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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study has been to acquaint the
author with the Ohio Farm Bureau and its equipment and tech­
niques for influencing Ohio lawmaking. The author, an urban­
ite, has, by marriage, found himself projected into a family
where everything from social life to fertilizer bears the la­
bel of the Ohio Farm Bureau. Even more stimulating to the
newcomer’s interest, have been the expressions of faith in
the Farm Bureau’s legislative programs and their methods for
attaining these ends. It is perhaps only natural, then, that
one in such a position would avail himself of this opportunity
to learn more about that which has come to be an oft-discussed
subject in his home.

The next question was where to start. The farmer takes
his problems for granted; the urban mind does not. The author
being of the latter, chose to first go back of the scenes and
examine some of the motivating factors or need for modern
agrarian organization; to review the beginnings of the Farm
Bureau movement, its present organization, its equipment for
influencing legislation, and the use of that equipment in the
97th General Assembly.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM

The main problems which confront the Ohio farmer today
are not uncommon to farmers of neighboring states. Nor do
the interests of the Ohio farmer differ greatly from the in­
terests of the Indiana, Michigan, or Wisconsin farmer. It is
generally true that what meets the agricultural demands of one
state will fill the same needs of the other states in that particular section and can often be applied as a remedy to the entire nation's agricultural requirements; however, there are some issues of varying importance which can arise out of a state's legislative action or inaction and therefore become unique to that state. Thus, by examining some of the national problems of agriculture we can see "writ large" what is true in the state of Ohio; other issues which depend upon the legislature for their solution must be discussed on the state level.

A persistent rural complaint concerns the farmers' share of the national income. "In 1850 agriculture contributed over 34 per cent of the national income. This had declined to 21 per cent in 1910 and to slightly over 10 per cent in 1932."1 Thus, while farm population is ever decreasing, the agricultural share of the national income is decreasing far out of proportion to the thinning farm ranks.

"Up to 1900, according to figures of the National Industrial Conference Board, the per capita share in the national income of all persons engaged in agriculture increased relative to the share received by persons in other occupations. Since that time there has been a progressive and even precipitous decline. Except for the years of 1918 and 1919, the money return to the farmer has lagged far behind the income of workers in other occupations."2

In 1935, for example, the agricultural income in the state of Ohio amounted to 240 million3 for 731,364 agricultural workers.4 The manufacturing income for the same year was 966

1P.H. Odegard and E.A. Helms, American Politics, p.227
2Ibid.
3John A. Slaughter, Income Received in the Various States 1929 - 1935.
million for 650,382 manufacturing employees.

This decreasing agricultural income cannot be attributed to decreased production. In fact, it frequently happens that the value of a bumper crop is far less than the same crop a year earlier even though the latter was a failure. During peacetime, with foreign markets protected against American commodities, the farmer must depend on the domestic market which, if backed with little purchasing power and swamped by a good harvest, means no market at all or at least the lowest returns for his labors. Confronted by this, the farmer strives to increase the volume of his production in order to meet his basic expenses and thereby floods an already glutted market. On the other hand, in times of prosperity, farmers seek to take advantage of the favorable prices by again increasing their volume of production. Surpluses pile up endlessly. It is evident, then, why farmers turn to the government for subsidies and collective agreements. Agricultural politics have centered around this problem of surplus production since World War I.

Interwoven with the surplus problem is the question of foreign trade. During the recent war, the United States developed highly specialized agricultural resources to produce for export. The heavy demands of our armed forces and foreign markets were able to absorb nearly a one-third increase over pre-war farm production. With farm production now geared so high, the farmers object more than ever to obstacles placed in the way of foreign trade. In reciprocal trade agreements, the United Nations and other international controls, agriculture
sees a hope for its surplus problems. Of course, there are certain groups who want protection against Argentine beef, Canadian cheese, etc.

It is becoming increasingly apparent to some agrarian leaders that the well being of agriculture is directly dependent upon the well being of the rest of the nation. That is, in times of depression when the purchasing power of the population is at a low ebb, the farmers suffer as a result of the lost market. In times of prosperity, the opposite is true.

"The arithmetic of farm prosperity has been written during these past war years....With 11 million unemployed in 1932...cash income from farm marketing was less than 5 billion dollars. With only 6 million unemployed in 1937 it rose to approximately 9 billions. By 1941 with only 3 million unemployed, farm marketing totals rose to 11 billion dollars and skyrocketed to 19 billions in 1944 with unemployment at zero. Number one objective for the American farmer today is full industrial production...full employment and adequate wage levels."

One of agriculture's biggest fears is that the return to a peacetime routine will be a return to the hardships that began for the farmers in 1921. They know that this fear can materialize when factories begin to shut down. This change of interest from the unit to the whole is being reflected in some of the legislative positions of agrarian interests.

Another major concern of the farmer is that of land values and mortgages. In order to make improvements and additions to his farm, long term loans become essential. During World War I, with the prices of farm products well above the costs,

---

5 Murray D. Lincoln, Speech, Nov. 16, 1944. Files of Rural Economics Dept., Ohio State University.
6 Ibid.
farmers were encouraged by the government and businessmen to buy and sell farms on the assumption that boom prices would continue indefinitely. As a result, an enormous burden of debts secured by high interest farm mortgages was piled up. Later, when prices declined relative to costs, these debts became so cumbersome that the farmer was forced to lower his standards of living to meet interest payments and often endured foreclosure. Even though prosperity swept the country in the 1920's, the farm debt grew and did not begin to recede until 1939.7 During the years of World War II, agriculture prospered and was able to liquidate billions in farm debt and set aside millions for the purchase of new machinery, land, and home improvements.8 The mistake of the first war was not repeated, at least not to a comparable extent. However, the number of mortgaged farms operated by full owners increased by about 10 per cent in 1942 over 1930. This indicates that a great many former tenants bought farms and they did so under prosperity prices thus exposing themselves to the same dangers of a generation earlier.

Upon reviewing the growth of farm-mortgage indebtedness and of farm tenancy during the past two generations, it is to be seen that our farmers up to 1939 were losing ownership of the land. In good times as in bad, the proportion of all farm

7Carl T. Schmidt, American Farmers in the World Crisis, p. 13. The mortgage-debt load on farmers "...amounted to $3,200,000,000 in 1910, $8,400,000 in 1920, and $9,600,000,000 in 1930. Because of foreclosures and other forms of liquidation during the depression, it had fallen to $7,100,000,000 by 1939."
8Statistical Abstract, 1946. By 1940, the farm mortgage debt in Ohio had dropped to $239,059,000 from $272,738,000 in 1930.
real estate actually belonging to the cultivating farmers had been steadily shrinking. In 1880 their equity\(^9\) made up approximately 62 per cent of the value of all farm real estate in the United States. By 1935 it had fallen to only 39 per cent. While the past five years have witnessed an improvement in this percentage, it is obvious that even a moderate recession will cause the resumption of the original trend.

This situation is the rural counterpart of the increasing gap in urban industry between workmanship and ownership. It runs directly counter to the Jeffersonian ideal of a democracy based on a mass of independent, property-owning farmers. But it is more than the mere denial of an ideal. The loss of property is also the loss of economic and political power. It may further mean a change in attitudes toward the land, toward the family, and toward the community. And this might well become a danger to our democratic institutions.

The farmers' great complaint in most states, is that land taxes, to all intents and purposes, approach confiscation. The justice of the farmers' cry was recognized by President Hoover at the Richmond Conference of Governors in 1932:

"The tax burden upon real estate is wholly out of proportion to that upon other forms of property and income. There is no farm relief more needed today than tax relief, for I believe that it can be demonstrated that the tax burden upon the farmer today exceeds the burden upon other groups.... The taxes upon real property are the easiest to

\(^9\)Carl T. Schmidt, Op. cit. "Equity" in farm real estate is obtained by subtracting (a) the value of mortgages on owner-operated farms plus the value of rented and manager-operated farm real estate from (b) the value of all farm land and buildings. In 1890 it amounted to 59% of the value of all farm real estate; in 1900, 54%; in 1910, 50%; in 1920, 46%; in 1930, 42%.
in times of depression, despite the decrease in the owner's income, places an undue drag upon that segment of the community in which real estate is the chief property item."\textsuperscript{10}

The farmers want the assessed values kept in line with actual values and a more equal distribution of the tax burden between farm owners and other groups. They believe that much can be accomplished in this respect through the reorganization of obsolete state tax laws.

During the past year, Ohio's newspapers have reported a growing agitation for better school conditions. Rural groups have long had a vital interest in these conditions. They are interested in achieving a greater degree of equalization of educational opportunity in those districts with lower than average tax valuations per pupil. According to an Ohio Farm Bureau publication\textsuperscript{11} the average cost of last year's operation of schools in the typical Ohio school district was approximately $112 per pupil in average attendance. Yet, there were eleven school districts that spent less than $55 per pupil per year; 39 that spent less than $65; 103 less than $75; 194 less than $85 and 274 that spent less than $90 per pupil per year. The districts which were operating at these low expenditure levels, and hence, were paying substandard salaries to teachers were generally those which, because of meager local tax resources, were dependent almost wholly on the revenue received under the Foundation Law. During the recent shortage of teachers, the rural schools have had to content themselves with a large percent of substandard provisional teachers while their former

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Cassius M. Clay, \textit{The Mainstay of American Individualism} p. 202
\item Ohio Farm Bureau Educational Sheet, \textit{What Do You Think} (undated) p. 4
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
teachers either left the profession or went to higher paying school districts. The frequent criticism is made that the rural school is too often the training ground for the urban school.

Agrarian interests are concerned over the question of public health. While the general death rate of rural people is today still less than that of city people, the decline in death rates has been much less in the country than in the cities. In 1900, the American farmer could claim a death rate about 50 per cent below that of his city cousins. To­day he can scarcely claim a 10 per cent advantage. In fact, the present death rate among infants and small children is actually higher in rural areas and small towns than in large cities. Maternal mortality was almost one-third higher in rural communities than in large cities in 1941, and in 1942 the infant mortality was over one-fourth higher in rural sections than in large cities. The rural rejection rate (draft) during the war was 53 per 100 while the general rejection rate was 43 per 100. The wealthy state of Ohio spends only seven cents per capita for public health and ranks 48th in per capita expenditures.

In the field of conservation, Ohio agriculture has been championing the cause for a law to regulate strip mining. Twenty-three counties of Ohio are affected by coal strip mining operations.13

12Ohio Farm Bureau Educational Sheet, 10-Point Program (undated) p. 2
13The need for strip mining legislation and the part that the Farm Bureau played in securing it are further discussed in a later chapter.
The issues which have been set forth here are but a few of the needs that the Ohio farmer desires to see fulfilled through organization. Other conservation measures, fertilizer programs, cooperatives, electricity, telephone services, farm research, collective action, etc. also enter into the farmers' motives for supporting a program of concerted action.

The approach of the Ohio Farm Bureau toward the solution of these problems is not confined to its legislative efforts; in fact, the author has been surprised, while interviewing certain of the organization's officials to learn that the legislative efforts are really secondary to its endeavors in fields outside of politics. Many times, the two spheres become interwoven; hence, while this paper concerns itself chiefly with the pressure group features of the organization, it cannot wholly disregard the other element.
THE ADVENT OF THE FARM BUREAU

The appearance of the American Farm Bureau Federation in 1921, to many, seemed very sudden. Its leaders who were then being called into consultation with the President and President-elect were, a year before, unknown.

"Almost overnight, it seemed, farmers and farmers' meetings everywhere were talking of marketing the nation's grain crop, the cotton crop, and the livestock crop cooperatively.... State and national law making bodies soon reflected the entry of organized and unified agricultural opinion and caused professional politicians no end of worry. Legislation showed the unmistakable imprint of a new force."14

However, the rise of the Farm Bureau Movement was not as sudden as it appeared to the casual observer. It may more aptly be viewed as another phase in the agrarian crusade which developed after the Civil War. The rise and decline of the Grange, the Farmers' Alliance, the Agricultural Wheel, the Brothers of Freedom, the Northwestern Alliance, the Farmers' and Laborers' Union, the Equity, and the Gleaners, together with the farmers' attempt at independent politics as represented by Greenbackism, Populism, and Bimetallism, all form the background for the Farm Bureau movement. The failure of most of these earlier movements caused many to believe that a workable national farm organization was impossible. But each successive movement emphasized agricultural needs and taught the farmers many valuable lessons.

With the development of scientific agricultural information, the need for an effective method of disseminating this information arose. Thus, the stage was set for the introduc-

14 Orville M. Kile, The Farm Bureau Movement. p. 2
tion of the county agricultural agent. Since the county agent required a local group of farmers to work with and through, there gradually developed a "farm bureau". This story is important in understanding the Farm Bureau Movement and its aims.

In 1902 and 1903, the boll weevil was taking increasing tolls from the cotton crop. To combat it, the "Farmers Cooperative Demonstration Work" was inaugurated. Shortly afterward, Congress made an appropriation of $250,000 to carry on the program. By 1906, the demonstration method of teaching farmers proved so valuable that several Texas counties hired full-time demonstrators who were agents of the Department of Agriculture. The idea spread, the work was intensified, and the character of the demonstrations enlarged to include all the standard farm crops, gardens, pastures, and later the breeding, raising, and feeding of livestock.

To make a survey of better farming methods in the North and West, the Department of Agriculture sent out a number of agents who frequently confined their investigations to limited areas for considerable periods of time. These agents found themselves in demand for institute lectures, special demonstrations, and were often sought by farmers to assist in solving local farming problems. As the demands on the agents increased, more men were assigned and soon the aim was to have one agent for every 25,000 farms. Encouraged by the results, the next step was to have one to a county, as in the South. The funds for this work came from the county and private sources and a little later from the Department of Agriculture. In 1914
Congress passed the Smith-Lever Bill which made funds available for the County Agent system to be extended into every agricultural county of the nation. But even prior to this time, counties had been organizing supervisory boards to take charge of the hiring of the County Agent and to supervise the expenditure of funds. These boards came to be known as Farm Bureaus.

The next step logically developed out of the practice of inviting the county farm bureau presidents to attend conferences at the state agricultural colleges.

"It soon developed that these various county units had interests which could best be served by some sort of state organization or association independent of the state educational institutions. The state extension forces were quick to realize that a state federation of the county farm bureaus would provide a powerful influence in securing liberal appropriations from the legislatures for further extension work. The more active officers of the county farm bureaus, on the other hand, saw the possibilities of united action in getting financial support from the state for the furtherance of the county farm bureau work. In some states laws were desired to authorize the county courts to appropriate county funds for the use of the local farm bureaus. In other states the urgent need for some piece of special legislation entirely divorced from any immediate farm bureau aid was the motive which drew the counties together into more or less definite state units."15

In 1917, the New York State Federation of County Farm Bureau Associations was the first state-wide organization. The West Virginia associations were similarly organized in 1918 and a number of other states followed in rapid succession.

Two years after the first state federation of farm bureaus had been organized, representatives of twelve states gathered at Ithaca, New York, to consider the advisability of

15p. cit. p. 111
forming a national organization. It was decided that a later meeting should be held in Chicago to perfect such an organization. During the ensuing interval, sectional ideas clashed and threatened to split the movement, but a more conciliatory spirit developed and in November, 1919, the American Farm Bureau Federation was launched on a temporary basis. In 1921, it was made permanent.

The new organization soon set forth its objects in the program of work under the following subdivisions: 16

"General
1. To develop a completely unified national organization to act as spokesman for the farmer and to adequately represent the farmer and the farmer's interests on all occasions.

"Educational
1. To create in the urban mind a better conception of the farmer's relationship to other units in the social and economic structure.

2. To reestablish agriculture in the public mind as the foremost industry, on which all others depend, and, in the prosecution of which man reaches his highest plane of development.

3. To encourage and assist in the development of food production to its highest state of efficiency.

4. To foster and develop all those lines of endeavor which make for better homes, better social and religious life, better health, and better rural living in every sense.

5. To conduct referenda on various national questions to determine farm sentiment before determining legislative action.

"Legislative
1. To safeguard the rights and interests and to assert the needs of the farmer whenever occasion may arise.

2. To establish without question the legality of collective bargaining.

3. To insist upon the presence of 'farmer minds' on all boards and commissions affecting agriculture, appointed by Congress or the President.

16op. cit. p. 129
"4. To defend the farmer's viewpoint in all matters relating to tax levies, tariffs, currency, banking, railways, highways, waterways, foreign markets, the merchant marine, territorial acquisitions and all similar legislative matters involving questions of policy, in any way affecting agriculture.

"5. To insist on some arrangement between capital and labor which will insure freedom from disrupting and criminally wasteful strikes.

"6. To strengthen the Federal Farm Loan Act and secure in addition, the establishment of a system of personal credits.

"7. To demand the regulation, under government supervision, of all commercial interests whose size and kind of business enables them to establish a monopoly dangerous to the best interests of the nation.

"Economic

"1. To extend cooperative marketing of farm crops to the point in the distribution system that the maximum benefits are secured for the producer, and incidentally, for the consumer.

"2. To limit the profits and reduce the costs of distribution in all lines not handled cooperatively.

"3. To so estimate the effective world supply of any farm product and to so regulate the flow to market as to eliminate sharp and extreme price fluctuations.

"4. To establish new foreign markets for surplus American farm products.

"5. To provide cheaper sources of fertilizer and more economical means of production."
THE RISE OF THE OHIO FARM BUREAU

The Farm Bureau movement in Ohio evolved along the same lines as in other states. It grew out of the county improvement associations (later known as farm bureaus) which had been organized over a period of years 1912-1919. These associations were groups of farmers organized primarily for the purpose of securing county agricultural extension agents in their respective counties. After such agents were secured, the associations sponsored the agricultural extension work and supervised the expenditure of funds.

The first county agricultural extension agent in the state began work in Portage County in 1912. The second began his duties as agent in Paulding County in 1913. Nine more counties employed agents the next year, mainly because of the impetus given the work by the passage of the Smith-Lever Act. By the end of 1917, there were agents in 29 counties. The emergency created by the entry of the United States into World War I further stimulated this movement and in 1918, agents were secured by 23 additional counties. By the end of 1920, extension work was under way in 78 of the 88 counties in the state. The programs of the county improvement associations were largely educational although in some counties attempts were made in the direction of cooperative buying and selling.17

The organization of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation was the result of the feeling on the part of many members of the county improvement associations that cooperative marketing and

17Farm Bureau pamphlet, History of Farm Bureau and Affiliated Companies (undated; mimeo.). p. 2
purchasing, legislative work, and several other projects could be developed more effectively by a federation of county units than by the separate county organizations. The possibility of federating county units was first discussed by a group of farm bureau presidents and state extension leaders in October, 1917. It was further discussed during Farmers' Week at Ohio State University in 1918 and a committee was formed to make plans for an organization meeting the following year. Efforts of this committee resulted in the organization of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation on January 27 and 28, 1919, during Farmers' Week. Representatives from 78 counties took part in the meeting. Two weeks later the organization was represented, together with eleven other state federations, at the meeting in Ithaca, N.Y., where plans were made for the later meeting in Chicago to construct a national federation.

The preamble to the constitution of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation sets forth the purpose for which the Organization came into being as follows:

"The Ohio Farm Bureau Federation was born to meet the business needs of farmers and is based on the belief that farmers can and will work together. The purposes of the organization are to represent, promote, and protect the business of farming by centralizing into a unit the strength and influence of the several county farm bureaus and joining it to the American Farm Bureau Federation, thereby securing legislative recognition in the state and nation, promoting an understanding of the relation of farming to other business, and other business to farming. Its motto is 'Not America for the Farmer, but the Farmer for America'."

The executive secretary's report for the year of 1923 indicates that the state federation was concentrating on its established program. Extracts from his 1923 report are as follows:18

---
18What the Farmers Think of the Farm Bureau, Ohio Farm Bureau, 1931, p. 8
---
"The major activities of the State Federation, during the past year, as in previous years, have been directed toward the setting up, and rendering assistance to the various commodity marketing associations, and, in addition, bringing about some outstanding accomplishments in connection with legislation and our Investment Service Department.

"Legislation was enacted during the past year that is most vital and far-reaching in effect. It provides the way whereby the farmer may take over the merchandising of his farm products, drive his own wagon to market and in the end come to the place where he, through his organization, will have a say in determining the price his products shall bring.

"The last several months have seen livestock commission firms set up at Cleveland, Buffalo, and Pittsburgh. We have established an order buying department to ship stock direct to packers. We have established a grain sales department. We have recently assisted in setting up the Ohio Poultry Producers' Association. It remained for the Farm Bureau Investigation Department to work out amendments to the present blue sky laws, and in face of serious opposition, secure their adoption during the recent session of the Legislature. This legislation and the activities of our department in sending out reports has eliminated the sale of stock in this State of the par value of approximately $736,000,000.

"Seventy-two thousand dollars rebated to members in savings and $27,000 put into surplus, after paying all expenses, is a record that we believe has not been excelled for one year's work in purchasing. To commodity associations and individual farmers much service, such as organization, legal, publicity, auditing, transportation, purchasing of supplies, statistical, and general counsel, has been rendered."
STRUCTURE OF THE OHIO FARM BUREAU

Eighty-six of Ohio's eighty-eight counties have county Farm Bureau Organizations. These are the basic units of the organic structure of the state federation. Each county organization has its own voluntary membership and its finances are derived solely from membership dues. Each elects its own board of directors which, after consulting the wishes and welfare of its members, adopts its own policies and a county program.

The state is divided into twenty-two districts with four counties to a district, and a member is elected from each district to the state board of trustees. The members in each county elect one or more delegates to represent them in selecting the Board member from their district. A county with not less than twenty members is allowed one delegate. For every 250 members in excess of the first 250, the county is entitled to an additional delegate. The state is also divided into four districts to elect four women directors. The delegates within each district elect the woman director for their quarter of the state.

The County Farm Bureaus are thus welded together into a state federation. The twenty-six member board adopts policies and plans the state program. A manager is hired by the Board to carry out this program. He is Executive Secretary.

Although the adult and youth councils, to be mentioned later, are on a sub-county level, their relationship with the county and state structure is purely functional. This relationship was described in an interview with Mr. W. E. Bair, Director of Personnel, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, May 6, 1947.
of the Ohio Farm Bureau and General Manager of all Farm Bureau activities in Ohio.

The organization on the state level is divided into three departments:

1. **Administrative Department.** This division, consisting of the Board of Directors and the Executive Secretary, plans and supervises all the activities of the state federation.

2. **Operating Department.** As its name implies, this department includes the various programs and activities of the Farm Bureau. It is sub-divided into the following:

   a. Organization Division
   b. Cooperative Purchasing
   c. Cooperative Marketing
   d. Cooperative Insurance
   e. Cooperative Finance Credit

3. **Finance Department.** Consisting of the Treasurer and his staff, this department controls Farm Bureau finances.

   Within the Organization Division are found the activities with which this paper is concerned. These activities or departments are:

   a. Membership
   b. Education
   c. Home and Community
   d. Legislative
   e. Youth
   f. Field Service

Thus, very briefly, we have a sketch of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation. Although all of the above divisions and sub-divisions contribute to the pressure which the Farm Bureau is able to exert, this paper is concerned only with those devices which are more directly designed to influence legislation.
CHAPTER II
THE ORGANIZATION DIVISION

In appraising any group which seeks to influence legislation, an understanding of its force of numbers, its propaganda techniques and its ability to get organized action are important. The Organization Division of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation has outlined its three main duties as follows:\(^1\)

"Building membership. Getting farm people to join Farm Bureau and affiliated organizations as the first step toward democratic self-help action.

"Developing understanding. Getting farm people to understand their problems and to want to work together in solving them.

"Getting organized action. Get more farm people to take part in the activities of the Farm Bureau and affiliated cooperative organizations."

By discussing each of these duties separately, it is possible to discern the foundation of the influence that the Ohio Farm Bureau is able to exert in state legislation.

**Building Membership**

In each county, the local Farm Bureau organization is responsible for securing and maintaining its own membership. It is the usual practice to do this through the volunteer efforts of the local leaders, Advisory Councils, or township units. In many cases, the counties employ a full time organization manager who has charge of the membership work and helps in the development of the county program. Other counties

\(^1\)Tentative Outline of the Farm Bureau Organization Program (undated) Ohio Farm Bureau.
secure someone for the duration of the membership solicitation who usually has charge of the membership roll call.

Membership is strictly confined to those engaged in agriculture either as laborers, managers, or farm owners. However, anyone may take part in the cooperative activities of the Farm Bureau.

At present, the membership fee in Ohio is $5.00 per year, of which $2.50 is sent to the Ohio Farm Bureau and $2.50 remains in the county. Of the $2.50 that comes to the state, 50 cents is sent to the American Farm Bureau, 50 cents is paid for a year's subscription to the Ohio Farm Bureau News, and the Ohio Cooperator, and 50 cents is returned to the counties to help finance their membership solicitation if they reach a certain membership quota. This leaves $1.00 of the membership dues to support the state program.

The inducements to non-members are very similar to those used by other organizations such as labor unions, etc. When non-members are approached in a membership drive, it is emphasized what the Farm Bureau has done and is now doing for the farmer: Farm insurance rates have been lowered because of Farm Bureau insurance; Cooperative trading saves the Ohio farmers thousands of dollars each year; and, in reviewing the accomplishments for the farmer through legislation, the following are cited:

2The ABC's of Farm Bureau (undated) Org. Div. O,F.B. "In fertilizer, feed, oil and similar products, the Association saved Ohio farmers $494,000 in 1943 alone."

3Ibid.
1. Secured Ohio laws under which all farm cooperatives operate.
2. Started and won the fight for electricity through rural electric cooperatives.
4. Protected real estate by:
   a. Helping to get a 10-mill limit
   b. Law requiring 65% vote for bond issues and levies.
   c. Securing lower legal interest rate on farm mortgages
5. Secured agricultural exemptions from Sales Tax.
6. Obtained law for farm truck licenses at lower cost.
7. Excluded agricultural tractors from license and sales tax laws.
9. Obtained a rural road program through proper highway fund allocation.

The non-member is thus shown how he is benefiting from the efforts of others. In one pamphlet used in membership drives, there appears a cartoon which depicts a large rowboat in a stormy sea. Surrounding the boat are dangerous sharks representing politics, taxes, and special interests. Farm Bureau members are working at the oars of "individual support" while two non-members ride comfortable in the stern. A dignified gentleman with the label "Farm Bureau leadership" is asking the non-members, "Isn't it about time to lend a hand?"

It is also impressed on the non-member that the Farm Bureau is no small concern; that the assets of its insurance companies are over 32 million dollars; that it owns warehouses, fertilizer plants, a refinery, feed mills, factories etc; and that through the power of such holdings, the Farm Bureau can effectively keep down many of the prices of farm commodities.

Most farmers do not need to be reminded that it was the Farm

4The Farm Bureau Tree, O.F.B.F., Nov. 1941 (inside cover).
Bureau who smashed the high fertilizer prices in 1923 and who lowered farm automobile insurance rates 40% below the average rates in 1926.

It is further brought out that each member may make his voice heard in the policies of the state federation; that it is very democratic. This democratic procedure for grassroots' participation in the organization's legislative process is supposed to function as follows: If a member has a strong conviction concerning a policy for the state Farm Bureau, he voices his opinion in his local Adult (or Advisory) Council. There, it may assume the form of a resolution, is voted upon and recorded in the minutes of the meeting which are forwarded to the state headquarters. The resolution, providing it had received a favorable vote in the local council is then investigated and very shortly is sent out with further information on the subject to all the councils in the state. Again it is voted upon and from the minutes of the meetings the results of the poll become known. The resolution next appears before the annual meeting of county delegates where experts such as rural economists, dairymen, the President of Ohio State University, etc. appear with further advice and information on the subject. The final vote is made by this body. If it is adopted, it becomes a part of the Farm Bureau program in Ohio.5

The Director of Legislation purportedly refers to this program before taking any action on issues in the General Assembly.

5This picture of the legislative process was obtained in an interview with Mr. D. R. Stanfield, Director of Legislation and Public Affairs, O.F.B., May 20, 1947.
In the event that the program does not include a stand on a pertinent issue, or an interpretation of the Farm Bureau's resolutions is required, the Board of Directors will make the necessary decision only if there is insufficient time to conduct a poll of the individual members.

For the past several years, the state headquarters has sponsored a Membership and Education Committee which is composed of the chairmen of the county membership committees. It meets once a year, exchanges suggestions from the various counties, and draws up a recommended plan for local membership drives. The Organization Division is now suggesting the establishment of the committee on a permanent basis to carry on its work throughout the year since it is through such a committee that grassroots' participation in the membership program can be most effectively developed. The first step toward this end was taken by the fieldmen who held district meetings of the farmers who had served as chairmen of county membership committees for the 1947 Roll Call. Approximately seventy counties were represented at these meetings. Each of the seven districts developed a recommended program for its district and for consideration in the development of a state-wide program.6

A meeting was held the latter part of May, 1947, for the chairmen from each of the seven field districts to build the state-wide program out of their district recommendations. From their discussions the program will include the following:7

---

6Report of the Organization Division (To the Board of Trustees) May 13, 1947.
7Ibid. Undated (June, 1947)
1. Roll Call Campaigns
2. Organization of Adult and Youth Councils
3. Council Officer Training.
4. Relationships with other organizations in the counties
5. The development of Membership Maintenance Projects
6. Meetings of members
7. Publicity

Since these membership devices are already in use, some are worthy of further consideration:

The Roll Call Campaign is a successful method for increasing membership. By May 1, as a result of the 1947 Roll Call, there were 54,131 Farm Bureau members for 1947. It is expected that membership for this year will go well beyond the 55,000 mark and may reach 56,000. The rate of increase will then equal that of the two previous years. The 1948 Roll Call plan will be completed sometime in August, 1947.

The adult and youth councils are the basic units of the Farm Bureau organization. The youth councils attempt to provide social life of a wholesome sort and to introduce the Farm Bureau educational program to rural youth. It is here that future leadership is often discovered and developed. The adult councils serve as units for educational discussions, getting grassroots' opinions, exchange of ideas, and social life. Their importance can be seen in various connections throughout this paper. On May 1, 1947, there were 1,423 adult and 128 youth councils.

---

8Report of the Organization Division, May 13, 1947, p. 6
In their relationships with other organizations, the Farm Bureau has, almost from its beginning, worked hand in hand with the Grange on the state level. In legislative activities, of course, Farm Bureau, like other interest groups, cooperates with all those within its sphere of agreement.

"The last year, a committee was set up to develop relationships with the churches. It...has made a rather careful study of this field. Its recommendations will soon be available to serve as a guide in developing such activities. We plan to follow the same procedure in developing relationships with the schools."9

To be aligned with churches and schools serves both to create a wider audience for understanding the Farm Bureau and to develop new contacts for increasing membership. Other relationships are developed on the county level. There seem to be isolated instances, however, where the Farm Bureau falls short in its cooperative relationships with organizations of similar ideals. In an interview with Mr. G. A. Knipp, General Manager of the Farmers Equity Creamery Co. in Ohio, an example was cited where the farmers of one community had erected a successful cooperative elevator. In spite of the fact that this elevator was fulfilling the cooperative ideals, a Farm Bureau cooperative elevator was installed in the same community and is competing with the former. The author has not found enough such examples to justify any general conclusions along this line, however.

The only membership maintenance project thus far is the Group Hospitalization program. This benefit is limited to Farm Bureau members and has proved quite effective in maintaining

---

9 Op. Cit. p. 6
membership. There is a growing interest in developing additional services whose benefits will be limited to Farm Bureau members.

**Developing Understanding**

The Education Department of the Organization Division plays a prominent role in the legislative activities of the Ohio Farm Bureau. It is here that future legislative proposals are often anticipated and the educational literature begins early to set forth the issues and start the members thinking on those questions. While this department does not limit its activities to legislative subjects, most of the educational material it sends out tends to strengthen the Farm Bureau movement in one way or another.

The most important media for the dissemination of educational literature which helps the farm folk understand their problems are the Advisory (or Adult) councils. These groups meet once a month in a home of one of the members. Many and varied are the subjects discussed. Problems of the county or township often enter the discussions and many helpful suggestions and ideas are exchanged.

To guide the councils in their discussions, the Organization Division through the Education Department, publishes a four page sheet entitled *The Advisory Council Guide* which is sent monthly to all the adult councils in the state. Each issue is devoted to one particular subject which usually concerns broad problems and trends. This provides thorough background material for more specific subject which follow and
will be further discussed later. On the last page of each issue there are five to ten questions which are voted upon at the close of the discussions. The results being forwarded to the state headquarters, it is possible to get a picture of state-wide rural thought.

To better illustrate the nature of this device, the author has chosen one issue at random to examine in this paper. Its subject is "The Farm Family". On the front page, beside a picture of a neatly dressed family facing a well-kept farm, appear the following paragraphs:

"FARM PEOPLE KEEP OUR CITIES ALIVE:

"New manpower and renewed character values come from farm homes."

"But, OUR FARM POPULATION IS DECLINING.

"From 1910 to 1945 our total population increased 51%. During the same period our farm population declined 21%. Today, only 18% of our population is on the land. Some say 5% with modern tools could produce all the food we need."

"Would this be a good policy? What would happen to our cities? To our nation? To the people forced off the soil? What would happen to YOU?"

On the second page beside a chart depicting the declining rural population, these paragraphs are found:

"THE FOUNDATION STONES

"We are a nation of families. The American family is the basic unit. Our way of life is only as secure as the families which are the foundation stones."

"Farm families contribute more than numbers. They add strength and quality to our democracy. They build character, moral fibre and a training for responsible living into our national life. These qualities spring out of farm life, and are needed to withstand the many 'social termites' that threaten to undermine our cities---juvenile delinquency,"

10 The Advisory Council Guide, December, 1946
vice rings, red-light districts, race prejudice and vicious political groups. Without moral and spiritual qualities, our urban communities would lapse into social decay.

"In recent years the American family has been suffering a setback. You can see it in the census figures. You can read it in the press. You can see it with your own eyes. The trend is tragic. It should make us think."

Two other charts show (1) the number of births in the United States per 1000 population from 1871-1942 and (2) the increasing divorce rate.

"WHAT ARE THE FACTS?"

"FAMILIES EVERYWHERE ARE SHRINKING IN SIZE"

"If the present trend continues, authorities tell us our population will be static by 1960. Most of this shrinkage is taking place in our larger cities. As more people live in cities and fewer people live in the country, our national birth-rate declines.

"BROKEN HOMES ARE ON THE INCREASE"

"Our National Divorce Rate Is Going Up At An Alarming Rate."

"The farm-to-city movement is on. The percentage of city people is growing. The per cent of our farm population is on the decline.

What do the above charts mean in terms of national welfare? Do they help explain the slowing down of our population growth? In the interests of national welfare, do we need a substantial rural population in the United States? Why? What conditions are found in the rural family that favor the rearing of children which you do not find in the city?"

The third page carries an interesting article entitled, "The Farmer Protects His Family":

"Since the period of first settlement, farm people have seen the threat to their freedom and security. They have pooled resources to strengthen their way of life, to make for happier homes and better citizens.

"They Did This By Building Their Own Institutions.

"They built schools to develop better citizens and provide for stronger homes in the future."
"They established churches to strengthen the moral life of the community and buttress the spiritual forces in the home.

"They set up local government to provide for an orderly community life where homes would be secure.

"They joined together in voluntary organizations to take care of many items of human welfare beyond the scope of the family.

"They did these things because they wanted to maintain their new freedom.

"Because they wanted their children to increase this heritage of freedom.

"They built these agencies to help the family circle find a better life."

Under the heading "What Will be Left For The Family To Do" is the following:

"In many ways the American family is losing its functions. We have been shifting the various duties of the family from the home to the community. In the early days much of the food, clothing and utensils used by the family were produced right in the home. Now we buy most of these things at the store. Instead of the old family get-togethers, husking bees and home-made fun, we buy our entertainment all done up for us on a disc, dial, screen or stage. Selling recreation has become big business. More and more we are going outside our homes to enjoy life, educate the young, provide religious instruction and find human fellowship.

"What Is Happening To The Following Family Functions?

"Bearing and rearing of children. (Remember when the Nazi State tried to take charge of this?)

"Training the children in the home. (How important is this? Should the school take over the development of character in the child?)

"Thrift? Sharing? Honesty? (How much of the educational job has the home turned over to the school? Do we have more children in foster homes and children's homes than we used to?)

"Economic activities. (How many of you women still bake your own bread?)"
"Protective activities. (What takes the place of the old musket over the door?)

"Recreational activities. (Have we been drifting away from home-made fun? Where do we drift to? What types of recreation today help bind the family together? What types pull the family apart?)

"Maintaining family affection and a 'home atmosphere'. (How do children behave when affection is lacking? Do children receive as much affection as they used to? Do they feel as secure?)

"Your job as Parent is to see that your children are: WELL-BRED, WELL-FED, WELL-READ, WELL-LED, WELL-WED."

The last page presents these "Questions for Discussion":

"1. How far can the public school go in taking over the functions of the family?"

"2. Can the church meet all the religious and spiritual needs that used to be supplied largely in the home?"

"3. How can the families of your neighborhood work through your churches, schools and farm organizations to improve family life?"

"4. What can families do together to strengthen the family unit?"

The following poll concludes the sheet:

"1. The recreation we get today is superior to that of our grandparents.

"2. Our family would be better off if we had more family worship in the home.

"3. The public schools monopolize too much of the children's time.

"4. Youth should be encouraged to hold their meetings and parties at the school rather than in the home.

"5. The pioneer farm home provided a better environment for character building than does the modern farm home.

"6. Public schools do more to educate our most promising rural youth for rural life.

"7. In most cases farm people should close their rural churches and attend town and city churches.

"8. Parents should leave the running of the school to the Board and teachers."
This issue is not as pointedly pro-Farm Bureau as others and yet it definitely serves at least three purposes: (1) Few would deny the moral values of the material presented here for discussion; (2) It strengthens the group-feeling of the rural community; and (3) It tends to break down the sales resistance to the organization's propaganda which any prospective member might have. Any one of these motives might be appealed to in a later instance should the necessity arise. Another issue is entitled "Pulling Together" and is devoted to the Farm Bureau cooperatives. Others carry such subjects as "propaganda", insurance, history of farm organizations, etc.

Although not all of the councils' minutes indicate whether or not the Advisory Council Guide was used in their discussions, it is known, from those that do, that approximately 50% of the councils use it regularly. The monthly increases and decreases in its use are apparently due to the topics discussed.\(^1\)\(^1\)\(^1\) A packet of issues, one for each family, is distributed to each council of the state every month.

The Youth Council Guide attempts to do for youth councils what the former does for the adult councils. It falls far short of this goal. In an interview\(^1\)\(^2\) with Mr. Darwin R. Bryan, Youth and Recreation Director, the difficulty of getting trained adult leadership was pointed out, and, as a result, the youth meetings seldom discussed the suggested topics; instead, the programs were made up of such recreation as square dancing etc. He added

---

\(^{12}\)May 20, 1947
however, that the youth councils do build up a friendly feel-
ing between the Farm Bureau and rural youth and that many or-
organization leaders worked up through the youth councils. Over
one-third of the cooperative store managers, he said, worked
up in this fashion.

Another publication of the Ohio Farm Bureau is The Ohio
Cooperator. This is a monthly, eight page newspaper. Its news
articles report the state, national, and international cooper-
ative activities. It features Drew Pearson's "Washington Merry-
Go-Round." Its editorials, among other things, answer at-
tacks against the Farm Bureau which members may have read in
other publications. While the legislature is in session, this
newspaper carries the latest developments concerning legisla-
tion which is of interest to the Farm Bureau. It lists the
names of committee members who are considering a particular
bill and the voting records of the Legislature are frequently
carried. Effective additional support can often be rallied
through this medium. The circulation now averages 120,000.

The Ohio Farm Bureau News is a thirty page monthly maga-
zine which contains the same general type of material as the
newspaper. It explains the Farm Bureau position on various
issues; its articles feature various activities of the cooper-
atives; it has a page for women and one for youth, and it car-
rries reports concerning membership, insurance sales, etc. This
magazine is sent to every Farm Bureau member. The subscrip-
tion price is included in the dues.

For cooperative managers, Farm Bureau employees, and lo-
cal board members, the Cooperative Association publishes a
weekly, six-page, mimeographed sheet called The Coop Reporter. It is made up of personal items and cooperative pep talks. To every insurance agent of the Ohio Farm Bureau goes a copy of the Challenger. This twelve page magazine contains news and tips of interest to insurance agents. The last publication to be mentioned is The Nation's Agriculture published by the national organization. It is a monthly, thirty-page magazine which carries news of nation-wide Farm Bureau activities.

It is difficult to measure the total influence of these publications. In one small community of about ten families known to the author, several interesting observations have been made in this connection, however: (1) The Advisory Council Guide, The Ohio Cooperator, and the Ohio Farm Bureau News are regularly and carefully read; (2) topics from these sources are frequently brought into family discussions and there is practically no questioning of their authority as there is toward other and more popular publications which are often regarded with suspicion; (3) the literature does not seem to affect the families' political faith but the way they vote is strongly influenced; and (4) through this literature, these people identify themselves with the Farm Bureau and are always ready to give it their support.

A new medium for reaching the rural population of Ohio is the radio station WRFD which will commence its broadcasting in the summer of this year. It will be known as the People's Broadcasting Corporation and is sponsored by the Ohio

---

13 The politics of six of the families are known; two are strong Democrats; four are equally strong Republican.
Farm Bureau. As to the nature of its broadcasts, the following paragraph is cited:\(^\text{14}\)

"Program charting will start with the farmer---what he likes---and what he needs. WRFD programs will be based on the long-recognized principle that radio to be truly useful must provide considerable information service and wholesome entertainment. Programs will revolve around four main elements---news---markets---discussions---and entertainment. The station will operate from sun-up to sun-down."

Continually, officials in the state headquarters are being called upon to address Farm Bureau groups over the state. This, too, serves to strengthen the grassroots' ties.

**Getting Organized Action**

This duty as interpreted by the Organization Division refers to the federation's efforts to get both members and non-members to join and make use of all the agencies and affiliated organizations of the Farm Bureau. This, then would include insurance, the various cooperative enterprises, the credit corporation etc. as well as the legislative machinery of the Farm Bureau. Part of these efforts have already been discussed under "Building Membership"; the efforts to get organized legislative action can be seen in the structure of the Legislative Department.

In every Advisory Council is maintained a "Legislative Minuteman". He receives legislative material from the state headquarters which keeps him informed as to the latest developments in the legislature, the official policies of the Farm Bureau and the reasons for these policies. Every month the Minuteman reports to his Council and presents a synopsis of

\(^\text{14}\)Ohio Farm Bureau News, May, 1947. p. 4
the material he has received. When the Council wants specific information on legislative matters, it turns to its Minuteman who supplies it. It is his job to help organize support in the form of letter writing and telegram campaigns when called upon by the Director of Legislation of the Fieldman.

In the event that there are no councils in a township, the County Farm Bureau makes provision to have that township represented by a Minuteman in the legislative activities. These Minutemen play an important role and the Farm Bureau makes effective use of them.

Each county has a Legislative and Public Affairs Committee which is composed as follows: three members are elected by the Farm Bureau Board from its membership; two are elected by the Cooperative Board from its membership; two are elected at large by the Minutemen from outside their number; and the Chairman of the County Home and Community Committee is the eighth member. The officers of this committee are a chairman, a secretary, and a spokesman. It is the usual practice to select a spokesman from the same political faith as the Congressman or State Representative of that district. The committee holds regular meetings at which plans are laid to further and coordinate all county legislative activity. During and preceding the recent session of the General Assembly, these county committees were urged to discuss one or more of the issues in the Farm Bureau Ten Point Program at each meeting. They study the voting records of Ohio Congressmen and State

---

15 Farm Bureau Legislative Material to all Legislative Committees (undated) Mimeo. p. 4
Representatives which are supplied by the Legislative Department. Frequently, these state and national representatives are invited to meet with the committee. Such meetings are very effective in getting the elected representatives to better understand the Farm Bureau program. One member of the committee, usually the secretary is responsible for publicity. A public relations program is carried on by the committee through which Farm Bureau ideas are presented to civic clubs, churches, schools, etc.

The state is divided into seven field districts. Each has its Legislative and Public Affairs Committee. It is composed of one representative from each county in the Field District who is elected by the County Legislative Committee. The functions of the field district committee are to plan and recommend activities for the county committees; meet at least quarterly; and elect a member to serve on the State Advisory Board of seven. The latter advises the staff as to field developments and devises plans that will assist the district committees in carrying out the Farm Bureau program.

Having inspected the equipment of the Organization Division for influencing legislation, it now remains to observe certain of its phases in action.
CHAPTER III
THE OHIO FARM BUREAU AND THE 97TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 97th General Assembly met in January, 1947. At that time, the Farm Bureau's outlook for the legislative session was "darker" than it had been for a number of years: Several powerful organizations were attacking the Farm Bureau because of the tax exemption given to its cooperatives; the new state administration was, by party tradition, more friendly toward big business than to farmers; and Mr. Ed Bath, for many years the Director of Legislation for the Farm Bureau, had just resigned and was hurling severe accusations at his former employers.

Yet, at the end of the session, the Farm Bureau paper published the following:

"Again organization paid off for Ohio farmers when in the 97th General Assembly recently adjourned, agriculture batted a cool 1000 percent. Now farmers are counting up the grains which their 'grassroots' legislative program has brought them.

"When working sessions of the legislature ended June 14, agriculture could view results of the five and one-half month session with real satisfaction. Every major bill which farmers sought had been passed. And every important measure which they opposed had been defeated.

"A sound strip mining bill was passed to check the wanton destruction of Ohio farm land through surface mining operations.

"A bill was passed providing additional money for Ohio schools so as to raise teacher salaries and offer fair educational opportunities to weak districts.

"A bill to permit the coloring of oleo to imitate butter was killed.

1From an interview, June 16, 1947, with Mr. W. E. Bair, Director of Personnel, Ohio Farm Bureau.
2The Ohio Cooperator, July 15, 1947. p. 1
"Two insurance bills that would work to the disadvantage of policyholders were killed.

"Three health bills were approved that will facilitate the provision of better health and hospital facilities in rural areas.

"A State Fair commission was created to select and purchase a new fair site.

"A fire marshall bill was passed which will provide better rural fire protection.

"The rural zoning bill which specifically exempts all land used for agricultural purposes was enacted.

"Two new drainage bills were passed to aid the farmers of north-western Ohio.

"A bill was passed to control the fox population.

"An annexation bill was passed which prohibits cities from taking in rural territory without consent of the whole township involved.

"Not in a quarter of a century has Ohio agriculture chalked up such an impressive record of favorable legislative action as the one just completed in Columbus."

This is, indeed, an impressive record. However, upon closer scrutiny, other factors tend to minimize greatly the effects of Farm Bureau's boast. In the first place, one might question the term "a cool 1000 percent". In one piece of legislative material sent out prior to the legislative session

---


What Do You Think, O.F.B.F. (undated).
appeared a two-page article entitled Cooperatives and the National Welfare, the main idea of which was expressed in the following: "The NTEA has now established a state setup to fight Co-ops in Ohio. This is a serious threat to cooperatives and must be fought aggressively on every level, county, state, and national." In The Ohio Farm Bureau News, May, 1947, another article expressed the Farm Bureau's aggressive stand against cooperative taxation. Articles in the Ohio Cooperator, The Advisory Council Guide and special legislative material from time to time, would all cause one to believe that the Farm Bureau classified the Cooperative Taxation bill as "major". However, by May 13, in a legislative report to the Board of Directors, the organization seemed to change its position, reported the bill as "minor" and unopposed. Mr. Stanfield, legislative agent for the Farm Bureau, in explaining this apparent reversal said only that cooperatives had no objection to the tax. Furthermore, the Fire Marshall, Fox Control and State Fair bills were, in the May 13 report, all listed as "minor" bills only to be reclassified after the adjournment of the session.

The question next raised is, how much credit is due the Farm Bureau for the bills listed in its "impressive record". The strip mining bill, in which the Farm Bureau was most prominent, will be later discussed more fully. While the Farm Bureau was among the early advocates of improved school conditions, the School Bill was championed by the Ohio Education

5Interview, June 6, 1947.
6The following viewpoint obtained in an interview with Mr. Hal Conifry, Legis. Correspondent, Scripps-Howard, July 1.
Association which is highly respected by the legislators for its accuracy of data. Ohio dairy interests led the opposition to the oleo bill. With ten insurance agents in the House and two in the Senate, the insurance bills would probably have been doomed anyway. The legislators were definitely health-conscious before the convening of the session and some type of health bill was certain to be passed. The Fox Control bill was instigated by farmer-legislators and pushed along by other members who like to fox hunt. The author was unable to ascertain the interest-groups behind the remaining bills, but even giving full credit for them to the Farm Bureau, the latter's record is not as impressive as appearances would lead one to believe.

In the last place, one might wonder how "dark" the Farm Bureau's outlook could be for a legislature giving far more than an equal share of representation to rural folk. In this connection, it is interesting to note that in the 97th General Assembly, twenty Representatives listed their occupations as farmers (they were outnumbered only by lawyers) and fifty-four gave their addresses as either R.F.D. or in towns of less than 5000 population.7 As Mr. Conifry pointed out, this constitutes an interest-group within the legislature which, if no outside agricultural group existed, would see that agrarian interests would not fare too badly.

Of these "major" bills on which the Farm Bureau took a stand, that organization feels that the strip mining issue was the most important and on this issue played a more prominent

---7Roster, 97th General Assembly of Ohio.
role than on any other. Since others, with whom the author talked, agree with at least the latter part of the preceding statement, the strip mining bill will serve to illustrate the techniques used by the Ohio Farm Bureau in its attempt to influence legislation.

One should date the beginnings of the Farm Bureau's fight on this issue several years back when the topic was introduced to the farmers through the *Advisory Council Guide* and the *Cooperator*. In the 96th General Assembly, the net result for strip mining legislation, in spite of the Governor's wishes, was the appointment of a commission to study the problem. The drive for a strip mine law in the 97th General Assembly began in June, 1946. At that time, the Farm Bureau organized a six-hundred man tour consisting of the fieldmen and representatives of the county Farm Bureaus from over the state. An inspection of the affected areas was made and the necessary steps for correction were pointed out. Each member of this tour, upon his return home, was able to give a vivid picture of the effects of strip mining. The tour received publicity in the *Columbus Citizen* and several other newspapers.

After a poll in which the "grassroots" voted to make strip mining a Farm Bureau resolution, all of the organization's

---

8 This legislative program was described by Mr. D. R. Stanfield in an interview, July 1, 1947.

---

9 A reporter who accompanied this tour stated to the author that the tour saw only the effects that the Farm Bureau wanted them to see. He added that a strong emotional reaction was felt at the sight of strip mining results, but that actually no high grade farm land was seen to be affected in spite of the high land appraisals made by the Farm Bureau guide.
publications swung into high gear to get the subject and its related facts before the people. A sample of this propaganda is reproduced here to show the emotional, high pressure appeal that characterizes much of the Farm Bureau's "legislative material".

"Taking coal commercially by the stripping method is known to have been done in 28 eastern and southeastern counties--is still done in 22.

"The Ohio Department of Industrial Relations report shows that in 1939, stripping in 99 mines, in 18 counties involved 700 acres and produced 3,759,482 tons. That was 19% of all coal produced from 684 acres - 90% of it came from 7 of the 18 counties.

"In 1944 - stripping was reported in 20 counties --508 mines produced 9,895,212 tons.

"Here's the growth record from the same source:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Tonnage Coal Mined</th>
<th>Total Strip-mined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>13,900,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>28,900,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>31,600,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>32,000,000</td>
<td>10,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The Problem:

"Conditions differ with location; type of soils; depth, size, quality of coal seam; use or adaptability of surface land; effect on homes, schools, tax duplicate, etc.

"But in the main the countryside is severely hurt -- often made useless and barren in every strip mine operation.

"The whole process is just the opposite of home or farm or community development, improvement, progress.

"Ohio with 23,318,080 acres ranks 35 in area. It ranks 5th in coal output. It is clear then that the whole public loses when coal stripping in vigorous expansion, reduces those acres to useless, often harmful spoil-banks and gullies.

"Coal operators want no regulation - no law....say it isn't needed....say they can't afford it. They want their...

10 Issues of County Farm Bureau Legislative Committee Meetings, (Undated) Mimeo. p. 22
own voluntary tree planting program to suffice, although it has proven totally inadequate and often an escape.

"Great Britain with its limited area and huge coal production regulates coal stripping and requires restoration. In 1944 the cost of restoration was 5% of the cost of digging the entire site.

"West Virginia passed a new law in 1945, requiring a registration fee of $50, and a permit for each operation. A corporate surety bond, in a penalty of $500 for each acre or a fraction, and with a minimum of $1000 for faithful performance. Restoration, drainage and safety are provided and the landowner has the choice of planting trees, shrubs, grasses or vines with selection of planting time and kind and quantity of lime and fertilizer. Much authority is given to the Chief of the Department of Mines and the Director of the Agricultural Experimentation of the West Virginia University.

"Without law and regulation, Ohio coal strippers will continue to profit at the expenses of the public. With law requiring restoration, the acreage can be made productive in many ways.

Legislative Attempts

"For several years bills have been presented to the Ohio General Assembly looking toward control of strip-mining but they failed under pressure group action of the coal companies, kindred businesses who feared licensing, lack of statewide interest, lack of organization of proponents, party opposition because of campaign contributions, etc., etc. Some seven bills in the present assembly indicated a growing, militant interest. Much attention was given--more progress was made this year than ever. Chief reason for failure was purely partisan politics.

"A commission was established partly as a face-saver--partly as a definite means of deciding what to do--of looking toward legislation.

"General Information.

"Against the coal operators' claim that the land stripped is usually valueless--usually unfit for agriculture, evidence is offered by a former auditor of Noble County that in Brookfield Township alone, thirty farm parcels totaling 4490 acres were sold from family ownership supporting a family-type farm to the coal operators for corporate ownership and spoil banks. Harrison County represents almost totally the taking of high grade farm land which supported thrifty, long lived enterprises, including four banks where there is now but one.

-44-
"Public school officials are able to show disastrous effects to schools in loss of pupils, loss of tax-supporting revenue and frequently in the continued necessity of maintaining transportation over or around spoil banks to scattered homes.

"Perhaps the most important factor in favor of licensing and regulating the coal industry and of the gathering of some equitable severance tax rests in the permanent loss, not to individuals, but to a community or a political sub-division through the taking of coal which is a non-renewable natural resource and a community asset.

"One reason we cannot depend upon the 'Let us alone' wishes of the coal operators is that the public would have to depend upon the whims and fancies of corporations and individuals to recover what it has lost and protect its interest. The public would have no control over what it planted nor how the plantings were treated, harvested, etc; no control over reclamation; no means of causing all possible land to be returned to farming or of putting into pasture all land not suited for general farming; nor would the public have the power to determine what land should be left to forestry, reclamation etc. Such a program in the hands of individuals and corporations is not in the public interest especially when the land acquired by the coal operators has been mined and thus ceases to serve the purpose for which it was acquired."

When the 97th General Assembly convened, Senator Jackson introduced a strong strip mining bill which was immediately referred to a commission for hearings and further study. The over-all strategy of the Farm Bureau in the committee hearings was to keep emphasizing the need for action. Farmers were brought in from various parts of the state to testify. Members of the committee tried repeatedly to get specific proposals from those favorable to the bill. At one hearing, the coal operators demanded that the committee see all the "propaganda" which had been issued by the Farm Bureau on the subject. The strategy used in these hearings was carefully planned by both sides; compromise amendments were kept at hand for use if necessary; and with their friendly members on the
committee these special interests planned to guide the questions and testimonials into favorable channels. After its opponents had weakened the bill by introducing substitutes, it died in the committee by a vote of 5-4.\textsuperscript{11}

The advocates of a strip mining bill next turned to the House where Representative White had introduced a similar bill that was then being heard before the House Conservation Committee. The same tactics were again employed and this time the bill succeeded in getting back to the chamber where a modifying amendment secured its passage.

The Farm Bureau's strength in the legislature is undoubtedly due, in most part, to the active participation by its members in the pressure activities. This participation is secured not only by informing them of the issues involved, but also by keeping them constantly aware of the progress that is being made in the legislature. Almost daily, while the Assembly was in session, legislative information was disseminated through the regular publications of the Farm Bureau or through mimeographed sheets. During this stage of the strip mining bill, the following information was released to Farm Bureau members:\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11}Throughout the Assembly's session, a suite of rooms in a nearby hotel was reserved by the coal operators where free refreshments were available to the legislators. Following the death of this strip-mining bill, the coal operators held a party in the Neil House to celebrate the occasion. Among various types of entertainment, the bill was officially burned and pronounced dead. In the \textit{Columbus Evening Dispatch}, July 15, 1947, appeared this item: "Last week a coal lobbyist reported to the Secretary of State expenses of more than $11,000. Most of the expense incurred by the coal lobby was for the entertainment of members of the General Assembly at a downtown hotel."

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{The Ohio Cooperator}, May 15, 1947. p. 1
"The House Conservation Committee held its first hearing for the proponents of House Bill No. 314, April 29. The next hearing on May 6 will allow the proponents to conclude and possibly hear the opponents.

"This bill is in many ways like the Pennsylvania Strip Mining Bill which has been held to be constitutional. The author, Ray White, Representative from Holmes County, while using many of the features of the Pennsylvania law, has incorporated the basic recommendations made by the Strip Mining Study Commission which reported to the 97th General Assembly January 15, 1947, after a 15-month study of the problem.

"Strip mining of coal today affects about 25 of Ohio's 88 counties. This means that better than one-fourth of our counties are faced with the problem of the destruction of land through failure to make provision for reclamation after the coal has been stripped.

"Strip mining legislation is not a political issue now but it may be in 1948 if the present legislature does not take adequate steps to meet the demand of citizens all over the state for strip mining legislation.

"There are powerful interests working behind the scenes, using every resource at their disposal to prevent any kind of strip mining legislation being passed by the 97th General Assembly. If we are to secure this needed regulation it is essential that YOU write to your senator and representative and point out the great need that exists in Ohio today for conservation---for after all, any strip mining bill is a conservation measure.

(The names of the House committee members were listed, after which this final strong appeal was made:)

"Doctor Kirtley T. Mather, Harvard University Geologist,...observed that the nations possessing a large number of well-watered acres of fertile soil will become the great nations of the future almost regardless of any other resources. The question he posed was---"Are there enough acres?"---and as the giant strip mining shovels gobble up mother earth that is the question that haunts every fair-minded citizen as he thinks of the future.

"Farmers---city people---strip mining operators---and others are going to have to cooperate in this field of conservation if this country is to continue as one of the great powers and to play its role in obtaining security and peace for its people."

As the bill went to the Senate, the Farm Bureau turned on all its steam. First, they sponsored a state meeting which
included Township Trustees, the Grange, the Ohio Federation of Women, the Isaac Walton League, the Organized Conservation Supervisors, and several other groups. Mr. D. R. Stanfield of the Farm Bureau, as chairman, explained the need of a strip mining bill. Representative Ray White, author of the bill, was the main speaker and, as he promised to "raise hell" in the legislature, sentiment was worked to a high pitch; everyone promised to organize letter and telegram campaigns. The high point of the meeting was reached when a delegation from the group called on the Governor who was told that unless the administration took advantage of this golden opportunity to write their own strip mining bill, Mr. Lausche (ex-Gov. of Ohio) would come back into office with this as his leading campaign issue. This, along with the letters and telegrams already pouring in seemed to have a profound effect on the Governor. Throughout the rest of the debate on the bill, the Farm Bureau could count on the powerful influence of the Governor to aid them.

It would be difficult to estimate the number of letters, telegrams, phone and personal calls received by the legislators at this time from constituents who wanted a strip mining law. They seemed to produce a stimulating effect. Members of the House converged on the Senate and engaged in urging the bill's passage. It is Mr. Stanfield's opinion that the legislators were tired of being "wined and dined" and were "refreshed" by the popular demand for action.

13 Mr. Lausche had tried in vain to get a strip mining bill from the 96th General Assembly. During the 97th Assembly he visited the strip mined areas and, according to Mr. Stanfield, made a strong speech favoring a strip mine law.
Once more it was the plan of the coal operators to kill the bill in the committee and perhaps they would have been successful had it not been for the pressure exerted by the Governor. Upon seeing the threat to the bill in the committee, the Governor called in the pro-coal senators for a conference after which he took them on an airplane trip over the strip mined areas of the state. This, along with a deluge of telegrams and letters\textsuperscript{14} passed the bill through the Senate Conservation Committee. When the bill came on the Senate floor, the strategy of the coal operators was how to take out the act's teeth. But the pressure was too great, the session was nearing an end, and the bill was hurried on to the Rules Committee. The coal operators worked hard to keep it here, but executive pressure succeeded in getting it out for a vote in the closing days of the Assembly. A complete victory for the proponents of the bill is represented in this final vote; the two "nays" were cast by senators directly connected with the largest coal company in the state.

The material on the strip mine bill has, thus far, been derived largely from Farm Bureau sources and represents the explanation given by the Farm Bureau for the passage of the bill. Further research throws a slightly different light on this achievement which the Farm Bureau claims as its dominant effort in the legislature. These other explanations raise an

\textsuperscript{14}To all Fieldmen of the state and the minutemen of Summitt County went the following telegram from Farm Bureau on June 21 (By permission of Mr. Stanfield; from his files):

"HEARING WEDNESDAY EVENING 7:30 SENATE CONSERVATION COMMITTEE ON STRIP MINING BILL 314. WE NEED SENATOR SHEPPARDS SUPPORT --WIRE--CALL--CONTACT HIM IMMEDIATELY" (signed) "D.R. Stanfield"
important question concerning pressure groups and will be dis-
cussed in the final chapter.

In an interview with one member\textsuperscript{15} of the Senate Conser-
vation Committee, it was learned that:

1. The actual need for a strip mining bill may be ques-
tioned. Most of the affected land was used solely for grazing
before its being strip-mined and afterward, whether reclaimed
or not, it will continue to serve as grazing land. Further-
more, the strip-mining law now requires that the coal opera-
tors cover the face of unmined coal to a depth of three feet.
Frequently, a hill may have a small horizontal vein of coal
near the top which is not mined, but at the bottom of the hill
is a thick vein which, after mining, leaves the upper vein ex-
posed on an almost perpendicular surface. To cover this ex-
posed surface is not only extremely difficult, but will, in
many cases, be proved futile by the first heavy rain. The
land, which may cost as high as $200 an acre to reclaim, will
in some instances, not be worth $30 an acre after the re-
claiming operation. Experts testified that the leveling off
of peaks and ridges of spoil banks will not conserve moisture
in the ground.

2. In the committee hearings, the Farm Bureau was crit-
icized for sticking solely to the need. The legislators were
acutely aware of the popular demand for a strip mining bill
and were anxious to frame something that would meet this de-
mand. In other words, it was useless to emphasize the need;

\textsuperscript{15} The terms of the interview, June 26, 1947, were that
the legislator's name be left out of the writing.
the legislators wanted a plan for action and they were unable to obtain anything concrete from the Farm Bureau. The committee members were even suspicious of data produced by the Farm Bureau in emphasizing the need. For example, on one occasion, Mr. Stanfield, to illustrate the uselessness of the land for grazing purposes, brought in statistics showing the decrease in the number of dairy cattle in the strip mined areas. When asked about the increase or decrease of dairy cattle in the nation as a whole, he only replied that he did not know. Committee members then conducted their own research and learned that a decrease is evident over the entire state and nation.

Much more effective than the Farm Bureau's presence in the committee, were the appearances of various civic organizations etc., from Harrison County, who testified not only for the need of a bill, but also had a few constructive suggestions for the actual substance of the bill.

3. From the same source and from Mr. J. R. Jones, Secretary to the Governor, the strip mining bill was referred to as a "Governor's bill". That is, in his campaign, Governor Herbert pledged himself to get a strip-mining bill and throughout the session of the Assembly was determined that this campaign promise would be kept. The pressure, then, which was turned on him was actually wasted effort. Mr. Jones stated that the delegation brought by the Farm Bureau to see the Governor never met him, but instead, talked to Mr. Jones who communicated their views to the Executive. These views had no influence on the established opinion of the Governor, however.

16Interview July 7, 1947.
The Secretary stated that the Governor appreciated the write-in support to the legislature.

In summarizing these rather conflicting contentions concerning the Farm Bureau's responsibility for a strip mining bill, it is suggested: (1) that a need for some degree of regulation probably existed; (2) whatever need did exist received a "second coat of Farm Bureau paint" and was made into a state-wide issue by the Farm Bureau; (3) this organization's efforts kept the issue alive through its own publicity organs, and (4) the Farm Bureau's instigation of write-in support kept the legislators aware of the popular sentiment, thus facilitating the passage of the bill.
Early in this paper the problems confronting present day agriculture were pointed out as being too complex to be solved by individual action. Out of this need was born the Farm Bureau. This organization in Ohio, has approached the solution to agriculture's problems in such a manner as to make it unique among the various state Farm Bureaus, at least in the extent of its use. It has roughly divided farm needs into two categories:

1. **Economic.** This category, considered by the Farm Bureau, to be the most important, can be solved in a large degree by "volunteer self-help". Thus, instead of attacking government for more farm credit, the Ohio Farm Bureau has its own credit organization; instead of appealing to the government as its sole attempt to raise the low farm income, the Ohio Farm Bureau has extensive cooperative enterprises designed to help the farmers' income through cooperative purchasing, marketing, etc. The main criticisms of this policy, as voiced by its opponents, seems to be that the resulting economic empire is too large to be in the hands of one group.

2. **Social and governmental.** Such problems must be met by working for favorable legislation. In its efforts to carry out this part of its program, the Farm Bureau has erected an elaborate structure of legislative machinery. It has been with this machinery and some of its functioning that this paper has dealt.
It now remains to summarize the operations of this machinery and to draw certain conclusions from the role of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation as an interest group.

Part I

The types of interest group methods employed by the Farm Bureau are:

A. Publicity or propaganda. Here is perhaps the foundation of the Farm Bureau as an interest group and a large part of the legislative machinery is for this purpose. Material is sent to the newspapers for publication, intra-group periodicals are published, speaking tours are arranged, discussion groups are organized and an attempt is made to guide their discussions, and the radio will be increasingly used in the near future. The term "publicity" as used by the organization, refers only to newspaper materials; the other activities, of course, constitute the "educational program". The significance of this aspect of its legislative effort is great and a failure to utilize it to its best advantage could mean a failure to secure an important element in the legislative program. In several places throughout this paper have been reproduced examples of the Farm Bureau's propaganda to illustrate its strong emotional character.

B. Appearing at Committee Hearings. This is an essential part of the work of the Farm Bureau's legislative director. During the busiest days of the recent session, he was assisted by the Director of Personal and several members of the Legislative Committee. The strategy used here is frequently
carefully planned by the legislative agent and the "friendly" members of the committee. When a representative of an opposing interest group is to take the stand, questions are designed to confuse the witness and make his testimony appear inconsistent and even ridiculous. When the Farm Bureau's representative was to appear, questions were formed to bring out favorable evidence and steer clear of possible loopholes. Many times a move of the opposition is anticipated and plans are made to counteract it. For example, Mr. Stanfield recalled that at one hearing the oleo interests produced a young mother and her child. The mother testified that she was suffering from an ailment; that her child kept her too busy for taking time to mix coloring into the oleo, and that by taking time to mix the coloring, her child would be neglected. To refute this, Mr. Stanfield merely colored a pound of oleo in thirty seconds before the committee.

G. Cooperating with other groups. The opposition to the oleo bill was led by the state dairy interests, but the Farm Bureau played a strong supporting role by appearing in the hearings and using its organization for write-in support. In pressing for the school bill, the Ohio Education Association organized a Citizens Committee which included the Ohio Farm Bureau, PTA, Amvets, and State Teachers Association. When spheres of agreement between such groups can be reached, a show of their combined numbers can be very effective.

D. Pressure on the Governor can mean the winning of legislative battles. The Governor, having much influence in the
97th General Assembly, was asked to use this influence on behalf of the strip-mining bill.

E. Write-in support is probably the Farm Bureau's most powerful direct method of influencing legislation. By sending out letters and telegrams to Fieldmen, County Legislative Committees, and Minutemen in districts whose representatives are doubtful, these legislators can be quickly informed of the popular support behind pending legislation. Mr. Stanfield advises caution in the use of this technique. If people are asked to give write-in support too frequently or on too many bills at the same time, they tend to lose interest and only a feeble response is heard. Also, the success of this method is dependent on how much the people have been "educated" on the issue at stake; thus, a successful letter and telegram campaign may be said to be some of the fruits of the indirect method of publicity.

F. Influencing the appointment of favorable committee members. Evidence of this technique's use by the Ohio Farm Bureau was sought by interviewing the president and vice-president of the legislative correspondents. While no evidence was found, the possibility of its use exists.

Part II

Any far reaching conclusions concerning interest groups in general or the Farm Bureau in particular should be based on a study of various groups and their legislative activities over a period of years. This paper has dealt with but one group and only a part of its legislative activities for one
year. Perhaps, then, it will appear a bit presumptuous to draw the following conclusions; however, it is felt that from the very construction of the Ohio Farm Bureau, especially its legislative machinery, and from its operations in the 97th General Assembly, as have already been discussed, some pertinent deductions can be drawn:

A. "...the task of the professional (or salaried) leaders of these groups is often as much to tell their membership what their interest is as to represent that interest before outside groups."¹ In spite of the Farm Bureau's policy of seeking genuine expressions of group opinion, we saw in the case of the strip mining bill, how thought on the subject was initiated from above to the grassroots. If we were to accept the Conservation Senator's word that there was really little need for a strip mining bill, we might be justified in asking: Does the Farm Bureau's legislative department exist to exert pressure or does it exert pressure in order to exist? The answer to that question is possibly found by raising other questions concerning the post-legislative session boast of the Farm Bureau's achievements. The minimizing factors of that article have already been discussed. Why, then, did the Farm Bureau make the boast? Could its purpose have been to create in the Farm Bureau's constituency a false impression of the organization's power and importance? Appearances might indicate that this organization, for the sake of its own survival, manufactured a major issue through its publicity organs; picked up by the Governor in his campaign and strongly supported by

¹Key, V. O., *Politics Parties and Pressure Groups*. p. 203
an aroused interest group, it finally became law. If this was the case, some might justify it as a questionable means to a desirable end; i.e. farmers are difficult to keep united and only through successes in legislation will many farmers continue to support.

Granting that there are public benefits resulting from the strip mining bill, and it is believed that there are, the powerful public sentiment stirred up by the Farm Bureau nevertheless illustrates a power, which if in irresponsible hands, could be a sinister threat to the general welfare. The practice of drumming up support and causing widespread interest in an issue by the means of stirring literature and urgent telegrams might not always favor a measure even as beneficial as the strip mining bill. The trust in the Farm Bureau by much of Ohio's agrarian population and their readiness to accept anything in a Farm Bureau publication could conceivably be used to their own detriment. It is believed that the present leadership of the Farm Bureau tends to use this ability with some discretion and to the farmers' better interests. Far from making any predictions, it is noteworthy to point out, however, that the Farm Bureau is still a rather young organization with strong inclinations toward idealism. But with the passage of time and any relaxation of popular vigilance the following danger could become imminent:

"The technical specialization that inevitably results from all extensive organization renders necessary what is called expert leadership. Consequently, the power of determination comes to be considered one of the specific attributes of leadership, and is gradually withdrawn from the masses to be concentrated in the hands of the leaders
alone. Thus the leaders, who were at first no more than the executive organs of the collective will, soon emancipate themselves from the mass and become independent of its control."2

The exercise of the ability to decide issues and to control the powerful influence of propaganda by an interest group's leaders is a heavy responsibility which must be assumed by all of the groups' leadership so long as these interests are to continue enjoying their present importance in law making. Only by curbing the hand of these groups in governmental functions, can the public safeguard against the potential spread of political misconceptions.

B. One of the most difficult duties in connection with the formation of public policy is the determination of what is really desired and needed. "Special interests came to be organized so that, in part, the cheese makers, the laborers, the drys, or others of like views and interests might have representatives who could state their attitudes authoritatively before the government and the public."3 The economic and social problems within such a group as agriculture are too complex to be quickly and adequately measured by formal government when the occasion arises. Interest groups such as the Farm Bureau should then perform the essential functions of (1) reconciling many of the differences within agriculture and (2) submitting the data of the group's needs and views to the legislature. Further, the interest group can supply necessary

---

2Robert Michels, Political Parties, A Sociological Study of the Oligarchial Tendencies of Modern Democracy. p. 31
information to the legislators much more quickly and at less cost than it could be obtained through special research. This information is frequently valuable in the framing of details in legislation which otherwise might be overlooked.

According to the Conservation Senator, the Farm Bureau fell short in achieving maximum influence before the committees. This, if true, was probably due to the inexperience of the Farm Bureau's legislative agent. The Senator recalled one bill (he did not name it) which was opposed by both the Administration and the Farm Bureau. It was the committee's intention to kill the bill by holding it, but following the Farm Bureau's hearing they sent it out as a slap to that organization. The Governor then intervened to get the bill back in the committee. Thus, an interest group can conceivably defeat its own purposes by antagonizing the legislators.

C. The interest group seems to provide a course whereby the citizen could escape his democratic responsibilities to the state. There is no way of knowing to what extent, if at all, the Farm Bureau has caused responsibility-assuming citizens to delegate their civic duties to the organization. The possibility, however, is apparent. On the other hand, by keeping the people informed as to when their interests are endangered by legislative action or inaction, it may be that the interest group will cause some individuals to assert themselves who would otherwise forsake their participation in public affairs.

D. The Farm Bureau's success as a powerful farm organization may be largely attributed to lessons derived from the
mistakes and failures of earlier agricultural organizations.

Its cooperative enterprises contribute greatly to the Farm Bureau's strength. Not only do they save the farmer money, but they also provide an outlet for diversified interests and demands within the organization itself. This ability gives the Farm Bureau a sort of versatility not enjoyed by earlier agricultural groups who, in order to meet their diverse internal interests, had but one recourse—to compromise these diversities in the realm of politics. From the cooperative attempts of the Farmers' Alliance in the last decade of the 19th century a valuable lesson was derived concerning the operation of cooperatives:

"'Supply stations' in the county were provided, a business agent was appointed, and orders for goods the farmers were in need of were by him dispatched to the state business agent, who would buy in large lots and distribute goods in small quantities among the counties as required. It is claimed that this practice reduced costs considerably to the farmer. It was, however, not properly appreciated by the farmers generally for the reason that competing merchants would in many instances meet the exchange prices and in fact at times sell below them. This made the farmers' organized efforts appear altogether fruitless and unnecessary, resulting also in making the business agent the victim of considerable unpleasant criticism. This, however, is another lesson in cooperation which the farmers of the country here and there are learning all over again. If they would reconstruct the market system, or buy operating materials at reduced costs, organization must not be spasmodic but continuous."  

The Farm Bureau has greatly enlarged the scope of its cooperatives; they are continuous, well entrenched and going concerns which are effecting a financial saving to the farmers.

Another lesson derived from the disintegration of the

---

Farmers' Alliance is that of steering away from partisan politics. Dr. C. W. Macune, the leading spirit in the Alliance, once warned:

"Let the Order be the great school of truth in which, by a thorough exchange of ideas, all may be truly educated. Let it be agreed that great principles shall be endorsed. Leave partisanship to the individual, but study and discuss political economy and arrive at true conclusions. There need be no apprehension as to what will be the partisan policy of any people who believe and think alike from enlightened understanding of the same subject."5

This advice went unheeded by the Alliance when it dissolved into the People's Party and ended shortly after. It has been previously pointed out in this paper how the Ohio Farm Bureau follows this advice through its program of education and its avoidance of partisan politics.

Another interesting comparison may be made by reviewing the reasons given for the decline of the Grange:6 (1) Farmers were too independent, aggressive, self-reliant and suspicious to adapt themselves to the cooperative method of doing business. (2) Farmers lacked foresight and were often led astray by temporary lower prices offered elsewhere. (3) Laws of many states made it impossible to use the Rochdale principles of cooperative organization. (4) Farmers lacked cash, capital and business experience. (5) The standard of admission to membership was too low. Too many persons joined the order who were not interested in agriculture. (6) Too many granges were formed.7

---

7Ibid. p. 278. In Ohio at one time, Adams County had 27 granges; Clermont 34; etc. In Kansas a grange existed for every 84 persons engaged in agriculture.
Benefitting from this, the Farm Bureau and other present agricultural organizations have a far better opportunity to avoid these earlier pitfalls. "The traditional individualism of the farmer is giving way to a growing consciousness of the need for collective action."8 Failures and depressions have taught the farmers that they must stand together if their voice is to be heard. Competent leaders have been employed to conduct the farmers' cooperatives and other businesses. Favorable laws have been secured which give the farmers freedom to organize more effectively. Fixed admission standards are maintained.

E. From conversations with Mr. H. H. Dougherty and Mr. Hal Conifry9 it was learned that in the 97th General Assembly and in previous Assemblies, there was the feeling among many legislators that the farmers are a somewhat overprivileged group. They get gasoline at a cheaper rate; until this year, their cooperatives enjoyed tax privileges; their farm vehicles are spared by taxes, etc. Yet, chiefly through the Farm Bureau, the farmers ask for the spending of government money to aid them. This situation seems unfair to some legislators and they are happy for any opportunity to encroach on rural privileges unless closely watched and pressured by the farm groups. Here it may be concluded that the Farm Bureau is protecting the interests of its constituents even though it appears to some to be at the expense of the general public.

---

9Legislative correspondents for A. P. and Scripps-Howard respectively.
F. The logical question in the final analysis would be, How well is the Legislative Dept. of the Farm Bureau meeting the needs for which it was intended? This would be difficult to answer from the evidence gathered during just one Assembly. However, it may be concluded that the Farm Bureau's well-knit state organization is so constructed to make it capable of securing favorable action from formal government. It then depends upon the capabilities of its leaders and their sense of responsibility to use this structure for its intended purposes.