Shall We Have a Federation of Farmers?

By A. W. Ricker

Whether or not you are a farmer, YOU ARE affected by the high cost of living.

The farmer is not responsible for the high cost of living. It is not the price which the FARMER GETS for his products which makes the cost of living high, but the PROFIT which is taken by the BIG COMMERCIAL INTERESTS in the process of exchange.

Conversely, it is not the BIG WAGES which you get, if you are a factory hand, miner, clerk, or railroader, which makes the farmer pay an exorbitant price for his machinery and other necessaries. THE SAME HAND THAT ROBS THE WORKER IN THE CITY ROBS THE FARMER. If your trade union has helped you, so will a farmers’ union help the farmer, and by learning more about practical cooperation, you will both be benefited.

A nation-wide organization of farmers is ONE of the ways to equalize the cost of living. If you are not a farmer put this booklet in the hands of some one who IS.

There are in this country several distinct and separate farmers’ unions. No single one is big enough to affect the business methods of the nation. If these unions could be federated they would become a power in almost any direction they might choose to move.

But it is not an easy task, however desirable, to merge several existing organizations into one, especially if they are long established. Age begets conservatism, and conservatism holds fast to the existing order.

Then, too, while the farmer is a farmer, and he is robbed of the cream of his production whether he is growing truck in New England, beans in Michigan, wheat in the Dakotas, tobacco in Kentucky, fruit in Arkansas or cotton in Texas, his problems vary with his locality and his peculiar crop.

This very diversity of crops is largely responsible for the fact that the farmers have five unions instead of one, for at the base of all successful organization there must be active identity of interests.

Sections Covered by Farmer Organizations

Let us take a look over the territory covered by existing farmer organizations.

In the east we have the Grange, officially known as the Patrons of Husbandry. This is an old organization and was once very powerful. In fact, it may be said to be the parent of granger organization in America. The Grange has disappeared almost en-
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tirely south of Mason and Dixon's line, is weak in the west, but in the east it is still active and exerts some considerable influence in public affairs.

Next in importance is the Farmers' Educational and Coöperative Union, known as the Farmers' Union. This organization has been very strong in the South among the cotton growers. It has very little strength in the Northwest, and none in the East.

Next we have the American Society of Equity, which is strong in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota and the two Dakotas. It is this organization which is primarily responsible for the coöperative terminal elevator at St. Paul, Minnesota, which has been the subject of several articles in Pearson's Magazine by Charles Edward Russell, Hon. P. V. Collins and other writers. The Equity Exchange is trying to get the wheat growers out of the clutches of the gigantic elevator trust, something the truck farmer knows nothing about.

Next we have the Gleaners, an organization which has its home in Michigan among the bean growers and the fruit growers. They bake beans in Boston but they grow them in Michigan. The Gleaners claim a membership of 80,000.

Then we have the Equity Union with headquarters at Greenville, Illinois, with a membership spread principally over that state, Kansas, and Nebraska. The Equity Union seeks to promote coöperative buying among small farmers.

In addition to these we have the National Farmers' Congress, which is more of an honorary body than a representative one. There is also a national organization of Jewish truck farmers, and to the foregoing may be added various loose forms of organizations such as county institutes, etc.

The five farmer organizations which may be characterized as unions have a combined membership of upwards of a million and a half. They are all dues-paying organizations. A score or more of periodicals represent them, no one of which, however, may be said to have a national circulation.

Here then in a nutshell is the situation among organized farmers:

They are divided into five unrelated groups.

Each organization is sustaining a struggling press, the circulation of which is small and locally confined.

The combined membership of the various groups is large enough to accomplish something practical if efforts and purposes were united.

How the American Federation of Labor Was Organized

A similar situation to that of the farmer organizations confronted the various labor bodies some years ago. Our city workmen were organized according to crafts. Printers had little in common with stone masons—stone masons with plumbers—plumbers with painters, etc., etc., and yet everybody realized that along certain lines the interest of all labor is identical and that strength is only possible in unity.

The necessity for a closer union of
trades organizations was so apparent that ultimately a way was found by which unity of action could be had, and this way took form in the organization of the American Federation of Labor. Under the banner of the Federation all the trades united. It was a unity without loss of identity. The printers still maintained their own union and their own officials, as did the carpenters, masons, painters, plumbers, boot and shoe workers, coal miners, etc., through a list of nearly two hundred separately organized trades. Since the formation of the American Federation of Labor, each year has brought the unions closer together. The building trades have been federated, as have the miners, the printing trades, etc.

to federate in some form of national unity, by means of which each existing organization will maintain its own integrity and identity.

Such a Federation might well decide to leave the Grange in possession of the Eastern field. The South might well be assigned to the Farmers' Union; the Northwest to the American Society of Equity; Michigan and contiguous territory to the Gleaners; Illinois, Iowa and Nebraska and perhaps other sections to the Equity Union. Then to these existing sub-divisions there might be formed an organization of tobacco growers of Kentucky, Tennessee and Virginia, and an organization of fruit growers, vegetable growers, and dairy men, covering

---

**PREVIOUS GRANGER UPRISINGS**

About every so often in the history of this country there has come a great Granger uprising. Granger movements have all displayed much zeal and enthusiasm, but sad to say they have all fallen far short of the ambitions and hopes of their organizers.

Industrial unionism is a consummation not far off.
The necessity for some form of federation of farm organizations is just as great as it is for the workers in the shops, factories and mines, and it is altogether likely that this union of farm organizations will come in much the same manner as that of the trades organizations.

**HOW GRANGER ORGANIZATIONS MAY BE FEDERATED**

It is not likely that the Farmers' Union will be willing to disband and join the American Society of Equity; nor is it likely that either of these will be willing to go out of existence and join the Grange, the Gleaners or the Equity Union; but it is easily possible that all of these organizations, and perhaps other organizations still to be formed, will be more than willing sections where these industries are dominant.

These are only suggestions but their practicability will be quickly recognized.

**Previous Granger Uprisings**

About every so often in the history of this country there has come a great Granger uprising. Granger movements have all displayed much zeal and enthusiasm, but sad to say they have all fallen far short of the ambitions and hopes of their organizers. The farmer was nearer his goal of national organization than he has ever been before or since in the early nineties when the great Farmers' Alliance movement brought a million organized farmers of the West and South in close touch with each other. The Alliance went into politics and became the trading stock of designing politicians and finally passed out of existence in the Bryan campaign of 1896.
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The writer went through this campaign and could write a book on how it happened. Suffice it to say that the Alliance movement passed away, and at no time until the present has it seemed possible to develop another powerful organization of farmers. The dial of time has now moved around to the place where, in the natural order of things, another great farmer uprising is due.

It requires no great skill of pen to tell why farmers organize and then re-organize whatever may have been the previous failures. They organize because of necessity. The individual farmer is helpless and powerless.

Farming is the one great industry in this nation that is still wholly competitive. The farmer plants his crop and grows his stock without any knowledge of what the demand will be for his product. He goes it blind and when his crop is ready for market he takes what is offered because there is nothing else to do. He is wholly at the mercy of the great aggregations of capital engaged in hauling, milling, packing and marketing his crop.

The farmer organizes for the same reason that weaker animals travel in droves, that primitive man lived in tribes. A union is eloquent testimony to the fact that robbery and injustice abound.

It is useless in the present state of things for the farmer to try to cure his troubles by politics. In the East the farmer is a Republican—in the South a Democrat—in the West he is both and other things besides. Political unity,—however much good it might do,—is at present impossible. Let us put that thought aside and try what has eased a great many of the burdens of the poor wage workers and peasant farmers of Europe, viz., COOPERATION.

THE FARMERS' MUCH VAUNTED PROSPERITY

The prosperity of the “independent farmer” is a favorite topic with the big capitalist press. The farmer is pictured as a plutocrat. He actually possesses an automobile.

It is well to examine this matter of rural prosperity. Prosperity is always a comparative term. If a person has lived for a period of years on a slender income and then experiences an increase of income, that increase of income seems like prosperity. The individual may have been producing in the first period two dollars of wealth and getting one, while in the second period of so-called prosperity he may be producing five dollars and getting two. The two dollars by comparison with the one dollar of the previous period spells prosperity to the unthinking mind, but it does not fool the student. Exact statistics are hard to get, but such as are available show that for every dollar of gain which higher prices has brought the farmer, his exploiters have gained two.

In some sections of the country farm values have enormously increased. This is especially true of the States of the Central Mississippi valley—the area of corn and hogs—and this territory includes all of
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Iowa and Illinois and parts of Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, Minnesota and Wisconsin. There the great bulk of corn and hogs is produced, and because their production is confined principally to this area, the price of land in these sections has enormously increased in value. The population of the country is increasing faster than the production of corn and hogs; hence a rise in the price of the products of corn land farms and of the farms themselves.

It is here that we find the farm owner in possession of his much advertised automobile, but only the farm owner.

When we turn to sections outside of the corn belt we find a vastly different situation.

The average cotton farmer—and we must always think in averages, not extremes—in mind. The prosperity of even the most fortunate farm owner is not to be compared with that of Big Business. The best managed of owned farms—even the exception—does not pay a return investment which will at all compare with bank profits or the profits of Big Business.

The tenant farmer

The tenant farmer has not prospered at all, nor has he any hope of prospering under the present system. The price of rent is closely adjusted to the tenant’s existence point. As the price of farm land rises, the tenant’s hope of becoming an owner goes along with it.

And the thoughtful farm owner will not overlook the fact that his children, as matters now stand, are doomed to tenancy.

The tenant farmer has not prospered at all, nor has he any hope of prospering under the present system. The price of rent is closely adjusted to the tenant’s existence point. As the price of farm land rises, the tenant’s hope of becoming an owner goes along with it.

It requires as much capital to become a tenant in the black land sections of the Mississippi valley as it required a few years ago to become an owner of 160 acres of land. When the owner of a quarter section of land and the father of an average family of four, bequeaths his property to his children, the bequest when divided represents about enough to stock and equip a rented farm. This simple illustration will help to understand the following figures taken from the census report of 1910.

### Farms—Tenure of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4,737,372</td>
<td>6,301,504</td>
<td>6,301,504</td>
<td>8,104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen from the foregoing that in 1890 farm owners in the United States numbered 3,249,728, and in 1910, 3,948,722, an increase of 678,994 in 20 years.
In 1890 farm tenants numbered 1,294,913, and in 1910 2,354,676, an increase of 1,059,763 in 20 years.

From 1900 to 1910 farm owners increased 8.1%. In the same period farm tenants increased 16.3.

During the period covered by the above statistics the government was still allotting homesteads. There are no figures available to show how much of the increase in farm ownership is covered by homesteads, but the number is large.

The homestead area is now practically exhausted.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from the above. We are slowly passing in this country to landlordism and tenantry. Below is an item taken from the Gleaner and

---

In 1890 farm owners in the United States numbered 3,269,728, and in 1910, 3,948,722, an increase of 678,994 in 20 years.

In 1890 farm tenants numbered 1,294,913, and in 1910, 2,354,676, an increase of 1,059,763 in 20 years.

From 1900 to 1910 farm owners increased 8.1%. In the same period farm tenants increased 16.3.

---

Business Farmer, the official organ of the Gleaners:

"An investigation made by the Agricultural Department a few years ago, brought out the fact that within the next ten years Illinois would be a state of tenant farmers. We know of one township in the best producing section of Illinois where there are but seven land owners residing upon and operating their farms. All of the other farm lands are leased out to tenants. Let it be said in favor of the farm tenants of the state of Illinois, that a majority of them are progressive young men who are good farmers and treating the soil well. However, the owners live in town; they have lost all interest in the farm save what they can get as their share of the proceeds of the crops. Year after year the owners are demanding more from the renter and as our correspondent says, it is true that with from one to three thousand dollars invested in stock and tools there are many tenants in the state of Illinois who cannot make a living. If the farmer renters of Illinois would thoroughly organize, they could adopt a uniform contract and soon solve the problem."
place in the program of a farmers' federation. It should be strictly frowned upon. Our declared purpose should be to foster cooperation.

The writer of this article desires to state frankly that in politics he is a socialist. The Socialist party has no desire to dominate a farmer organization. Socialists would look with pleasure on the formation of a farmers' federation because cooperation is our common goal, but the federation never need fear the presence of socialists in its councils. Socialist farmers would join such an organization gladly and they would form one of the greatest safeguards against its destruction by professional politicians.

The farmers' Union has practically disappeared from two of the Southwestern States precisely because the dominant political party of these States corrupted the organization. In this connection, and as expressive of the attitude of the socialist, I here quote from an article in the May Pearson's by Chas. Edward Russell, who is a well-known Socialist. In discussing the situation of the Northwestern farmers, Mr. Russell says:

To correct these intolerable evils every kind of governmental remedy has been tried and re-tried, from regulative pills to rate-control plasters, and not a condition has been changed. Weary years of agitation for new laws and different laws and more laws have seen only defeat and failure. Most of the legislation was jokered or bedeviled, and if it got through with its teeth undrawn it was something that would not work. For a long time the plundered victims were designedly driven them to unite in several excellent associations for common defense and common action. One of these, the Society of Equity, is leading the revolt of the Northwestern farmers.

This matter of politics cannot be too strongly emphasized. Years ago the Grange went into politics to its great hurt. The Knights of Labor grew to tremendous proportions as an industrial organization. It made the mistake of entering politics as an organization and this brought about its funeral. The Farmers' Alliance turned into the same broad highway that leads to destruction. An industrial organization should remain an industrial organization.
The Socialist realizes that the capitalist interests of this nation never give anything to the working people or farmers except when the giving will bring back to the capitalist more than is given.

The farmers, too, must realize this fact before they can even make a beginning toward self-betterment. A farmers' organization must therefore not look to bankers, railroad magnates, or politicians for help, but must depend on the cooperation of its own members, locally and nationally.

I do not wish to be understood as opposing political action.

I believe in political action and that farmers should use their political power effectively in their own interest. The point I am trying to emphasize is that a trade union, or farmers' union, should not as an organization meddle with politics or per-

No political action is necessary to bring this about.

It will take years to get direct government loans, while rural credit associations can be formed in as many months. One such association is already in a flourishing condition among farmers of North Carolina, while another is being organized in North Dakota.

Rural credit associations would almost immediately take the cotton farmers out of the clutches of the credit trust of the South.

The Government ought to loan money to the farmers as readily as it does to the banks, but the Government will not do it and cannot be made to do it until an organized demand is made by millions of farmers.

It will be much easier to organize cooperative credit associations among farmers than it will be to educate them to a point where they would lay aside political differences and act together. The Farmers' Alliance tried that and failed. Let us not repeat the mistakes of the Alliance.

Cooperative crop marketing is a matter for the most searching consideration. It can be begun in a small way and developed to huge proportions.

The problem of tenantry and how to overcome it is of vital consequence, not only to the millions of existing tenants, but to the youth now living on the farm—a large part of whom face inevitable tenantry under the present system. Topics like these furnish subjects for a literature much of which remains to be written and applied in this country.

The matters dealt with in this pamphlet are only suggestive. The program outlined below is, of course, imperfect, but of sufficient breadth to illustrate what a close federation of farm organizations could do:
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A SUGGESTED PROGRAM

First: A Federation of farm organizations under the suggested title, "THE FARMERS' FEDERATION OF AMERICA."

Second: This to be a federation of all existing farm organizations, and such as may hereafter be organized; which Federation will not supplant existing organizations but which will promote and stimulate the growth of the several federated units. The promotion by the Federation of organizations of such branches of the farmers' industry as the tobacco growers, the fruit growers, the milk producers, etc.

Third: The handling by the Federation of all such matters as are fundamental to all the organizations, such as:

Fourth: The creation and distribution of a literature which will deal with coöperation, cooperative crop marketing, rural credits, tenantry, and other farm problems.

Fifth: To act with the united power of the Federation in support of the individual union—where such support is needed—and it will be needed whenever an organization of farmers takes any action that will menace the profits of their exploiters, as witness the attempts of the grain trust to put the Equity Exchange out of business.

The writer believes that the organization of such a Federation is eminently practical and desirable. If he could do anything to promote such an organization it would be with the belief that he was doing one of the best things of his life.

In the March and April, 1915, issues of PEARSON'S Charles Edward Russell contributed two articles on the Equity Exchange of St. Paul. This is a cooperative grain exchange owned by farmers of the Northwest which is handling grain independently of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange and the elevator trust. Mr. Russell later visited Ireland and wrote a highly interesting article on what coöperation has done for Irish farmers.

In the October, 1915, PEARSON'S Mr. P. V. Collins, late editor of the Northwestern Agriculturist, told of his fight for the farmers and what was done to him.

In the November PEARSON'S Mr. Russell had another article on the Northwestern situation. Another article of very great educational value which appeared in November was "How the German Farmer Gets Credit," an account of the rural credit system of Germany. These will be followed by other articles covering the whole range of farm economics—both American and European. Before we are through the readers of PEARSON'S are going to know a great deal more about coöperation in its practical workings than is now known in this country.

It will take years to get direct government loans, while rural credit associations can be formed in as many months. One such an association is already in a flourishing condition among farmers of North Carolina, while another is being organized in North Dakota.

Before giving the manuscript of this article to the printers several copies were sent to prominent officials of the farmer unions—to editors of farm papers—to presidents of agricultural colleges—authors, etc. It is significant that the replies were all hearty endorsements—not one of them unfavorable.

Space does not permit publishing this correspondence in full, but here are a few brief extracts:

Wausau, Wis.,
July 21, 1915.

I assure you that I shall be very glad to render you all possible assistance in your proposed plan.

Fraternally yours,
H. G. TANE, Sec'y-Treas.,
American Society of Equity.

Kendalia, W. Va.,
July 5, 1915.

Allow me to express to you my personal appreciation for your kindness in enclosing to me your article on the establishment in this country and the bringing together as it
were all the various agricultural and farm organizations in a proposed Farmers' Federation of America.

I have read with much interest your plain, explicit and able paper on this subject, and am very much impressed with the possibilities which it outlines. Many of the suggestions you have made in your article are timely, wise and of much value, and I notice from reading the agricultural press that many such men as the Hon. Herbert Quick, the editor of the Farm and Fireside, who is an able agricultural writer of national repute, have recently in their writings made special reference to the establishment of such an organization as you have outlined, and I believe the time is ripe for the bringing together of the various farm organizations in such a federation as you have so ably described.

I feel that I know what it is to establish such an organization as you have described, and how hard it is to get the farmers of this country to stand together in solid phalanx as against a common enemy, but I am strongly of the opinion that the farmers of this country are better prepared at this time and nearer ready to receive such an organization as you have spoken about than they have ever been at any previous time in this country.

Yours very truly,
O. D. Hill, Sec'y,
Farmers' National Congress.

Arlington, Ore.,
July 28, 1915.

I have looked over your article and believe you have a very good conception of farm conditions and also of the need of an organization that would bring all farm organizations under one federated body.

The Farmers' Society of Equity has already united with the Farmers' Union in this state and I believe this organization together with the American Society of Equity could easily be united with the Farmers' Union, each organization losing its identity in a new name.

As all these organizations have identically the same purpose and ends in view it would hardly seem necessary to construct the federated machinery for them. When such organizations as the potato growers, bean growers, truck gardeners, egg producers, dairymen, stockmen and numerous other single purpose organizations are formed they should be federated into the larger organization.

I desire to thank you for the interest that Pearson's has taken in the movement for fair play for the farmer.

Respectfully,
J. D. Brown,
Pres. Farmers' Union of Oregon.

Amherst,
July 19, 1915.

I have very keen sympathy with your main thesis. I should like to see your article published and any other steps taken that may forward the idea. But I will have to confess that I feel extremely doubtful about the matter coming to a head in the immediate future on the lines you suggest. I am inclined to think that a more inclusive movement which seeks to federate on even larger lines is the really vital thing to take up.

Yours very sincerely,
Kenyon L. Butterfield, Pres.,
Massachusetts Agricultural College.

Mead, Nebr.,
July 14, 1915.

Your proposed article is very good, the great need of Federation of some kind cannot be overestimated. The question now is how can this be accomplished?

Yours very truly,
C. H. Gustafson, Pres.,
Farmers Education & Cooperative State Union of Nebraska.

Atlanta, Ga.,
July 5, 1915.

I have your letter of June 22nd, and I want to tell you that I have tried, and tried hard a number of times to federate the farm organizations of this country. There will be absolutely no trouble about getting the Farmers' Union into a federation.

Yours very truly,
C. S. Barrett,
National President Farmers' Union.

Detroit, Mich.,
July 9, 1915.

Your suggestion with reference to a federation of all the farmers' organizations is a mighty good one, and I haven't a single criticism to make of your plan.

Very truly yours,
Grant Slocum, Secretary,
Ancient Order of Gleaners.

Harvey, N. D.,
July 5, 1915.

I have gone over your manuscript describing your federation plan quite carefully and am pleased to be able to say that I am heartily in favor of any plan which will in any material way help to get the farmers together in a large aggregation or federation. While I was so closely identified with the work of organizing the Equity Society in the northwest, as the editor of the Cooperator's Herald, I was struck with one very peculiar feature of the organization work and that was the feeling of antagonism between some of the Equity workers and the workers in the other organizations. I tried to foster a spirit of cooperation between the organizations engaged in organization work in this state particularly, and succeeded to a certain extent, but while I was working along this line I had my eyes opened to the very thing which I feel sure you will find will be the most difficult one to overcome and which is likely to prove the rock upon which any federation movement is likely to split.

So far only one farmers' organization has been willing to cooperate with the Equity Society out here and that is the Grange, which has been doing some organization work in the state.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Ricker, that Big Business is either responsible for the starting of some of the farmers' organizations or has secured control of them after
SHALL WE HAVE A FEDERATION OF FARMERS?

they have come into the field. This is especially noticeable in this section where we have the big grain fight on our hands. The same thing is true of the cooperative movement. The two big cooperative publications so-called are organs owned and controlled by the grain combine. The Cooperative Journal of Chicago is owned and controlled by the Chicago Board of Trade interests and the most influential organ of that body working under the cloak of cooperation. The Cooperative Manager and Farmer of Minneapolis is the most influential organ of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. Most of the organizations you mention in your pamphlet are controlled by big business largely through the influence of these publications. When the cooperative movement took the local field in the grain business and made line elevators unprofitable the grain combine turned its attention to the work of saving the terminal field and if possible to secure control of the farmers' elevators. This they have succeeded in doing by financing farmers' companies and I presume they have 75% to 90% of the farmers' elevator companies, cooperative and stock companies, sewed up so tight they cannot wiggle. This has been the hardest thing that the Equity Cooperative Exchange has had to meet. Some of the farmers' organizations are mere auxiliaries of the grain combine. They organize farmers' elevators and then get one of the big Chicago or Minneapolis commission concerns to finance their business. You cannot get the organizers of such organizations to mention cooperative terminal marketing.

These organizations have either been organized or gotten control of by big business in order to keep the farmers split up and in order to see to it that the farmers are kept fighting among themselves and in order to plant and foster discord.

It is usually agreed that it is the suspiciousness with which the farmer regards efforts in his behalf and the petty jealousies, etc., among the farmers themselves that are the great obstacles to overcome. I used to think so, too, but I have been in pretty close touch with a good many farmers during the past twenty-five years and I have been in pretty close touch with a good many organizers and officers of farmers' organizations also and I have come to the conclusion that the very greatest obstacles to overcome are the narrowness of the organizers and officials of farmers' organizations and their petty jealousies and efforts to maintain themselves in their positions, if nothing worse. Many of them when they see the opportunities to exploit the farmers through the organizations are not big or strong enough, to hold out against that temptation.

I assure you that I shall be glad to do anything that my limited means and ability may permit toward the furtherance of such an organization.

Very sincerely yours,

Geo. L. Nelson,
Nelson's Free Lance.

Davenport, Iowa,
June 29, 1915.

Yours of the 23rd inst. to hand with manuscript referred to, and note contents fully.

I read the copy with much interest and the main point you try to cover, namely, "A Federation of Farmers," is well taken and is absolutely necessary.

Respectfully yours,

D. H. Stuhm, Manager,
The Middle West Crop Bureau.

My object in publishing this pamphlet is to put it in the hands of the rank and file of the union membership. Federation, if it comes at all, must come from the rank and file. I also hope to get the pamphlet into the hands of the many thousands of farmers who do not now belong to farmers' unions but who ought to belong.

The writer has had practical experience with farm matters; not the kind of experience gained from books alone, but the kind which comes from handling the pitchfork and the plow. His interest in this matter is personal as well as theoretical.

I WOULD LIKE TO GET A LETTER OR A POSTCARD FROM EVERY FARMER WHO READS THIS PAMPHLET.

Do you agree with what I have said?
Do you want a Farmers' Federation?
Will you help to make one? Write to me, care of Pearson's Magazine, and we will see what we can do about it.

Through the generosity of Pearson’s Magazine I am able to send you this single copy. I cannot ask Pearson’s to supply copies to you in bulk, but you may have them for distribution at the cost of printing and mailing—as follows—10c. per dozen, 75c per hundred, etc., etc.

Address,

PEARSON'S MAGAZINE
425 E. 24th St., New York City.
IOWA'S BRILLIANT SENATOR

WILLIAM S. KENYON
Iowa
UNITED STATES SENATE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
August 26th, 1914.

I want to commend the courageous course of Pearson's Magazine. If you could only secure a hearing at the hands of the American people they would--after reading your magazine--better understand what is going on at Washington and comprehend the forces against which certain independent characters in our National life are battling.

Pearson's tells the truth and the truth--when understood by the people--will lead them to take a more active participation in the affairs of their Government. Success to Pearson's

Years ago the writer of this pamphlet and the junior senator from Iowa were boys together in the same Iowa city. In those days the senator was a "paper carrier" after school hours and his chums called him "Billy." Everybody liked "Billy" and respected him because he was white clear through.

All of these old school chums were mighty proud of "Billy" when one day an unusually progressive Iowa legislature elected him senator.

Kenyon has made a little more than good. That is he has gone further over to the side of the people than is considered "safe" by his political associates in Congress.

Washington has not been able to put a yellow streak in "Billy." Whenever anything crooked is proposed in the U. S. Senate--and a lot of things are--you hear from Kenyon.

Senator Kenyon says that you ought to know more about what goes on at Washington for your own good--and Senator Kenyon knows. Read his letter.

Here's another Senator who has not always voted to suit "the interests." This senator is from the state of New Jersey and his name is Martine. He don't say much but the little he does say is full of meaning. Here it is:

"I enclose my check for two years' subscription. I read your magazine with great gratification."  
JAMES MARTINE.

It is said in Washington that the files of Pearson's Magazine are more often used than any other publication in the Congressional library.

Charles Edward Russell stays in Washington while Congress is in session and is in close touch all the time with what goes on. He tells you about it each month in the columns of Pearson's.

"Isn't that reason enough why you ought to read every issue of Pearson's Magazine?"

Subscription Price, $1.50 Per Year

PEARSON'S MAGAZINE, 425 East 24th Street, New York City