

Jackson, Gardner
1946-52

H. Jackson
(Bardue)

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA

NATIONAL OFFICE:
3501 EAST 46TH AVENUE
DENVER 16, COLORADO

ADDRESS REPLY TO:
300 B STREET SOUTHEAST
WASHINGTON 3, D. C.

8/11/46
Cotuit, Mass.

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:-

The enclosed copy of a long letter to Jim Patton breaking my active collaboration with him and others in the Farmers Union leadership is passed on to you because you have had such sympathetic interest in the Farmers Union and in Jim. I am quite sure I am not exaggerating the significance of the Communists' influence in Farmers Union affairs latterly.

I am sorry I will not be at Dennis next Tuesday when you are there but I must go back to Washington tonight to try to lay lines for work this fall and winter. Dode and all the kids are at our whaling captain's cottage at Cotuit (a half hour from Dennis) where we've been going summers for 20 years. Dode has her 73-year-old mother with her - a fine woman and a great admirer of you. I would give a lot to have her meet you. She is somewhat incapacitated by an arthritic leg but her mind is as forward-looking as ever. If you happen to drive through Cotuit as you leave the Cape I wish you'd pop in for a cup of tea with her and Dode. We're on the main street of the village and our telephone number is Asterville 4162. (over)

I hope you are well. I'm determined
somehow to have a talk with you
before many weeks pass. Please give
our warmest to Miss Thompson.

Yours sincerely,
Gardner Jackson

C
O
P
Y

8/3/46
Gotult, Mass.

Dear Jim:-

When you wrote to me from Denver soon after the meeting of the new board and executive committee I had already decided to sever my relations with you, Glenn Talbot and the NFU; even though I consider the reasons you cite in your letter for asking such severance as childishly inadequate, just as I was sorely disappointed in Glenn's unresponsive evasiveness in his letter replying to the formal proposals for rescuing the NFU from its plight which I laid before the chairman of the executive committee in writing.

You were aggrieved because I did not address my proposals to you as president and did not talk them over with you before presenting them. You thus betrayed a conspicuous unwillingness to face the realities of the action taken by the NFU convention at Topeka last March establishing the new, expanded board and the new executive committee with powers formerly exercised by the office of the president -- action confirmed by referendum among the membership of the NFU although by so disgracefully small a portion of that membership (scarcely 14 per cent) that it emphasizes the woefully low ebb to which the membership has receded in concern over the conduct of the national administration of the organization. What is one forced to conclude when one sees that scarcely 14 per cent of the membership of an organization responds to a referendum mail vote on a proposition to transform the administrative setup of that organization? What must one think of the educational and leadership efforts of the national headquarters of such an organization?

You were further aggrieved because I did not talk these proposals of mine over with you while in Denver. By writing that in your letter to me your mind betrayed itself subject to the well-known psychological trick of forgetting things that are uncomfortable to remember. The dozens of conversations we had had prior to the Denver board meeting (and prior to the Topeka convention) about the dilemma you found yourself in over the conflict between your role as high-power, public-relations voice on the Washington and international policy fronts and your role as administrative and educational leader of a bunch of farmers ought to have made it seem sheer supererogation if I had talked with you in Denver.

Why, hell's bells, Jim, if you'll force your mind to go back over our conversations carefully, you'll remember that the final one we had just before you left Washington for the Denver board meeting was almost explicitly what I set forth in my formal proposals to the executive committee. And what's more, you'll remember that you approved my proposed presentation as right and proper and in accord with the requirements of the situation -- at least you voiced such approval with your lips and tongue.

Finally, in your letter you said that it would be administratively unwise to retain anyone on the NFU staff who already had enough resources to pay his own way or was able to obtain such resources. One can only deduce that the person to whom you write that administrative dictum is one in whom you have no confidence, in whose sincerity of motive concerning the NFU you no longer believe.

So, Jim, I was vastly relieved when, on your recent visit to Washington, you reasserted your faith in my purposes and went so far as to ask me to carry on for the NFU on specific projects such as the FAO (including the forthcoming FAO meeting at Copenhagen in the role of NFU member

of the U.S. delegation), the French farm boy enterprise and other French negotiations, the atomic energy problem, Food for Freedom, etc. You will recall that, chronologically, I had not seen your letter when we had our last face-to-face conversation because Mike I had not burrowed through the quantity of mail Eric had piled up at home while I was away in Denver, Chicago and up here. But I had already expressed my willingness to get off the payroll in my formal letter to the executive committee (much as I disliked being a pawn in a bargain to eliminate Phil Rene). Moreover, I had already concluded in conversations with Ben Stong, Russ Smith, Morris Rosenthal and Allen Haden that the circumstances in the NFU respecting you, Glenn, Gladys Edwards, Ole Cleson and others regarding the Communists, and the power struggles among you, made it out of the question for me to lay plans for any further, protracted relationships.

I was anxious, however, to see through to a partial conclusion at least, various projects to which I have put my hand in the name of the NFU -- particularly the ones I listed in the paragraph above. Consequently I was, as I say, greatly relieved when you volunteered the request, without prompting from me, that I carry through on these specific matters. Because of the unpredictable and rapid shifting of your attitudes and judgements over the past many months I did not feel secure, however, in making plans for Dede, the family and myself for the next two or three months until I talked with you again following my conversation with Ursula Duffus at the State Department concerning NFU representation at the FAO Copenhagen meeting.

The vigor of your expression of intention to recommend to Glenn and the executive committee that I continue on the above-mentioned projects and to fight with the full force of your mind and personality for that recommendation, including participation in the Copenhagen deliberations -- that vigor of expression organ-voicing over the long-distance telephone wires from you in Denver to me in Washington gave me sufficient security to start making plans with Dede and the family.

I started formulating the reports you asked me to draft for you, with coplanets Glenn, which you said you needed for purposes of conducting an effective fight with him and members of the executive committee in support of your recommendation -- though why you felt the need of such reports on the various projects is beyond me because you have repeatedly heard from me in detail just what I am up to on them, why I felt morally obligated to see them further along the road and why I consider them of importance to the family-type farming ~~concepts~~ and other concepts of which you, Glenn and the NFU, with the aid of Paul Sifton, Russ Smith and some others of us behind the scenes, have been spokesmen in the public arena, though apparently not nearly enough among your own farmers and their neighbors.

On this background, Jim, how do you expect me to react to the telephone call I received here at Cotuit ~~and~~ Cape Cod yesterday from Russ Smith in the now-on-the-market Washington office? How can I feel good about what I can only interpret as a craven retreat from a position you so passionately and effusively stated to me hardly two weeks ago?

The executive committee at whose next meeting you were going to make and fight for your recommendation regarding the projects and my relation thereto has not even met yet as I write this (it does not meet till next Monday). And yet, according to Russ Smith's telephone report to me yesterday, in a phone conversation with him the day before from St. Paul you told him that Glenn and you had decided (without reference to the other members of the executive committee) that I am too inflammatory an individual to represent the NFU at the FAO gathering because of what you and Glenn judge to be the opinion of the other U.S. farm

organization representatives about me.

I would like to know the evidence on which you and Glenn base your judgement. Certainly it is not my unqualified opposition to the Communists -- and opposition whose unreservedness you, Glenn, Ole Oleson, Gladys Edwards, Don Chapman, Russ Smith, El Yeomans and, of course, Waldo McNutt and Archie Wright deplore along with the Communist Party's agricultural policy boys in this country, Len Harris and Don Henderson, to say nothing of George Marshall, Merle Vincent, Jerry O'Connell and Raphael Zorn of the Marshall Foundation.

No, Jim, that reason you cited to Russ Smith as the basis for your decision will not bear examination. Surely you can't in your right senses consider me a more dissonant note among Ed O'Neal, Al Goss and Homer Brinkley than you are. And Russ tells me, despite your eloquent promises to me, that you really wanted and intended to go to Copenhagen yourself.

Poor old Russ, who thinks I mess up my life and my objectives by not being cagey enough, was put in a hell of a position by your telephone call to him. I handed it to his sense of decent trust and friendship that he phoned to inform me of what had happened -- something I might have expected of you following our last two conversations (and if I took the words of friendship in your last two letters literally) but which I now at long last know I've always been an incurable romanticist and sentimentalist to expect.

Russ said he accepted the sudden assignment to go to Copenhagen in place of me because he thought it was what Glenn and Gladys Edwards and the others wanted, because they want you to stay out in the field a while and see if you can help organize and educate some farmers so that the NFU utterances and operations at the Washington and national headquarters level will really amount to something more than a showy, intellectual and emotional facade.

Russ's embarrassment was obviously enhanced by the fact that he had earlier applauded with every show of earnestness the prospect of my representing the NFU in the FAO matters because of my months'-long negotiations and intimacy with the FAO people, the French agriculture crowd, the Indians, etc. His embarrassment was at its peak when he told me he did not argue with you about my position in the matter because he thought it would do no good and might bring about a result which neither he nor Glenn nor Gladys Edwards nor Ole Oleson would like.

Please do not interpret what I have been saying as meaning that I disapprove of Russ Smith's assignment to FAO affairs. I certainly do not, though I think my recent experiences and my temperament make me a more valuable representative at this particular stage of development in FAO. Russ, after all, was persuaded to join the NFU staff as much by me as by anyone else. He has an excellent mind, as I've often told you. I think he'll do a good job of representing the NFU at Copenhagen despite his too-great caution, as it seems to me. All the differences between him and me revolve around this obsession he has for eagerness. These are not times for eagerness. On the contrary these times shout for moral and intellectual courage and integrity.

You will recall, and so will Glenn, that I began my remarks at the board meeting in Denver by expressing regret that Russ Smith was not present to hear me express pride in the part I played in bringing him into the NFU. I then diverged to take pokes at Phil Reno's immediately-preceding boasting of his experience and titles with labor

organizations, then spoke of the French farm boy's almost certainly-fatal illness (of which I had learned that noon) and the symbolization involved in his fate as an individual in its reference to the NFU objectives, and then leapt into a tirade against people and organizations who felt the need of absolutes to lean upon and could not stand on their own feet, with asides about the Marshall Foundation and cracks at what I deemed to be your misinterpretation of Foundation deliberations and intentions (at least the intentions of four of the trustees).

Glenn, in his unresponsive reply to my formal proposals, listed these remarks and my manner of delivering them (which he said clearly showed that I had been drinking too much and was not possessed of all my faculties) as one of the reasons for removing me from the payroll. Without consideration of the justice of his comments about which there is sharp difference of opinion, as I have learned subsequently, I cannot but feel sorely disappointed in Glenn for having included that as a reason in view of the circumstances.

He knew days before I made these remarks that I was slated to be knocked off the payroll. I had talked with him about Ole Oleson's session with me at your home the Saturday before the new board even met. He knew even before Ole propositioned me to step down without a fuss that Ole was going to make such a proposition because he and Ole had agreed upon it beforehand. And when I told him about the Ole talk the next day he naturally interposed no objections at all to Ole's suggestion.

So you will understand (and, I hope, so will he) why I am disappointed at him for trotting out a false reason for an action he had decided upon well in advance of the occasion which gave him the basis for fabricating the additional reason. I regret exceedingly having afforded Glenn whatever basis I did to use as a handle against me, though the end-result would not have been changed one jot by a display of the greatest restraint on my part that evening before the board.

Now, Jim, you and Glenn (and the members of the executive committee and the board to whom I hope you will have your office transmit copies of this letter) may dismiss this long and detailed communication as merely the expression of one who is sore at being deprived of a pleasant and interesting junket to Copenhagen. Or you may even think it's an expression of soreness at being dropped from a payroll, though my agreement to that beforehand coupled with the modesty of my NFU stipend and the amount of long-distance telephoning I've done (and traveling) for NFU at my own expense (through the good luck of still having some money to use for such purposes) should make it difficult for you to entertain such thoughts.

Of course I'm not happy over being let down on the Copenhagen sessions, especially since I was planning to take Dode whose judgement, as you well know, I trust more than my own for the good and simple reason that it is better than mine. But it is not being deprived of the trip on NFU's behalf that eats me and makes me set down these many words.

No, Jim, it's the implication of that action by you and Glenn that stirs me up to type this epistle. The circumstantial evidence is strong that the real reason my proposal to the executive committee (entailing no expense to the organization as it faces the \$45,000.00 deficit for the current year) was rejected, and the real reason you abandoned your commitments to me so quickly in St. Paul under the influence of strong-man Glenn is my insistent, un-cagey and unsilenceable opposition to Communist infiltration to official positions of power and influence in the NFU.

I don't have to remind you of the long and bitter struggles I have

had with the Communist or pro-Communist trustees of the Marshall Foundation -- George Marshall, Jerry O'Connell, Raphael Zon, and now Merle Vincent substituting for Army-involved Heber Blankenhorn -- since 1939 to get the funds that made possible the expanded Washington operations of the NFU. I don't have to tell you that many of us understood your appointment of the pathetic Communist or pro-Communist boy, Phil Reno, to your headquarters staff in Denver as political and labor relations official was at the behest of George Marshall and Lem Harris, the Communist Party's avowed agricultural policy fellow, in order to insure a continuing flow of money from the Marshall Foundation to the NFU. I do not have to recall to your mind Lem Harris's visit to you in Denver a few years ago to tell you that of the total amount of money remaining in the Marshall Foundation the NFU would be allowed so much and to ask you as President of the NFU how you wanted that sum spread over the ensuing few years -- Lem Harris, not a trustee of the Foundation.

It's caused me deep sorrow over the past several years to watch your mind turn to the Communists in its desperate reach for the security it lost when it forsook the practical, day-to-day causes of the family-type farmers in the field and became enmeshed in the shakling web of limelight, power and influence incident to the Washington and international environment where you've spent most of your time latterly. As you know, I've made no bones about expressing to you my concern over this situation.

Two episodes at the Denver board meeting high-lighted this desperate reach of your mind for security. The first was that paragraph in your report to the board in which you recommended doing by indirection what earlier in the report with high, moral words you had rejected doing directly in respect to the stipulations voted by four of the Marshall Foundation trustees (against my solitary opposition) to control use of further funds allotted NFU by the Foundation and to control appointment of persons to be paid by those funds. Your recommendation to have a joint farmer-labor committee set up and have that committee ask for the funds rather than the NFU was a distressing performance, Jim. It was precisely what George Marshall and his Communist or pro-Communist colleagues wanted, and would have given them the power to select at least the labor members of the committee and, quite likely, the farmer members as well. I am glad the board turned down the recommendation.

The second episode was your appointment of a separate veterans committee within the NFU and your selection of Waldo McNutt, the New Jersey FU president, as its chairman. It was significant that you risked making this latter selection of the well-known Communist advocate only after putting your arm around the shoulders of the NFU educational director, Gladys Edwards, and having a whispered consultation with her. I doubt whether it would have made any difference if I had told you beforehand of my conversation with ~~McNutt~~ NFU Eastern Division executive secretary Ed Yeomans after taking a group of French farm boys out to some of his poultry farmers at Freshhold, N.J.

You will recall that later I did tell you of Ed Yeomans' working up a caucus in the New Jersey FU to depose McNutt as president, "not because he is a Communist but because he lacks personal integrity." You will remember that I reported my reply to Ed as having been, "Well, for God's sake, Ed, don't you realize that lack of personal integrity and being a Communist are virtually synonymous, that abandonment of personal integrity is part of the sworn technique of becoming a Communist?"

I think I also told you that Ed voiced deep concern over the strength of my feelings on Communists in the NFU and said that he wasn't building a big NFU organization in the east (helped along greatly, he explained, by the recent grain contract with A.W. Bill ~~Thatcher~~ Thatcher, manager of the FU Grain Terminal Association) just to have it blown to

pieces in a factional fight induced by what he more than hinted was my obsession about Communists. I think I likewise told you of my alarm at Ed's informing me that his cooperative wholesale manager and the personnel thereof were selected for him by Lem Harris, the avowed Communist Party agricultural policy boy to whom I have referred several times above.

While speaking of Lem I should, for the sake of the record at least, repeat my conversation with him in the early morning hours of the last night of the Topeka convention when the delegates were sweating out their arguments over the proposed increase in dues; amendments to the charter; by-laws, constitution, etc. The conversation was at his invitation. In substance Lem said to me, "Well, Pat, we didn't have enough troops to take you this time but we will by the time the next convention rolls around." He was referring to the one significant floor fight of the convention over the international plank in the proposed program which came from my typewriter with the aid of Allen Haden and Morris Rosenthal. That fight was led by Waldo Matt, seconded by the New Jersey educational director, Frances Lieber. You will remember the contest was over the phrasing calling for continued efforts to bring about greater democratization in the United Nations; to eliminate the veto; to achieve international control of atomic energy and to give ultimately more authority to the Assembly of UN than to the Security Council. Lem, with no reticence whatever, identified that fight as the touchstone conflict of the convention.

Recalling my long acquaintanceship with Lem (soon after his graduation from Harvard when he changed his mind about going to divinity school and into the ministry and went into the Communist Party instead and started helping set up Farm Research, Inc., as his first assignment), I said to him, "Lem, you're an easy fellow to get along with because you've never concealed your Communist Party membership and your objectives. I feel I can trust you as a friend." To which Lem replied instantly, with his characteristically disarming charm, "You better not, Pat, I'll cut your throat any time it serves our cause."

Numerous other conversations and experiences since I've been actively interested in the NFU (10 years), all going to the same issue, could be recorded. I'll content myself with only two or three more. The first of these is the several-hour discussion with that good wheat farmer from North Dakota, the president of the biggest business enterprise bearing the NFU's title, the FU Grain Terminal Association, Ole Oleson (middle initial L.), the man whom Glenn is grooming ~~for~~ as your successor when and if you, Jim, set upon your ambition to run for the U.S. Senate from Colorado. That discussion took place, with my daughter Deborah participating, while we were waiting for an early morning plane to return Ole to St. Paul after he had taken part in a nationwide broadcast over Mutual with UNRRA Director-General LaGuardia and FAO Director-General Sir John Boyd Orr at a Food for Freedom conference in the National Press Club auditorium in Washington.

I thought I had made a dent in Ole's fervent insistence on the value of the Communists as "the only worthwhile action group left of center in the country" during the discussion. And daughter Deborah thought I had, too. But when I had my session with Ole in your bedroom, Jim, the Saturday afternoon before the new and expanded board met at the Albany Hotel, his first words to me were, "Pat, you know, you and I can work well together if you'll get over one thing. You're crazy on this Communist business, absolutely crazy." I could see there was no point arguing further with him in the short time at our disposal since he was impatient to cut our talk short so that he could leave with the even-more-impatient Waldo Matt downstairs for another cocktail party and dinner arranged by the latter New Jersey farm leader (who became a farm leader after being, as a Youth Congress factotum, one of the loudest denouncers of FDR as a war monger up to the time Hitler attacked the Soviet).

My object in putting down these various episodes in a letter to you, Jim, is to give you an outline of the background on which I now withdraw whatever support I might give or give help get others to give to the NFU as long as its leadership entertains its current attitudes on the Communist issue. And when I say leadership I most emphatically include Glenn and his sister Gladys Edwards and the intelligent and philosophical Montana NFU president, Don Chapman, as well as all the other state presidents and staff members who oppose a frank discussion and facing of the issue, even within the bosom of the organization and not for public consumption -- all these, in short, who scream "red-baiting!" at the merest hint of raising the issue.

This is no easy decision for me to make. Next to the Sacco-Vanzetti case I have put more into the cause of the NFU since I met you in Denver in 1936 than into any other single cause. That has been because I believed in the ideas clustered around the central one of family ownership and operation of farms represented by the NFU and because I believed in the NFU leadership. I still believe deeply in the ideas put together after much sweating by Obid Wyant, Fred Stever, Russ Smith and the others for the program adopted by the Popaka convention. As you've heard me say again and again, greatly centralized ownership of land has always throughout history led to the rise of tyranny, the destruction of democratic processes and the eventual downfall of the society in which it occurs. Consider the rise and fall of the Roman Empire as an example.

But while retaining complete faith in the written program of the NFU, I have lost faith in the NFU leadership as it presently expresses itself. That leadership, confronted by the perplexities of a sorely-troubled world, by the organization's financial and administrative problems it has brought upon itself and by its personal difficulties inside and outside the organization, appears to me to be bewitched by the siren song of salvation for humanity sung by the Communists. It seems almost zealously eager to grasp, for personal and organizational security, that political methodology which operates on the fatally-destructive tenet that the end justifies any means. That method sets brother against brother, son against mother and friend against friend. In the modern world it finds its most obvious expression in the police state.

This very long letter, Jim, has been written without heat, anger or animus. It has come from me in a spirit of profound regret and sorrow. I have no personal discomfort whatever at the accusations of red-baiting, etc., thrown at me by Glenn, Gladys Edwards (and her able and disturbed protegee, Juliette Fleischl) and the others. As I wrote to Glenn while in Denver, I've had a longer experience and over more years have tried harder to accommodate my efforts to the Communists (even after my first encounter with them in the early stages of the Sacco-Vanzetti case a quarter of a century ago taught me to despise them) than anyone connected with the NFU. You may not remember that the Sacco-Vanzetti case grew out of the red raids of A. Mitchell Palmer after the last war. And the first stint I did in Washington after we moved there in 1930 was to write a chapter on "The American Radical" for the book, "America As Americans See It," in which I talked of the trick in mass psychology of pinning the red label on anyone differing with you -- a trick employed by those counterparts of the Communists among the capitalists who, like the Communists, function on the tenet that the end justifies the means. The Communists and their misguided sympathizers now use "red-baiter" and "fascist" in the same way the capitalists use "red."

But circumstances and conditions have changed vastly since the Sacco-Vanzetti days and since our early days in Washington. I will no longer keep silent on what has become, in my judgement, an issue of major importance for the future of our children and people everywhere. Saturday

afternoon following the final session of the executive committee I sat with NFU Vice-President Herb Rolph, Oklahoma FU President Homer Duffy and that pillar of strength within the NFU, C.E. Huff. Without exception they expressed worry over my attitude on this question. Huff said, "You're right about it, Pat, but you're so earnest you frighten us." I expect and intend to go on being earnest.

In conclusion, Jim, I scarcely need say that there's no point in my transcribing the reports on the various projects you asked for. Dode wants me to turn the French farm boy project back to you or someone else right away. But I feel a moral obligation to see that they get shifted to the kind of farming each of them wants before doing so. Moreover, judging by the almost callous lack of concern shown by almost everyone in the NFU (except Don Chapman) for the success of this valuable but delicate experiment in practical, international collaboration I dread to think of what might happen to that fine group of French boys. I've been writing each of the boys personal letters since I've been up here and also composed a letter to the parents of the Fousault boy who died in New Jersey (copy enclosed) which Russ is releasing to the press in Washington early in the week.

I am truly sad that things are as they are in this NFU business because I would like to be in a position to explain to you and Glenn and the others just what meaning for the NFU organization and business enterprises some of the French negotiations have to which I have been a party. But I'm sure that both you, Jim, and Glenn will understand why that's out of the question now. (If you're interested, you might ask Ernest Dean, Kansas FU president, with whom I discussed one aspect of these negotiations and their relation to Kansas FU membership and Howard Cowden.)

Yours sincerely,

Gardner Jackson

James G. Patton, President,
The National Farmers Union,
3501 E. 46th Ave.,
Denver 16,
Colo.

P.S. In addition to the copy to Glenn I'll probably be sending copies of this letter to some of the people mentioned in it, so please don't be surprised if you hear from them. I intend to send a copy to one NFU person barely mentioned in the letter. That's Ben Stong. Both you and Glenn know that I think he got the rawest and most unjust human equation treatment of anyone at the Denver board meeting. ~~It was a mistake~~ The attempt was made to make him the scapegoat for the mess the NFU is in. It would have succeeded except for his highly intelligent and courageous resistance. Without him as editor of the national paper of the organization and as your assistant in the Denver national headquarters matters would have taken a far worse turn for NFU during the past few years.

2nd P.S. I neglected to say that your action in appointing the McNutt veterans committee seemed to me to be clearly against the consensus of the Topeka convention. It was certainly in opposition to the policy advocated by the American Veterans Committee.

C
O
P
Y

Denver, Colo.
7/5/46

The Chairman,
Executive Committee,
National Farmers Union Board,
Albany Hotel,
Denver, Colo.

Dear Sir:-

The situation with which you and your committee and the board are wrestling is indeed unfortunate. But, as I have told Jim Patton, Glenn Talbott and others, I believe it is not irreparable.

Moreover, from conversations I have had with some of my friends outside the NFU who share my belief in the organization's great importance in the national and international scene, I am satisfied there are many, many people throughout the country who would like to help prevent any curtailing of any of the NFU's activities. In fact, it is my conviction that a systematic approach to these people would demonstrate their readiness materially to aid in the expansion of the NFU's activities, to say nothing of preventing a curtailment.

Any such approach, however, would have full likelihood of success only if certain conditions were agreed to and set forth in making the approach. These conditions are:

1. Presentation in writing of the administrative setup of the NFU under the reorganization, with identification of the officers and their responsibilities, including the probable amount of time each officer is likely to give in the ensuing year to these responsibilities in the national organization away from his state, cooperative or other functions.
2. Preparation and presentation in writing of a concrete plan for expanding the number of members of the NFU, with specific listing of states in which the new organizational efforts are contemplated, the number and nature of personnel to be employed in the efforts, etc.
3. An over-all picture of the financial status of the NFU with a statement of the amount of finances needed -- in addition to the amounts reasonably to be expected from dues, contributions to educational funds, etc., -- to carry out the expanded organizational efforts.
4. A statement of ~~XXXXXX~~ assurance of the NFU's continued intention to remain independent of any other organizations, whether political, labor, religious or economic, and to resist infiltration into official positions within the NFU of persons designing to use these positions for partisan political or other purposes not in strict conformity with the program of the NFU adopted at its Topeka convention in March, 1946. This statement of assurance becomes doubly needed because of the increasingly significant role the NFU is playing in the international scene and will continue to play.

If these conditions are met, I believe substantial sums of money can be raised, without strings attached, to further the NFU's organization drive and for other NFU purposes. Feeling as I do about the NFU, and as I have felt for a long while, I am prepared to help in instituting such a campaign for funds.

The campaign should not be carried on by individuals on the NFU payroll. The cost of such methods is prohibitive as a breakdown of the cost in the past, using those methods, will almost certainly prove. The campaign should be carried on by a professional money-raiser on a commission basis if one can be found in whom the NFU can have complete confidence.

I believe I know such a one. He is Harold Oram of New York City. He has been raising money for good causes for many years and is beyond reproach in his methods. Among other causes in his office is fund-raising for the shareholders. Currently he is directing the raising of funds for the National Committee on Atomic Information, of which I am a member in my capacity as a member of the Washington staff of the NFU. The success he is attaining in the latter cause is remarkable.

Since it is my understanding that my stipend from the NFU has to be withdrawn for the time being in the necessary retrenchment, I will have to set about replacing it from outside individual sources whose faith in the NFU program and purposes is beyond question. Our family finances are not enough to permit me to function without some outside income, such as I'd like to. I could if the college education of two of our three boys was not still ahead of us, and another year for the third boy -- I could, that is, if I asked my wife to pitch in and help. I don't want to do that if I can help it. I think you will understand why.

I want to retain my connection with the NFU, particularly because of certain negotiations with the French and others into which I have been intimately drawn and which I believe have major meaning for the NFU and its business enterprises and ideas. Also my functioning in the atomic energy and other matters in Washington seem to me not insignificant for NFU. Finally, Russell Smith appears to be anxious to continue my collaboration with him.

I await your reply to this expression of my desire to continue to try to help in the building of the NFU.

Yours sincerely,

Gardner Jackson

PRESS RELEASE

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, 300 B St. S.E., Washington 3, D.C.
Atlantic 9647-9648-9649

*Hope it's okay!
It went to all the
people you listed*



National Headquarters
3501 East 45th Avenue
Denver, Colorado
Elyria 7382

RELEASE DATE - P. M. Papers of Tuesday, August 6, 1946

SUBJECT - DEATH OF A FRENCH FARM BOY

WASHINGTON - As the body of one of the 40 French farm boys brought to this country for training on National Farmers Union and National Cooperatives farms was finally prepared for shipment to his parents in France the National Farmers Union made public today a letter to his parents in which the boy's life and trip to the United States was termed a "symbol" of the fight against dictatorships of all kinds and against those who "would make a religion of the state."

Daniel Foucault, 18-year-old farmer's son from the province of Mayenne in France, died of "acute meningo-encephalitis" at the Long Branch (New Jersey) Hospital several weeks after arrival in this country with 39 other French farm boys to get training in U.S.A. farming methods.

The visit of the 40 French farm boys for a four to six months' training experience in the U.S.A. was arranged by the French Federation of Agriculture and the Union of French Farmer Cooperatives with the National Farmers Union in this country. It is the first time in the history of U.S. agriculture that such a project in international education and collaboration has been undertaken by private, non-government farm organizations.

The 40 French farm boys were placed on farms in Montana, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The Foucault boy was on the poultry farm of Daniel Herson in Lakewood, N. J., at the time his fatal illness forced his removal to the hospital.

Dr. Frank J. Altschul, the attending physician on the Foucault case at the Long Branch Hospital, after citing the diagnosis as 'acute meningo-encephalitis', said in his report, 'In spite of the fact that our own laboratory studied many specimens of the spinal fluid and blood and that specimens were also sent to the Rockefeller Institute and to the Army Institute of Pathology, it was impossible to classify the type of encephalitis. On clinical grounds and from the laboratory studies all we can say is that it probably was the so-called epidemic type of acute meningo-encephalitis which is believed to be caused by a virus.'

The letter to the Foucault boy's parents, signed by Gardner Jackson for the National Farmers Union, is as follows:

"The recent death of your 18-year-old son Daniel at the Long Branch (New Jersey) Hospital was a deep personal loss to you. He carried in his young hopes as parents that he become a leader in the further development of French farming and in the improvement of living standards of the French people and peoples everywhere.

"Because we naturally had not had the opportunity to know him as well as you his death was not so personal a loss to those of us who had a hand in bringing him to the United States for training experience on our National Farmers Union and National Cooperatives farms.

"But his death had real and sorrowful meaning to us nonetheless. He was one of 40 French farm boys selected out of many hundred applicants who wanted to come to this country for training in our agricultural methods. The fact that he applied for the opportunity and was chosen is evidence that he possessed high qualities.

"It shows that he had a combination of those qualities of intelligence and dauntless courage which have made the French people rise from the oppression of the Nazi hordes and again assume their historic role. That role has always been in the vanguard of forces working for the advance of culture against brutish aggression born of fear and its twin offshoots, competition and cupidity.

"The struggle for power in the world expressed in aggression continues through dictatorships functioning with inhuman disregard of the potentialities of the individual members of society. France, where your son had his being, is a vital crusader against this march of tyranny. The French people, always rejecting throughout their existence as a nation the appeals of those who would make a religion of the state, have never wavered in their passionate devotion to democratic processes -- particularly that portion of the French people engaged in farming.

"The selection of your son, deriving from this heritage, for the trip to our country marked him as a significant member of that too-slowly-increasing body of human beings animated by the strong conviction that only through true cooperation between peoples of all nationalities, colors, religions and political and economic faiths across the face of the earth can civilization be saved and advanced in this atomic era.

"So, as his physical remains leave our shores to return to the French soil from which they sprang, we in the National Farmers Union want you, his parents, to know in the midst of your personal grief that his passing at so young an age has not been in vain so far as we are concerned.

"Conscious of the great contribution the French people have made by their thinking and actions to the origins and development of the United States as a nation our members dedicate themselves anew in your son's death and your parental suffering to the principles of genuine, international collaboration of which his participation in the venture to our farms with his 39 comrades was a symbol.

"We pledge our determination to carry on unceasing application of our minds and our hearts to the problem of helping our global society evolve into one in which resort to war is never again taken.

"We extend to you our deepest sympathy. We hope you will be able to find solace in your personal sorrow through this commitment from us that the broad, social implications of your son's death will never leave our minds or the minds of those who come after us in our organization."

+