

July 15, 1969

# JAMES HOUSE BIG FARMER

SCHURZ'S PROSTITUTED PRESS owning the El Centro Post-Press, the Brawley News, and the Indio Daily News, all in the 75th Assembly District of California ( all of Imperial County and the Eastern 2/3rds of Riverside County) has been running a monthly article entitled "FARMER OF THE MONTH" which is just propoganda. The article has a few grains of truth in it but most of it is so distorted that the reader will get the wrong impression as to the state of the agricultural economy here.

In the first place, the farmer discussed in the "FARMER OF THE MONTH" article is always a local resident. This creates the impression that the farmers with a good reputation for farming, are just locals and are the ones who dominate the agricultural industry here.

THIS IS UNTRUE. ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS AND ABSENTEE CORPORATIONS OWN 70% OF THE LAND HERE AND ACTUALLY DO 80% OF THE FARMING BECAUSE THEY LEASE LAND IN ADDITION TO THE LAND THEY OWN. THE MANAGERS OF THESE ABSENTEE CORPORATIONS AND LANDOWNERS OF COURSE HAVE TO LIVE HERE BUT THE PROFITS GO TO THE OUTSIDERS. INCIDENTALLY, THESE MANAGERS ARE NOT WRITTEN UP AS "FARMER OF THE MONTH" SO THAT THE AVERAGE CITIZEN LIVING IN THIS AREA, DOES NOT KNOW THE EXTENT OF THE FARMING BY THESE OUTSIDE BIG FARM INTERESTS.

In order to build up the public image of the local independent farmer, SCHURZ'S PROSTITUTED PRESS TWISTS AND DISTORTS THE FACTS so that it is not realized by the readers that the local independent farmer is battling against great odds imposed on him by the absentee landowners and corporations which are the power structure in the 75th Assembly District.

For example, a Newsletter dated June 17, 1969 entitled "JOE MCKIM LITTLE FARMER" was put out to tell the true story about him to rebut the Schurz article in the DESERT FARM NEWS of June 10, 1969 which was put in as a supplement in all the Schurz papers. This Newsletter showed that the main reason Joe McKim is still in the farming business, is that he gets a handout yearly from the Federal Government amounting to \$12,077.00 FOR NOT GROWING COTTON. This handout is what saves Joe McKim. The big absentee farm interests who control the agricultural economy in the 75th Assembly District have a practical monopoly on the Federal handouts and a local independent farmer can not remain in business without them.

In addition, it was shown that Joe McKim is exploited by the big farm interests who are preventing the enforcement of the U.S. Reclamation Law which states that no absentee farmers are permitted and that each person in a family is entitled to farm 160 acres here if THEY LIVE HERE. Joe McKim and his family consists of 4 persons and therefore are entitled to own and farm 640 acres. But the McKim Family only owns and farms 300 acres ( 75 acres per person) and in this way is deprived of making a better living.

Although the title of this Newsletter was "JOE MCKIM LITTLE FARMER", it should be understood that the "little farmer" appellation is used by the standards that exist here. Each acre here because of the constant growing season of 12 months, constant sunshine, guaranteed

irrigation water supply so that there are no droughts, and no storms to damage crops, equals in yearly production five acres in the Midwest or Deep South. So McKim's 300 acres give a production of 1,500 acres elsewhere in the U.S. James House of Brawley and his partner, Louis R. Hausmann, farm 1,700 acres which are equivalent to the production of 8,500 acres in the Midwest or Deep South.

Readers are urged to go to the library and read in the July 8, 1969 issue of the Schurz papers the article on James House "FARMER OF THE MONTH" so you can compare with what is written in this Newsletter to better understand the clever propoganda of the PROSTITUTED PRESS.

Louis C. Hausmann (the grandfather of Louis R.) was the manager of the American Fruit Growers, an absentee farming corporation, for many years. He is the one who had the knowledge of farming. He and a partner owned the RIVER FARMS. James House married the daughter of Grandfather Hausmann. Mr. Hausmann taught his son-in-law the farming business. House learned the business well and everyone I spoke to has told me that James House is a very good farmer. Then the grandson of the elder Hausmann came along and he was taught by the grandfather and Louis R. and James House became partners in Hausmann and House.

The propoganda of the big farmers as put forth by the Schurz newspapers is such as to make the reader believe that a local farmer needs \$150,00.00 to \$200,000.00 in farm machinery to farm and therefore no little farmer can be a success. This is untrue. The average farmer here needs at the most a tractor and a disc and the rest of the farming operations are best and more cheaply done by contractors.

In this article on James House, it is stated that there is an investment of \$200,000.00 in farm machinery intimating this is used only by the House firm. THIS IS NOT TRUE. On Highway 111, one mile North of Brawley, you will see a shed with the sign HIGHLINE EQUIPMENT CO. Technically, this \$200,000.00 of farm machinery and particularly beet planting, and beet harvesting machinery, belongs to Highline Equipment, which is listed as a farm contractor. Although Jim House and Louis R. Hausmann own Highline Equipment, this firm has done farm contracting operations for many other farmers AND THIS LARGE AMOUNT OF MACHINERY CAN NOT BE CONSIDERED AS ONLY DOING THE WORK OF ONE FARM. So you can see how untrue the big farmer propoganda is in this instance.

In addition, there are 2 families involved in the firm of Hausmann and House. James House, his wife and 3 children who live in a very beautiful home 365 Sycamore Drive, and Louis R., his wife and 4 children living at 591 Russell Road, Brawley in a house in the \$30,000 class.

The peculiar thing about the firm of Hausmann and House is that the wife of James House owns 80 acres and the other 1,620 acres that the firm farms is all rented. At an average rental price of \$50.00 an acre yearly, Hausmann and House have to pay about \$81,000.00 yearly in rent. It is fortunate in having one of the biggest beet allotments and in addition gets a Federal handout of \$30,142.00 yearly FOR NOT GROWING COTTON to help pay this big rent of \$81,000.00 per year.

When a local farmer has to rent land to farm, he pays about  $\frac{1}{2}$  the profits as rent yearly. Hausmann and House with a total of 11 persons in the family are making a living off 890 acres (80 fully owned and  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the 1,620 that are rented). This means that each person is living off 80 acres. But if the U.S. Reclamation Law was enforced, and the absentee landowners driven out, these eleven persons could legally own and farm 11 times 160 acres or a total of 1,760 acres!!!

Hausmann and House would not have to pay \$81,000.00 yearly to rent land. Yet in this article in the Schurz papers, "threats of 160 acres limitations" is put forth as propoganda to make the readers believe that Hausmann and House would be hurt if the U.S. Reclamation Law is enforced. Does saving \$81,000 yearly sound like being hurt?

James House has a good record in civic activities and as a farmer. Unless the U.S. Reclamation Law is enforced, he is going to be squeezed by big landowners like the Irvine Co., United Fruit Co., Purex Co., CBK Industries, Kaiser Aluminum, Dow Chemical, and S.P. Railroad!!!