperatives and legislation were moderate, with the exception of part of the legislative section, where the speaker used loaded words to criticize political patronage as a form of "gangster" government. But this was only one comment in an entire section.

Less moderate, however, was the development of the assertion about the capitalist who allegedly acted only with the profit motive in mind. Here, the familiar Farmers Union phrases about the Fascism of Hearst and the dominance
of the Homestake Mine in South Dakota were used. And the comparison of Homestake Mine to the tentacles of an octopus was hardly a moderate comment.

On balance, this speech demonstrated moderation in some parts and lack of moderation in others.

Good taste

The third question asks whether the speaker displayed good taste. There were no observable instances of poor taste or vulgarity in the speech. In fact, his one reference to the deity would tend to suggest that the speaker was attempting to keep things on a high plane.

Familiarity with interests

Reference was made to whether or not the speaker revealed a broad familiarity with the general interests of the day. The answer to this is that he did. Loriks demonstrated familiarity with Farmers Union concerns of 1936 and with news events of his time such as the Homestake Ore tax battle, in which the Union had played a major role. The financial interests of the nation like the Hearsts and the Mellons and the Morgans, cited by Loriks, certainly were a source of concern during the Depression. These would have been issues and interest of concern and of knowledge to the audience. And it also seems likely that there was
at least some awareness of the cooperative movement in Scandinavia, referred to twice by the speaker.

Intellectual integrity

Finally, the question was asked whether the speaker showed that he was possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom. This relates to the previous question in that wisdom would have to be based on a familiarity with issues of the day. One might ask whether the speaker was completely intellectually honest in presenting such a one-sided view of capitalism and the moneyed interests. Could they have been all that bad? It probably made for greater dramatic effect to present an emotional, one-sided position, but intellectual honesty might have indicated a more moderate position. So while the speaker had wisdom, he may not have had complete intellectual honest in development of one major assertion.

Good will

Balance in praise

The initial question asked under good will concerned the speaker's balance between too much and too little praise of his audience. The examples of praising the audience in this speech were indirect, mainly by use of "we" to point to organization accomplishments and hope for the future. By saying that "we will do this," he seemed to be making his
audience his partner, which would be an indirect way of praising his audience. There was also speaker praise for the Union's preamble, its accomplishments in South Dakota, and for its future work. Since the listeners were Farmers Union members, this would have represented indirect praise. There would have appeared to be a proper balance between too much and too little praise, with the praise being accomplished by indirection.

Identification with listeners

The second question used to determine good will was whether the speaker identified himself properly with his listeners and their problems. There has already been discussion, together with examples, in the emotional proof section. Loriks accomplished this identification in large part through his extensive use of personal pronouns—"I, we, and you." The reference to being a "buck private" in the cooperative movement was also probably an attempt to establish identification with his listeners.

In this speech, there were no possibly unfamiliar historical or classical examples, as there were in the 1935 radio address.

The overall answer is that Loriks did identify himself properly with his listeners and their problems.
Candor

The third question asked whether the speaker was candid and straightforward. The answer would appear to be that he generally was. There were no instances where the speaker seemed to be trying to mislead his audience. He did, of course, launch a one-sided attack on the excesses of capitalism and the financial interests of the nation, but for that particular audience, that would not have represented any particular attempt to mislead, as the audience would have been predisposed to think in that way. However, it might have shown a greater fairness if the speaker had presented, or at least acknowledge, the counter-arguments that could have been made to his positions.

Rebukes

The fourth question asked whether the speaker offered any necessary rebukes with tact and consideration. There were no direct rebukes in the speech. Rather, the rebukes were indirect, made of such third parties as Farmers Union adversaries and moneyed interests, as represented by Hearst interests. These indirect comments were, however, strongly stated.

Offsetting personal reasons

The fifth question asked whether the speaker offset any personal reasons he might have had for giving the speech.
Emil Loriks was running for re-election as Farmers Union president at this convention, so it seems likely that he wanted to consolidate and expand his support. But the listing of Farmers Union accomplishments was done in such a moderate and tactful way that the speaker did not appear to be trying to overly exploit the situation. Moreover, the attacks on the moneyed interests were a part of Farmers Union ideology, so they did not represent any over-glorification of personal considerations.

**Messenger of truth**

Finally, the question was asked whether the speaker revealed, without exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth. In this speech, Loriks did not appear to show off, as he had in the earlier speech, by using little known historical and classical references. The references in this speech should have been understandable to the listeners, so the answer is that the speaker did reveal himself as a messenger of the truth without exhibitionism.

**Assessment**

The logical proof in this 1936 presidential address was the most effective in the recitation of multiple examples about the accomplishments of the Farmers Union in the areas of education, cooperatives and legislation. The
logical proof was weakest for the second assertion—dealing with the financial interests and their alleged sole concern with profits. Only further assertions were given as proof, except for the use of a statistic of how much money the Homestake Gold Mine was taking from South Dakota.

The speaker also made effective use of emotional proof, particularly in the use of loaded words and in adjusting to and analyzing the audience, and in identifying himself with that audience. There was a greater use of personal pronouns than there was in the earlier radio address. This may be due in part to the fact that Loriks was speaking to a "live" audience this time.

Loriks also made effective use of ethical proof in the aspects of character, sagacity and good will. He painted his cause as virtuous and his opponents' as not virtuous, and he was tactful and moderate while demonstrating his familiarity with concerns of the day. He might have demonstrated greater intellectual integrity had he dealt with counterarguments to his position. A willingness to deal with counterarguments would also have indicated a greater degree of candor. The speaker had strong audience identification and showed no tendencies of exhibitionism.
October 1937 Farmers Union Presidential Address

The Setting

Emil Loriks spoke to the South Dakota Farmers Union twenty-second annual convention held at Huron, South Dakota, October 12-14, 1937. National Union president J. G. Everson, as he had been the year previous, was the South Dakota convention's featured speaker. The Evening Huronite reports that Everson addressed the convention twice on Wednesday, October 13, the convention's key day, once in the afternoon and again in the evening. The Huronite noted an opening day registration of 395, with the additional note that the sessions were open to the public. Loriks spoke Tuesday afternoon, October 12, but no summary was provided in either the Huronite or the Argus Leader. Likewise, no estimate, except for the registration figure, was discovered for Loriks audience.

For national president Everson's talk Wednesday night, the Huron College Auditorium was "filled to capacity," according to the South Dakota Union Farmer, "despite the strenuous times, crop failures and drought." Both the Huronite and Argus reported that there had been pre-convention expectations of "a ruction in the serenity that has marked convention sessions." But the trouble did not materialize. "Although pre-convention gossip had pointed to spirited opposition to Loriks and
other Union officers in their bid for re-election, the incumbents were returned to office by margins of approximately 3 to 1. Loriks' re-election victory must have seemed especially sweet. As both the Argus and Huronite reported:

Loriks, opposed by Roy Brassel of Madison, was given a staunch vote of support by the 1937 convention and in addition to being re-elected president, was chosen to represent the South Dakota Farmers Union at the coming national convention.

Logical Proof

Lines of reasoning

After introductory comments, Loriks began this 1937 address by saying, "HUMANITY AT THE CROSSROADS," and then adding the Bryanesque, "Shall we crucify mankind on the Cross of Profits or can we save mankind through economic democracy?" Carrying the Bryan theme further a few paragraphs later, Loriks added, "YOU have carried the CROSS. You know what it is to wear a crown of thorns--You have tasted the bitter cup." He went on to describe "conditions of scarcity," and then to offer examples of Farmers Union cooperative and legislative programs. The speech ended with an extended series of concluding statements, beginning with these words, "Let us consecrate and rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles and objectives of the Farmers Union, enunciated thirty-five years ago."
Assertions

Together with the series of concluding statements in this speech, there were three major assertions. The first assertion was that humanity was at a crossroads. The terms of the struggle were expressed in a world context, a national Farmers Union context, and a South Dakota context. The next assertion was that the country was wandering in the desert of economic scarcity. The last assertion was that cooperation should be regarded as the Union's primary program, with legislation supplementary. Despite this assertion, the speaker spent approximately four and one-half pages of his speech developing the idea that the Union needed to be active politically and cited specific legislative examples.

The conclusion, a series of assertions based on the speech, was this:

Let us consecrate and rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles and objectives of the Farmers Union, enunciated thirty-five years ago.
Let us remember the words of John A. Simpson--the Farmers Union must stand on two legs--Cooperation and Legislation.
Let us continue to fight for drought relief to meet the immediate needs of our people.
Let us continue to fight to restore home ownership and meanwhile to improve conditions of farm tenancy.
Let us promote our educational program for that is the foundation of all cooperative or legislative achievement.
Let us build membership in 1938.
Methods of development

Assertion I

The initial assertion, "HUMANITY AT THE CROSSROADS," was stated immediately after an introductory sentence about the South Dakota Farmers Union observing its twenty-second birthday. Loriks immediately followed his assertion with, "Shall we crucify mankind on the Cross of Profits or can we save mankind through economic democracy?"

Loriks put this assertion first into a world context, stating "This tragic World drama of destruction is being enacted on three continents, Europe, Africa and Asia," and that the other side of the drama was portrayed by the Cooperative Commonwealths of northern Europe, . . . who have through Cooperative Development as embodied in the fundamental aims and purposes of the Farmers Union, lifted themselves from destitution to the highest standards of living of the average citizen anywhere in the World today.

After citing the Scandinavian example, Loriks mentioned the founding of the Farmers Union by Newt Gresham thirty-five years before. "Today (this year 1937) the thirty-fifth anniversary of this momentous event, it is well to consecrate ourselves, to rededicate ourselves to those high and noble principles for which the Union was founded. . . ."
The Union was then put into its South Dakota context. "Twenty-two years ago in South Dakota, those original purposes, aims and objectives were written into our own Constitution... READ IT! MEMORIZE IT!" That constitution was then compared to the Rock of Gibraltar, "untarnished and unsullied by the vicious attacks of demagogues and charlatans, imposters and 'fake medicine men' with their quack cure-alls and nostrums."

The struggle that was the basis of Loriks' assertion was referred to in its South Dakota manifestations:

Since we won that decisive victory over the economic dictatorship that ruled our own State for fifty years, in our program to tax the rich and powerful, we see those forces worming right into our own Union itself, to undermine, to checkmate, to neutralize or destroy it.

Since we entered the Cooperative field to check the profit system, we have also stepped on the toes of powerful interests who are likewise fighting us to a finish.

In South Dakota, we have won notable victories on two fronts against economic dictatorship—through Legislation and through Cooperation.

The speaker then asked rhetorically, "Did you ever suppose that these gains would be unchallenged?" Calling on his fellow Union members to go forth in the struggle, Loriks said these Bryaneseque words:

Those of you who have helped us do these things, YOU have carried the CROSS. You know what it is to wear a crown of thorns—You have tasted the bitter cup.

Loriks then offered another extended analogy, by comparing Newt Gresham and his fellow founders of the
Farmers Union to Moses. "Like Moses of old, they saw their own class steeped in slavery, and they visioned, too, a land flowing with milk and honey of abundance." 146

The "Pharaohs of today, the Morgans and Mellons of high finance, are just as loath to release their strangle hold on the people as they were thousands of years ago." 147

Warning that the struggle might be long, Loriks said that "The Israelites had been enslaved for four hundred years under the Pharaohs—a dictatorship of Egypt." 148 After referring to the Golden Calf, the speaker said:

The fact is that after four hundred years in the desert they were not fit to be free. It took forty years in the desert to educate them and prepare them for what should come! 149

Most of this first assertion was developed by further assertion, or by specific example and analogy. Twice, reference was made to a crown of thorns, and the Farmers Union struggle was directly compared with that of Moses and the Israelites.

Assertion II

While still developing his initial assertion, Loriks provided some transitional material to his assertion about economic scarcity by saying, "Our journey through the economic desert of scarcity and want may require forty years
and more. Isn't it thirty-five years now? We have five years left to go."150

"WE ARE WANDERING IN THE ECONOMIC DESERT OF SCARCITY TODAY!"151 The first support for this assertion came in a statement commending two of the South Dakota Farmers Union districts for expressing the need for the observance of the Farmers Union National Program. "The principles for economic emancipation enunciated by Newt Gresham and the founding fathers of this great Union are so fundamental that we can never hope to achieve the objective by ignoring them."152

Loriks then reiterated his initial theme before going on to support his second. "WE STAND AT THE CROSS ROADS IN AMERICA TODAY. We haven't much time to choose which way to follow."153 Loriks then developed his point about economic scarcity by referring to cuts being made in relief programs and by asserting that people have the right to ask for relief.

In South Dakota,

with 80 percent of our great State . . . wiped out completely by drought so far as cash crops are concerned . . . allowance for farm drought relief has been pared to the bone . . . from $225 million in 1935 to $135 million in 1936 to less than $20 million the current year."154

After this presentation of statistics, the speaker said:
It means that more crumbs will have to fall from the tables of the Profit System so long as that system endures. It means that we will have to coordinate our efforts and stand united in our demands for more liberal concessions in grants and work relief, and liberal feed and seed loan policy recognizing that human needs come first.

Then came the assertion that his listeners had the right to such relief:

**WE HAVE A RIGHT TO ASK THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR AID AND ASSISTANCE IN TIMES OF GREAT EMERGENCIES SUCH AS DROUGHT AND FLOOD AND OTHER CATASTROPHES BEYOND OUR CONTROL. IT IS THE DUTY OF THE GOVERNMENT TO COME TO THE AID AND ASSISTANCE OF ANY AREA THAT IS SO STRICKEN.**

Loriks offered no historical data or other evidence to support this assertion, but he did say that the Midwest Drought Conference recommendations, then pending, "must be given further impetus." 157

Assertion III

The balance of the speech was spent in the development and embellishment of this assertion:

**WE BELIEVE THAT COOPERATION SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AS THE PRIMARY PROGRAM OF THE FARMERS UNION, AND THAT LEGISLATION SHOULD BE SUPPLEMENTARY THEREETO. AS WE BUILD ECONOMIC STRENGTH WE SHALL BUILD LEGISLATIVE STRENGTH.**

To develop this assertion Loriks then cited the Preamble of the South Dakota Farmers Union Constitution which set forth the cooperative program. 159 "Every successful cooperative that we build," he continued, "is a block in the building of a new economic structure, based on
service, rather than profit motive." In addition, he said, "Legislation alone cannot solve the problem. While we are trying to legislate ourselves out of our difficulties, due to an insane economic system, we see dark and ominous clouds gathering on the horizon, the symptoms of the impending crash of that system." The speaker cited unemployment, foreclosures, evictions and dispossessions of homes and farms in support of his point that "yet there is scarcity and want and a lack of the good things of life for the average farmer."

Despite his assertion that legislation was secondary for the Farmers Union, he spent more than four pages of his speech talking about either legislation that the Farmers Union had backed in the past or that it was then supporting.

Providing the statistic that 66 percent of farm land in South Dakota was tenant operated, Loriks said that while in the legislature, he had written the first Graduated Land Tax Amendment three years ago, before it was "even a part of the Farmers Union program." This bill, he said, came within one vote of passage in the 1937 legislative session.

Loriks then dealt with the net income tax and the ore tax. The Farmers Union, he said, had gotten the ore tax increased 50 percent, to where "it will now yield more
than a million dollars annually. That is certainly one Farmers Union accomplishment that must be rated as constructive and worthwhile."\textsuperscript{165}

After citing accomplishments in the areas of reducing interest rates, penalty rates on delinquent taxes, extension of time for tax payments, treatment of tax deeds, curtailing 1933 state spending, enactment of moratorium and deficiency judgment laws, and reducing tax valuations—all Farmers Union legislative concerns, Loriks then went on to discuss the tractor fuel bill.\textsuperscript{166}

The Farmers Union had also tried to promote the instruction of cooperative education in the state's schools, working through the Department of Public Instruction, Loriks said.\textsuperscript{167}

Before going on to discuss further aspects of Farmers Union political involvement, the speaker referred to "a very definite and pronounced campaign on foot today to split farmers and labor, to pit one group against the other."\textsuperscript{168} He pleaded with his listeners, "Let us ever be on guard against vicious propaganda of prejudice to keep us divided and fighting one another. Farmers and laborers are all victimized by the same economic system, so let us not be fooled."\textsuperscript{169}

Loriks then referred to a resolution passed at the previous state convention calling for farmer-labor
cooperation for the exploration of "independent political action." Saying that the Farmers Union Constitution barred "entrance into any partisan political arena," Loriks went on to make a distinction between "party politics" and "legislation." He cited a Progressive Alliance that had been organized that "contributed much support to most of our Farmers Union Legislative Program." Loriks called for an organization of a coalition of "progressive forces" in every county of South Dakota. This coalition would "not only promote legislation in the public interest, but publicize the record of public servants, good or bad, so that we may have an informed and enlightened electorate." He added, "In my opinion, this is as far as we can go in the matter." "The Farmers Union must always be kept clear of any partisan political alliances, and concentrate on men and measures irrespective of their party affiliations."

After stating the statistic that only 10 percent of the nation's farmers were organized, he went on to call the audience's attention to an upcoming hearing of the Senate Agricultural Subcommittee in Sioux City later in October. He urged a large representation from South Dakota. His agenda for this hearing was to work for a basic price, "determined on basis of cost for that part of our crops domestically consumed," and to insist on the
refinancing at immediate and low interest of all farm and
home loans at as low rates "as granted to any other group
of industry." 178

The speaker then called for efforts to reverse a
Federal judge's decision that reduced the tax valuation
of the Northwestern Railroad 50 percent, "which according
to our Director of Taxation will, if not reversed, mean a
loss of about $900,000,000 [sic] in tax revenues to the
state, and the loss will be every year." 179

In concluding his segment on legislation and the
Farmers Union, Loriks said, "The time has arrived for
enactment of a balanced program, permanent in nature and
with the objective of the COST OF PRODUCTION in mind." 180

The speaker also admitted that the Farmers Union
had made a mistake. "We fumbled the ball on the Court
issue!" 181 (The Union had supported Franklin Roosevelt's
"court-packing" plan.)

The speech was concluded with the series of summary
assertions, already cited.

Assessment

Again, the form of reasoning was primarily inductive,
moving from specifics to generalizations. But even this was
not always done. For instance, the assertion that the
country was in conditions of scarcity was not supported by
evidence of the alleged scarcity. Rather, the approach was to give specific dollar figures on how the South Dakota farm drought relief had been cut, and to assert further that people had the right to such aid. This sub-assertion was not supported.

In developing the first assertion about humanity being at a crossroads, the speaker did cite trouble spots throughout the world, and offered the analogy of the Farmers Union role in the struggle being similar to that of Moses leading the Israelites. He also made reference, in developing the South Dakota dimensions of the struggle, to the Farmers Union ore tax battle.

The speaker provided the most plentiful examples to prove his point about Farmers Union-backed legislation. Less attention by far was paid to the cooperative aspect of the assertion that cooperative building ranked first and legislation second in the Farmers Union program.

As to whether there was sufficient evidence to justify the conclusions reached, the answer is mixed. In development of the first assertion about humanity being at a crossroads, more specifics could have been offered to develop the inductive reasoning. Most of the evidence came in the extended analogy of comparing the Farmers Union and its leadership to the Israelites and Moses. Likewise, more data could have been advanced to demonstrate that there
were indeed conditions of scarcity. Who was suffering, how much they were suffering, and whether the suffering had gotten worse were all questions that could have been answered. The speaker was specific in speaking of cuts in relief programs in South Dakota, but he did not demonstrate, except by assertion, that there is an inherent right to such aid.

The evidence was not consistently sufficient to support the generalizations that the speaker was making. Moreover, Loriks did not directly confront the counter-arguments that would have been made to his positions. For instance, there would have been those who probably would have argued that the United States economic system was essentially sound. Had Loriks provided more evidence to support his viewpoints, he would have, at least indirectly, been confronting various counterarguments.

The major types of support in this speech were example and analogy—in particular, the extended analogy offered about the Farmers Union being comparable to the Israelites and Moses. The examples were most plentiful in the extended section about Farmers Union-backed legislation.

To the degree that Loriks' assertions were supported, the reasoning employed was logical. The strongest support came in the extended section about the Farmers Union program. If the analogy to the Israelites was a
true one, that was also a fairly well-supported section. But the assertions about being in a struggle and being in conditions of scarcity both needed more evidence.

There was an inconsistency in the speech. Loriks asserted that cooperatives were the primary program of the Farmers Union and that legislation was supplementary. Yet he spent more than four pages of the speech giving specific examples of legislation backed by the Union while only two paragraphs were spent on cooperatives. In these paragraphs, there were no examples of cooperatives; only assertions. Given Loriks' background as a legislator, it is not surprising that he would spend time on legislation in his speech. Yet one might ask why he did not place legislation on a higher plane of importance in his assertion.

The question was then asked as to whether the forms of support were the best choices. The answer would appear to be that in many cases they were. Certainly the long list of Farmers Union-backed legislation, like the gold tax, should have been familiar to the audience. And the analogy to Moses and the Israelites should have been a familiar one. The specifics offered about the reductions in farm drought relief in South Dakota should have also been familiar to the audience. The conditions throughout the world referred to by Loriks at the beginning of his speech would have been in the news and probably known by the audience. There were no apparent obscure references in
the speech nor were there references that would have
required a detailed knowledge of history or the classics
to understand.

The only instances where the forms of support were
inadequate were in the areas where the examples and
analogies were not plentiful enough.

As to whether the lines of reasoning were the best
choices, overall they probably were. There was a logical
progression, especially in the development of the assertion
about legislation, from providing specific examples to the
general statement of worth of the Farmers Union program.
The reasoning about being in conditions of scarcity was
less valid as was the assertion about humanity being at a
crossroads.

Emotional Proof

Loaded words

This speech again included many loaded words. His
opening assertion, HUMANITY AT THE CROSSROADS,\textsuperscript{182} is an
example. So is the Bryanesque, "Shall we \textit{crucify} mankind
on the \textit{Cross of Profits} or can we \textit{save mankind} through
\textit{economic democracy}?"\textsuperscript{183} This wording was repeated a bit
later when Loriks, after talking about the world and state
context of the economic struggle, said, "Those of you who
have helped us do these things, YOU have carried the \textit{CROSS}.\textsuperscript{184}
You know what it is to wear a crown of thorns—You have tasted the bitter cup.\textsuperscript{184}

In talking about the struggle, Loriks used these words:

The other side of the drama in strange contrast is portrayed by the Cooperative Common-wealths of northern Europe, cold, barren, mountainous, countries, for centuries steeped in poverty and want, who have through Cooperative Development as embodied in the fundamental aims and purposes of the Farmers Union, lifted themselves from destitution to the highest standards of living of the average citizen anywhere in the World today.\textsuperscript{185}

The history of the Farmers Union was also presented with the use of some loaded words:

Thirty-five years ago, Newt Gresham and his intrepid little band, ten hard-hit, destitute, poverty-stricken farmers of Raines County, Texas, organized the first Farmers Union local. . . . They wrote the Farmers Union Constitution, the Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence from economic tyranny and despotism, that will ring through the ages.

In speaking of this constitution a few paragraphs later, the speaker said:

It stands there today like the Rock of Gibraltar, untarnished and unsullied by the vicious attacks of demagogues and charlatans, imposters and "fake medicine men" with their quack cure-alls and nostrums. In the raging storm on the rock-bound coast of economic dictatorship, it stands a beacon light to guide the ship of economic democracy to a safe haven.\textsuperscript{186}

The next paragraph went on to say:

Beware of the siren-voice of those imposters who would tempt you to deviate from the straight and narrow course chartered by the founding fathers
of this great Union. Beware of them in whatever form they may appear, whether in black cloth, in purple robes, in overalls or baggy pants.

Loaded words were used to describe both the Farmers Union as a tax victory, and Farmers Union cooperative efforts. "Since we won that decisive victory over the economic dictatorship that ruled our own state for fifty years," and "We have stepped on the toes of powerful interests who are likewise fighting us to a finish," are two examples.

The speaker continued a few paragraphs later with these words:

The safest course to pursue to avoid opposition seems to have been one of pure condemnation and denunciation, blind and indiscriminate, with no thought of ever getting results. In other words, a NEGATIVE philosophy of indiscriminate criticism and fault-finding and "bellyache" seems to be the line of least resistance. Because when you build or accomplish nothing, then you have nothing to defend.

Blind, unreasoning expressions of hatred, condemnation and prejudice from the platform gets us nowhere, if that is all we do.

The language used to draw the analogy between Newt Gresham and the Farmers Union and Moses and the Israelites was likewise emotional. Here are excerpts:

Newt Gresham and the founders of this great Farmers Union had a vision. Like unto Moses of old, they saw their own class steeped in slavery and they visioned too a land flowing with milk and honey of abundance. . . .

Newt Gresham launched his Crusade to liberate the farmers from an economic tyranny of concentrated wealth with very meager equipment. All he had was a mule and a saddle. Talk about courage and
fortitude! To thus do battle with an economic system intrenched [sic] and powerful.

The Pharaohs of today, the Morgans and Mellons of high finance, are just as loath to release their strangle hold on the people as they were thousands of years ago. Our journey through the desert of economic scarcity and want may require forty years and more. Isn't it thirty-five years now? We have five years to go.

In speaking of the Isrealites' struggle, Loriks said, "Sometimes they lost the vision completely, as for instance when they builded themselves a Golden Calf and worshipped it."\(^{193}\)

Loaded words were used to develop this assertion:

WE ARE WANDERING IN THE ECONOMIC DESERT OF SCARCITY TODAY! We see in the distance the mountain peaks of abundance and plenty for all, and the course is charted for us to follow. Yet we find ourselves frequently chasing some mirage or getting off on some bypath. We sometimes give way to dissention, bickering, quarreling and petty strife. Yet, we are on the march, and we see the objectives in the distance. The pathway is marked. Why do we tarry?\(^{194}\)

The struggle was put in these words:

The road charted by Newt Gresham and the founders of the Union, the road to economic democracy (Cooperation) leads to equity, justice and a fuller life for all. The road we have been traveling (Profit System) leads to destruction, chaos and war!\(^{195}\)

Loriks blamed financial interests for cutting South Dakota's drought aid with these words, "To the accomplishments of wails and howls from Liberty League and Wall Street interests and their bird dogs, the allowance for farm drought relief has been pared to the bone."\(^{196}\) He continued,
"It means that while we are in this desert journey, in this period of transition, enduring hardships and the ravages of drought, we must live. We must exist. We must eat." 197

In exhorting his listeners to work hard to enact the Farmers Union program, Loriks said, "We may as well quit 'crying for the moon' and get right down to work. There is no Royal road, no short cut, no easy way to do this difficult job that was laid out for us in the Constitution of the Farmers Union." 198 While the Farmers Union struggle was continuing, the speaker said, "We see dark and ominous clouds gathering on the horizon, the symptoms of the impending crash of that system." 199

Loriks' development of the assertion about Farmers Union legislation also employed some loaded words. In speaking of the need for farm ownership, and for farm homesteads, he said:

Farms homesteaded half a century ago, received as a gift from our Government, neither interest nor principal to pay, have been sacrificed on the altar of an unjust economic system until today about 66 percent of the farm land in South Dakota is tenant operated. 200

In speaking a little later about the graduated land tax amendment, Loriks said, "The Federal Land Bank moved in and waged a bitter fight against this Amendment. It seems strange they should pull chestnuts for Big Insurance and Loan Companies." 201 Other Farmers Union measures were discussed in these terms, "We have secured enactment
of moratorium and deficiency judgment laws, reduced tax valuations, etc. an imposing array of patchwork to lessen the suffering under a crumbling capitalism.  

And finally, in speaking of efforts made to divide farmers and labor, Loriks said, "This propaganda is of the most vicious and damnable kind!" And there was an assertion that "there is a vast difference between 'party politics' and legislation and the Farmers Union has always taken a keen interest in legislation."  

The 1937 speech did employ more loaded words than the previous presidential address, although it should be noted that it ran two pages longer than the 1936 speech. In the 1937 speech, loaded words were used in the development of all three assertions, but especially for the first two. The material about legislation, with the few exceptions noted, was mostly developed in a nonemotional way.  

**Audience analysis**  
The question was then raised as to how well Emil Loriks analyzed his audience for this speech. The audience would have been predominantly Farmers Union members attending the convention, along with perhaps a few members of the general public who might have attended the session at which the speech was given. All three major assertions would have related to the Farmers Union ideology which was
critical of capitalism, inclined to view the world as being in an economic struggle and supportive of reform legislation and presumably would have been subscribed to by the audience.

Some of the particular bits of evidence used by the speaker should also have been familiar to the audience. This audience would have heard the story of the Farmers Union founding by Newt Gresham and would have probably been familiar with the Farmers Union cooperative and legislation interests. The various legislative battles of which the Union had been or was a part of should have been known by the audience.

The analogy to Moses and the Israelites should have been an appropriate one for Loriks to use as this Biblical story is well known.

Loriks' use of loaded words would also probably typify his audience analysis. The speaker perhaps used these words because he felt they would appeal to his audience and because he felt the use of these words would provide an effective way to influence his audience.

Adjustments to the audience

The next question dealt with how well the speaker made adjustments to the audience. During this convention, as he had the previous year, Loriks was running for re-election as Farmers Union president. According to
information already presented, there was a candidate opposing Loriks, and there had been pre-convention reports of a possible "ruction" at the convention. Though Loriks was re-elected by a three to one margin and was also selected as South Dakota's delegate to the upcoming national Farmers Union convention, it seems likely that the speaker did have the election in mind as he spoke.

The assertions he made would appear to have been tailored to fit his audience. The speaker seemed to stress the importance of active Farmers Union membership and participation to his audience, so the material about Union cooperatives and legislation would have fit that requirement. In talking of the conditions of drought and scarcity, Loriks used the specific information about the rate of farm tenancy in South Dakota--a figure which should have had meaning to his audience. He also made the statement that "80 percent of our great State of South Dakota" was "wiped out completely by drought so far as cash crops" were concerned, 205 a figure which should have had relevance to this audience.

The use of loaded words would also be a reflection of the speaker's adjustment to his audience. Likewise, the examples and the analogy he provided should have related to the listeners' familiarity. There were no
apparent obscure examples or analogies that the audience would not have known.

**Identification with the audience**

The fourth question dealt with the degree of speaker identification with the audience. As he did in the previous presidential address, Loriks made extensive use of "we" in presenting his assertions and developing his evidence. In fact, all three assertions in this speech were stated in terms of "we":

```
WE STAND AT THE CROSS ROADS IN AMERICA TODAY!
WE ARE WANDERING IN THE ECONOMIC DESERT OF SCARCITY TODAY!
WE BELIEVE THAT COOPERATION SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AS THE PRIMARY PROGRAM OF THE FARMERS UNION AND THAT LEGISLATION SHOULD BE SUPPLEMENTARY THERETO.  
```

The Bryan-like statements were also phrased in the first person plural. For example, "Shall we crucify mankind on the Cross of Profits or can we save mankind through economic democracy?"  

```
The early history of the Farmers Union was also put in terms of "we" with these Lincoln-like words: "It is well to consecrate ourselves, to re-dedicate ourselves to those high and noble principles for which the Union was founded. . . ." Loriks put both the ore tax battle and cooperative efforts in South Dakota into terms of "we," "Since we won that decisive victory over the economic
dictatorship," and "since we entered the Cooperative field to check the profit system, we have also stepped on the toes of powerful interests, . . ."209 This was followed by the use of "you," "Did you ever suppose that these gains would go unchallenged?"210 "You" was also used in the recapitulation of the Bryan theme, "Those of you who have helped to do these things, YOU have carried the CROSS. You know what it is to wear a crown of thorns--You have tasted the bitter cup."211

The analogy to Moses was also expressed in the first person plural. "Our journey through the economic desert of scarcity and want may require forty years and more. Isn't it thirty-five years now? We have five years left to go."212

In presenting his assertions about economic scarcity, Loriks put the situation into the first person plural. "While we are still living under the Profit System, we are face to face with grim realities--scarcity of the necessities of life. Our immediate problems have become so acute that they have submerged and overshadowed everything else."213 He continued a few lines later, "We must exist. We must eat. We must have clothing, food, shelter and fuel to keep warm. . . ."214 And the assertion used to develop the major assertion about scarcity was likewise put in terms of "we," "WE HAVE A RIGHT TO ASK THE
Most of the material on Farmers Union legislation was also developed with the use of "we." For example, "We have in South Dakota inaugurated a program for legislation to provide for a graduated tax on large holdings of land." Or, "We have in the last two sessions of the South Dakota Legislature inaugurated and sustained a program of taxing based on ability to pay, through Net Income and Ore Tax." The rest of the legislative examples were likewise put into the first person plural.

The speaker's conclusions to this speech, already cited at the beginning of this section, were also put in terms of "we." In part, they read:

Let us consecrate and rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles and objectives of the Farmers Union.

Let us remember the words of John A. Simpson.

Let us continue the fight for drought relief.

Let us continue the fight to restore home ownership.

Let us promote the educational program.

Let us build membership in 1938.

Loriks made extensive use of personal pronouns, especially "we" and "us," and to a lesser extent, "you," to build identification with his audience. Another means of audience identification would have been in his selection of examples and analogy that would have been known by his
listeners. It would appear that the speaker did establish a strong sense of audience identification.

Social intelligence

The final question used in analyzing emotional proof is the extent to which the speaker demonstrated social intelligence, or the ability to select the proper ideas and the proper appeals for the occasion. As already established, Loriks did use appeals, examples and an analogy fitting to the occasion, as they would have been familiar to his audience. Again, he was apparently trying to "sell" his audience on the Farmers Union and on his leadership of that organization, so it would be proper to use examples familiar to the audience, to establish common ground. Loriks again fulfilled the expectations of a presidential address by indicating where the group had been and what it needed to do.

Assessment

In the 1937 presidential address, Loriks again made extensive use of emotional proof. Perhaps more so than in his 1936 presidential address, Loriks used many loaded words, particularly to develop his first two assertions. To use phrases like "crown of thorns," or to make a distinction between "party politics" and legislation, is
a stronger way to say things than to use more neutral language.

The extensive use of loaded words also figured prominently in the speaker's audience analysis, his adjustments to the audience, his identification with the audience and his demonstration of social intelligence. Moreover, the extensive use of "we" and "our" and the use of "you" were important ways for the speaker to establish a link with his listeners. The use of familiar examples and analogy were also a means to establish identification and to adapt and adjust to the audience.

Ethical Proof

Character

Association with virtue

The first question used to analyze character is whether the speaker associated either himself or his message with that which is virtuous. The clearest example of this technique was Loriks' use of the analogy comparing the Farmers Union and its leaders to the Israelites and Moses and the forty-year journey. The glorification of the Farmers Union Constitution by calling it "the Magna Charta" and "the Declaration of Independence" would have represented another attempt to link his cause and his message with virtue. The comparison of this document to
the Rock of Gibralter would be another example of the same thing.

The long list of Farmers Union legislative efforts, both past and current, would represent an attempt to put the message into the category of virtue, because these bills were expressed in terms of the help they offered to farmers.

Praise to cause

The next question was closely tied to the previous one--asking whether the speaker properly bestowed praise upon himself and his client. Again, the legislative examples cited in the speech seem to provide evidence of this. Loriks, in citing the Farmers Union stand on a graduated land tax amendment, stated "I wrote the first Graduated Land Tax Amendment in collaboration with Representative Oscar Johnson of Kingsbury County three years ago." The personal reference might be construed as a way of linking his cause to that which was virtuous.

Opponents' cause not virtuous

To look at the other side of the first two questions--whether the speaker linked his opponent and his opponents' cause with that which is virtuous, there were again references to moneyed interests, in this phrase, "The Pharoahs of today, the Morgans and Mellons of high
finance," although there were perhaps fewer such phrases in this speech than in the other two addresses. There was also a reference to those opposing the Union as making "vicious attacks" and being "demagogues, and charlatans, imposters and 'fake medicine men' with their quick curealls and nostrums." Loriks referred to "the siren-voice of these imposters who would tempt you from the straight and narrow course charted by the founding fathers of this great Union." He made reference to the profit system in these words, "The road we have been traveling (Profit-System) leads to destruction, chaos and war!" Those who had opposed farm relief were described--"To the accompaniments of wails and howls from Liberty League and Wall Street interests and their bird dogs, the allowance for farm drought relief has been pared to the bone." A bit later in the speech, Loriks referred to "crumbling capitalism." Also, "Let us ever be on guard against vicious propaganda of prejudice to keep us divided and fighting one another." The judge who had made the recent decision reducing the tax valuation of the Northwestern Railroad by 50 percent was also criticized. "This Court decision must be reversed! It is just another fight that has been thrown into our lap, and under the system we must expect those things."
effect of this million dollar relief for a corporation would mean "a million dollars more on your neck and mine."\textsuperscript{229}

There was also an attack on people within the Farmers Union who apparently did not want to take a stand or simply wished to criticize and not act:

The safest course to pursue to avoid opposition seems to have been one of pure condemnation and denunciation, blind and indiscriminate, with no thought of ever getting results. In other words, a NEGATIVE philosophy of indiscriminate criticism and fault finding and "bellyache" seems to be the line of least resistance. Because when you build or accomplish nothing, then you have nothing to defend. Blind, unreasoning expressions of hatred, condemnation and prejudice from the platform get us nowhere if that is all we do.\textsuperscript{230}

All of these phrases would appear to be a means of linking the opponents' cause with that which was not virtuous.

Minimizing attacks on cause

The next question asked whether the speaker minimized unfavorable expressions of himself or of his cause previously established by his opponent. One instance of this lies in the Loriks statement, just cited, of criticism of those in the organization who had a supposedly negative philosophy or did not wish to take action. It seems possible that some attacks might have been made on his activist approach.

Also in 1938, as had been true in the 1937 Farmers Union convention, Loriks had an opponent for the presidency.
It is not recorded in the *Union Farmer* or the newspaper accounts read by this writer just what the opponent might have said about Loriks. But it would seem reasonable to expect that Loriks, in this speech, would deal indirectly with his opponent's position, even though he made no direct reference. All the listing of Farmers Union legislative accomplishments and the one reference to his having actually drafted one of the bills might be seen as an attempt to minimize any attacks that might have been made on Loriks' position.

There was one other attack that had been made on Loriks in the months preceding the 1937 convention which was reported in the July 21, 1937, issue of the *South Dakota Union Farmer*. The headline for the story read, "State President Not on Federal Payroll," and reference is made to "a smokescreen barrage of poison gas propaganda 'lies'" that

seem to have been put out, not openly, but under cover, that the State President of the S.D. Farmers Union is receiving emoluments from many sources and is on the payroll of the following: Pillsbury Flour Mills, U.S. Government, Farm Service Stores, Serum Companies, Various Oil Companies, etc. 231

The Union Farmer story referred to the attacks being "circulated amongst our membership," and Loriks then replied:

As President of the Farmers Union, I have never spent any time defending myself against malicious slander.

PERMIT ME TO STATE ONLY THE SIMPLE FACT THAT I AM NOT ON ANY PAYROLL EXCEPT THE FARMERS UNION. 232
It seems plausible that Loriks may have had these attacks in mind as he made the statement in his speech about those who wanted to complain rather than act. So the speaker did, in this speech, confront attacks made on himself and on his cause.

Speaker authority

A further question was whether the speaker relied upon authority derived from his personal experience. As noted, Loriks based his speeches on his own knowledge and appraisal of news events. There were also some personal references in this speech which would point to an affirmative answer to the question.

Early in the speech, when he was talking about the founding of the Farmers Union in Texas by Newt Gresham and his associates, Loriks said, "Uncle Dorn was a member of this local." And later in the speech, as mentioned, Loriks cited his authorship of the first graduated land tax amendment to come before the legislature. These two references would seem to indicate an effort by the speaker to establish his authority for this speech.

Apparent sincerity

The final question was whether the speaker gave the impression of being sincere. On the basis of the available evidence cited so far, it would appear that he
was. The anti-capitalism themes were a part of his other speeches and seemed to represent Loriks' sincere beliefs. And the pride in the legislative accomplishments of the Union appeared to have been well-meant, or sincere. There was seemingly a basic compatibility between the speaker's stands and those of his audience.

**Sagacity**

Common sense

The answer to the question of whether the speaker used common sense appears to be yes. The strongly-stated Loriks attacks on the excesses of capitalism and the profit system and upon the Morgans and Mellons would have represented common sense approaches for his particular audience, although for another audience they might have seemed extreme. Taken in the context of the time in which he was speaking, the program and ideology of the Farmers Union and the particular audience he was addressing, Loriks' approach seems to have been a common sense one.

**Tact and moderation**

Regarding tact and moderation in this speech, about the only significant instance of a lack of moderation was the attack on those in the Farmers Union, who wanted to "bellyache" and not act. But these may well not have been overly strong terms for his particular audience, and the
speaker perhaps wanted to leave a strong impression by using these particular words.

Good taste

Regarding good taste, there were no observed instances in this speech of a lack of taste or of any sort of vulgarity. And the analogy made by Loriks to Moses and the Israelites perhaps represented an attempt to emphasize the good taste, or certainly the virtue, of what he had to say.

Familiarity with interests

Reference was made to whether the speaker revealed a broad familiarity with the general interests of the day. The answer was that he for the most part did. In speaking of the drought situation and the need for farm relief in South Dakota, Loriks used specific figures to support his point. He cited the reductions in drought aid to the state from 1935 to 1937 and spoke of an 80 percent crop failure. In discussing farm tenancy later in the speech, he said that the figure for South Dakota was 66 percent, and for his own county, Kingsbury, 75 percent.

Loriks put his assertion about humanity being in a struggle or at the crossroads into both international and state contexts—citing as specific evidence the Scandinavian Peninsula. The data about Farmers Union legislative
accomplishments and stands was also specific, with bills being discussed by name. The ore tax battle reference would have been based on the Farmers Union involvement in that controversial issue.

The speech, therefore, apparently reflected a strong knowledge of the interests of the day.

Intellectual integrity

Finally, the question was asked whether the speaker showed that he was possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom. This relates to the previous question in that intellectual integrity would have to be based to a certain extent on a knowledge of the issues of the day. One again could ask whether the speaker was being fully honest in presenting a one-sided view of his assertions. Was the profit system as bad as he said it was, was the situation of scarcity as bad as indicated, were the moneyed interests that evil, was the Farmers Union program as good as Loriks said it was? Again, considering the audience and their predispositions, plus the need to communicate as part of a total convention program--a situation which might have implied some time restraints--it probably was not a case of blatant intellectual dishonesty for the speaker to be one-sided, but he could have perhaps been more moderate in this regard.
Good will

Balance in praise

The initial question is whether the speaker achieved a balance between too much and too little praise of his audience. Again, praise was accomplished indirectly, primarily by the extensive use of "we" in developing the three major assertions and in giving the extended examples about the Farmers Union backed legislation. Making the audience a partner, by using "we" and to a lesser extent, "you," would represent an indirect way of praising the audience. There was also praise by the speaker for the Farmers Union Constitution, which he called a "Magna Charta." None of this indirect praise was apparently excessive, so the overall answer to the question would be that there was a balance.

Identification with listeners

The second question was whether the speaker identified himself properly with his listeners and their problems. There has already been discussion, along with citation of examples from the speech, of Loriks' identification with his audience under the emotional proof section. Loriks accomplished identification therough the use of personal pronouns—"we," "you," and occasionally, "I."
The reference to his having written a land tax bill may
also have been an attempt to establish a link with his audience by showing that the speaker had the interests of the Farmers Union in mind by drafting that bill.

There were no apparent obscure references or references that would have required extensive historical or classical knowledge in this speech. The speaker did appear to identify himself properly with his listeners and their problems.

Candor

The third question asked whether the speaker was candid and straightforward. The answer to this was that he generally was. There were no observable instances where the speaker was trying to mislead or to be less than candid. The presentation was one-sided, but for this audience, this would not represent an effort to mislead. One might, of course, argue that the speaker could have presented examples of Farmers Union failures in legislation, but on the whole he was candid, pointing to areas that needed additional work. The speaker also admitted that the Union had made a mistake on the Supreme Court issue, so this would seem to be an example of candor. The speaker was candid and straightforward.
Rebukes

The fourth question asked whether the speaker offered any necessary rebukes with tact and consideration. There was one instance of a direct rebuke, of an attack on those in the Farmers Union who would only criticize and not act. The direct rebuke perhaps was not totally tactful, as there was rather strong language used: "In other words, a NEGATIVE philosophy of indiscriminate criticism and fault finding and 'bellyache' seems to be the line of least resistance. Because when you build or accomplish nothing, then you have nothing to defend."234 This rebuke could have been stated more matter of factly. However, the speaker may have desired to provoke a strong reaction from his audience and his choice of language for the rebuke may have been deliberate. So there perhaps is not enough information available to say if the rebuke was sufficiently tactful or not; it does leave the impression of being somewhat tactless.

Offsetting personal reasons

The fifth question asked whether the speaker offset any personal reasons he might have had for giving the speech. Emil Loriks was running for re-election at this convention, and he had also been under attack as reported in the Union Farmer, for allegedly being on the payroll of the government and big companies. These allegations had been firmly denied by Loriks. But surely the fact that such an attack had been
made would at least have been at the back of the speaker's mind as he addressed the Farmers Union members. However, no direct reference was made to either these attacks or to Loriks' opponent for the Union presidency.

Loriks seemed to have handled the situation by listing various Farmers Union legislative accomplishments. He did not appear to have been trying to overly exploit the situation. His attacks on profit-making and moneyed interests were a part of Farmers Union ideology, so they would not seem to represent any glorification of personal considerations in giving this speech.

Messenger of the truth

Finally, the question was asked whether the speaker revealed, without exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth. In this speech, the speaker did not appear to be trying to show off, as he had in the earlier radio speech, by citing references that would not have been familiar to his audience. The only possible instances of showing off would be in mentioning that his uncle had been a member of the first Farmers Union local in Texas, and that he had drafted a bill backed by the Farmers Union. But these were not apparently exhibitionist; they would seem to be efforts to establish identification with the audience. So the answer to the question is that
he did reveal, without exhibitionism, his qualities as a messenger of the truth.

Assessment

The three major assertions were not logically and adequately supported, except for the use of the supporting materials about Farmers Union legislation. The examples given to support that assertion were plentiful. The assertion about the nation's being in a struggle was supported by the use of the analogy comparing the Union with Moses and the Israelites. While the speaker said that cooperatives were a more important part of the Farmers Union program than legislation, he devoted only two paragraphs to cooperatives and more than four pages to legislation. The assertion about the conditions of scarcity was supported by statistics about crop failure and reductions in farm relief to South Dakota, although the assertion could perhaps have been more adequately developed.

Lorik's again made extensive use of emotional proof, especially in his use of loaded words, and in adjusting, analyzing and identifying himself with his audience. There were more examples of loaded words in the 1937 speech than in the 1936 speech, but the 1937 speech was longer and might have been expected to contain more such instances. Loaded words were used particularly in the development of the first two assertions, and to a lesser extent in the
development of the final assertion. Loriks appeared to have had his audience and their predispositions and frame of reference in mind as he gave this speech. The data he used should have been familiar to them.

There was also effective use of ethical proof in this speech. Under character, the speaker certainly attempted to associate his message with virtue and his opponents' position with evil. He dealt by indirection with attacks made on him and he appeared to be sincere. Loriks also demonstrated sagacity, exhibiting common sense in relation to his audience and a familiarity with their interests. Given the ideology of his listeners, he was moderate enough, and he was tactful. The speaker was probably intellectually honest, even though one-sided in viewpoint. But he did admit at one point that the Union had made a mistake on the Supreme Court issue.

The speaker also exhibited good will. He was balanced in his approach to praise of his audience, making his audience a partner by use of personal pronouns. He appeared to have identified himself with his listeners' problems and was candid, even to the point of admitting a Farmers Union mistake. There was the one instance of a direct rebuke to those in the Union who allegedly criticized and did not act, but the language was perhaps chosen for an emphatic effect.
It is difficult to say that one form of proof predominated as there were clear examples of all three. Emotional proof was certainly a major factor in this speech, but so was logical proof, particularly in the development of the speaker's final major assertion. And the speaker also appeared to have made effective use of ethical proof.

Immediate and Long-Range Effects of the Loriks Speeches

Definitions and Measures

Before attempting to speculate on what some of the immediate and long-range effects were for these three speeches, it is first necessary to offer some definitions of effect, and to suggest some common measures of effect. Thonssen, Baird and Braden suggest that one significant factor is whether there were "substantial responses associated with possible changes in belief, attitude, or action, . . . which may come hours, days or months after the delivery of the speech."235 The three authors pose these questions:

Did the speech have an effect upon the subsequent disposition of the question?
Did the speech help produce a delayed response?
Did the speech create a readiness in listeners to act in a certain way when the right stimulus came along?

Thonssen, Baird and Braden say that some critics of the social scene doubt that some oratory has influence at all. But their own conclusion seems to be that "unquestionably, many speeches over the years have exercised long-range effects."

To put the questions into the context of Emil Loriks and the three speeches, one can attempt to analyze effect by asking such questions as whether he was re-elected and what happened to the ideas he advocated. A long-range effect would be to ask what he later did in the Farmers Union organization and in politics.

There is some limitation to answering even these questions. For one thing, it does not follow that just because one event precedes another, that the first event was the cause of the second. Certain events can be pointed to, following in succession, but speculation about effect will have to be that, only speculation.

1935 Radio Speech

Certain events that happened after the September 9, 1935, radio address can be mentioned, although by no means can a direct cause-effect relationship be established. Less than one month after this speech, Emil Loriks was re-elected state Farmers Union president. For the year 1935, there
were membership gains in the South Dakota Farmers Union of 617. On the other hand, Loriks' call for America not to get involved in the war in Europe eventually was not heeded as by late 1941, the United States did declare war against the Axis Powers.

1936 Presidential Address

At the convention where the 1936 speech was given, Emil Loriks, as already reported, was re-elected Union president by a substantial majority. One of the components of the Farmers Union program to which Loriks devoted attention in this 1936 speech was a call for a graduated land tax. His 1937 presidential speech reported that in the 1937 legislative session, the bill passed the House and failed to pass the Senate by just one vote. Loriks compared this situation to that in 1935 when the bill could not even be "smoked out" of committee.

Some of the other Farmers Union legislation whose passage was urged by Loriks in 1936 did not get so far—a Nonpartisan Primary Law and the Sims Bond Currency Bill.

The speaker also said that the opposition was trying to limit Farmers Union influence in the legislative races then pending. Historian Herbert Schell reports that in the 1936 elections in South Dakota, while Roosevelt carried the state by a "handsome majority," Democratic Governor Tom Berry was defeated, and "the legislature swung back into the
Republican column with control of the upper house held by the margin of a single vote."241

Farmers Union membership, according to Thompson, dropped in 1936 by 1,152.242 He credits the organization's membership losses from 1936 through 1939 to "the economic plight of the farmers," and in part to "the drifting away of many of the new members who had joined during 1934 and 1935 but who soon lost interest in the organization."243

1937 Presidential Address

At the 1937 convention, Loriks was overwhelmingly re-elected Farmers Union president and was also chosen to represent the South Dakota Farmers Union at the national convention, as already reported. There also was not any "ruction" at the convention, as it had been rumored there might be.

In the 1937 session, the South Dakota legislature increased the Homestake ore tax by 50 percent, from 4 percent to 6 percent.244 In his 1937 speech, Loriks cited several examples of Farmers Union legislative success in addition to the ore tax increase:

We have secured enactment of many minor legislative acts designed to relieve economic conditions, such as reducing interest rates, penalty rates on delinquent taxes, extension of time for tax payments. Also for taking tax deeds, as well as curtailing spending as we did in 1933. Then we have secured enactment of moratorium and deficiency judgment laws, reduced tax valuations. . . .
Loriks also pointed to the passage in 1937 of a bill to "give South Dakota farmers the same high grade tractor fuel as North Dakota and Nebraska already had." There was a state Farmers Union membership loss of 1,149 in 1937, according to Thompson. Some of the possible reasons for the late 1930s drop in members have already been mentioned.

Assessment of Immediate Speech Effects

Loriks was continually re-elected throughout the 1930s as president of the South Dakota Farmers Union and was also selected as a national convention delegate in 1937. Some of his programs and proposals were later adopted; others were not. Membership for 1935 increased, but for 1936 and 1937, it decreased.

One cannot say that these events happened because of Loriks' speeches, or that they would not have happened if he had not spoken. The membership figures varied, as Thompson suggests, for various reasons, among them drought and a loss of farmer interest. The programs that the Farmers Union was pushing might have gotten through the legislature anyhow, even if Loriks had not been pushing them. But perhaps his advocacy did have impact. And with the 1936 elections came a legislative swing to the Republicans, but even this was not all bad for the South
Dakota Farmers Union, as the 1937 session did increase the Union-sponsored and backed gold ore tax.

Assessment of Long Range Effects

Emil Loriks continued, after his leadership of the South Dakota Farmers Union from 1934 to 1938, to play an active role in politics and in the Union at a regional and national level. In 1938, as was reported earlier, after winning the six-man Democratic primary in the spring, Loriks resigned his Union post to run against Republican Karl Mundt for the East River Congressional seat. Loriks lost the 1938 election. This was his last attempt at elected political office.

In 1942, Loriks was elected national secretary-treasurer of the Farmers Union, defeating Jim Graves, longtime holder of that office. Farmers Union scholar John Crampton feels that this election was not due to ideology, but rather to Loriks' "personal vigor." Crampton quotes one Loriks backer as saying:

This is not a matter of personalities and certainly not a matter of repudiation. Emil Loriks has had experience on the National Board. We are moving into a period of total war. A tremendous drain of manpower and night work of traveling. Loriks is capable. He is vigorous and active and he would be available to work in any phase of our National Program including travel anywhere, day or night. He is the type of man I believe we need for this position.
Loriks in the late 1930s was part of a group of Farmers Union officials that founded the regional grain marketing cooperative, the Grain Terminal Association, based in St. Paul, Minnesota. From 1957 to 1967, Loriks served as GTA president, a job which meant he gave a considerable number of speeches as he had in his tenure as South Dakota Farmers Union president.

One of course cannot say that Emil Loriks' South Dakota Farmers Union speeches of the 1930s were directly responsible for his later political and Farmers Union activity. But at the least, these speeches of the 1930s would have helped provide training and experience for his later persuasive efforts. And the speeches perhaps could have influenced people to act favorably on his behalf.

**Summary**

**Logical Proof**

For all of the selected speeches, Loriks presented major assertions and then developed them. For the radio address in 1935, he tried to cover more assertions than he did for the two presidential addresses. The question has already been raised as to whether the speaker may have tried to cover too much ground in the radio talk.

For all three speeches, the reasoning was inductive. For forms of support, Loriks used examples and analogies in
all three speeches. He made use of testimony in the 1935 address and presented statistics in the 1937 address.

For all three speeches, there appeared to have been lack of sufficient support for all the assertions presented by the speaker. However, some assertions were more adequately supported than others.

The speaker also tended to be one-sided in his approach and he did not directly confront the counter-arguments that could have been made against his case. In fact, some of his comments about Huey Long seem surprising, both in light of the feelings of his own day and in the light of what scholars since have had to say about Long.

Two of the speeches contained internal inconsistencies. The speaker appears to have liked to use Biblical analogy, employing that technique in two of the speeches.

In general, the logical proof in these three speeches by Emil Loriks tended to be somewhat weak. Insufficient data was given to support some of the assertions and there was a one-sided presentation of the speaker's case. But it can be noted that for this particular audience, to whom Loriks was presenting views which they were probably predisposed to believe, it might not have been as important to present strong logical proof. If the speaker had been trying to present a case at odds with the
audience's views or one about which they were neutral, stronger logical proof might have been indicated.

**Emotional Proof**

All three speeches made extensive use of loaded words. Long's enemies were described in emotional terms and in all three speeches, such names as "Hearst" were cited with strong feeling. The capitalistic interests were always open to strong criticism.

The speaker used more neutral terms in discussing Farmers Union legislation and cooperative efforts in his speeches.

In the two presidential addresses, Loriks made major use of personal pronouns, especially "we," and to a lesser extent, "you." There was also some use of "I" in each of the speeches, which along with the citation of Farmers Union programs, could have been a way to establish speaker identification with the audience.

In fact, identification with the audience appears to have been a major part of Loriks' emotional proof and a major attribute of his overall speaking style for these selected speeches. Given the fact that one of the reasons Loriks said he went into politics was that he felt farmers were not adequately represented and needed to be heard more,²⁵⁰ it can be seen why Loriks might have tried to identify himself with his audience. The speaker also
seemed adept at attempting to analyze, and adjust to, his audience. Except for the one speech which contained obscure historical and classical references and which quoted obscure figures, Loriks tended to use examples and references that should have been familiar to his audiences. He tended to deal with current news events, with Farmers Union legislative and cooperative accomplishments and with Famres Union history.

Loriks made extensive and effective use of emotional proof in these three speeches, particularly in his extensive use of loaded words, and in his strong efforts to identify with his audience. Given the Farmers Union program and ideology, it is perhaps not surprising that a Farmers Union state leader would make significant use of emotional proof in addressing the organization's members.

Ethical Proof

The character component of ethical proof was prominent in all three of the Emil Loriks speeches. In each speech, he portrayed his cause as virtuous and his opponents' as not virtuous. In all three speeches, he equated his side with Biblical good, and the capitalist opposition with evil. In all three speeches, the speaker asserted his authority by use of "I." The speaker also appeared to be sincere.
The speaker in all instances used common sense and good taste and appeared to demonstrate intellectual integrity. Where he might be faulted as far as sagacity goes was in the component of moderation, for he was not always moderate. The opposition was painted in strongly emotionally tinted words.

The speaker praised his audience, by indirection most usually, by linking the Farmers Union causes with what was perceived to be virtuous and by pointing to Union legislative, educational and cooperative achievements. The speakers' attempts to identify himself with his listeners has already been referred to in the discussion of emotional proof. This identification was particularly strong because of the use of "we" and "you," which was also a means of trying to establish the audience as his partner.

There was only one example of a direct rebuke in these three speeches and it was a none-too-moderate criticism of those in the Farmers Union who wished to complain and not act.

In only one speech was there an example of exhibitionism on the speaker's part, through the use of possibly obscure historical and classical references. The two "live" addresses did not have any such examples. The speaker appears to have been candid in his approach, even
to the point of admitting, in the last speech, that the Union had been wrong on the Supreme Court issue.

The speaker seems to have made more extensive use of both emotional and ethical proof than he did of logical proof, which in all three speeches exhibited weaknesses. However, there were some instances within the speeches of some assertions having adequate logical proof.

Effects

There were some immediate effects than could possibly be linked to Emil Loriks' speeches. He continued to be re-elected as South Dakota Farmers Union president during the 1930s and some of his ideas were enacted into legislation. One must be cautious, however, in saying that the events of the speeches directly caused the following developments of re-election and legislation.

To look at longer range effects, Loriks did continue to be active in both politics and in Farmers Union activities, even beyond the state level, after these speeches were given. At the very least, the speech-making during the 1930s while he was president of the South Dakota Farmers Union, would have helped provide Emil Loriks with experience and training for his later involvements. And it is possible to speculate that his being in the public eye as a South Dakota Farmers Union speaker could have helped influence his later activities.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter was to summarize the procedures and findings of this study, draw conclusions relative to the questions raised in the "Purpose of the Investigation," and propose recommendations for further study.

Summary

The purpose of this inquiry was to determine the effectiveness and effect of Emil Loriks' agrarian Farmers Union rhetoric from 1934 to 1938, the years of his South Dakota Farmers Union presidency.

Three speeches were selected for analysis. They included a September 1935 Farmers Union radio address broadcast over WNAX, the 1936 Farmers Union presidential address and the 1937 Farmers Union presidential address. The speeches were selected from a total of more than thirty available speech texts for the period, to provide as wide a range of Farmers Union subject matter as possible and to deal with substantive policy issues at both the state and national level, rather than just internal organizational matters.
Historical background to aid in understanding the events of the 1930s Great Depression was compiled, with attention paid to historical, political, social and economic developments. Particular emphasis was given to agricultural policy issues of the period. The historical review began with developments in the 1920s when agricultural conditions worsened in both the nation as a whole and in South Dakota.

*Speech Criticism* by Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird and Waldo W. Braden, was used as the standard for establishing criteria in judging the effectiveness and effect of Emil Loriks' invention components in the three speeches. The invention components of logical proof, emotional and ethical proof were selected for analysis.

Questions were raised for the analysis of each of the three invention components, based on questions suggested in *Speech Criticism*.

Emil Loriks' logical proof in the three selected speeches was found to be generally inadequate in that insufficient evidence was offered to support his major assertions. This was not true in each case, however. The speaker tended to use examples and analogies, with a lesser use of statistics and testimony. There were some instances of internal inconsistencies. He did not deal with the counterarguments that could have been made to his assertions.
There were both immediate and long-range effects of Loriks' three speeches. He continued to be elected South Dakota Farmers Union president from the years 1934 to 1938. Some of the ideas he advocated were later enacted into legislation. Loriks ran for elective office in 1938, and he later moved on to positions of expanded leadership in regional and national Farmers Union organizations. At the very least, these speeches did not preclude this subsequent involvement, and it is possible that they may have helped make it attainable.

Conclusions

On the basis of the evidence amassed from this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted:

1. Emil Loriks was an influential and persuasive communicator in Farmers Union rhetoric.

2. Loriks' rhetoric closely reflected the ideology and program of the South Dakota and national Farmers Union organizations.

3. In the three speeches selected, the speaker often failed to meet the established criteria for effective logical proof.

4. Regarding logical proof, the major shortcoming was insufficient evidence to support the assertions.

5. Loriks appears to have satisfied the established criteria for emotional proof.
6. Loriks' use of loaded words appears to have been the most salient characteristic of his use of emotional proof.

7. The speaker appears to have satisfied the established criteria for the use of ethical proof.

8. It seems likely that Emil Loriks' background as a state senator from 1927 to 1934 influenced him to concentrate on a discussion of Farmers Union-backed legislation in the selected speeches.

Recommendations for Future Study

This study must be considered in light of its limitations. It dealt only with inventional components and not with the other canons. It was impossible to determine direct cause-effect relationships between Emil Loriks' inventional choices in the three speeches and events that happened subsequently in the Farmers Union organization or on the state political scene.

However, this study did provide an evaluation of the inventional choices of one persuasive Farmers Union communicator. It also set the speaker in his historical, economic and political context and indicated how the three selected speeches related to the ideology and program of the organization he headed.

From what has been learned about Emil Loriks and others like him, who could perhaps be termed "supporting
figures" in the agrarian protest movements of the Upper Midwest, other scholars might undertake studies of comparable figures. For instance, the rhetoric of leaders in other farm organization such as the opposing Farm Bureau could be studied. Comparison could be made of these other speakers' inventive choices.

Another possible area of study might be that of the rhetoric of the Farm Holiday movement, of which Emil Loriks was a part. While there have been historical studies made of the Farm Holiday, there is no study available of its rhetoric or of the rhetoric of some of its leaders.

In addition, rhetorical studies might be undertaken of other South Dakota political and agricultural figures. Eventually, this could lead to comparative studies of various prominent South Dakota figures. The analysis might also extend to regional and national dimensions as well. Comparisons could also be made of South Dakota agrarians like Loriks with other protest leaders like "Alfalfa Bill" Murray and Governor Floyd B. Olson of Minnesota.
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1935 RADIO ADDRESS
Farmers Union State President
Pays Tribute To Huey Long Who
Was Genuine Friend of Humanity

Emil Loriks Warns Against Prospect of War in Africa
As Repetition of What Happened in 1917
In Broadcast Over WNAX
Although Huey Long had not passed away at the time the following broadcast was given, he was very low. The expression given by President Loris is generally true of millions of people throughout the United States.

The complete broadcast follows:

The people of this Nation were shocked at the tragic news of the shooting of our friend, Senator Huey P. Long of Louisiana last night. We hope and pray for his recovery.

The people of South Dakota expected to hear Senator Long address the State Convention of the S. D. Farmers Union at Yankton next month (October 9th). That was the plan.

Our plans may have to be changed in view of what has happened during the last twenty hours.

It is with a heavy heart that I speak this evening and I am discarding my prepared radio broadcast at this time. Only six hours ago the news came to me of the terrible tragedy down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. I feel I would be derelict in my duty as President of the Farmers Union if I did not at this time comment on the extraordinary qualities of the great champion of the common people who is at this moment fighting for his own life, fighting against odds.

A Friend of the People

Is the assassin’s bullet, the cross, or the hemlock ever going to be the reward for faithful service to humanity?

Since Socrates was forced to drink the fatal hemlock, Jesus Christ crucified upon the Cross, history has been a chronology of such events. Our own Abraham Lincoln, the great Emancipator, was murdered at the hands of an assassin. TODAY, the outstanding friend of the downtrodden, the exploited, the destitute, lies at death’s door, the victim of the bloody hand of an assassin. Senator Huey P. Long of Louisiana, most mis-represented, maligned and persecuted of statesmen today by the powerful interests that rule this Nation because he dared to attack the evils at their source, has been shot down in cold blood by the recking, smoking pistol in the purpled hands of an assassin.

Abraham Lincoln had almost completed his work when shot down. Huey Long’s work had just begun. Lincoln liberated the negro, the chattel slaves of his day. He abolished a system gave way to competitive wage slavery, a better system in the eyes of capitalism, for chattel slavery carried with it the responsibility of caring for the slaves.

What Is the Situation in America Today?

Arthur Brisbane said three years ago: “One hundred million American citizens have nothing to lose but the economic chains holding them in slavery”, or words to that effect.

Senator Long’s Work Just Begun

The task of emancipation is a bigger one today than in Lincoln’s time.

It is a sad commentary on our times that the friends of freedom the enemies of slavery are thus destroyed.

The Farmers Union cannot but feel grateful to Senator Long for his loyal support of our Farmers Union Program. His unequivocal stand for Farmers Union and Labor Union legislation together with “Share the Wealth” Program, which had for its purpose the breaking up of large fortunes and the use of these funds for gainful employment for the unemployed millions, naturally attracted the support of the millions of American citizens whom Brisbane described as having nothing to lose but the

(Continued on Page Four)
FARMERS UNION STATE
PRESIDENT PAYS A TRIBUTE TO HUEY P. LONG

(Continued from Page 1)

economic chains holding them in slavery. It likewise incurred the enmity of those who own AMERICA.

The senator was a potential candidate for the Presidency and he had a reputation as a fighter for the people second to none. He asked no quarter and he gave none. He always stood face to face with the powers of iniquity and fought the forces of darkness and injustice even though single handed sometimes.

Undoubtedly there was a premium on his life, a price for his scalp. He was not entirely unaware of the dangers lurking in his path for this was not the first time that an attempt had been made to take his life.

The history of the past six months are heavy with the tragedy of loss of fighters for the Farmers Union.

It is not so long ago since the loss of Senator Bronson Cutting of New Mexico, killed in an aeroplane crash en route to the National Capitol to fight for the Patman Bill, for the Adjusted Compensation for the soldiers.

It is quite recently that congressman Traux of Ohio, that staunch and sturdy friend of the farmers and member of our Farmers Union, died in the harness, fighting for the Frazier-Lemke Bill.

We can ill afford such losses at this crucial time. But as Lincoln said, "it is for us the living to dedicate ourselves to the carrying out of the unfinished task before us."

In order that you may not think that I am merely giving my personal views over the air tonight relative to Senator Long of Louisiana, I will quote the tributes and endorsements of various groups:

Letter From Simpson

Dear Senator:

I want you to know, once more, that I appreciate and admire the intelligent and courageous fight you are putting up for the great mass of common people in this Country.

Your slogan, "Redistribute the Wealth of the Country", is the best remedy proclaimed in the Nation.

John A. Simpson, President
National Farmers Union.

There is a tribute to Senator Long from our late beloved National President of the Farmers Union, the greatest farm leader in our nation's history.

President Everson has likewise endorsed his legislative record.

Similar endorsements of his 100% legislative record come from the Federation of Labor, Posts of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Here's one from Plain Talk Magazine: Speaking of Senator Long's record—"The only 100% record all the way around for public interest, for the veterans of humanity is that other measures of humanity is that of Senator Huey P. Long of Louisiana. Other Senators come near to the point of perfection, but none is wholly perfect except the record of the Louisiana Senator."

Certificate of Honor presented to Senator Huey P. Long at a public ceremony by Victory Post of the American Legion, Washington, D. C., for his 100 per cent record and service to the veterans of all wars in the United States Senate.

Certificate of Honorary Membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, certified by National Headquarters and State Headquarters that Senator Huey P. Long's record is 100 per cent in behalf of Veterans.

When the above certificate was presented to Senator Long, the following remarks were made by C. W. Forbes of the A.V. of F. W.:
"We have declared you a member of our body, Senator Long, for the untiring, consistent and faithful service which you have rendered the veterans and for the stands you took in the United States Senate. Regardless of what you may have lost by your activeness, you have gained the untiring support of the veterans of our organization, who stand ready to support you in everything you undertake."

Similar certificates for service have been issued to Senator Long by other veteran organizations.

"Labor", the official paper of all railroad brotherhoods, said:

"Long and his colleague, Overton, are the first Senators from Louisi ana since the Civil War who have voted on the people's side of major issues. The record Long has made since he came to Washington would do credit to George W. Norris or any other Progressive."

Senator Long was presented with a life membership in the Twenty-second Reserve Marines Association of New Orleans, First Battalion, U. S. Marine Corps.

The hearts of millions of Americans tonight are heavy with tragedy—patiently awaiting the next report at ten o'clock this evening. Will the voice of Senator Long be forever silenced? A hundred million American citizens are, or should be praying for his recovery.

The handful who own America perhaps are rejoicing and gleefully hoping that his lifeless body will soon be lowered into the inhospitable grave.

Huey P. Long, the crusader for justice, the second emancipator, who would lift from the guter one hundred million people enmeshed in slavery, may before the golden sun kisses Louisiana tomorrow morn, be amongst the immortals.

Would his death spur the living on to achieve the task for which he gave his life?

World Moving Into War

Black war clouds are hovering over us—The Gods of War are thundering and ominous signs point to the impending catastrophe. WAR IS IN THE AIR!

Before our next F. U. radio broadcast—Yes, before the State Convention next month, Mussolini's heavy artillery, machine guns, tanks and aeroplanes will bark death into innocent Ethiopia.

Mussolini's brutal frankness reveals that he is going to cut the throats of Ethiopians merely for the sake of territorial expansion—creating an outlet for Italy's surplus population.

Cruel and barbarian as Mussolini's plans appear, we and many other nations are not in a position to throw stones. Have we not been guilty of the same sin? Have not the U. S., England, France and others taken over territories from weaker races for the purpose of aggrandizement and exploitation?

However, we are hoping that the World was emerging from barbarism. We had hoped that civilization was ascending to a higher plane, yet, today, the members of another mighty military conflagration are aglow. Nations are carrying fuel to the scene and a Roman dictator is igniting with the flame of fascism and starting this conflagration. ALL THIS IN THE BIRTHPLACE OF CHRISTIANITY,—WHERE THE PRINCE OF PEACE WALKED OVER NINeteen Hundred Years Ago.

War Seems Inevitable

The question is, shall it embroil the whole world? Will America again send millions of the sons of American mothers thousands of miles across the waters to pull chestnuts out of the fire for our financial interests?

Those of us who served in the last WORLD WAR will answer most emphatically NO!

However, a new generation has grown up since then!

Will the youth of today be led forth to another slaughter?
We know that war preparations are proceeding at fever heat in all the European Nations. We know that British and Italian fleets are maneuvering in the same waters and that British aeroplane factories are operating at full capacity.

It is only a question of time—of days perhaps until the guns will roar. That the all powerful British fleet will move into action against Italy to safeguard England's investments in Africa is almost a foregone conclusion. IT WILL BE A CAPITALIST WAR!

Nothing but a miracle can prevent another World orgy of bloodshed, carnage and devastation Africa and Europe are the seething cauldron where this broth of Hell is boiling. Ere long the bloody Nile will tinge the Mediterranean with the mixed blood of Europeans and Africans!

Bear in mind that red blood also courses through the veins of Ethiopians, though their skin be dark. They too love their country and their homes. THEY WILL FIGHT!

Humanity's highest hope is that the good people of Italy will rise up and refuse to bear arms; that they will refuse to kill their dark skinned brothers of Ethiopia for the further glorification of Mussolini!

LET US NOT FEEL TOO SECURE BECAUSE OF OUR REMOTENESS FROM THE SCENE OF ACTION! LET US NOT FORGET 1917.

Let us not forget how the press of the country and other agencies of publicity were prostituted by powerful financial interests seeking to protect their financial interests! propagandizing our people into a war frenzy against our good German neighbors across the sea.

Let us not forget how public officials like Congressman Rankin of Montana, Senator Gore of Oklahoma and such were relegated to private life because of their opposition to WAR! Let us not forget how the elder Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin was persecuted, misrepresented and maligned because of his opposition to human slaughter.

Let us fortify ourselves against another tidal wave of propaganda, should the war mongers again seek to stampede America into war as they did in 1917.

Let us remember what General Smedley Butler said in a public utterance! In all the wars that he had ever served he had simply acted as a bill collector for the House of Morgan. BEWARE-DOLLAR DIPLOMACY.

The recently reported investment of American and British Capital in Ethiopian Oil Concessions appears to us the most brazen attempt of Capital to drag the United States into another World War. deal has been cancelled. Let us hope that never again will the sons of American mothers be sacrificed to safeguard American capital on foreign soil, under foreign flags.

May God keep this Nation through the dangers of the coming year. May the lustre of Old Glory never be soiled or stained by future war, anarchy or internal strife. May it never advance save to bring freedom, liberty, self-government and equality of opportunity to all.
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REPORT OF THE STATE PRESIDENT  
(Emil Lurka)  

This is our twenty-first birthday, our twenty-first anniversary as the South Dakota Division of the Farmers Educational and Co-operative Union of America. We are of age.

I am sure we all love that name FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND CO-OPERATIVE UNION. When you say that name you have said it all! The words EDUCATIONAL and CO-OPERATIVE explain what kind of Union we should have.

There may be those who would make it a political Union or a Sectarian Union, or some other kind of Union but past experience has taught us the dangers and the pitfalls incident thereto.

Permit me to refer to the PREAMBLE to our CONSTITUTION—Quote: "In order to obtain a better and more direct market for all products of the farm and to eliminate unnecessary expenses in buying our supplies, we have organized the Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, South Dakota Division."

It would be a good thing for all of us occasionally to refresh our memories by reading and re-reading Articles I and II, The Preamble and Purposes of the Farmers Union.

Our Country is in the throes of a political campaign! It is well to remind ourselves that whoever is elected President of the United States we will still have the same economic system to contend with. That political parties merely serve to keep people divided and to perpetuate the profit system. That it will be necessary for us to change the system.

That is what we propose to do. That is what we would do if we carry out the Preamble and Purposes of the Farmers Union as set forth in our Constitution.

Democracy has not failed. It is our economic system that has failed. As mankind evolved from Savagery to Barbarism to Slavery to Feudalism to Capitalism, it is now in the process of transformation to the next step in its economic evolution, namely CO-OPERATION! What are we doing to help change our economic system? Let us ask ourselves that question, each and every one of us.

Are we helping to build a new economic order or are we merely following political panaceas and cure-alls advocated by various and sundry political demagogues?

Are we just talking, or are we doing things?

Sometimes I think we are long on speech making and short on actual accomplishment.

We will have to travel a great deal faster in the future than we have during our entire past history if we are going to save civilization.

We are not traveling an uncharted course.

In the "welter of world chaos with its economic dissolution and internecine strife" we behold in Northern Europe, on the Scandinavian Peninsula, a race of people who have developed the co-operative principle to such an extent that it has elevated living standards to the highest, banished slums and illiteracy, provided social security. They are building a new social and economic order within the old structure of capital and doing a beautiful job of it. They are doing it without violence, without bloodshed or the sacrifice of human lives.

They have really accomplished much of what we are trying to do.

Organizing Co-operatives

In this year 1926 we have not only talked co-operation. We have gone out in the field and built Farmers Union Co-operatives. Ti Co-operatives are affiliated with our own Central Co-operative Wholesale, The Farmers Union Brokerage Company at Sioux Falls, Sioux Falls, Watertown and Mitchell.

Despite the most unprecedented drought and crop failure in his history of our State, we started to build Farmers Union Co-operatives. We have started to build a NEW ECONOMIC ORDER, that will gradually replace the old tottering profit system that one speaker on last night’s program so aptly described as "THE DEAD CAT IN THE WELL".

It is an impressive array of Farmers Union Co-ops that have started in South Dakota the past year and that are now in the formative stage, and the most remarkable part of it all is that this phenomenal growth has been accomplished so far without one cent of Co-operative finance from the Government.

These Co-ops are federated together, purchasing cooperatively through our own Co-operative Wholesale, handling Farmers Union Products.

Farmers Union Should Sponsor Both Consumer And Producer Co-operation

South Dakota being chiefly an agricultural state, it is obvious that the Farmers Union should sponsor both consumer and producer coop
Itives and that is what we are doing. We are essentially producers and we are also the chief consumers.

Would it be logical to abandon our Farmers Union and producer co-operation and simply join some Consumer Organization? It would seem obvious that the Farmers Union should develop both types of co-operation and seek to balance the two. When we surrender our bargaining power we likewise surrender our economic power.

Political Solution

Political parties serve the dominant economic interests. Can we become the dominant economic interest under the profit system?

Can we become the dominant economic power by patronizing or continuing to patronize the exploiters?

Obviously we must accomplish the job ourselves. We must build a new economic order through co-operation. We can build this right within the present structures, without violence, without bloodshed and without the sacrifice of human lives.

Just a few words more on co-operation. As a member of many co-operatives during the last twenty years, I am making this observation. I would not give much for a co-op that serves simply as a marketing post or as a retail agency for an old line concern. While a co-operative of that kind does some good it will never solve the problem. It will never change the system. It simply becomes a merchandising tool in the hands of the profit system. And consequently we hear that: "What does a few dollars dividend mean anyway? That will never save our farms and homes, etc."

Co-operation must be carried on clear through. We must have a vision, a clear perception of the final objective, an understanding of what we hope to accomplish.

Speaking of vision, this will illustrate the point:

Construction work was proceeding on a mighty edifice, a cathedral, and multitudes of workmen were busy at various tasks. One workman was interviewed and asked: "What are you doing?" He replied, "I am mixing mud." Another one replied "I am wheeling bricks for $1.00 a day." A third one indicated the same way replied with a proud smile, "Why, I am building a cathedral." That man had vision.

And so it is in the co-operative movement. The man who thinks only in terms of a few dollars dividend and builds co-operatively only as retail merchandising outlet for old line products, is thinking only in terms of the man hauling bricks, getting $2 or $3 per day.

The man who tries to build a co-operative structure clear through to the marketing terminals and to the processing and manufacturing of our products and supplies is thinking in terms of the man who had vision, the man who said: "I am building a cathedral."

The co-operators who think in terms of building a new economic order are possessed of vision. They are the ones who will ultimately change society.

As a buck private in the co-operative movement, I have always adhered to this philosophy, call it blind unreasoning loyalty if you will, that I will market through my co-op and buy my supplies through my co-op regardless of chiseling tactics of the opposition. I will never chase the penny snicker but laid out for me by the exploiting interests. The dividends are a minor consideration.

My aim is to market all my grain through the Farmers Union, all my live-stock through the Farmers Union and to purchase my supplies so far as possible through the Farmers Union. Personally I do this to the extent of several hundred dollars per month giving little thought to dividends. I am helping to build a New Economic Order.

Today, the eyes of the World (a World torn by economic dissolution and international strife) are on the Scandinavian Peninsula. There we behold a Co-operative Commonwealth of the highest order. There we behold a race of people who have secured "The Greatest Good for the Greatest Number", where they have practically banished unemployment, illiteracy, slums and poverty. Where living standards of the common people are high and human welfare receives first consideration.

The time is here—the hour has struck, when we must decide what to do. It is up to each and every one of us. Shall we flounder aimlessly on the drift with the current until we are engulfed in the swirling current of foremism?

Capitalism has been compared to the slot machine. He who plays the slot machine long enough will inevitably go broke. The profit system has already busted most of us. It has put us down in the economic gutter. No wonder that men and women, frustrated in their life's work, are subscribing to all sorts of political panaceas and promises of political demagogues. They make the mistake of thinking that some human Messiah is going to lead them out of the wilderness when the truth is—the job is ours. We must do it ourselves. No one else is going to do it for us, and the sooner we realize that the better it will be.

We must build economic power through economic organization through co-operation. We must run our own business and operate it at cost. The service motive to replace the motive for profit.

And remember this—Dominant economic interests have always controlled the political machine regardless of political party. You and I (the 99% of the people) should be dominant but we can never become that so long as we play the capitalistic slot machine, so long as we patronize the exploiting system.

You can become the dominant economic power by patronizing yourself, building your own co-operatives, and thus you will eventually become the dominant political power.

Those who own America (the Morgans, the Hearsts and the Mellons) are the dominant economic interests and they also control politics. They are the exponents of the profit system. They make laws, they declare war—ANYTHING FOR PROFIT.

Hearst-Illomestake --- Example of Dominant Economic Power

We have had a taste of it in South Dakota—how the dominant economic interest (The Hearst-Illomestake Mining interest) situated in one County has dominated our State for half a century.
Today we behold Hearst in the role of America's Fascist No. 1, with the largest newspaper empire in the World to promote the selfish avaricious cause of a decadent capitalism. Hearst is leading America on the road to Fascism, to capitalistic dictatorship.

South Dakota is helping to nourish this beast whose tentacles reach into every corner of our land. Do you know that they are sucking $18,000,000 to $19,000,000 out of one Gold Mine in South Dakota annually? More than Jefferson and Napoleon for the entire Louisiana Purchase, every year taken out of one Gold Mine in South Dakota. Do you know that this gold is helping to nourish the Hearst Belugas to finance his poison propaganda to be spread through the columns of the largest newspaper empire in the World plus a large national chain of broadcasting stations Hearst owned.

You members of the Farmers Union, when you fought the Hearst Homestead interests, were not fighting just a local enemy—you were fighting the biggest menace to democracy in America today. Your fight was just a skirmish on one front.

Do we have the courage to face such a formidable enemy or will we succumb to the gas barrage emanating from this world's largest newspaper empire and radio broadcasting chain?

These are the weapons with which the dominant economic interests will fight the co-operative movement. These are the weapons with which dominant economic interests control politics plus millions of campaign contributions.

You and I have surrendered these weapons to the enemy. Our job is to regain them.

State Fair Exhibit

This is the first year since I became a State Official in the Farmers Union that we have had Headquarters and Exhibits at the South Dakota State Fair. Nevertheless, it was a great success. The Juniors did a mighty fine job of running our "show" and the various activities of the Farmers Union (Insurance, Livestock Commission and our Co-operative Wholesale Brokerage Co.) were all represented. It was estimated some 6,000 or more visitors came to our Headquarters during Fair Week. It was favorable publicity for the Union and was the means of establishing many new contacts.

It should be continued.

The Junior Camps were a real success and should be continued. With the expansion of territory, we may have to establish more of them in order to accommodate the entire State.

Educational work will have to be stressed more and more in connection with our co-operative program. The Northern States Co-operative League has been the source of much valuable material for co-operative studies. We appreciate their cooperation.

Co-operative Education should be the major project in the educational field the coming year. We should cover the subject thoroughly from both producer and consumer standpoint.

The Farmers Union must never permit itself to be swallowed up by some Consumer Movement. We must sponsor and promote both consumer and producer co-operation and maintain a balanced system.

Legislation

We hope the time has come when we can distinguish between legislation and "politics". The political parties have been, in my estimation, a curse to our democratic form of government.

Political patronage under our system of political parties has promoted a form of "gangster" government with rival gangs contending for the privilege of looting the public treasury. It becomes principally a fight for the "spoils" of office.

Non-Partisan Primary

The South Dakota Farmers Union is about to initiate a Non-Partisan Primary Law in our State that will do away with political party designation on the ballot and candidate's names will appear as they do now, in the independent column.

This will require some real co-operation and a great deal of work in the various counties to obtain the signatures required. The outcome will depend on that to a large extent. We learned from the recent One Tax campaign that special effort had to be put forth to secure the necessary number of signatures.

Home Ownership

We believe individual home ownership is a guarantee of stability of any government. We can not believe that God Almighty created this World to be owned by Insurance and Loan Corporations and that the people should be homeless serfs, share croppers and tenants.

Therefore to discourage large holdings of land we propose to enact a Graduated Land Tax and to amend the Constitution to permit us to legislate for our childrens benefit at least.

Monetary Reform

While many are of the opinion that monetary reform can only be accomplished through political action, we must not lose sight of the fact that there is one branch of Government that has gradually overshadowed them all—the JUDICIAKY.

Unconstitutional laws are always challenged if they are good for the people, but unconstitutional laws enacted for special privilege are never challenged. WHY?

South Dakota last year initiated a move (from Hanson County) to test the Constitutionality of the Federal Reserve and National Bank Act. It passed the National Convention. It is a plank that is still good as new. It has never been used!

We will renew our efforts at the coming National Convention to have this carried out.

Sims Bond Currency Bill

While we are waiting for enactment of National Legislation along monetary lines, we can go a long way by enacting the Sims Bond Currency Bill in our State.

Savings would thus be invested in bonds of small denomination that
would circulate the same as money and would serve as an additional medium of exchange. It would be a circulating medium on which the people would draw interest rather than the big bond holders. Let us not wait for Congress but do what we can ourselves.

**Legislative Committee Report**

When the Legislative Committee reports to this Convention and the report is acted on we will know more fully what our program will be, and I have merely mentioned here some of the main issues I believe the Union should fight for.

We are not unmindful of the fact that since the smoke cleared from the last Session and the Farmers Union marched to victory, the opposition has never left one stone unturned in their efforts to eliminate our members in the Legislature. After November 3rd we will know our strength, however. Our success depends chiefly upon youth folk's return as it did in the last Session. It was your support that made it possible for the Union to win.

Let us concentrate for further legislative victories in the next session, but let us not forget to build a new economic system, a new economic order through co-operative efforts. Let us remember this...We get a crack at legislation only once in two years, but we can build co-operatively 365 days in the year. Remember this too, the dominant economic interests usually control political parties.

**LET US CONTINUE TO REMIND OURSELVES OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES FOR WHICH THE FARMERS UNION WAS FOUNDED.**

1937 challenges us to present a united front. We accept the challenge and we sincerely believe that before the bells ring out the old year and the curtain is drawn on the new year, we will have a solid Union of States.

**Centralizing Farmers' Union Activities**

For economy, efficiency and service and to co-ordinate the work of the Farmers Union, I would recommend that as soon as expedient we consolidate our various Farmers Union offices and activities in one place.

It is with the hopes that the membership will give this some serious consideration so that we will be in a position to take some action in the near future, that I make this recommendation.

Motion prevailed to adopt report.

**REPORT OF THE STATE SECRETARY-TREASURER**

(By E. H. Sauber)

To the Delegates and Members of the South Dakota Farmers Union in Annual Convention assembled:

As your Secretary and Treasurer I am going to submit to you and for your consideration my annual report of the financial standing covering the period for one year commencing September 16th, 1935, and ending September 15th, 1936.

During this period I have received from the different sources the sum of $17,108.80; there was a cash balance on hand at the beginning of the year of $3,450.57, making a total to be accounted for of $20,559.37. During the same period I have paid out the sum of $20,375.43, leaving a cash balance on hand at the close of the books on Sept. 15th of $183.94.

The following is a copy of the annual audit report as prepared by Charles H. Richardson of Yankton, S. D., public accountant and auditor, showing in general the "Receipts and Disbursements" and shows also in detail from whom the money was received and to whom paid.

I shall also submit to you a membership report showing the total paid up membership for 1936; it will show the membership in each county and district organization.

**ACCOUNTANT'S CERTIFICATE**

TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE

UNION OF AMERICA, SOUTH DAKOTA DIVISION

I have examined the books and vouchers of the office of the Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. E. H. Sauber, for the year ending September 15th, 1936.

The cash balance in each bank has been reconciled and verified. All entries in the books of original entry have been checked.

I have found that the books have been kept in a very satisfactory manner.

I hereby certify that in my opinion, the following statement of Receipts and Disbursements and all supporting detail statements are true and correct.

Signed

Charles H. Richardson,
Accountant and Auditor.

**AUDIT REPORT**

of the

OFFICE OF SECRETARY AND TREASURER

E. H. Sauber

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA

(South Dakota Division)

**YANKTON, SOUTH DAKOTA**

**STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS**

From September 16, 1935 to September 15, 1936

**RECEIPTS**

Balance on hand, September 16, 1935 .......................... $ 3,450.57

Dues and Fees ........................................ $ 12,061.56

Advertising .............................................. 398.00

Supplies .................................................. 120.95

Bills Receivable, F. & M. Brokerage, Sioux Falls ....... 1,500.00

Educational Fund ....................................... 2,947.64

Farmers and Merchants State Bank Dividend ...... 294.28

Miscellaneous ........................................... 771.37

Total Receipts for Entire Period ......................... $17,108.80 $17,108.80

Total Receipts, Including Balance at Beginning of Period $20,559.37
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1937 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS
MINUTES
of the
Farmers' Educational & Cooperative
Union of America
(SOUTH DAKOTA DIVISION)

Twenty-second Annual Convention at Huron, South
Dakota, October 12-13-14, 1937

OFFICERS

EMIL LORIKS, President, Arlington, South Dakota
J. C. SKAGE, Vice President, Toronto, South Dakota
PAUL G. ERICKSON, Secretary-Treasurer, Sioux Falls, South Dakota

DIRECTORS

First District—Enoch Hofstad, Elk Point, South Dakota
Second District—Jessie Kistler, Mt. Vernon, South Dakota
Third District—W. C. Hermann, Rockham, South Dakota
Fourth District—Wm. Sinkular, Dallas, South Dakota
Fifth District—Fred Root, Keystone, South Dakota
The people are waking up to the fact that the farmer has been discriminated against. The cities of the east have been building on the products of the west but the time will come when the west will be able to retain their money and use it.

I want to thank Mr. Lurk for the splendid address he has given us and I know he is speaking from his heart. I am glad Huron is welcoming us and know we are going to behave so that they will want us back again.

I thank you.

Mr. Loriks at this time appointed the Program Committee consisting of Oscar Johnson, Mrs. E. H. Everson, Ed Backlund, Chris Serum and U. B. White and also the Credential Committee consisting of O. W. Horsley, E. G. Habeger, Mrs. August Hanson, Jennie Harrison and Leo Zimmer.

Mr. A. J. Maag, President of the State Federation of Labor, was now introduced by the President and he gave us a few words of welcome from himself and the Labor Organization.

Following this Mr. Irving Levine, State Secretary of the Workers Alliance of Aberdeen, South Dakota, was introduced and gave a splendid talk which appears elsewhere in this issue.

Mr. Chester Grafton of Michigan, National Director of Junior Education of the Farmers Union, was next introduced and spoke a few words of greeting.

Mr. E. H. Everson, National President of the Farmers Union, was also introduced at this time and expressed his pleasure at being with us and his sincere wishes for a fine convention.

Mr. L. S. Herron, Editor of the Nebraska Union Farmer, was presented at this time to the convention and brought greetings and good wishes from the Nebraska State Farmers Union.

Motion prevailed to adjourn until 1:15 P.M.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON

Music and entertainment which included the fine Progressive Local Band from Tripp County conducted by Elmer Owen.

Meeting called to order by President Loriks who announced we would have a report from the Credential Committee which showed County Delegates present 34, Legislative Committeemen 34, and local delegates 155, or a total of 223 delegates and since sufficient delegates were present to constitute a quorum the convention was now open for the transaction of business and would remain in session until all business was disposed of. Mr. Herron at this time gave an address on Cooperation which appears elsewhere in this issue.

A report was called for from the Program Committee and was made by Oscar Johnson who gave the majority report adopting the program as printed and a motion was made and seconded to adopt.

A minority report was given also by U. B. White, Secretary, which is as follows:

PROGRAM COMMITTEE MINORITY REPORT

We the Minority part of the Program Committee wish to report that on hearing from eleven members appearing before our committee asking a change in our tentative program for a change in the place of our National President E. H. Everson, four members appearing against the change we recommend that this question be settled by the delegates themselves as to when they wish to hear our National President E. H. Everson address this convention.

Signed—U. B. White, Sec. of Committee.

Much discussion followed these two reports. Substitute motion was made and seconded to accept the minority report. Substitute motion for all pending motions carried that Mr. Everson be placed on the program in the afternoon following Glenn Tafelott.

Motion prevailed that the program report as amended be accepted.

Vice-President J. C. Shape in the chair.

STATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

BY ELMIR LOHRS

This is our twenty-second annual convention, our twenty-second birthday. Today we are observing the biggest event of the entire year. HUMANITY AT THE CROSSROADS!

Shall we cruelly mankind on the Cross of Profits or can we save mankind through economic democracy?

That is the question, the struggle confronting every nation in the World today. That struggle is dramatized with guns and bayonets, with machine guns, shrapnel and poison gas, indiscriminately destroying property and snuffing out innocent defenseless human lives. This tragic World drama of destruction is being enacted on three continents, Europe, Africa and Asia.

The other side of the drama in strange contrast is portrayed by the Cooperative Commonwealths of northern Europe, cold, barren, mountainous countries, for centuries steeped in poverty and want, who have through Cooperative Development as embodied in the fundamental aims and purposes of the Farmers Union, lifted themselves from destitution to the highest standards of living of the average citizen anywhere in the World today.

Thirty-five years ago, Newt Gresham and his intrepid little band, ten hard-hat, destitute, poverty-striken farmers of Raines County, Texas, organized the first Farmers Union Local. Uncle Dorn was a member of this local. They wrote the Farmers Union Constitution, the Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence from economic tyranny and despotism, that will ring through the ages.

Today (this year 1937) the 35th anniversary of this momentous event, it is well to consecrate ourselves, to re-dedicate ourselves to those high and noble principles for which the Union was founded, those original and fundamental purposes, aims and objectives for which the Union was organized.

Twenty-two years ago in South Dakota, those original purposes, aims and objectives were written into our own Constitution. In that immortal document our founding fathers wrote in plain and simple language, our aims and objectives—to achieve economic democracy through the cooperative movement. READ IT! MEMORIZE IT! Then read it over and over. Read it in unison at Union meetings, whether local or county or
State, or National. Certainly those who hold positions of leadership in the organization should be familiar with it.

It stands today like the Rock of Gibraltar, unshaken and unsullied by the vicious attacks of demagogues and charlatans, impostors and “fake medicine men” with their quack cures and nostrums. In the raging storm on the rock bound coast of economic dictatorship, it stands as a beacon light to guide the ship of economic democracy to a safe haven.

Beware of the siren-voices of these impostors who would tempt you to deviate from the straight and narrow course charted by the founding fathers of this great Union. Beware of them in whatever form they may appear, whether in black cloth, in purple robes, in overalls or baggy pants. I see these forces beckoning to you from all sides. I see it more clearly now than ever before since the Farmers Union has won some victories.

Since we won that decisive victory over the economic dictatorship that ruled our own State for fifty years, in our program to tax the rich and powerful, we see those forces worming right into our own Union itself, to undermine, to checkmate, to neutralize or destroy it.

Since we entered the Cooperative field to check the profit system, we have also stepped on the toes of powerful interests who are likewise fighting us to a finish.

In South Dakota we have won notable victories on two fronts against economic dictatorship—through Legislation and through Cooperation.

Did you ever suppose that these gains would be unchallenged? The President of the Oklahoma Farmers Union recently said that the big fight in their State has always been, to hold the gains they made! They have won victories from time to time, but their big fight has been to hold the ground gained.

We have found that to be true in South Dakota. We are now in position of having to defend and hold the ground we have gained, both in Cooperation and Legislation.

The safest course to pursue to avoid opposition seems to have been one of pure condemnation and denunciation, blind and indiscriminate, with no thought of ever getting results. In other words, a NEGATIVE philosophy of indiscriminate criticism and fault finding and “bellyache” seems to be the line of least resistance. Because when you build or accomplish nothing, then you have nothing to defend.

Blind, unreasoning expressions of hatred, condemnation and prejudice from the platform gets us nowhere, if that is all we do. It is when we really build cooperatives to check the profit system and when we really put laws on the statute books that tax the rich or limit special privilege, then is when we step on the economic dictatorship that rules our State and Nation.

Those of you who have helped to do these things, YOU have carried the CROSS. You know what it is to wear a crown of thorns—You have tasted the bitter cup!

Newt Gresham and the founder of this great Farmers Union had a vision. Like unto Moses of old, they saw their own class steeped in slavery, and they visioned too, a land flowing with milk and honey of abundance.

Like unto Moses they prepared for the journey by educating and organizing, and invoking Divine guidance. Like unto Moses they probably realized that the journey through the desert would be a long one measured in what we call time, to reach the goal, the New World of abundance of the good things of life for all.

Newt Gresham launched this Crusade to liberate the farmers from an economic tyranny of concentrated wealth with very meager equipment.

All he had was a mule and a saddle. Talk about courage and fortitude! To thus do battle with an economic system entrenched and powerful.

The Pharaohs of today, the Morgans and Mellons of high finance, are just as faith to release their strangle hold on the people as they were thousands of years ago. Our journey through the economic desert of scarcity and want may require forty years and more. Isn’t it thirty-five years now? We have five years left to go.

The Izraelites had been enslaved for four hundred years under the Pharaoh—a dictatorship in Egypt. When Moses tried to liberate them, to lead them to a land of abundance, there was much dissatisfaction and strife. Frequently they betred to go back to the old submission and slavery. Sometimes they lost the vision completely, as for instance when they built themselves a Golden Calf and worshipped it. The fact is that after four hundred years in the desert they were not fit to be free. It took forty years in the desert to educate them and prepare them for what should come.

WE ARE WANDERING IN THE ECONOMIC DESERT OF SCARCITY TODAY! We see in the distance the mountain peaks of abundance and plenty for all, and the course is charted for us to follow. Yet we find ourselves frequently chancing some mirage or getting off on some by-path. We sometimes give way to dissention, bickering, quarreling and petty strife. Yet, we are on the march, and we see the objective in the distance. The pathway is marked. Why do we tarry?

Let us keep our eye ever on the goal! On this difficult and dangerous journey there is something for each and every one of us to do, and the sooner we get busy the sooner we will reach the goal.

Right here I want to pause and commend the First and Second Districts of our South Dakota Farmers Union for recent expressions in District Meetings wherein they have stressed need for observance of our Farmers Union National Program. After all these years in the desert, that is a very timely admonition, that we get back to the travel and pathway charted by the founding fathers of the Union.

The principles for economic emancipation enunciated by Newt Gresham and the founding fathers of this great Union are so fundamental that we can never hope to achieve the objective by ignoring them. They charted the course. The philosophy they enunciated must be implanted in the hearts and minds of men and women, it must become a part of our every day life. It must be reflected in every deed, in constructive achievement and accomplishment. It must become the same as a religion with us.

WE STAND AT THE CROSS ROADS IN AMERICA TODAY! We haven’t much time to choose which way to follow. The road charted by Newt Gresham and the founders of the Union, the road of economic
democracy (Cooperation) leads to equity, justice and a fuller life for all. The road we have been traveling (Profit System) leads to destruction, chaos and war.

So much for a long term program.

Immediate Problems Acute

While we are still living under the Profit System, we are faced with grim realities—scarcity of the necessaries of life. Our immediate problems have become so acute and so severe that they have submerged and overshadowed everything else.

With 60% of our great State of South Dakota wiped out completely by drought so far as cash crops are concerned, our people are facing a period of dire need and suffering, perhaps unparalleled heretofore. To the accompaniments of wails and howls from Liberty League and Wall Street interests and their hirelings, the allowance for farm drought relief has been pared to the bone. It has been reduced from $225,000,000.00 in 1935 to $150,000,000.00 in 1926 to less than $20,000,000.00 the current year.

What does this mean?

It means that while we are in this desert journey, in this period of transition, enduring hardships and the ravages of drought, we must live. We must exist. We must have clothing, shelter and fuel to keep warm when the long and cold winter months descend upon us. This is the first essential, overshadowing every other consideration right now.

It means that when winter's arctic blasts sweep the plains of the great Northwest, there will be suffering on a scale heretofore unknown, unless we get recognition of our Mid-West States Drought Conference Recommendations and press hard for further concessions from the Federal Government in this time of distress.

It means that more crumbs will have to fall from the tables of the Profit System so long as that system endures. It means that we will have to coordinate our efforts and stand united in our demands for more liberal concessions in grants and work relief, and liberal feed and seed loan policy recognizing that human needs come first.

WE HAVE A RIGHT TO ASK THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR AID AND ASSISTANCE IN TIMES OF GREATER EMERGENCIES SUCH AS DROUGHT AND FLOOD AND OTHER CATASTROPHIES BEYOND OUR CONTROL. IT IS THE DUTY OF THE GOVERNMENT TO COME TO THE AID AND ASSISTANCE OF ANY AREA THAT IS SO STRICKEN.

Our Mid-West Drought Conference recommendations, endorsed by half a dozen States, by several Governors, including our own Governor, our own State Board of the Farmers Union must be given further impetus! Let us keep up the fight!

Long Time Program Of the Union

Quoting from the National Program of the Farmers Union: "WE BELIEVE THAT COOPERATION SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AS THE PRIMARY PROGRAM OF THE FARMERS UNION, AND THAT LEGISLATION SHOULD BE SUPPLEMENTARY THERETO, AS WE BUILD ECONOMIC STRENGTH WE SHALL BUILD LEGISLATIVE STRENGTH."

The Preamble (Articles I and II of our own State Constitution of the S. D. Division) clearly sets forth the Cooperative Movement as our program.

Every successful cooperative that we build is a block in the building of a new economic structure, based on service rather than profit motive. Certainly this takes a lot of time and effort and sacrifice on our part, but it is the only peaceful and orderly way to do the job. It will require education and understanding and during our desert journey these are the things we must acquire.

We may as well quit "crying for the moon" and get right down to work. There is no Royal road, no short cut, no easy way to do this difficult job that was laid out for us by the Constitution of the Farmers Union.

While in the period of transition (desert journey) we, of course, try to patch up the old system the best we can as we go along, to make conditions as tolerable as possible, and so work for legislation to right wrongs, to correct injustices and to protect the weak. However, we may as well recognize from the outset that legislation alone cannot solve the problem.

While we are trying to legislate ourselves out of our difficulties, due to an insane economic system, we see dark and ominous clouds gathering on the horizon, the symptoms of the impending crash of that system. You see these symptoms on every hand. Unemployment on a scale heretofore unknown. Foreclosures, evictions and dispossessions of farms and homes to the extent that independent farm home ownership will soon be a thing of the past. Artificial scarcity of the good things of life. All this has happened here, in the richest Country in all the world. The U. S. A. with more COTTON, more CORN and more OIL than all the rest of the world, and yet there is scarcity and want and a lack of the good things of life for the average farmer.

Farm Home Ownership

Loss of farms and homes has been one of the main symptoms of disintegration of an overmature economic system. Farms homesteaded half a century ago, received as a gift from our Government, neither interest nor principal to pay, have been sacrificed on the altar of an unjust economic system until today about 60% of the farm land in South Dakota is tenant operated. In my own county 75% of the farm land is tenant operated.

Graduated Land Tax

Not content to just sit and wait for Federal Refinancing, we have in South Dakota inaugurated a program for legislation to provide for graduated tax on large holdings of land. This requires first an amendment to the Constitution.

I wrote the first Graduated Land Tax Amendment in collaboration with Representative Oscar Johnson of Kingsbury county three years ago. It was not even a part of the Farmers Union program, but we introduced it. At that time (1933) we could scarcely get enough signers to smoke it out of Committee. After two years of education the picture has changed. In the 1937 session we secured its passage in the Senate 27 to 17, sponsored by Senators Dahme and Tielle, and in the House sponsored by Rep. Oscar Johnson it lacked just one vote of passage.
The Federal Land Bank moved in and waged a bitter fight against this Amendment. It seems strange they should pull chestnuts for Big Insurance and Loan Companies.

We battled for eight years before we were able to get certain tax measures on our statute books. The Graduated Land Tax fight is only begun. Let us continue our campaign of education.

Ownership and security may not be possible under an exploiting Profit System, nevertheless we are going to employ every mechanism through legislation and otherwise, to encourage, promote and restore home ownership.

Taxing Ability to Pay

We have in the last two sessions of the South Dakota Legislature inaugurated, and sustained a program of taxing based on ability to pay, through Net Income and Ore Tax.

The Ore Tax enacted in 1935 after the most dramatic legislative battle in the history of our State or any other State was in this session increased 50%. It will now yield more than a million dollars annually. That is certainly one Farmers Union accomplishment that must be rated as constructive and worth while.

These are really major accomplishments for they establish fundamental and far-reaching principles for the first time in the history of South Dakota.

We have secured enactment of many minor legislative acts designed to relieve economic conditions, such as reducing interest rates, penalty rates on delinquent taxes, extension of time for tax payments, also for taking tax deeds, as well as curtailing spending as we did in 1933. Then we have secured enactment of moratorium and deficiency judgment laws, reduced tax valuations, etc., an imposing array of patchwork to lessen the suffering under a crumbling capitalism.

Your very good legislative Chairman, Mr. Brarrell will probably report to you fully on matters of legislation. He put in long hours and worked faithfully for your Farmers Union legislative program in the last two sessions at Pierre.

F. U. Co-ops Demand High Grade Tractor Fuel

One of the little chores we did at Pierre was to get a law enacted to give South Dakota farmers the same high-grade tractor fuel as North Dakota and Nebraska already had. This turned out to be a bitter fight too, because the big petroleum companies apparently did not want it. The Senate put a 4% State tax on it but we concentrated on the House Committee and had this stricken and the bill put back into its original form, and it passed.

Cooperative Education in the Public Schools

With the assurance from our Department of Public Instruction that Cooperative Education would gradually be introduced in the Course of Study in the public schools, we did not press for enactment of our proposed law on this subject, yielding to the counsel that it would be better to have this phase of education come into our Schools in a natural way than to attempt to make it immediately mandatory and take chances of losing out. Mr. Hines, Superintendent of Public Instruction, will report to you on the progress of this work some time during this Convention.

Agriculture and Labor

There is a very definite and pronounced campaign on foot today to split farmers and labor, to pit one group against the other. Every week I receive propaganda in the mails designed to arouse our prejudices against labor. It sets forth the false premise that we have nothing in common with labor.

This propaganda is of the most vicious and damnable kind! While organized farmers are split into several organized groups, labor is likewise split, yet despite their differences in the field of organization, they are united and stand shoulder to shoulder when they go to Washington seeking legislation, and they have been more successful than we. Possibly we can learn something from this.

Let us ever be on guard against vicious propaganda of prejudice to keep us divided and fighting one another. Farmers and laborers are all victimized by the same economic system, so let us not be fooled.

Independent Political Action

Our last State Convention passed a resolution introduced by Mr. Enoch Hofstad that state officials confer with leaders of trade unions, unemployed organizations, cooperatives and other farm organizations in exploring possibilities for independent political action even to the extent of formation of a national Farmer-Labor party to be controlled by farmers and laborers.

Our Farmers Union Constitution bars entrance of our Organization into any partisan political arena. So that is definitely out and should be, for past history reveals that party politics has been the pitfall of destruction of farm organizations before.

However there is a vast difference between "party politics" and legislation, and the Farmers Union as an Organization has always taken a keen interest in legislation. In the last session of our South Dakota Legislature, a Conference of Progressive Groups organized into a Progressive Alliance that contributed much support to most of our Farmers Union Legislative Program.

Thus we have already explored the possibility for independent political action so far as legislation is concerned and would be in position to recommend in keeping with Mr. Hofstad's Resolution that this coalition of progressive forces be organized on a definite and permanent basis in every County in the State, not only to promote legislation in the public interest but to publicize the record of public servants, good or bad, so that we may have an informed and enlightened electorate. This is in line with the policy always pursued by the Farmers Union, and is in my opinion as far as as we can go in the matter.

Whenever any such organization becomes swallowed up by any political party, then its usefulness is ended, and it thereby destroys itself. Neither can we permit the Farmers Union to become an adjunct to any political party. The Farmers Union must always be kept clear of any partisan political alliances, and concentrate on men and measures irrespective of their party affiliations.

Oklahoma Calls for Unity

Oklahoma Union Farmer recently advocated a National Conference of Farm Organizations to unite on principles of a legislative program.
This is a timely suggestion and one that has much merit. Farmers as a class are but a minority today. Only 10% of that minority organized. Surely that 10% should stand united on fundamental principles.

Farm Conference (Hearings) Sioux City—October 18-20

The Agricultural Senate Sub-Committee from Washington conducting hearings in Agricultural areas to determine sentiment on farm legislation will be in Sioux City, October 18-20. I hope there will be a real expression of farm sentiment at this meeting, and that it will be one of unity. I hope there will be representatives there from every section, every county of our States as well as adjoining States. In this conference there will be representatives of all groups of organized agriculture, as well as unorganized farmers, all shades of opinion, and it is vital and important that there be some unity in the expression of fundamental principles.

My thought is that the first and foremost consideration in a meeting of this kind is to work for a basic price, determined on basis of cost for that part of our crops domesticaly consumed. That is really the objective of the Farmers Union, and we should be for any mechanism that will accomplish the job. Then the necessary legislative machinery should be provided to make for orderly marketing.

In addition to that we should insist on refinancing at immediate and low interest of all farm and home loans at as low rates as granted to any other group of industry. Necessary legislation and machinery should be set up to enable tenants to become home owners.

It is my hopes that those who meet in Sioux City can agree on some fundamental principles to be embodied in legislation and not quarrel too much about the mechanics. Unity is all important. If this Committee of Congress can report back to Washington that farmers are united in their demands for a basic price and for as low rates of refinancing as enjoyed by any other group or industry, then we will go somewhere.

On the other hand, if their report is that we are divided into many different groups all pulling in different directions we can not hope to get much consideration.

Government Relief for Railroads

Speaking about the Courts, did you know that a Judge of a Federal District Court recently rendered a decision that may cost us people almost one million dollars per year? Judge Wyman of an inferior Federal Court, by a scratch of the pen, rendered a decision reducing the tax valuation of the Northwestern railroad 60% which according to our Director of Taxation will if not reversed mean a loss of about $900,000,000 in tax revenue to the state, and the loss will be every year. We have fought attempted increases in freight rates, we have gone before Interstate Commerce Commissions in Minneapolis and Chicago.

We fought eight years to get an Ore Tax on the statute books, and a struggle it was. We had to educate and crystallize public sentiment in public meetings on the injustice in our system of taxation, as well as the personnel of our legislative bodies. And today we witness the Corporations through another government set-up, the courts, getting relieved of a tax burden of almost one million per year, almost off setting all the benefits of the Ore Tax.

A million dollar relief to corporations means a million dollars more on your neck and mine. Possibly another cent of sales tax will be the answer.

This Court decision must be reversed! It is just another fight that has been thrown into our lap, and under the system we must expect those things.

Congress Convenes in November

While it seems that most of the farm legislation passed so far has been of emergency nature, farmers feel that the time has arrived for enactment of a balanced program, permanent in nature and with the objective of COST OF PRODUCTION in mind. While we hope other groups will see the advantage in our mechanism under the Thomas-Massengale Bill, nevertheless there can be an agreement on the objective, even if we differ on ideas as to mechanism whereby to attain that goal.

Our Cost of Production Bill has not seen daylight since John A. Simpson was at helm, that is, it has not been on the floor of either House or Senate for consideration in four years. Its authors seem to have gone along with and voted for those other programs, AAA and Soil Conservation, etc. However, far be it from us to criticize or censure them. Possibly they did the best thing possible under the circumstances!

We furnished the ball on the Court issue! Let us hit the ball in this coming session for legislation that will secure for farm products domestically consumed, the average cost of production! I believe the opportunity is here now.

Back to Fundamentals and Constructive Achievement

Let us concetrate and rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles and objectives of the Farmers Union, enunciated thirty-five years ago.

Let us remember the words of John A. Simpson—The Farmers Union must stand on two legs—Cooperation and Legislation.

Let us continue the fight for drought relief to meet the immediate needs of our people.

Let us co-operative the fight to restore home ownership and meanwhile to improve conditions of farm tenancy.

Let us promote our educational program for that is the foundation of all cooperative or legislative achievement.

Let us build membership in 1928.

Motion prevailed to adopt.

Emil Loriks in the chair.

REPORT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT

BY J. C. SKAGE

To the delegates and members of the South Dakota Farmers' Union in annual convention assembled:

First I wish to thank the officers and members of the Farmers Union for your cooperation, and the respect you have shown me during the past year. I realize that I have undoubtedly made many mistakes which you have overlooked and I am grateful to you indeed, for your kindness.

As your Vice-President I have been called upon to substitute for President Loriks on several occasions. I realize that there is no one in
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