

SELLING (OUT) THE FARM

HOW THE KOCH AGENDA HURTS
AGRICULTURE IN ARKANSAS



BRIDGE
PROJECT

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
2000s: Koch-Founded And Funded Americans For Prosperity (AFP) Pushed Policies Dangerous To Arkansas Agriculture	3
AFP Was Founded, Funded, And Controlled By The Koch Brothers.....	3
AFP Opposed Multiple Farm Bills	3
Americans For Prosperity Supported Prohibition On New Enrollment In Conservation Reserve Program.....	6
Americans For Prosperity Supported Elimination Of Foreign Market Development And Access Programs Program That HelpS Farmers Sell Goods Abroad.....	7
AFP Wanted to End All Funding for Federal Agricultural Research	9
AFP Wanted to End Commodity Assistance Program	9
AFP Proposed Eliminating Department of Agriculture, Said It And Other Departments Had “Simply Outlived Their Usefulness.”	9
1990s: Koch-Controlled Citizens For A Sound Economy Attacked Multiple Programs That Are Vital To Arkansas Farmers	10
Citizens For A Sound Economy Was the Koch-Controlled Predecessor To American For Prosperity	10
1992: Citizens For A Sound Economy Opposed Federal Administration Of The Crop Insurance Corporation.....	10
1992: Citizens For A Sound Economy Criticized The Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, Which Provided Direct Loans to Farmers	11
1992: Citizens for a Sound Economy Attacked Foreign Agricultural Service	11
Citizens For A Sound Economy Attacked USDA Marketing Loan Programs	11
1980s: The Clark-Koch Plan for Agriculture - Eliminate Federal Support For Farmers	12
In 1980, David Koch Ran For Vice-President Against Ronald Reagan With Libertarian Ed Clark.....	12
Clark-Koch Ticket Supported Eliminating Farm Export Assistance	12
Clark-Koch Ticket Proposed Large Cuts to Soil Conservation Service	13
Clark-Koch Ticket Wanted to Eliminate Support for Food and Agricultural Science That Benefitted Individual Farmers And Agricultural Businesses.....	13
Clark-Koch Ticket Wanted To End Funding Tor Program That Provided Information To Agriculture Industry On World Agricultural Outlook.....	13

Introduction

The Farm Bill plays a critical role in Arkansas's economy, benefitting the livelihood of the state's farmers by guiding crop planting efforts, aiding in access to crop loans, and bolstering the state's critical agriculture economy writ large. Whenever the future of this important legislation has been jeopardized by political back-and-forth, Arkansas's agricultural community has vocalized its support for the Farm Bill – such as in 2013 when Chairman of the Arkansas Rice Federation Dow Brantley said that farmers “desperately need a farm bill written so we know where we stand” when it comes to deciding which crops to plant. That same year, Arkansas Farm Bureau President Randy Veach said that the state's farmers and consumers would “suffer” if Congress did not pass a Farm Bill or extend the previous bill.

Yet despite obvious and vocal support for the Farm Bill, Americans for Prosperity (AFP), the Koch brothers' primary political engine, has consistently been at the forefront of the fight against the Farm Bill. AFP opposed passage of the Farm Bill in 2014, and went so far as to attack crop insurance premium subsidies and revenue guarantees – intended to protect the livelihood of farmers – as “corporate welfare.” AFP also opposed the 2013 and 2012 Farm Bills, and advocated for making cuts to the crop insurance program in the 2012 bill. Taking their advocacy a step further, AFP is spending big to help their preferred candidate in Arkansas's 2014 U.S. Senate contest, Republican Congressman Tom Cotton. Why? Because Congressman Cotton was the only member of the Arkansas congressional delegation to vote against the Farm Bill. Instead of standing with the rice and cotton farmers who drive Arkansas's agriculture economy, Tom Cotton turned his back on his home state by joining the out-of-state billionaire Koch brothers in opposing the Farm Bill.

This Koch-fueled advocacy against a bill so critical to Arkansans and the state's economy goes even deeper, though. AFP has a long history of involving itself in legislative battles around policies important to the agriculture community and to Arkansas in particular. For instance, in 2012 AFP supported prohibition on new enrollment in CRP (the Conservation Reserve Program), a policy enacted under President Ronald Reagan that pays farmers annual rent in exchange for conserving a portion of their lands, which protects the critical wildlife habitats enjoyed by nearly 700,000 sportsmen in Arkansas and better prepares farmers for drought conditions. This one program, which AFP opposes, directly benefits more than 3,000 Arkansas farms. Guess who joined AFP in opposing this pro-Arkansas program? That's right, Congressman Cotton.

AFP also supported efforts to eliminate the Farm Bill's Foreign Market Development Program and the Market Access Program (MAP), which help farmers sell their goods abroad. Once again, Congressman Cotton voted to eliminate these programs – a shocking move since he represents a state that produced agricultural exports worth \$3.9 billion in 2012, supporting more than 25,000 jobs.

It's clear that Tom Cotton and the Koch brothers are bad for Arkansas's farmers. If you want more proof, American Bridge has the inside story on the long history of the Koch agenda harming agriculture in Arkansas. This report highlights the extent to which the Koch agenda has damaged the agriculture industry in Arkansas.

2000s: Koch-Founded And Funded Americans For Prosperity (AFP) Pushed Policies Dangerous To Arkansas Agriculture

AFP WAS FOUNDED, FUNDED, AND CONTROLLED BY THE KOCH BROTHERS

Americans For Prosperity Was Founded By David Koch. According to FactCheck.org, “Founded by billionaire businessman and conservative/libertarian political activist David Koch, Americans for Prosperity has emerged as one of the most influential conservative issue advocacy groups on the national and state political scene. A major force behind the Tea Party movement, AFP seeks to support free markets and entrepreneurship by advocating lower taxes and limited government spending and regulation.” [FactCheck.org, [10/10/11](#)]

Politico: Americans for Prosperity is “Koch Brothers’ Main Political Arm.” According to Politico: “The Koch brothers’ main political arm intends to spend more than \$125 million this year on an aggressive ground, air and data operation benefiting conservatives, according to a memo distributed to major donors and sources familiar with the group.” [Politico, [5/19/14](#)]

- **Politico Headline: “Koch Brothers’ Americans For Prosperity Plans \$125 Million Spending Spree.”** [Politico, [5/19/14](#)]

David Koch Is Chairman Of Americans For Prosperity Foundation. According to Americans for Prosperity Foundation’s website, which lists David Koch as “Chairman,” “David Koch is the executive vice president and a member of the board of directors for Koch Industries, Inc., based in Wichita, Kansas. He helped found Americans For Prosperity, and also serves on the board of directors for the Reason Foundation and the CATO Institute. David was the Libertarian Party candidate for vice president of the United States in 1980. He received his bachelor's and master's degree in chemical engineering from MIT.” [AmericansForProsperityFoundation.com, accessed [3/17/14](#)]

AFP OPPOSED MULTIPLE FARM BILLS

2014 Farm Bill

January 2014: Americans For Prosperity Said Farm Bill “Continues The Status Quo Of Broken Farm Programs”

According to a legislative alert from Americans for Prosperity, “Tonight after most people in Washington had left their offices to go home for the day, the Farm Bill conference committee delivered its long-awaited report. [...] Diving into the policy details, this conference report seriously disappoints. It continues the status quo of broken farm programs and unchecked food stamp spending.” [Senate Vote 21 (2014), AFP Scorecard website, [Viewed 8/25/14](#); House Vote 31 (2014), AFP Scorecard website, [Viewed 8/25/14](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/28/14](#)]

February 2014: Americans for Prosperity Opposed Farm Bill Over “Broken Farm Programs,” Attacked Crop Insurance Premium Subsidies And Revenue Guarantees As “Corporate Welfare.” According to AFP: “On behalf of more than two million Americans for Prosperity activists in all 50 states, I write to urge you to vote NO on the Farm Bill conference report, H.R. 2642. This deal continues the status quo of broken farm programs and unchecked food stamp spending. [...] Although it eliminates the widely-criticized direct payment program, it expands a number of other corporate welfare programs such as crop insurance premium subsidies and revenue guarantees.” [Americans for Prosperity Scorecard, [2/19/14](#)]

Arkansas Agricultural Groups Supported 2014 Farm Bill

Arkansas Farm Bureau President Randy Veach Said That Arkansas Farmers And Consumers Would “Suffer” If Congress Did Not Pass A Farm Bill Or An Extension Of The Previous Farm Bill. According to Arkansas News, “It’s very critical, and every day that goes by it gets more critical that we have something that we can depend on, either a five-year comprehensive farm bill or an extension of this one that we can take to our lenders and get a crop loan,” Veach said. In his talk at the convention, Veach said that if Congress fails to pass a new farm bill or another extension, it would not only be farmers

who suffer. Without a new or reauthorized bill, the nation's farm policy would revert to what is known as permanent law, a farm bill that was passed in 1938 and amended in 1949. That bill requires the government to buy products made from milk at a price based on what it cost farmers to produce milk decades ago, adjusted for inflation to today's dollars, and that price is expected to affect the price of milk at grocery stores. 'You'd have to bring those prices on up, and that's where you get your \$7 and \$8 a gallon on milk that would take place if you went back,' Veach said." [Arkansas News, [12/4/13](#)]

- **Veach Said Arkansas Farmers Were Unable To Get Loans Without A Farm Bill.** According to Arkansas News, "The lack of a reauthorized farm bill is getting critical for Arkansas farmers who need to apply for crop loans, the president of Arkansas Farm Bureau said Wednesday. 'Producers are already lining up their finances for next year, and they have nothing, nothing to take to their lenders right now,' Randy Veach told reporters after giving a talk on the farm bill at the organization's annual convention in Little Rock. 'The farm bill has expired, we don't have an extension, we don't have a new farm bill, so we have nothing right now.'" [Arkansas News, [12/4/13](#)]

Arkansas Farmer Jeff Rutledge Said It Was "Frustrating" That Congress Had Not Passed A Farm Bill And He Was Unable To "Make Any Plans" For Planting Crops. According to the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, "Newport farmer Jeff Rutledge needs time to secure financing for next year's crops and wants the assurance of a new federal farm bill. 'We would love just to see some movement,' Rutledge, 39, said. 'It's just frustrating not to be able to make any plans.' He - along with his mother and uncle - grows rice, soybeans, corn, sesame, wheat and cotton in the bottoms of the White River." [Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, 10/20/13]

Arkansas Rice Federation Chairman Dow Brantley Said Farmers Don't Know Which Crops To Plant Without A Farm Bill And That Farmers "Desperately Need A Farm Bill Written So We Know Where We Stand." According to the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, "Arkansas Rice Federation Chairman Dow Brantley said there are too many unknowns without a farm bill in place and there is no more time to waste. In addition to rice, he grows cotton, corn and soybeans near England. 'We're at the mercy of the [federal] legislature,' he said. 'Give us a farm bill.' Farmers don't know which crops to plant because subsidies haven't been set, or whether they can compete with farmers in other countries whose crops are being subsidized, Brantley said. 'We desperately need a farm bill written so we know where we stand.'" [Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, 10/7/13]

The Agricultural Council Of Arkansas Said It Was "Disappointed" With The Failure Of The Farm Bill And That It Was "Unfortunate" That A "Hyper-Partisan House" Left "Farmers, Businesses And Consumers Out To Dry." According to a press release by the Agricultural Council of Arkansas, "The Agricultural Council of Arkansas is disappointed with the U.S. House of Representatives' failure to approve the farm bill. We appreciate the votes in support of this legislation from Arkansas Congressmen Rick Crawford, Steve Womack, and Tim Griffin. They understand that this bill is critical for Arkansas farmers, businesses and consumers. Unfortunately, a hyper-partisan House of Representatives has left farmers, businesses and consumers out to dry. We hope that all members who voted no on this bill will hear from their constituents in the coming weeks and reconsider their votes. We remain optimistic that compromise is still an option before current law expires at the end of September." [Agricultural Council of Arkansas Press Release, [6/20/13](#)]

Arkansas Cattlemen's Association Said The Farm Would Have Provided "Much Needed Disaster Assistance To Arkansas Farmers Affected By Recent Floods And Tornadoes And Last Year's Drought." According to a press release by the Arkansas Cattlemen's Association, "The Farm Bill, if it had passed, would have provided much needed disaster assistance to Arkansas farmers affected by recent floods and tornadoes and last year's drought. These relief programs will not be available now due to the failure of the bill." [Arkansas Cattlemen's Association Press Release, [6/20/13](#)]

The Arkansas Rice Producers' Group And Arkansas Rice Federation Called The Failed Farm Bill Vote A "Setback." According to The City Wire, "The Arkansas Rice Producers' Group and the Arkansas Rice Federation issued a joint statement calling the vote a 'setback.' 'In addition to the stability needed across the farming community, the farm bill offers hunger assistance to those that need it most and funds vital research that is required if we are going to meet the growing population of the world,' said Arkansas Rice Producers' Group Chairman Dow Brantley." [The City Wire, [6/21/13](#)]

The American Farm Bureau Federation Said They Were "Highly Disappointed" The Farm Bill Did Not Pass. According to an Arkansas Farm Bureau press release, "Agriculture groups were universally disappointed. 'The American Farm Bureau Federation is highly disappointed the House did not complete work on the 2013 farm bill, the 'Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.' It was a balanced bill that would have provided much needed risk management tools and a viable economic safety net for America's farmers and ranchers.'" [Arkansas Farm Bureau Press Release, [6/20/13](#)]

Cotton Voted Against The Farm Bill

Cotton Was The Only Member Of The Arkansas Delegation To Vote Against The Farm Bill. According to an Arkansas Farm Bureau press release, “The U.S. House of Representatives voted down the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013. With a vote of 195 for and 234 against, the House rejected the proposal, leaving a huge question about U.S. farm programs going forward. Out of the Arkansas delegation Reps. Rick Crawford, Tim Griffin, and Steve Womack voted for the proposal. Rep. Tom Cotton voted against it.” [Arkansas Farm Bureau Press Release, [6/20/13](#)]

2014: Cotton Voted Against The Farm Bill. In January 2014, Cotton vote against the conference report on the 2014 Farm Bill, which reauthorized federal farm and nutrition assistance. [House Vote 31, [1/29/14](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/28/14](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 2642](#)]

2013 Farm Bill

June 2013: AFP’s Position On Vote On House’s 2013 Farm Bill: “No.” According to the AFP’s scorecard website, AFP’s position on 2013 House vote 286 was “No.” The vote was on the House’s version of the 2013 Farm Bill, which, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would [have] reauthorize[d] agriculture programs through fiscal 2018 and shrink the nation’s largest nutrition benefit program, cutting \$33 billion from current law.” The House rejected the bill by a vote of 195 to 234. [House Vote 286 (2013), AFP Scorecard website, [Viewed 8/25/14](#); Congressional Quarterly, [6/20/13](#)]

2012 Farm Bill

AFP Was One Of “A Number Of Non-Farm Public Interest Organizations” That Called For Congress To Reject Plans To Attach The Farm Bill To Fiscal Cliff Legislation In 2012. According to the Food & Fiber Letter, “A number of non-farm public interest organizations are calling on Congress to reject reported plans to attach the next farm bill to fiscal cliff legislation. They say that a simple one-year extension of the current farm legislation would be far more preferable because the farm legislation approved by the Senate and a similar measure that has yet to be approved by the House have not been adequately discussed and debated. [...] In addition to NTU and EWG, other groups in the coalition include Americans for Prosperity, Citizens Against Government Waste, Taxpayers for Common Sense, R Street, and the U.S. Public Interest Research Group.” [Food & Fiber Letter, 12/17/12]

The Director Of Policy For AFP Stated That “AFP Stands Opposed” To The 2012 Farm Bill. According to a letter from AFP policy director James Valvo to the Senate, “Next week, the Senate will begin consideration of the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012 (S. 3240), the omnibus farm bill that sets agricultural and food policy in the United States. Like its predecessors, the 2012 Farm Bill is shaping up to be a big handout to agri-business industries at the expense of the American taxpayer. On behalf of more than two million Americans for Prosperity activists in all 50 states, I am writing to say that AFP stands opposed to this legislation and the continued practice of using tax dollars to prop up private industries.” [Americans for Prosperity press Release via LexisNexis, 6/2/12]

Americans for Prosperity Attacked People Who Said 2012 Drought Was Reason to Pass Farm Bill

AFP And Other Conservative Groups Accused Farmers Of Trying To Lock Taxpayers Into “A Trillion Dollars Worth Of Bad Agriculture Policy” By Highlighting Their Need For Drought Assistance.” According to the Billings Gazette, “The two groups, like-minded on other political issues, spent the last two weeks lobbying against each other. Farm groups warned of dire consequences without a comprehensive farm bill that included much-needed drought assistance. Conservative groups like Americans for Prosperity, Grover Norquist’s Americans for Tax Reform and the Competitive Enterprise Institute accused farmers of using the current drought to lock taxpayers into ‘a trillion dollars worth of bad agriculture policy.’” [Billings Gazette via LexisNexis, 8/5/12]

Americans for Prosperity Wanted to Cut Funding for Crop Insurance in 2012 Farm Bill

AFP: “Federal Spending On Crop Insurance Programs Should Be Cut.” According to a letter from AFP policy director James Valvo to the Senate, “Federal spending on crop insurance programs (Title XI) should be cut. Farmers are generally better equipped to handle business risks than other sectors of the economy, since they tend to be wealthier than average and have relatively low debt. Plus, farms have a much lower rate of failure than other industries. Nevertheless, the 2012 farm bill expands the amount that the federal government will spend on crop insurance assistance-CBO estimates that this line item will amount to \$94.6 billion over the 2013-2022 period, which is \$5.1 billion more than current law.” [Americans for Prosperity press Release via LexisNexis, 6/2/12]

“Influential Conservative Groups” That Came Out Strongly Against The 2012 Farm Bill Included “Tea Party Activists From Americans For Prosperity And FreedomWorks,” Groups “Singled Out New Crop-Insurance Measures In The Bill As Particularly Wasteful.” According to the Food & Fiber Letter, “A number of influential conservative groups have come out strongly against the House farm bill, which has been estimated to cost more than \$900 billion over 10 years. The Senate-passed bill has a larger price tag of \$947 billion over the next decade. The right-leaning groups, including Tea Party activists from Americans for Prosperity and FreedomWorks and more established players like Americans for Tax Reform, Heritage Action and the National Taxpayers Union, said the strong rural economy and \$15 trillion debt ‘make it essential that Washington’s role in agricultural policy be reduced.’ They singled out new crop-insurance measures in the bill as particularly wasteful.” [Food & Fiber Letter via LexisNexis, 7/26/12]

AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY SUPPORTED PROHIBITION ON NEW ENROLLMENT IN CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Americans For Prosperity Supported The Republican Study Committee FY 2013 Budget Resolution. According to the Americans for Prosperity’s 112th Congress Key Vote Scorecard, “Vote 17 -- 3/29/2012 -- Issue: Budget & Spending. Roll Call: 149 Result: Failed AFP’s Position: Yes. This was a vote to approve the RSC FY2013 Budget Resolution (Substitute Amendment to H. Con. Res. 112).” [112th Congress Key Vote Scorecard, Americans for Prosperity, [6/20/12](#)]

- **2012: Republican Study Committee Budget Supported Prohibition On New Enrollment In The Conservation Reserve Program.** In March 2012, the Republican Study Committee proposed a budget that would have prohibited new enrollment in the Conservation Reserve Program as part of its proposed budget resolution covering fiscal years 2013 to 2022. According to the Republican Study Committee, “Beginning in FY 2012, new general enrollments in CRP would be prohibited, resulting in approximately \$9 billion in savings over ten years.” The vote was on an amendment to the House budget resolution replacing the entire budget with the RSC’s proposed budget; the amendment failed by a vote of 136 to 285. [House Vote 149, [3/29/12](#); Republican Study Committee, [3/12](#)]

Conservation Reserve Program Was Started Under President Ronald Reagan

Conservation Reserve Program Pays Farmers Annual Rent In Exchange For The Farmers’ Removal Of Environmentally Sensitive Land From Agricultural Production. According to the Farm Service Agency’s Website, “The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) is a land conservation program administered by the Farm Service Agency (FSA). In exchange for a yearly rental payment, farmers enrolled in the program agree to remove environmentally sensitive land from agricultural production and plant species that will improve environmental health and quality. Contracts for land enrolled in CRP are 10-15 years in length. The long-term goal of the program is to re-establish valuable land cover to help improve water quality, prevent soil erosion, and reduce loss of wildlife habitat.” [Farm Service Agency –Conservation Reserve Program, accessed [12/17/13](#)]

- **Conservation Reserve Program Was Signed Into Law By President Ronald Reagan In 1985.** According to the Farm Service Agency’s Website, “Signed into law by President Ronald Reagan in 1985, CRP is the largest private-lands conservation program in the United States. Thanks to voluntary participation by farmers and land owners, CRP has improved water quality, reduced soil erosion, and increased habitat for endangered and threatened species.” [Farm Service Agency –Conservation Reserve Program, accessed [12/17/13](#)]

The Program Benefits Over 3,000 Arkansas Farms

Conservation Reserve Program Reported 5,766 Enrolled Contracts In Arkansas For Land Conservation, Enrolled 3,207 Arkansas Farms On 235,696 Acres In Arkansas As Of October 2013. According to the Conservation Reserve Program October 2013 monthly summary, the Program has a total Arkansas enrollment of 5,766 contracts for land conservation while the total number of Arkansas farms enrolled in the Program as of October 2013 was 3,207. The Conservation Reserve Program also enrolled 253,696 acres in the program in Arkansas. [Conservation Reserve Program-October 2013 monthly summary, [10/13](#)]

- **Conservation Reserve Program Paid An Annual Rent Of \$15,878 To Arkansas Farmers At \$67.37 An Acre As Of October 2013.** According to the Conservation Reserve Program October 2013 monthly summary, the Program paid \$15,878 in annual rent to farmers in Arkansas. [Conservation Reserve Program-October 2013 monthly summary, [10/13](#)]
- **Conservation Reserve Program Enrolled 25,307 Acres Of Flood-Plain Wetlands In Arkansas As Of October 2013.** According to the Conservation Reserve Program October 2013 monthly summary, the Program has 25,307 acres of flood-plain wetlands enrolled in Arkansas as of October 2013. [Conservation Reserve Program-October 2013 monthly summary, [10/13](#)]

Cotton Voted With AFP

2013: Cotton Voted To Prohibit New Enrollment In The Conservation Reserve Program. In March 2013, Cotton voted to support prohibiting new enrollment in the Conservation Reserve Program, as part of the Republican Study Committee's proposed budget resolution covering fiscal years 2014 to 2023. [House Vote 86, [3/21/13](#); Republican Study Committee, [3/18/13](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/25/13](#)]

AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY SUPPORTED ELIMINATION OF FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT AND ACCESS PROGRAMS PROGRAM THAT HELPS FARMERS SELL GOODS ABROAD

2012: Americans For Prosperity Supported The Republican Study Committee FY 2013 Budget Resolution. According to the Americans for Prosperity's 112th Congress Key Vote Scorecard, "Vote 17 -- 3/29/2012 -- Issue: Budget & Spending. Roll Call: 149 Result: Failed AFP's Position: Yes. This was a vote to approve the RSC FY2013 Budget Resolution (Substitute Amendment to H. Con. Res. 112)." [112th Congress Key Vote Scorecard, Americans for Prosperity, [6/20/12](#)]

- **Republican Study Committee Budget Supported Elimination Of The Foreign Market Development Program.** In March 2012, the Republican Study Committee proposed a budget that would have eliminated the Foreign Market Development Program, as part of its proposed budget resolution covering fiscal years 2013 to 2022. According to the Republican Study Committee, "The FMDP is used by agricultural trade associations and commodity groups to help promote exports and provide nutritional and technical assistance to other countries. This program would be terminated beginning in FY 2013, resulting in savings of \$350 million over ten years." The vote was on an amendment to the House budget resolution replacing the entire budget with the RSC's proposed budget; the amendment failed by a vote of 136 to 285. [House Vote 149, [3/29/12](#); Republican Study Committee, [3/12](#)]
- **Republican Study Committee Budget Supported Elimination Of The Market Access Program.** In March 2012, the Republican Study Committee proposed a budget that would have eliminated the Market Access Program as part of its proposed budget resolution covering fiscal years 2013 to 2022. According to the Republican Study Committee, "The MAP is intended to promote overseas marketing of U.S. agricultural products. MAP funds consumer promotions, market research, trade shows, advertising campaigns, and other programs designed to subsidize the sale of brand-name products in foreign markets by private cooperatives, trade associations, and businesses.[...] Taxpayers should not be forced to pick up the tab for this kind of corporate welfare. The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform even targeted this program as one in need of change. This program would be terminated in FY 2013, resulting in \$2 billion in savings over ten years." The vote was on an amendment to the House budget resolution replacing the entire budget with

the RSC's proposed budget; the amendment failed by a vote of 136 to 285. [House Vote 149, [3/29/12](#); Republican Study Committee, [3/12](#)]

Programs Were Vital For Marketing U.S. Farm Products Abroad

Foreign Market Development Program Was a \$34 Billion Program That Focused On Helping Farmers Sell In Foreign Countries. According to Beef Magazine, “The \$34.5-billion program focuses on reducing market impediments, improving the processing capabilities of importers, modifying restrictive regulatory codes and standards in foreign markets, and identifying new markets or uses for U.S. products. The program was established in 1954.” [Beef magazine, [11/27/06](#)]

Market Access Program Advertises US Agriculture In Foreign Countries. According to Fox News, “The USDA's Market Access Program (MAP) has spent about \$2.1 billion over the last 14 years. MAP currently spends about \$200 million each year to promote U.S. agricultural products in foreign markets. The funds are used to reimburse agriculture groups for some of the money they spend on overseas ad campaigns and promotional activities. Millions are spent each year to promote U.S. products ranging from cotton to watermelon.” [Fox News, [12/17/13](#)]

- **The Program Operates On A Cost Sharing Structure Whereby Participants Contribute A Minimum 10% Match For Generic Products And A Dollar-For-Dollar Match For Branded Products.** According to the USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service, “FAS provides cost-share assistance to eligible U.S. organizations for activities such as consumer advertising, public relations, point-of-sale demonstrations, participation in trade fairs and exhibits, market research and technical assistance. When MAP funds are used for generic marketing and promotion, participants must contribute a minimum 10-percent match. For promotion of branded products, a dollar-for-dollar match is required.” [Foreign Agricultural Service, Viewed [8/26/14](#)]

Every Dollar Spent On Agricultural Trade Promotion Programs Creates \$35 In Economic Benefits. According to the USDA, “USDA's international market development programs have had a significant and positive impact on U.S. agricultural exports. An independent study released in 2010 found that trade promotion programs like MAP and FMD provide \$35 in economic benefits for every dollar spent by government and industry on market development.” [USDA, “USDA Helps Open and Expand Export Markets for U.S. Agriculture through 2014 Farm Bill Programs,” [4/16/14](#)]

The Programs Assisted Arkansas

Market Access And Foreign Market Development Funds Were Matched To Arkansas Corn And Grain Sorghum Board Funds To Promote Arkansas' Commodity Exports. According to the Arkansas Corn and Grain Sorghum Board, “Every dollar the Board invest in the Grains Council is matched \$3.4 to \$1 through USDA export promotion programs like the Market Access Program (MAP) and the Foreign Market Development (FMD) funds. These funds are authorized through the Farm Bill and award to different agriculture commodity groups. Through our support of the Grains Council Arkansas Corn and Sorghum is promoted to foreign buyers both through trade missions and foreign buying groups coming to Arkansas.” [Corn-Sorghum, accessed [12/17/13](#)]

- **Funds Were Matched At A Rate Of \$3.4 Federal to \$1 State.** According to the Arkansas Corn and Grain Sorghum Board, “Every dollar the Board invest in the Grains Council is matched \$3.4 to \$1 through USDA export promotion programs like the Market Access Program (MAP) and the Foreign Market Development (FMD) funds.” [Corn-Sorghum, accessed [12/17/13](#)]

Arkansas' Agricultural Exports Were Worth \$3.2 Billion In 2008. According to the US Department of Agriculture, “Arkansas ranked 11th among all 50 states in 2008 with agricultural exports estimated at \$3.2 billion. Agricultural exports help boost farm prices and income, while supporting about 37,065 jobs both on the farm and off the farm in food processing, storage, and transportation. Exports remain important to Arkansas' agricultural and statewide economy. Measured as exports divided by farm cash receipts, the State's reliance on agricultural exports was 38 percent in 2008.” [Department of Agriculture, [09/09](#)]

Arkansas' Agricultural Exports Ranked 11th Overall Out Of 50 States. According to the US Department of Agriculture, "Arkansas ranked 11th among all 50 states in 2008 with agricultural exports estimated at \$3.2 billion." [Department of Agriculture, [09/09](#)]

Agricultural Exports Supported Over 37,000 Jobs In Arkansas. According to the US Department of Agriculture, "Agricultural exports help boost farm prices and income, while supporting about 37,065 jobs both on the farm and off the farm in food processing, storage, and transportation." [Department of Agriculture, [09/09](#)]

Arkansas' Agricultural Exports Represented 38% Of Total Agriculture Economy. According to the US Department of Agriculture, "Exports remain important to Arkansas' agricultural and statewide economy. Measured as exports divided by farm cash receipts, the State's reliance on agricultural exports was 38 percent in 2008." [Department of Agriculture, [09/09](#)]

Arkansas Exported Nearly \$3 Billion In 2011 From Its Top Five Exports: Rice (\$918 Million), Soybeans (\$807 Million), Poultry (\$509 Million), Cotton (\$473 Million) And Wheat (\$276 Million). According to Farm Flavor, Arkansas exported \$918 million in rice, \$807 million in soybeans, \$509 million in poultry, \$473 million in cotton and \$276 million in wheat in 2011. [Farm Flavor, [12/17/13](#)]

Tom Cotton Voted To Eliminate The Programs

2013: Cotton Voted To Eliminate The Foreign Market Development and Market Access Programs. In March 2013, Cotton voted to support eliminating the Foreign Market Development Program and Market Access Program as part of the Republican Study Committee's proposed budget resolution covering fiscal years 2014 to 2023. [House Vote 86, [3/21/13](#); Republican Study Committee, [3/18/13](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/25/13](#)]

AFP WANTED TO END ALL FUNDING FOR FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

AFP: "Federally-Funded Agricultural Research Should Be Ended Entirely And Transferred To The Private Sector." According to the Americans for Prosperity website, "Cut Government-Subsidized Agricultural Research by 25% – Save \$702 million. As the Cato Institute's Chris Edwards explains: 'Most American industries fund their own research and development programs. The agriculture industry is a notable exception.' Together, the Agricultural Research Service, the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, the Economic Research Service, and the National Agricultural Statistics Service requested \$2.8 billion in budget authority last fiscal year. Federally-funded agricultural research should be ended entirely and transferred to the private sector; a good start is cutting these accounts by 25%." [AmericansforProsperity.org, [June 2013](#)]

AFP WANTED TO END COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

AFP Wanted To Cut The Commodity Assistance Program. According to the Americans for Prosperity website, "End a Duplicative Welfare Program – Save \$281 million. The USDA runs several programs to help feed the poor. But one program in particular, the Commodity Assistance Program, duplicates the functions of other nutrition programs and does more to prop up prices for politically-connected commodity producers than it does to serve the needy. Nevertheless, the program lives on and Congress appropriated \$281 million in FY2013." [AmericansforProsperity.org, [June 2013](#)]

AFP PROPOSED ELIMINATING DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, SAID IT AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS HAD "SIMPLY OUTLIVED THEIR USEFULNESS."

Americans For Prosperity Proposed Eliminating Department Of Agriculture, Said It And Other Departments Had "Simply Outlived Their Usefulness." According to Americans for Prosperity: "Other departments have simply outlived their usefulness. The country used to have an agrarian economy but no longer, yet the Department of Agriculture is one of the largest in the government." [Americans for Prosperity Policy Paper, [October 2011](#)]

Americans For Prosperity Placed Department Of Agriculture On List To “Close Wasteful Federal Departments” Touted Savings Of \$1,325 Billion Dollars. [Americans for Prosperity Policy Paper, [October 2011](#)]

1990s: Koch-Controlled Citizens For A Sound Economy Attacked Multiple Programs That Are Vital To Arkansas Farmers

CITIZENS FOR A SOUND ECONOMY WAS THE KOCH-CONTROLLED PREDECESSOR TO AMERICAN FOR PROSPERITY

Citizens For A Sound Economy Was Created In 1984 By David Koch And Richard Fink. According to the New Yorker, “In 1984, David Koch and Richard Fink created yet another organization, and [President of FreedomWorks Matt] Kibbe joined them. The group, Citizens for a Sound Economy, seemed like a grassroots movement, but according to the Center for Public Integrity it was sponsored principally by the Kochs, who provided \$7.9 million between 1986 and 1993.” [The New Yorker, [8/30/10](#)]

Citizens For A Sound Economy Was “Principally” Sponsored By The Kochs, Who Gave \$7.9 Million To The Group Between 1986 And 1993. According to the New Yorker, “The group, Citizens for a Sound Economy, seemed like a grassroots movement, but according to the Center for Public Integrity it was sponsored principally by the Kochs, who provided \$7.9 million between 1986 and 1993.” [The New Yorker, [8/30/10](#)]

The Koch Brothers Were “Very Controlling” Over Citizens For A Sound Economy. According to the New Yorker, “Within a few years, the group had mobilized fifty paid field workers, in twenty-six states, to rally voters behind the Kochs’ agenda. David and Charles, according to one participant, were ‘very controlling, very top down. You can’t build an organization with them. They run it.’” [The New Yorker, [8/30/10](#)]

Americans for Prosperity Started From Split with Citizens for a Sound Economy in 2004. According to The New Yorker: “In 2004, Citizens for a Sound Economy was accused of illegitimately throwing its weight behind Bush’s reelection. The group’s Oregon branch had attempted to get Ralph Nader on the Presidential ballot, in order to dilute Democratic support for John Kerry. Critics argued that it was illegal for a tax-exempt nonprofit organization to donate its services for partisan political purposes. (A complaint was filed with the Federal Election Commission; it was dismissed.) That year, internal rivalries at Citizens for a Sound Economy caused the organization to split apart. David Koch and Fink started a new group, Americans for Prosperity, and they hired Tim Phillips to run it.” [The New Yorker, [8/30/10](#)]

1992: CITIZENS FOR A SOUND ECONOMY OPPOSED FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

Citizens For A Sound Economy Opposed Federal Administration Of The Crop Insurance Corporation. In a brochure entitled “Wasting America’s Money II,” Citizens for a Sound Economy stated: “Of course, FmHA isn’t the only source of funds for farmers looking to make investments, nor the only one that loses money every year either. [...] Then there’s the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, which provides insurance for farmers in case their crops don’t survive the harvest and cannot earn a government subsidy. It’s not a bad idea – we have insurance for all other kinds of risky business, but letting the government handle it is a mistake.” [Citizens for a Sound Economy, “Wasting America’s Money II,” Pg. 22, 1992]

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Implemented The Federal Crop Insurance Program. According to the USDA, “Congress first authorized Federal crop insurance in the 1930s along with other initiatives to help agriculture recover from the combined effects of the Great Depression and the Dust Bowl. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) was created in 1938 to carry out the program. Initially, the program was started as an experiment, and crop insurance activities were mostly limited to major crops in the main producing areas. Crop insurance remained an experiment until passage of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1980.” [USDA, “History of the Crop Insurance Program,” Viewed [8/26/14](#)]

1992: CITIZENS FOR A SOUND ECONOMY CRITICIZED THE AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND, WHICH PROVIDED DIRECT LOANS TO FARMERS

1992: Citizens For A Sound Economy Criticized The Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund. In a brochure entitled “Wasting America’s Money II,” Citizens for a Sound Economy stated: “Of course, FmHA isn’t the only source of funds for farmers looking to make investments, nor the only one that loses money every year either. For example, the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund has to be reimbursed \$4.1 billion to cover its losses in 1990 and \$6 billion more in 1991. A private insurance company with those losses would have been out of business years ago. But government agencies seem to go on forever no matter their cost or effectiveness.” [Citizens for a Sound Economy, “Wasting America’s Money II,” Pg. 22, 1992]

The Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Provided Direct Loans To Farmers Who May Not Qualify For Credit Through Other Institutions. According to the Heritage Foundation, “The Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund provides direct loans to farmers who may not qualify for credit through other institutions.” [Heritage Foundation, [6/25/13](#)]

1992: CITIZENS FOR A SOUND ECONOMY ATTACKED FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

1992: Citizens For A Sound Economy Attacked The Foreign Agricultural Service, Export Enhancement Program. In a brochure entitled “Wasting America’s Money II,” Citizens for a Sound Economy stated: “Even crops for export are protected by the government. The Foreign Agricultural Service is in charge of promoting sales of our surplus crops abroad, at whatever cost. If a farmer exports his crop and doesn’t receive as high a price as he would here, the Foreign Agricultural Service will make up the difference!” [Citizens for a Sound Economy, “Wasting America’s Money II,” Pg. 17-18, 1992]

The Foreign Agricultural Service Administers Market Access Program

The Foreign Agricultural Service Administers The Market Access Program To Share The Cost Burden Of Establishing International Export Markets For U.S. Agricultural Products. According to the Foreign Agricultural Service, “Through the Market Access Program (MAP), FAS partners with U.S. agricultural trade associations, cooperatives, state regional trade groups and small businesses to share the costs of overseas marketing and promotional activities that help build commercial export markets for U.S. agricultural products and commodities. MAP reaches virtually every corner of the globe, helping to build markets for a wide variety U.S. farm and food products.” [Foreign Agricultural Service, Viewed [8/26/14](#)]

- **The Program Operates On A Cost Sharing Structure Whereby Participants Contribute A Minimum 10% Match For Generic Products And A Dollar-For-Dollar Match For Branded Products.** According to the Foreign Agricultural Service, “FAS provides cost-share assistance to eligible U.S. organizations for activities such as consumer advertising, public relations, point-of-sale demonstrations, participation in trade fairs and exhibits, market research and technical assistance. When MAP funds are used for generic marketing and promotion, participants must contribute a minimum 10-percent match. For promotion of branded products, a dollar-for-dollar match is required.” [Foreign Agricultural Service, Viewed [8/26/14](#)]

Every Dollar Spent On Trade Promotion Programs Creates \$35 In Economic Benefits. According to the USDA, “USDA’s international market development programs have had a significant and positive impact on U.S. agricultural exports. An independent study released in 2010 found that trade promotion programs like MAP and FMD provide \$35 in economic benefits for every dollar spent by government and industry on market development.” [USDA, “USDA Helps Open and Expand Export Markets for U.S. Agriculture through 2014 Farm Bill Programs,” [4/16/14](#)]

CITIZENS FOR A SOUND ECONOMY ATTACKED USDA MARKETING LOAN PROGRAMS

Citizens For A Sound Economy Attacked USDA Marketing Loan Programs. In a brochure entitled “Wasting America’s Money II,” Citizens for a Sound Economy stated: “The USDA has even created marketing loan programs to advertise U.S. agricultural products abroad – using our tax dollars for brand-name advertising for private American companies which also happen to have a great deal of campaign money to spread around. [...] With so many giveaway programs to choose from and to take advantage of, many American farmers are torn between trying to figure out how to get the most out of this ridiculous system or how to get more out of working in the fields. Of course, they have to work in their fields if the government is paying them not to farm their land. Getting rid of the programs altogether is the best solution, but could Congress eliminate these huge subsidies to big industrial farms and still look out for the small family farmer? Yes.” [Citizens for a Sound Economy, “Wasting America’s Money II,” Pg. 18, 1992]

The Marketing Assistance Loans Provide Agricultural Producers Interim Financing At Harvest Time. According to the Farm Service Agency, “Marketing assistance loans provide producers interim financing at harvest time to meet cash flow needs without having to sell their commodities when market prices are typically at harvest-time lows. Allowing producers to store production at harvest facilitates more orderly marketing of commodities throughout the year.” [Farm Service Agency, [7/23/14](#)]

“For Many, A USDA Loan Is Their Only Chance To Continue Farming Or To Start Their Career On The Land.” According to Farm Aid, “Though it has tried to re-brand itself as the ‘Lender of First Opportunity,’ USDA’s Farm Service Agency is, for all intents and purposes, still the ‘Lender of Last Resort.’ When a farmer turns to the FSA for a farm operating or farm ownership loan, they have been turned down by other lenders. For many, a USDA loan is their only chance to continue farming or to start their career on the land.” [Farm Aid, “Government Shutdown: The Impact on Food and Agriculture,” Viewed [8/26/14](#)]

During The 2013 Government Shutdown, More Than 6,300 Farmers Waited On Congress Before Moving Forward On Their Obligations. According to Farm Aid, “In all, more than 6,300 US farmers waited on Congress before they could move forward with their farm operations, pay their bills or prepare for harvest and planting: 1,423 farmers waited to receive their approved USDA direct farm operating loans while FSA offices were closed. Since a ‘loan delayed is a loan denied,’ as they say, this delay places more than 1,400 farms in serious jeopardy. An additional 2,161 families waited for disbursement of approved USDA direct farm ownership loans, and an additional 1,005 waited on guaranteed ownership loans. Many of these farm families had already waited months. 1,800 of the approximately 29,000 farmers expected to receive USDA loans this year had to wait even longer for their applications to be processed.” [Farm Aid, “Government Shutdown: The Impact on Food and Agriculture,” Viewed [8/26/14](#)]

1980s: The Clark-Koch Plan for Agriculture - Eliminate Federal Support For Farmers

IN 1980, DAVID KOCH RAN FOR VICE-PRESIDENT AGAINST RONALD REAGAN WITH LIBERTARIAN ED CLARK

David Koch Ran As Vice-Presidential Nominee on Libertarian Party Ticket In 1980. According to The New York Times: “It was 1980, and the candidate was David H. Koch, a 40-year-old bachelor living in a rent-stabilized apartment in New York City. Mr. Koch, the vice-presidential nominee for the Libertarian Party, and his older brother Charles, one of the party’s leading funders, were mounting a long-shot assault on the fracturing American political establishment.” [New York Times, [5/17/14](#)]

CLARK-KOCH TICKET SUPPORTED ELIMINATING FARM EXPORT ASSISTANCE

Clark-Koch White Paper: “Foreign Agricultural Services...Subsidizes Farm Exports And Export Operations, Compiles Information, And Administers Import Controls To Protect Domestic Producers. The Import Controls Should Be Eliminated To Ease Prices For American Consumers, And The Agriculture Industry Should Pay Its Own Export Expenses.” In a white paper, Clark-Koch wrote, “Foreign Agricultural Services[:] This program subsidizes farm

exports and export operations, compiles information, and administers import controls to protect domestic producers. The import controls should be eliminated to ease prices for American consumers, and the agriculture industry should pay its own export expenses.” [Clark-Koch For President White Paper On Taxing And Spending Reduction, 1980]

CLARK-KOCH TICKET PROPOSED LARGE CUTS TO SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Clark-Koch Proposed Large Cuts to Soil Conservation Service. [Clark-Koch For President White Paper On Taxing And Spending Reduction, 1980]

CLARK-KOCH TICKET WANTED TO ELIMINATE SUPPORT FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE THAT BENEFITTED INDIVIDUAL FARMERS AND AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES

Clark-Koch Ticket Proposed Eliminating Science and Education Administration Programs That Provide Support for Food and Agricultural Science and Education Programs. In a white paper, Clark-Koch wrote, “Science and Education Administration[:]The programs of the SEA provide planning, support, and coordination for food and agricultural science and education programs. The beneficiaries of this program are the individuals and businesses in the agriculture industry. We recommend removing federal support for these programs and allowing universities, farm organizations, agribusiness companies, co-ops, and other sectors of the agriculture industry to pay for those functions that are really cost-effective. The basic principle is that those who expect to benefit from a program should pay for it, voluntarily.” [Clark For President White Paper On Taxing And Spending Reduction, 1980]

CLARK-KOCH TICKET WANTED TO END FUNDING FOR PROGRAM THAT PROVIDED INFORMATION TO AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY ON WORLD AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK

Clark-Koch White Paper: “World Food And Agricultural Outlook And Situation Board...Provides Information On The World Agricultural Outlook To The Agriculture Industry. Those Who Benefit From This Service Should Pay For It Privately.” In a white paper, Clark-Koch wrote, “World Food and Agricultural Outlook and Situation Board[:] This program provides information on the world agricultural outlook to the agriculture industry. Those who benefit from this service should pay for it privately.” [Clark-Koch For President White Paper On Taxing And Spending Reduction, 1980]