A STUDY OF THE OKLAHOMA COTTON GROWERS ASSOCIATION WITH EMPHASIS UPON THE LOCAL RECEIVER SYSTEM.

By
OLIN M. FARRINGTON
Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
1922

Submitted to the Department of Agricultural Economics
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
1930
APPROVED:

[Signature]

In Charge of Thesis

[Signature]

Head of Department of Agricultural Economics

[Signature]

Dean of School of Agriculture

[Signature]

Dean of Graduate School
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

Kindly acknowledgment is made for the inspiration and helpful suggestions given the writer by Professor O. W. Herrmann. Recognition is also given to Mr. J. W. Jones, Economist in Charge of Membership Relations, Federal Farm Board, for his council and help.

Deep appreciation is felt for the aid given by the officials and local receivers of the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association.
CONTENTS

1. Historical Foreword ........................................ 5

2. The Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association and
   the American Cotton Growers Exchange .............. 12

3. The Success of the Oklahoma Association
   Compared with Other Members of the
   American Cotton Growers Exchange ............... 22

4. How the Oklahoma Association Differs from
   Other Cotton Associations ..................... 29

5. A Study of the Local Receiver System .............. 42

6. Discussion and Criticism of the Local
   Receiver System ..................................... 83

7. The Directorate and Association Government ... 93

8. Summary ................................................. 100

9. References .............................................. 103
HISTORICAL FOREWORD.

The debacle of farm prices during the period of economic readjustment following the World War, brought about a wave of agrarian discontent which has been recorded in American economic history as the causation of an epochal farmer movement. The tangible result was the sudden formation of large scale centralized cooperative marketing associations.

This movement began in the South and during the years 1921 and 1922 spread rapidly over the wheat and tobacco regions.

Agricultural prices and values slumped more than those of other commodities also sooner.(1) The farm income per capita in 1918 was $359 compared with $677 for non-farm income; in 1919 farm income was $409 compared with $710 for non-farm income per capita while in 1920 the per capita incomes for the groups were $244 and $838, respectively.(2) Thus in 1920 farm income slumped 40 percent while non-farm income increased 18 percent.

Cotton was among the first of the major commodities, either agricultural or non-agricultural to break in price after the period of war inflation. This advance break was intensified by the fact of the forecast of

(2) Report of Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry 1921.
the large 1921 crop. Owing to the nature of the commodity and its extremely inelastic demand cotton prices, even in normal years, violently react inversely to relative production figures. (3)

The purchasing power of cotton and cottonseed dropped from the peak of 304 in April 1920 to 101 in December and then slumped to the low level of 76 in April 1921. (4) The cost of living increased during the first part of this period and the drop was less pronounced. Index numbers of clothing in June 1920 was 287.5, in December 258.5, and in May 1921 was still at the high level of 222.6. (5)

Such a state of affairs was indeed conducive to some sort of a movement by the cotton farmers and it was but natural that the marketing system became the object of attack.

The foregoing portrays that which is generally considered to be the immediate cause of the organization of the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association which was the first of large scale state or regional centralized cotton marketing associations. During the period subsequent to the depression of 1914 there were, however,

(3) John D. Black - "Agricultural Reform in the United States" - Chap. IV.
(4) Index Numbers of Farm Prices - Table 757 - Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, 1924.
many activities which had an important bearing upon this movement. The U. S. Cotton Futures Act of August 14, 1914, and the U. S. Warehouse Act of August 11, 1916, also had an influence.

The U. S. Department of Agriculture and various State colleges and experiment stations also spent considerable effort in analyzing the marketing system and in giving aid to the cotton producers. A study of the primary market conditions in Oklahoma was made by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1912-13. (6) A similar though more extensive study was later made over the cotton belt. (7)

Backed by the results obtained from these studies together with the successful experience of a local cooperative association established at Hope, Arkansas, in 1912, the Department of Agriculture entered into a campaign to set up community organizations of cotton farmers for the purpose of improving marketing conditions. (8) This effort started in 1917 and by 1921 there were 85 such organizations operating in various cotton producing states, 12 being located in Oklahoma. (9)

(5) From Index Numbers of Cost of Living in the United States - Table 512 - Statistical Abstract of the United States 1923.
(6) U. S. D. A. Department Bulletin - No. 36.
(9) "Cooperative Pattern in Cotton" - R. H. Montgomery - Chap. I.
The aim of this work was to emphasize the relation of varieties to uniformity of cotton fibre, the value of producing a single variety in a given community and to show the benefits of proper, impartial classing of the cotton before initial sale in the primary markets. For this latter service a licensed government cotton classer was employed - the expense being jointly paid by the farmers, the State Experiment Station and the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

This work was indeed noteworthy and perhaps would have been the foundation of the cooperative movement, had it not been for the complete "stampede" of the American Cotton Association by Aaron Sapiro.
American Cotton Association.

Many writers without closely noting dates of events leave the impression that no concerted action was taken by the agricultural leaders toward widespread reform in the marketing of cotton until after the break in cotton prices or until after the period of depression had begun. This, however, is erroneous. By the middle of 1919 leaders were active in nearly every cotton producing state. The United Cotton Growers of America was organized and the American Cotton Association was set-up in May 1919 and by the last of that year had established separate state branches in several of the southern states. (10)

A call was issued by this organization for a national convention to be held in Montgomery, Alabama, April 13-16, 1920. (11) This convention of farmers, merchants, agricultural journalists and editors, and leaders in professional agriculture, met with the announced purpose of attempting to evolve some plan to more widely extend the principle of cooperative marketing in the cotton belt. (12)

The feature of the convention was the addresses and activity of Aaron Sapiro and his highly centralized cooperative plans. Although his plan was not officially adopted by the convention, it made a profound impression upon those present. The official action of the convention was the appointment of a committee to work out a cooperative marketing plan which was to be officially adopted at a proposed future convention.

It is of interest to note that the price of spot cotton in New Orleans was 41.50 cents on April 13-14-15th and that on April 16th, both spot and future prices climbed to new levels. New Orleans spot prices reached the highest peak of the whole war-time inflation period on the closing day of the Montgomery Convention.

The fact that Aaron Sapiro could sweep such an audience of cotton men with his cooperative plan — and cotton selling for 41.75 cents — the same as he did nine months later when the prices had crashed until a 500 pound bale of cotton would not exchange for a suit of clothes, certainly augers well his abilities as an orator and leader.

The final cooperative plan drafted by the committee representing the American Cotton Association called for a loosely federated organization with emphasis on local associations. The functions of these locals were cotton
classing, warehousing and selling. Later it was planned to centralize selling in state and national overhead organizations.(13)

The findings and plans of this committee were never officially acted upon as interest was centered upon Oklahoma where cooperative activity had begun.

OKLAHOMA COTTON GROWERS ASSOCIATION AND THE

AMERICAN COTTON GROWERS EXCHANGE.

Oklahoma had been represented at the Montgomery Convention by twenty-two delegates. In a meeting on May 10-11, 1930, these delegates appointed a special committee to draft a cooperative plan for Oklahoma. The first plan brought forth contemplated the formation of local associations - federated into county units. The plans called for erection or purchase of at least one warehouse per county. Classing, selling and storage was to be handled separately by each unit. Later it was expected to fuse these county units into a state wide sales organization. Carl Williams, editor of the Oklahoma Farmer-Stockman, approved such a set-up and editorialy stated that in the beginning, these local associations should be featured.*

This plan, however, did not meet with general approval. A second plan calling for a strongly centralized state association very similar to the one outlined by Sapiro at Montgomery was then drawn up. This plan was approved on June 10, 1930, by a convention of farmers and extension workers representing 32 counties.(I) The way was now cleared for organizational activity. Sapiro was in the state.

* Mr. Williams, in an editorial under the date - May 25, 1920 - gave a lengthy analysis of this proposed

(I) Oklahoma Farmer Stockman, June 14, 1920.
Cotton prices were still at a peak. The average daily price for spot cotton in New Orleans for the month of June 1920 was 40.52 cents per pound. However, by the time the sign-up campaign started in October, the market was breaking violently. The State Bankers Association, The Grange, The Farmers Union and the Extension Division of the A. & M. College endorsed the organization and aided in the drive for members. By April 1, 1921, 35,000 membership contracts had been signed which on paper, represented approximately 400,000 bales of cotton or 100,000 bales more than the minimum set to make contracts binding.

The Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association was duly incorporated April 26, 1921. The price of spot cotton, New Orleans, that day was 11 cents per pound.

The fact that the great drive for membership, which was the most impressive feature of the whole movement, took place during and after the debacle of cotton prices has probably caused writers and investigators to state or infer that the whole movement was an outgrowth of depression.

set-up - He stated that the first step would be local selling associations, the second, local warehouse associations, and then later county and district associations enlarged finally into state and national organization, all to be part of American Cotton Association. He stated however that any such arrangement is impossible until local organizations have been formed and doing business,
Organization campaigns followed in other states and within two years state wide or regional centralized cotton marketing associations were incorporated and doing business in all the principal cotton producing states. The "Oklahoma Plan" of organization was closely followed, having been recommended by the American Cotton Association in a convention at Montgomery, Alabama, September 3-4, 1920. (2)

Table 1 shows the number of associations and the cotton handled cooperatively in the United States since 1921.

**The American Cotton Growers Exchange.**

The leaders of the cooperative movement anticipated the need of a central or overhead organization even before the separate state associations had been completed. Sapiro's plan, as given to the Montgomery Convention, called for such an unit empowered to coordinate the activities of the associations, to promote further organizations and to act as a central sales agency.

and that the first step and the only one to be considered right now is the local selling associations composed of growers only and enjoying the use of a governmental cotton classifier to tell what the cotton is worth.

(2) Oklahoma Farmer Stockman - September 10, 1920.
Table 1. Cotton Handled Cooperatively in the U. S. 1921-29. (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Large Scale Cotton Marketing Associations Number</th>
<th>Cotton Marketed Cooperatively Bales</th>
<th>Percentage of total Production Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921-22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>351,839</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>754,002</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>925,221</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,092,553</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,461,986</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,206,639</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927-28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>817,287</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,114,254</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the call of Oklahoma officials, representatives from Arizona, Texas, Mississippi (Delta or Staple) Associations met in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, April 18, 1921. Leaders from other cotton states also were present. A tentative agreement was approved by the Texas, Arizona and Oklahoma representatives. This original agreement called for centralized sales by the overhead agency. Later at a meeting in Memphis, this was modified, to be optional on the part of the member associations. In this

(3) Data from U. S. D. A. Circular No. 94.
form it was approved by the three mentioned associations.

Carl Williams of Oklahoma was chosen to be the first President and General Manager. Headquarters were established in Dallas, Texas.

The Delta or Staple Growers Association of Mississippi did not become a member of the Exchange and during the nine years of their existence have continued as a strictly independent business organization.

In the first two years the Exchange entered into a promotional campaign aiding in organizing Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi (short staple) and Tennessee.

As a rule the member associations have chosen to handle their sales independently although they have relied upon the market information given out by the Exchange. A feature of the American Cotton Growers Exchange has been the development of its statistical department. This has been rather marked during the two seasons (1927-28, 1928-29) when a concerted attempt has been made toward price forecasting.*

The sales policy and sales program followed by most of the member associations of the American Cotton Growers Exchange, including the Oklahoma Association, during the

* John D. Black in "Agricultural Reform in the United States" (Chapter VII) makes note of the phenomenal sales success of the cotton associations following this forecasted price, as to time and amount, during the season 1927-28. He says that this success will perhaps cause the cotton cooperatives to place undue faith in price analysis.
season 1928-29, certainly portrays the fallacy of placing explicit faith in such forecasting. Because new and unforeseeable situations are always developing in the economic world, price forecasting can not be an exact science. It can, however, be an invaluable guide. Together statistical analysis and careful market observation can help greatly. Alone the statistical analysis in its present development is the less trustworthy.

**Field Service.**

One of the fundamental weaknesses of the centralized type of cooperative organization is the looseness of hook-up with the individual members. The centralized pattern has perhaps received its severest criticism on this score. Many converts of the Federated plan openly say that if a cooperative association is to endure and prosper there must be active local units in the system and that, in order to be satisfied and loyal, the members must perform an active physical function.

In the beginning of their activity the cotton cooperatives, even the centralized in pattern, made provision for district, county and local units. Charts showing the organizational pattern of these cooperatives when compared with charts of federated associations have
often brought out but little difference and have led to confusion as to the structural set up. Historical and business studies of the cotton cooperatives have invariably stressed the attempt of the associations to establish and actively maintain these divisional units.

The different associations (members of the American Cotton Growers Exchange) religiously endeavored to maintain these units during the early years and most of them are trying to do so at this time.

In order to give emphasis to this activity, the directors of field service of the twelve associations then comprising the Exchange, were called together in December 1924. (4) The result of this meeting was the adoption of the so termed Standard Field Service Plan, applicable to the various state associations. See Figure 1.

It will be noted that this plan called for one district supervisor for each 2,000 members, and "a number" of salaried field service men - under each district supervisor - and in turn a local leader to each 10 members.

A scrutiny of this plan shows it to be patterned after military organizations.

Figure I. Standard Field Service Plan.
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(5) Data obtained from American Cotton Growers Exchange.
This plan evolved from the campaign organizations in the various states. The strength of the structure lies in the local leader and his militant squad of ten men. In order to fit the set-up to the more prosaic duties of everyday business, and organizational activities, an attempt was made to feature community meetings and programs. The central idea was to keep the local leaders and members busy with the social and business problems of the community as well as with those pertaining to the Association.

This plan seems theoretically sound but it has never worked with any degree of success in a given community for any length of time.

Time and experience is proving that this set-up is primarily a driving militant machine and admirably adapted to aggressive membership campaigns. Like an army it will get results in the stress and heat of battle but also like an army it is a sour failure in everyday business activities. It is over organized - and especially so for an institution which has little or no actual physical processes or facilities in the community.

Since the Standard Field Service Plan was devised, a number of the state associations have attempted to
utilize it with more or less modification. The more subsidiary activities entered into by the Association the more successful did this plan work. The Associations sponsored by and connected with the Farm Bureau have attained some success with the plan in certain communities.
THE SUCCESS OF THE OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION COMPARED
WITH OTHER MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS OF THE AMERICAN
COTTON GROWERS EXCHANGE.

The Staple Cotton Growers Association has been previously mentioned. This organization is set off from the other large centralized cotton associations in several respects. The area covered by the organization is much more restricted, covering some 10 full counties and parts of 6 more in northwestern Mississippi.

Most of the cotton produced is of extra staple—thus the name Staple Growers. The plantation system is the prevailing farm type of organization. Furthermore, this association, owing to an advantage in handling a more or less specialized product and partly due to differences in sales and business policies, is fundamentally different from the other association. Therefore, the writer will make comparisons dealing only with the member associations of the American Cotton Growers Exchange.

Number of Members.

One way of comparing the relative sizes of cotton cooperatives is by membership.

Table 2 shows the membership of the principal associations connected with the American Cotton Growers Exchange.
Table 2. Membership of Ten State Centralized Cotton Associations Connected with the American Cotton Growers Exchange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Association</th>
<th>Date of Incorporation</th>
<th>May*</th>
<th>July 14**</th>
<th>June 29**</th>
<th>Jan. 25**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>11,380</td>
<td>25,148</td>
<td>11,455</td>
<td>12,149</td>
<td>15,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>14,569</td>
<td>13,727</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>4,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>43,198</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>5,658</td>
<td>8,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>6,253</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>4,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>38,052</td>
<td>4,116</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>55,041</td>
<td>13,375</td>
<td>25,722</td>
<td>31,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>14,912</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>2,768</td>
<td>3,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,785</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>3,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>19,146</td>
<td>49,436</td>
<td>21,786</td>
<td>17,817</td>
<td>19,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative dates have been taken so that membership is shown under both old and new contracts. Measured by membership the Oklahoma Association ranks first among these organizations.

(1) U. S. D. A. Department Bulletin 1392.
(2) American Cotton Growers Exchange.
* Under old contract.
** Under new contract.
Bales of Cotton Handled.

Table 3 shows the baleage handled by ten members of the American Cotton Growers Exchange between the years 1923 and 1929. No comparative figures are given for the seasons 1921-22 and 1922-23 as all of these organizations were not functioning at this time. The Oklahoma organization also ranks first in this measurement.

Percent of Cotton Handled.

Tables 2 and 3 have compared the gross sizes of the associations. A more equitable comparison of their success is in showing the percentages of the total bales of cotton produced within the states that were handled by the respective associations.

Table 4 shows these data for years 1923 to 1929. Oklahoma has greatly outranked all these associations during the past six years, with the exception of the Arizona Association. The Arizona Association, however, serves a limited and specialized area and is hardly comparable.

Figures 2 and 3 show how the Oklahoma Association compares with the other ten associations collectively— as to bales handled and percent of state crop received by the organizations.
Table 3. Number of Bales of CottonHandled by Ten State Centralized Cotton Associations Connected with the American Cotton Growers Exchange. (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ala.</td>
<td>65,319</td>
<td>79,388</td>
<td>106,252</td>
<td>106,663</td>
<td>80,093</td>
<td>56,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariz.</td>
<td>7,948</td>
<td>9,749</td>
<td>16,125</td>
<td>11,610</td>
<td>19,438</td>
<td>64,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark.(4)</td>
<td>41,515</td>
<td>42,412</td>
<td>125,543</td>
<td>65,088</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>23,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>70,812</td>
<td>105,979</td>
<td>113,093</td>
<td>85,518</td>
<td>21,205</td>
<td>62,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La.</td>
<td>29,890</td>
<td>26,535</td>
<td>51,170</td>
<td>55,319</td>
<td>24,697</td>
<td>26,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. C.</td>
<td>130,853</td>
<td>116,472</td>
<td>158,995</td>
<td>131,468</td>
<td>45,864</td>
<td>58,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okla.</td>
<td>118,743</td>
<td>141,440</td>
<td>205,926</td>
<td>195,195</td>
<td>162,788</td>
<td>363,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. C.</td>
<td>121,215</td>
<td>99,257</td>
<td>96,364</td>
<td>70,976</td>
<td>26,743</td>
<td>27,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn.</td>
<td>15,315</td>
<td>18,141</td>
<td>32,161</td>
<td>15,382</td>
<td>20,828</td>
<td>28,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tex.</td>
<td>182,318</td>
<td>284,321</td>
<td>243,949</td>
<td>195,327</td>
<td>193,697</td>
<td>115,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>817,784</td>
<td>967,736</td>
<td>1,191,766</td>
<td>975,526</td>
<td>612,158</td>
<td>837,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Data from American Cotton Growers Exchange.
(4) Includes Missouri Association.
Table 4. Percent of State Cotton Production Handled by the Respective State Associations - 1923-28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ala.</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariz.</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark.(5)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. C.</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okla.</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. C.</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of 11 States</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outstanding feature of these data is the phenomenal growth of the Oklahoma Association during the seasons of 1927-28 and 1928-29.

5) Includes Missouri.
Fig. 2
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Bales of cotton handled. Oklahoma Association and other Cooperatives belonging to American Cotton Growers Exchange.
Fig. 3  Deliveries to Association as to total State ginnings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Oklahoma</th>
<th>Other members of American Cotton Growers Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW THE OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION DIFFERS FROM OTHER ASSOCIATIONS CONNECTED WITH AMERICAN COTTON GROWERS EXCHANGE.

Writers and investigators dealing with the cotton cooperatives have made but little distinction or differences in the structure and general policies of the various associations connected with the American Cotton Growers Exchange.

The data previously presented has shown that, prior to the season 1928-29, no given association was outstanding in performance. This fact no doubt explains why little comparative study has been made. The recent phenomenal growth of the Oklahoma Association calls for a closer study of any structural differences which might be evident, together with analysis of the factors which may have brought about this sudden increase in the amount of cotton handled.

It is evident that there are but minor constitutional distinctions in the associations. All have very similar association agreements and marketing contracts; likewise corresponding executive machinery and selling plans.

Even so there are certain major differences which, taken jointly, tend to set off the Oklahoma Association from the other members of the Exchange.
These differences can be thus classified:

1. Not connected with or controlled by a general farm organization.

2. Has not entered into subsidiary activities.

3. The Board of Directors function under an entirely different "code" or understanding.

4. Has entirely departed from The Standard Field Service Plan.

Not Connected with a Class Organization.

Most of the Cotton Cooperatives are more or less allied with a general farm organization. Membership in four of the associations necessitates membership in the Farm Bureau. The Oklahoma Association, as such, is neither directly or indirectly connected with any other organization within the state.

The relative advantage or disadvantage thereby given the Oklahoma is entirely immeasurable. It stands to reason, however, that two memberships would be more difficult to procure than one—especially when dealing with farmers.

The Farm Bureau does not operate in Oklahoma, however the Farmers Union is very active. It is generally understood that in the cotton producing sections of the state,
the membership of the Farmers Union is largely made up of association members.

General farm organizations have played an important part in agricultural progress. As pioneers in agricultural organization they have met with many failures also they have made notable successes. Their histories invariably show more or less political activity. Because of these things a feeling of prejudice and distrust toward such organizations exists in the minds of some farmers.

The aims of a general farm organization and a centralized cotton cooperative association follow the same general principles, namely, the betterment of the farmer both financially and socially; however, they are far from being identical. Any direct tieup therefore would at least create a divided interest if not in some cases, cause open friction and hostility.

Certain officials of farm organizations have maintained that there should be no direct tieup with cooperatives. In a signed article - "Kentucky Farm Bureau Backs Cooperative Marketing" - appearing in the Burley Tobacco Grower, May 1926, page 8, Harry Hartke, then President of the Kentucky Farm Bureau says:
"I consider it fundamentally unsound to allow the members of any cooperative organization to sign contracts which demand perpetual tribute to the Farm Bureau through or from a cooperative organization. This service should be recognized as an obligation of the Farm Bureau and therefore it should ask for nothing in return."

(Mr. Hartke is now President of the National Milk Producers Federation - which is the nation's oldest commodity federation).

Subsidiary Activities.

Those who have determined the policies of the Oklahoma Association have never considered it advisable to undertake any subsidiary activity.* They have been content to merchandise cotton. Other cotton cooperatives have entered this field more or less extensively.

Some of the enterprises have been closely correlated with the production and marketing of cotton, as production credit - and establishing gins, others have been opportunistic in nature seemingly with an object of increasing general interest and bolstering up a dwindling membership.

*In 1925 an attempt was made to organize a subsidiary cotton seed corporation. Although considerable time and money was spent in a contract drive no organization took place. The board of directors were divided as to the expediency of the undertaking.
The various Cotton Associations have entered into the following subsidiary activities:

1. Production Credit.
2. Building and Operating Gins.
5. Sale of Feed.
6. Writing Life Insurance.

Perhaps the Oklahoma association has suffered some handicap in following the policy of doing but one thing, still there has been many advantages. Local merchants, bankers, and civic organizations have a favorable attitude toward the association which undoubtedly would not be the case had the association undertaken these activities. These favorable public agencies have certainly been a factor in the growth of the association.

Of the enterprises mentioned that of ginning demands attention. The marketing associations, must in some manner, be affiliated with farmer-owned and controlled gins. This is one of the greatest present problems of the cotton cooperatives.

The Texas Association has fostered the building of some 13 gins in that state.

The ginning problem in Oklahoma will be discussed later under "Problems of the Oklahoma Association".
The credit system of the south is faulty and inadequate and in many sections vicious. Eleven of the cotton associations have undertaken the establishment of subsidiary Credit Corporations. Owing to the widely scattered membership which necessitates high costs of administration little success has been obtained.

The Staple Cotton Growers have attained notable success in this undertaking and have rendered their members a very valuable service. (1) This, however, has been possible because of a relative dense membership over a smaller area when compared to the other associations - also the members are extensive operators, therefore the average loans have been relatively large and easily secured. Under these conditions administration has not been unyieldy nor costs excessive.

Differences in Functioning of the Board of Directors.

The duties of the Board of Directors and method of selection as set forth in the Constitution and By-laws of the Oklahoma Association are nearly identical with those of the other cotton cooperatives. In actual functioning, however, there is considerable difference.

(1) U. S. D. A. Department Circular 397.
At present the directors of the Oklahoma Association function in a three way capacity.

1. As an orthodox directing board.
2. As district field supervisors.
3. As district managers.

They function as a directing board under the authority of the Constitution and By-laws, and receive such remuneration as set forth therein.

They act as field supervisors and district managers by mutual consent and perform such duties under regulations passed by the body, as directors, together with a well understood "code". When thus functioning they are not directors but paid employees of the association.

In the second year of association activity the board of directors felt that it would be advantageous for each director to spend at least some time in the field supervising the various field men, and local receivers and in contacting the members. By a vote of the Board each director was allowed $10.00 per diem and expenses when performing these duties. This pay schedule has been maintained until the present with the exception of one year when it was cut to $8.00 per diem.
All ten of the directors with but one exception "work" their district most of the time. The yearly expense accounts of the various directors range upward to approximately $5,000.00.

As district managers they have full appointive and removal power over the local receivers of their districts. Also they aid in making contracts with cotton compresses when railroad gins and compresses are so located that cotton may be received by the railways at the compress. Otherwise all cotton is compressed in transit by railroad.

Under this system the directors come in very close contact with the members, and the local public agencies. They get a first-hand perspective of those conditions and problems pertaining to their districts.

There has been rather keen competition between directors and districts for larger deliveries of cotton. Individually the directors have been very aggressive.

In functioning as a body to determine general association policies there is indeed a nice distinction between a board made up of district managers and supervisors and one made up of "orthodox" directors.
Abolition of the Standard Field Service Plan.

The Standard Field Service Plan (Figure I) has been previously discussed. At this point it is well to note that the Oklahoma Association had, on paper, soon after the organization period, approximately 1,200 "locals". These "talking locals" began to expire soon after the contract drive was finished. The length of the period of expiration depended mainly upon one factor - the loquacity of the members.

Aware of the need of a closer relationship with the members, the management tried to establish and maintain local contact organization and also kept a corps of field workers. In 1934 there were 31 full time field men employed.

Although the Standard Field Service plan was never fully instituted, an effort was made toward that end. The association was handicapped in this effort in that there was no subsidiary activities to promote and neither was it allied with a general farm organization. The "community program" plan was never put in successful operation.

During the season 1925-26 the Association entered into a vigorous campaign of legal prosecution of contract violations. The field men were utilized in this work
and in addition a number of legal agents were employed on a commission basis. The result was much dissatisfaction and ill feeling which in some instances has never been erased. This ill feeling was mainly directed at the field men.

A general feeling that the field service was not worth its expense became manifest among many members and certain directors.

Effective January 1, 1927, and subsequent to a heated Board session, the services of the itinerant field men were discontinued. Since that date there has been no regular force of field men. Each director was allotted $2,700.00 per year to be used at his discretion for promotional and organizational purposes. Most of the directors used this money in partly maintaining contract solicitors at certain seasons, in paying expenses of local receivers to and from general conferences at the central office or in paying expenses pertaining to the Cooperative Essay Contests held throughout the schools of Oklahoma.

At present the field service of the Association has been almost completely decentralized. The Director of Field Service, resident office at Association headquarters, acts as a general coordinator and editor of the house organ.
The directors supervise, appoint or dismiss the local receivers in their respective districts. There is no appeal to his decisions although the board of directors could at any time by a majority vote to change this "code" or understanding.

Thus the Standard Field Service Plan has been completely abolished in Oklahoma. The local receiver has become the contact agency of the association.

The above differences between the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association and other member associations of the American Cotton Growers Exchange, have had a direct bearing upon the recent growth of the Oklahoma Association. It would, however, be absurd to say that they are the causa sine qua non.

**Factors Entering into the Recent Growth of the Oklahoma Association.**

The great increase in deliveries of cotton to the Oklahoma Association was brought about by a combination of conditions, the most important of which can be thus outlined:
A. Factors originating within the Association.

1. Changes in the new marketing agreement.
   a. Incorporating a withdrawal clause.
   b. Creating new option pools, or selling plans - daily pool.

   a. Allowing the use of the futures exchange by sales department.
   b. Setting a stipulated per bale charge for handling cotton.
   c. Allowing either tenant or landlord members to divide cotton crop before delivery to Association.
   d. Open statements by officials that contract would not be enforced by legal action - nor an attempt made in collecting liquidated damages.

3. Change in Field Service which placed more importance and emphasis on the local receivers.

4. The aggressiveness and activity of the local receivers - especially in making delivery of association attractive to members by rendering personal services in the local markets.
B. Factors originating outside the Association.

1. Building of cooperative gins by the Farmers Union.

2. The fact that western Oklahoma cotton farmers had enjoyed favorable economic conditions because of:
   a. Low production costs.
   b. Good yields.
   c. Relatively good prices.

3. The economic and social independence of these western farmers.

4. Favorable attitude of bankers, merchants and ginners toward the Association.

C. The large amount of bought or speculative cotton handled by the Association.

These conditions were interlocking and can not be easily valued separately; however, it is evident that the local receiver, through his presence and activity, directly entered into the effective amalgamation of these factors.
A STUDY OF THE LOCAL RECEIVER SYSTEM AS ADOPTED BY
THE OKLAHOMA COTTON GROWERS ASSOCIATION.

Introduction.

The local receiver system* has been in operation in a more or less organized manner since the first year of association activity. Many versions are given as to just how and when the system was instituted. Undoubtedly it was an outgrowth of the old locals of the organizational period. The local agent was not a part of the original business set up of the Association but in fact an after thought or a temporary necessity. He was a local member who knew how to bill-out cotton and understood Association procedure in writing out advance payment drafts, and his function was to help or instruct the members in these things. For this he was paid - usually 40¢ per bale.

During the first year a large number of such agents were appointed by the directors or elected by the locals. There was no uniformity as to selection or duties required. By the second year there was a designated local receiver in practically every shipping point in the state.

* Geo. O. Gatlin - U. S. D. A. Department Bul. 1392 - "Cooperative Marketing of Cotton", page 33 states that several associations employ local receiving agents at delivery points to assist members in delivering and in obtaining advances. He says that the Oklahoma association adopted the plan in the second year and in 1924-35 had about 400 of these agents.
The local receivers were never tied up very closely with the Field Service of the organization. The degree of coordination and supervision varied greatly in the different districts. In some points the local members continued to elect receivers annually. In other places no new election was called unless there was dissatisfaction or unless the receivers refused to serve. The directors annually appointed the agents in many delivery points either with or without recommendation of the field men.

During the early years, with but few exceptions, the receivership carried no particular monetary attraction and in many cases the directors or field men had difficulty in finding Association members who were willing to assume the responsibilities. At places where no capable member could be found the appointment was given a non-member such as a friendly ginner, the cotton drayman, a merchant, a clerk, or even perhaps the town notary public or the preacher.

Prior to 1927 the local receivers were never considered a factor in field service or membership relations, albeit they were of great value to the members and the local public agencies.* Usually these agents were staunch Association "wheel-horses" who believed religiously in the

* No mention of the local receivers is made in Oklahoma Experiment Station Bulletin 178 - "Attitudes of Oklahoma Farmers Toward Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association".
principles and practices of cooperative marketing. Undoubtedly they did much to smooth over the wave of resentment and ill-feeling which swept over the membership in 1925-26 as the result of unfavorable association prices and legal prosecution of contract violations.

Since the services of all itinerant field men were terminated January 1, 1927, the local receivers have been the contact men of the Association as well as the local business agents.

**Object of the Study.**

The object of this study was to determine how the local receivers functioned and what services they performed; to determine the factors which caused wide variations in deliveries at near-by points; to find the effects of these local representatives upon membership relations and attitudes, and to ascertain a measure for their success and efficiency.

**When, Where and How Data was Collected.**

Personal contact was made with 86 local receivers of the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association during May, June and July, 1929. The writer attempted to interview
the receivers in Western Oklahoma points where association deliveries approximated 1,000 or more bales of cotton, and also some of the leading receivers in Eastern Oklahoma.

Figure 4 shows the geographical location of the receivers studied.

Data thus obtained is not representative of the 400 receivers as a group. It was deemed advisable, however, to interview the more successful receivers in complying with the purpose of the study as previously stated.

It is apparent that local receivers handling but a small number of bales of cotton on a flat commission of 40¢ per bale receive but little wage and especially so when the active cotton season is spread out over at least five months. Receivers at these points of small Association deliveries conduct their Association duties entirely as a sideline enterprise even during the ginning season.

As a rule they are merchants, clerks, railway or express company employees, cotton draymen, etc., to whom the association member comes for an advance payment draft after having hauled his bale of cotton to the railway platform. The receiver, at his convenience, goes to the depot and bills out the cotton. In the points of large
Association deliveries the receiving system is entirely different and here the local receivers have become a vital cog in the Association machinery.

Of the 86 receivers contacted 75 were located in the southwestern portion of the state - distributed over 17 counties. Eleven were located in 10 eastern counties.

It is readily seen (Figure 4) that the study has a marked geographical bias. This bias, however, is in conformity with the geographical strength of the Association. In 1928-29, the Association received 321,611 bales from these 17 counties, which was 88.5 percent of the entire receipts of the Association.

Ginnings in these counties totaled 701,337 bales. Thus the Association received 45.9 percent of the entire crop from these 17 western counties. Even though the 75 towns visited were the larger cotton points, the ratio of Association deliveries to total ginnings conformed closely with that of the entire 17 counties as a whole, being 49.2 percent (Table 4) compared with 45.9 percent.

Association deliveries from the 86 points totaled 261,645 bales or 72 percent of the total baleage handled by the Association.

The 75 Southwestern receivers handled 257,235 bales or 70.7 percent of the total association receipts from the entire state. The 257,235 bales represented 80 percent of the total association receipts from the 17 Southwestern counties.
Table 5 shows the 86 points separated as to Eastern and Western Oklahoma.

In making comparisons between the receivers it will be necessary to eliminate the eleven from the Eastern side of the state as local conditions there are not comparable with the conditions in the West.

Bias in Comparing Receiving Agents.

It is apparent that equal effort applied in a like manner by the same receiving agent in different points or communities would show considerable variation in results when measured in bales of cotton handled, or in percent of cotton handled as to total ginnings. There are many local conditions and factors which make this true. Greater variations, however, will be found in the receivers themselves. By trying to determine these variables and then by noting the effects of these factors on Association deliveries, an attempt will be made to measure the successful receiving agent.

Owing to the multiplicity of factors and characteristics, and the difficulty of measuring such personal qualities as industry, personality, and ability to "get-a-long" with farmers together with the relatively small number of receivers (75) entering into this part
Table 5. Showing Comparison between Receivers in Eastern and Western Oklahoma. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Location of Receivers</th>
<th>Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Total Assn. Deliveries</th>
<th>Average Assn. De-Livery per Point</th>
<th>Percent Assn. De-Livery to Total Ginning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in Points or Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Western Oklahoma</td>
<td>522,864</td>
<td>257,235</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Eastern Oklahoma</td>
<td>42,545</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>565,409</td>
<td>261,645</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the study; no attempt will be made to measure the factors by statistical correlation. The summary tables will merely portray some of the things which seemingly have been advantageous to certain receivers or groups of receivers.

As previously stated the average percent of the total ginnings, in the 75 Southwestern towns, delivered to the Association was 49.2 percent.* In other words, these 75 receiving agents, as a group, handled 49.2 percent of the local ginnings. This mean percent will be used as a measure of relative success. In addition the average

(1) As of July 15, 1929 - Data from Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association.
* Ginning figures, by towns, were taken from Individual Ginners Reports on file with the State Corporation Commission, Cotton Division, State Capital, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
Association delivery for the group in question (class intervals of the tables) will be given. Thus a two way comparison will be shown.

Figure 5 graphically shows the relative success of the receiving agents when measured by the percent of ginnings handled. Even though selected, the group tends toward the normal curve.

**Balesage Handled by the Receivers.**

The amount of cotton handled by the 75 receivers ranged from 381 to 11,744 bales. The percent of total ginnings delivered to the Association by the receiver ranged from 18.9 to 98.8 percent.

Table 6 shows in summary form the receivers grouped and compared when sorted as to amount of cotton handled. Table 7 shows same data with wider class intervals. These data tend to show that the receivers who handled a larger number of bales also handled a larger percent of the total ginnings.
Table 6. 75 Local Receivers Grouped as to Bales of Cotton Handled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bales of Cotton Handled</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Number of Delivery per Receiver</th>
<th>Average Assn.</th>
<th>Delivery as to total Ginnings</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 to 2000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>-10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 to 3000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001 to 4000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001 to 5000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>+5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 to 6000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,406</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>+7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6001 to 7000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,633</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001 to 8000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,147</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8001 to 9000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,731</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>-20.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9001 to 10000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,212</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>+16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,206</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Comparison of 75 Receivers Grouped as to Bales of Cotton Handled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bales of Cotton Handled</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Delivery livery as per to total Ginnings</th>
<th>Weighted Average Assn. Average Delivery livery as per to total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001 to 6000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,446</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>+3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,420</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>+2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect of Number of Bales Ginned and Number of Gins in the Town upon the Efficiency of Local Receivers.

Table 8 shows the receivers grouped as to total ginnings in the towns. These data show that the receivers functioned with greatest efficiency when the ginnings were 6,000 to 9,000 bales. This group handled 53.4 percent of the cotton ginned. There was, however, only small variation in the extremes.

A more equitable comparison is to group them in reference to the number of gins present, as it is probable that it would take more effort to cover a greater number
Table 8. Efficiency of 75 Local Receivers Grouped as to Number of Bales Ginned in the Town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bales Ginned in the Town</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Average Delivery</th>
<th>Weighted Percent Deliveries to Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>+3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001 to 6000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6001 to 9000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>+4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9001 to 12000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12001 to 15000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,489</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of gins. Table 9 shows such a grouping. The striking feature of this table is the little difference or variation shown between the groups of receivers.

The drop from 49.1 percent deliveries for the 6 gin group to 45.8 percent for the 7, or over, group, is accounted for by the fact that in three of the cases the agent was also designated as receiver at inland gins a considerable distance from his home station.

The rather low percent for the 2 gin group (43.9) is no doubt explained in that a number of these receivers were old men.
Table 9. Comparison of Efficiency of 75 Receivers
Grouped as to Number of Gins in the Town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gins in Point</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Average Deliveries</th>
<th>Weighted Percent Deliveries to Total Ginnings</th>
<th>+ or - Total Mean</th>
<th>Average 49.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>+ 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>- 5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>+ 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>+ 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,910</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>- 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &amp; over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect of Age of the Receivers.

The age of the receivers ranged from 21 to 71 years. The average age was 47.7 years. Table 10 shows a sorting as to age. The three groups are nearly equal in size. The younger group handled the most cotton and a larger percent of the total ginnings, even so, there was but little variation in efficiency.
Table 10. Efficiency of 72 Receivers Grouped as to Age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Receivers</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Average Delivery Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Weighted Average Deliveries as to Assn.</th>
<th>Variation from Average Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 to 39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>+ 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>+ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 to 77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>- 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Association Affiliation.

Sixty-seven of the 75 receivers were bona fide members of the Association, 5 were non-members, while in 4 towns a local cooperative association held the receiving contract. These associations were two Farmers Union Elevators and two Independent Cooperative Associations maintaining elevators and feed stores. These cooperative associations have been successful as receivers, two have received for the association 4 years and two 9 years. One of them, in a non-cooperative gin town, handled 5,704 bales or 72.3 percent of all cotton ginned. As a group they received 53.3 percent of the ginnings - averaging 4,093 bales.
Table 11. Comparison of 67 Local Receivers Separated as to Years as Association Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Member of Association</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Average Assn. Deliveries</th>
<th>Percent Deliveries as to Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>+.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>+9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3,845</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3,585</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 5 non-members averaged 894 bales which was 33.2 percent of the cotton ginned. Non-members have usually made poor receivers.

Table 11 shows the success of 67 member-receivers separated as to the years of affiliation with the Association. The size of the groups are very unequal, and the low efficiency of the 4 to 6 year members, 40.5 percent, means but little. The table shows little or no advantage of old Association members over the new. The mere fact of the length of time as association member seemingly carries but little weight.

A more equitable comparison might be in length of time acting as receiving agents. Table 13 shows this in one year classes. There is no uniformity or graduation
Table 12. Efficiency of 75 Local Receivers Separated as to Number of Years so Acting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Receiver</th>
<th>Number Receivers</th>
<th>Average Assn. Deliveries</th>
<th>Percent Deliveries as to Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average Deliveries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,655</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,686</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>+7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>-16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the showings of this table - second year, fourth year and eighth year receivers were all above the average. It would be expected that a receiver would be more efficient the second year than in the first. The table shows this to be so. The most interesting feature is the turnover of receivers per year. During the last six years this turnover has averaged 14.6 percent. In 1927 the replacement was 22.6 percent. This shows that the receiver system has not reached a very stable point.
Occupation and Experience.

Of 71 receivers making answer 46 stated they were producers of cotton either actively or by hired labor or tenants. (Table 13). Separation as to growing cotton showed no advantage, in fact the non-producers were slightly more effective.

When the sorting was made as to farming experience, either past or present, widely different results were obtained. (Table 14). These data show that those receivers having no farming experience handled 39.7 percent of the ginnings while those with that experience handled 51.4 percent. Undoubtedly a man with farm experience has an advantage in dealing with farmers.

Of these 71 receivers, 42 owned land. The size of the holdings ranged from 10 to 2,500 acres, averaging 285 acres. A sorting as to ownership of land showed less than 1 percent advantage for land owners. This also tends to show that farming experience carries more weight than land ownership or cotton production.

Table 15 portrays the relative success of the 75 designated receiving agents based upon present occupations. The term professional denotes such occupations as banker, lawyer, real estate or insurance agent; while tradesmen denotes carpenters, contractors, plumbers and ginners.
Table 13. Success of 71 Local Receivers with Comparison Based on Growing of Cotton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Assn. Receivers</th>
<th>Average Deliveries</th>
<th>Percent of Assn. Deliveries to total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growing Cotton(2)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>-.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Growing Cotton</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>+.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. 71 Local Receivers Compared in Reference to Farm Experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Experience</th>
<th>Number of Deliveries</th>
<th>Average Deliveries</th>
<th>Percent of Assn. Deliveries to Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No farm Experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With past or present farm Experience</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The average cotton acreage was 136 acres, ranging from 10 to 1,020 acres.
Table 15. Comparing the Success of 75 Local Receivers on the Basis of Present Occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Average Assn. Deliveries</th>
<th>Percent Assn. Delivery as to Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average 49.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Farmers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3,964</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>+ 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>- 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradesmen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>- 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing gin or Elevator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>+ .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Dryman or Yardman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>+ 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Farmers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>+ 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>+ 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Coop. Associations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>+ 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,430</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receivers following the above occupations showed to a decided disadvantage. Active farmers as a large group were the most successful. The miscellaneous group embraced 3 young men all under 33 years in three of the larger ginning points. All three were outstanding. One, a county commissioner handled 78.8 percent of 5,843 bales ginned.
Another, a 23 year old University Law Student, living on father's farm, handled 66.1 percent of 8,815 bales ginned in a non-cooperative gin town. The other, age 33, had left the farm the previous cotton season, and was giving full time to the receivership. He handled 10,668 bales of cotton from 15 gins, seven of which were "inland", which was 52.9 percent of total ginnings. Every one of these 15 gins (3 being cooperative) cooperated with him to the extent of keeping a card index on each association customer, and filling out, and tagging the bale with a special association information tag. Also these 10,668 bales were hauled at gin expense to the compress where the receiver maintained office. As a rule this local receiver wrote out advance payment drafts and deposited them for the members. The banks kept a separate association ledger containing a record of drafts and directions (from the member) as to dispensation of receipts — i. e. as to deductions for landlord's share, rents, notes, etc. Duplicate deposit slips were then mailed to the members. In this manner 10,668 bales were handled without a single lost bale or draft even though the member never saw his cotton after it left his wagon or auto trailer "in the seed".

Service was given these members in a manner which made them feel that the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association
was not located in Oklahoma City - 200 miles away.
Similar service is given members in many of the delivery points in Western Oklahoma.

**Effect of the Presence of a Cooperative Gin in the Town.**

One or more farmers cooperative gins were located in 50 of the 75 points visited. Table 18 shows a comparison in association receipts from cooperative and non-cooperative gin towns.

This table shows only 6.7 percent difference (percent of deliveries as to total ginnings) between such points which is contrary to general belief. This table, however, should not be taken at face value. In several of the 25 non-cooperative gin points, local farmers cooperatives other than gins were in operation - also farmers stock gins (non-cooperative). The greatest factor, however, lies in the fact that the presence of cooperative gins in nearby towns together with the threat of building in the town aided the receivers in obtaining the good will and cooperation of the private gins. Also nothing succeeds like success and the fact that the Association was receiving so much cotton in other points quickly reflected results in these non-cooperative gin towns. Even so, these data do show conclusively that a live local
Table 16. Effect of the Presence of Farmers Cooperative Gins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Coop. gin</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Average Ginnings</th>
<th>Percent Assn. Delivery as to Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coop. gin in town</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>+ 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Coop. gin in town</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>- 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

receiver, in Western Oklahoma, can get cotton out of a non-cooperative gin point in no small amount.

**Effect of Place where Receiver Maintains His Office.**

Most of the receivers have found a necessity for a regular place of office during the delivery season. In the solution of this and many other problems, the receivers have used the trial and error method. No association policy has ever been formulated as to the why, where and how of this local office. In many cases the directors have advised receivers but even then the receivers have worked out their own local problem.
The question of an office is indeed pertinent. It should be noted that the receiver actually handles, tags, "bills-out" and writes advance payment drafts on each bale of cotton delivered to the Association. The three leading receivers in Oklahoma received and handled, collectively, more cotton in 1928-29 than was received by the State Associations in Arkansas, Louisiana, South Carolina, or Tennessee. The receipts of 8 receivers totaled more than any of the associations connected with the American Cotton Growers excepting the Texas Farm Bureau Association.

Table 17 shows the place of office with comparative results. It will be noted that the group maintaining office at railway or compress platform handled more bales and also were 4.2 percent above the average. Eight of this group had been successful in persuading the gins to deliver all Association cotton to the railway or compress at their own expense. Three of the eleven maintained office at the compress - eight at the railway dock. Three of the latter had erected small office buildings on the dock after having obtained a lease for the space from the railway companies.

Seven receivers had erected, purchased or rented an office building near the gins. This group handled 63.3 percent of the ginnings. It should be noted that
Table 17. Place of office of 75 Local Receivers with Comparative Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Office</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Average Delivery by Assn.</th>
<th>Total Delivery</th>
<th>Percent Assn. Delivery as to Total Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average 49.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railway or compress platform</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In gin office</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regular business houses</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own office or yard near gins</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>+14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In local coop. elevator, warehouse or cream station</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,901</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>+ 8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. Cotton Yard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

their office was separate and apart from regular gin offices. In all of these points the gins were delivering or association cotton to the railway/compress platform at no charge to members.
Mention has been made concerning four of the group of 6 where the receiving office was maintained in a local cooperative elevator, warehouse or cream station. This group handled 57.8 percent of the local ginnings. In every case the office was near the gins. (In Western Oklahoma the gins are usually closely grouped).

The receivers office was located in regular business houses in 24 towns. Previous data (Table 15) showed that 11 receivers were merchants. Obviously these men held office in their place of business as did the 4 professionally occupied receivers. Nine other receivers held office in regular business houses. This large group handled 42.6 percent of the cotton or 6.6 percent less than the average.

Two receivers were county cotton yard men who received association cotton on the yard. In both cases the members delivered their cotton to the yard. These men handled 37.7 percent of the cotton or 11.5 percent below the average. The average association delivery for the county in which these two points were located was 57.8 percent of the total ginnings.

Of the 75 receivers one-third or 25 had their office in a regular gin office. It is but natural for a receiver to accept such an offer from a ginner who is sympathetic
toward the Association, and particularly so if a large percent of the present association cotton is being ginned there. Eighteen other receivers said that they had, in the past, maintained office in with a ginner. The 25 receivers in question handled 45.1 percent of the total ginnings which was but 4.1 percent below the average.

Table 18 shows these 25 receivers further separated.

Table 18. Comparison of Success of 25 Local Receivers who Maintained Office in a Regular Gin Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Receiver in Regular Gin Office</th>
<th>Percent Assn. Office of Receivers Delivery as from Assn. to total Average Ginnings</th>
<th>Variation from Average 45.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No coop. gin in town</td>
<td>7 1,727 44.9</td>
<td>- .3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop. gin in town (office with coop. gin)</td>
<td>18 2,694 45.2</td>
<td>+ .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 or 3 gins in town (office with coop. gin)</td>
<td>9(3) 2,292 57.2</td>
<td>+12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5-6 gins in town (office with coop. gin)</td>
<td>9(3) 3,638 39.8</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For all 25 Receivers</td>
<td>25 2,417 45.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Separations of 18 receivers listed above.
These data show a very wide variation (17.4 percent) in the success of receivers having office in cooperative gins when sorted as to the number of gins in the town. The local receivers who maintained office with the gin were very successful in towns with 3 or less gins.

Nine local receivers with office in the cooperative gin and stationed in towns where there were 4, 5 or 6 gins, received only 39.9 percent of the ginnings while sixteen receivers stationed in cooperative gin points with 4, 5 or 6 gins but who did not maintain office in the cooperative gin handled 62 percent of the total ginnings.

These data show that it is certainly advisable for local receivers to maintain office independent of any gin (even though cooperative). This especially applies to delivery points in which a relatively small percent of the total ginnings is handled by a given gin.

There are two reasons for this. First, it is but natural for the gin managers to think that the local receiver is trying to pull ginning customers to the favored gin. Because of this they are hesitant in cooperating with the local receiver and in some cases may become hostile to the Association. Secondly, when the receiver who is independent (so far as office is concerned) tends to spend more time around each of the gins, in which case the gin managers work with him better.
It is an easy matter for any receiver to office in a cooperative gin and get most of the cotton out of that gin without much work or effort. Almost invariably receivers of this type "knocked" the private gins, while those agents who were actively working in all the gin yards said that the private ginners cooperated with them and in many cases advised their customers to deliver to the Association.

One receiver (in a cooperative gin point - 5 gins in town) said that two years previously he had maintained office in the newly built cooperative gin as he knew that most of the Association farmers would gin there. He stated, however, that early in the season he heard the other ginners were complaining that he and the Association were treating them unfairly, and especially so since they were friendly to the organization as proved by the fact that previous to the building of the cooperative gin, they were hauling all association cotton from their gins to the railway platform at an expense of 30¢ per bale. Because of this feeling on the part of the private ginners, the receiver stated that he built a small private office in the gin district.

During the 1928-29 season this agent received more than 75 percent of the cotton ginned. The cooperative gin handled nearly 4,500 bales or nearly double that of any private gin. This receiver was a member of the board of
directors of the farmers gin, however he stated that just to show the other ginners his personal appreciation for their cooperation in his Association work - he made it a rule to gin at least one bale of his own cotton at each of the private gins.

The truly successful local receivers have certainly found it advantageous to obtain the good will of all ginners in their towns.

**Extra Service Given Members.**

The Association marketing agreement stipulates that the member shall deliver his cotton to the Association at such railway or compress points as designated by the Association.

The contract between the Association and the local receiver states:

"The party of the second part shall: (a) receive all cotton in bales delivered to him ... for said Association by its members and shall, at his sole expense, safely keep and store said cotton as directed by said Association in a storage place or yard provided by him, etc., etc."

According to the terms of the contract the receiver is to maintain a yard to which the members deliver their cotton - and store it there until shipment is made.

This plan is very seldom followed in fact but 4 receivers interviewed maintained such yards and in these cases, compresses were "picking it up" by truck at the yard. This was made possible by a fight between independent and "line" compresses.
Mention has been made of the practice of the gins delivering the members cotton to the railway or compress platform. In one association district delivering 40,971 bales, it was reported that this method prevailed in all but two small towns. Several inland gins, both cooperative and private, were hauling association cotton to the railway at an expense of 40 to 75 cents per bale.

Other methods are followed in various towns:

(1) The members haul the cotton after ginning to the railway or county cotton yard (these yards are still common in a few of the south central counties) where the agent "receives" it and writes advance payment drafts.

(2) The receiver takes charge and tags the cotton at the gins. He then has it hauled to the railway platform or compress by the regular gin haulers and charges the drayage to the members. In one district in Western Oklahoma this procedure is quite uniformly followed. The members would rather pay 10 to 25 cents drayage than haul a bale.

(3) The local agent "receives" cotton at the gin and pays drayage. He does this in order to give the members service and to make it easy for them to deliver cotton to the Association. Some of these receivers have attempted to get the gins to stand the expense but failed, others have never made such attempts.
(4) On two points the members hauled their cotton to the county cotton yard. Later it was hauled by the yardman to the railway platform and the drayage charged to the members. Needless to say these towns were far below the average in the percent of ginnings delivered to the Association.

Data was obtained in 65 towns as to how the cotton was handled after being ginned. In 32 towns all or a part of the cotton was hauled at gin expense to the railway or compress dock. A total of 107,587 bales were thus hauled at an average expense of about 18.25 cents per bale. At least 125,000 bales of Association cotton were hauled by the gins in Western Oklahoma.

Twenty-three receivers handling an average of 4,821 bales reported that more than half of the Association cotton was hauled by the gins. From these points 54.6 percent of the ginnings went to the association.

The gins perform this service even though they are direct competitors of the Association.* There are a number of reasons why this is done, the more important being:

(1) The presence of the cooperative gins which are naturally very favorable to the Association.

(2) Where there are no cooperative gins there is the threat of building them and especially if the farmers become dissatisfied with the present gin service.

* Unpublished data on file in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Oklahoma A. & M. College conclusively show that
(3) The presence and activity of the local receivers.

(4) The State statute which defines cotton gins as public utilities there placing them under the jurisdiction of the Corporation Commission and thus bringing about a lawful uniform ginning rate. This condition reduces competition among gins to a competition of service.

(5) Because the Association has not entered into ginning of cotton.

Membership Solicitation by the Local Receivers.

The receiving agents procure most of the membership contracts even though the directors (with one exception) keep paid solicitors in the field all or a part of the time. Seventy-five receivers submitted data concerning this activity which is summarized in Table 19. In these data the number of days spent are days other than during the ginning season.

Some successful agents stated that they spent no time soliciting members even during the ginning season. They said that all the farmers in the community knew about the Association; that the best way to get new contracts was to give service to the present members and furthermore that voluntary members are usually loyal. Most of the receivers in 1928-29 the gins of Western Oklahoma bought 46.7 percent of the cotton produced.
however "worked" the gin yards diligently during the cotton season and made a definite attempt to contact every farmer who ginned in the town.

Table 19. Days spent Soliciting Members by 75 Local Receivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Spent Soliciting Members</th>
<th>Number of Receivers</th>
<th>Average Deliveries as from Assn. Deliveries to total Ginnings</th>
<th>Percent Assn. Deliveries</th>
<th>Variation from Average 49.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No time spent</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10 days</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 days and over</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,435</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>+3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consensus of their opinion was that it didn't pay to spend much time in the field. Most of their summer field work consisted only of seeing and talking to prospects with no attempt to sign contracts. The time to do that was during the ginning season.

The receiving agents were also asked as to what percentage of the new members were voluntary signers. Although the term, voluntary, is indefinite, they reported that out of 9,058 members signed, 5,469 or 60.4 percent came to them at the gins or office wishing to sign contracts.
This certainly shows that, during the season 1928-29, the Association had the confidence of the farmers of Western Oklahoma. Many of these voluntary signers had been approached at other times.

Figure 6 graphically shows the truly marked correlation between ginnings, deliveries, and membership contracts signed. These data are shown in a time series on the percentage basis.

This graph portrays one of the greatest assets of the local receiver system, namely, that there is a definitely located, well-known representative of the Association present in every shipping point during this important period - not only present but giving a special service to the members.

The foregoing charts, graphs and discussion have not fully portrayed that which makes a successful local receiver but rather shows what the more successful receivers do and how they do it. The measure of a successful local receiver entails other factors.
The Measure of the Receiver.

1. Office or business proficiency:

It is absolutely essential that the receiver, first of all, is efficient in the mechanical and clerical duties of handling cotton and that he closely follows the rules of procedure laid down by the office. It is imperative that the records and reports are accurately kept, and promptly submitted. All central office orders and requests must be carried out if the association is to function smoothly and efficiently.

2. Knowledge of the Association:

A receiver must be well informed on all phases of the Association, and must have a knowledge of the business set-up of the organization. He must thoroughly understand the principles of cooperative marketing and realize its possibilities and its limitations.

While it cannot be said that the individual receiver knowing the most about the Association is the most successful, it stands to reason that the more he knows about the organization, the better will it be represented.

3. Cooperation with Local Bankers:

The local representatives of the Association realize the value of friendly bankers. Many of the receivers said that it was easy to get cotton after the bankers in their towns lined up for the organization.
Furthermore, it is imperative that the receiving agents work in harmony with the bankers from a business standpoint. It is their duty to do everything possible to speak up the local association business transactions and to see that bills of lading and drafts are cleared through the banks promptly. This can only be done by cooperation between the bankers and the receivers.

4. Cooperation with the Railways:

The actual billing out and shipping of cotton, in itself, justifies the maintenance of a local representative in points where association deliveries are relatively large. Most of the freight agents, especially in Southwestern Oklahoma, are friendly to the Association. This is natural because as a rule the shipment of association cotton means less work to them than shipment of buyer's or gin cotton.

In certain points the railways are cooperating with the receivers, even going so far as to enlarge the cotton platforms and build small offices on them for the receiver as at Erick and Roosevelt. Such concessions from the railways certainly necessitate prolonged effort on the part of the receiver.

At other points shipping facilities are entirely inadequate and demand improvement. The receiver must have help of the Association in putting their case before the railway officials.
5. Cooperation with Ginners:

The major objective of the local receiver is to get as much cotton as possible for the Association and in order to do this he must endeavor to get the cooperation and good will of all ginners in the town.

It has been very fortunate for the Association that the Farmers Union has built gins in Oklahoma, and that there are now more than 100 cooperative gins running at capacity in the state. Likewise it has been fortunate for the Farmers Union that the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association is in existence. Furthermore, it is very fortunate for both organizations that the Association has kept within the realm of marketing cotton and that only. The time is near at hand, however, when there must be a closer tie-up between the Association and cooperative gins.

It is surprising how, as a rule, the local receivers have realized the value of cooperating with all ginners. The most successful receivers are the ones who are cooperating with all the ginners in their communities, and who are getting the ginners to cooperate with the Association.

It is significant to again state that at least 125,000 bales of Association cotton was delivered to the railway dock or compress platform at gin expense. This practice of course is not possible in every town. However, by proper manipulation, it could be utilized in many other
points. The receivers should keep in mind that, what one gin will do for the association members, the competing local gins will do likewise.

Besides delivering cotton, the ginners can be of great service in filling out scale tickets with information needed in completing association records.

6. **Cooperation with Civic and Local Organizations:**

While not imperative, this will help indirectly in selling the association to the business men of the locality and thereby increasing membership and deliveries. This is more important in the eastern part of the state where the cotton buyer is usually one of the community leaders. The local receiver should attain local prominence as a business agent.

7. **Knowledge of Cotton.**

The management of the Association, seeing the need of this, made considerable effort to have the receivers attend the 1929 A. & M. College Summer Cotton School held in the Association Building at Oklahoma City.

In competing with local buyers, it is important that the receivers know something of the grade and staple of cotton. This is specially true since the creation of the daily pool which gives members privilege of calling cotton on the date of delivery to the Association.
8. Baleage Received:

The goal toward which receivers are working is the delivery of all the cotton ginned in their towns. Local and sectional conditions are such that a given effort will not produce the same results in different localities. One measure of success, however, is the percentage of total cotton ginned which is shipped to the association.

9. Attitude of Member toward the Receiver and Service Given Members:

The receiver is the contact man of the Association. He must of necessity work harmoniously with the local members. The management is duty bound to see that the receivers are satisfactory to the members.

The association has no field service other than that given by the receivers, therefore the service work with the membership must be continuous throughout the year.

10. Personality and Industry:

Considerable data has been given concerning age, occupation, place of office, and other factors. There is one quality, however, which is far more important, namely, personality and the ability "to get along" with people - especially with farmers. The duties of a local receiver are such that he must be a combined salesman and "trouble-shooter", which necessitates resourcefulness. Above all else the receiving agent must be industrious and must possess a will to do.
DISCUSSION AND CRITICISM OF THE LOCAL RECEIVER SYSTEM.

The above has given a rather general picture of the Local Receiver System and how it functions in various local points. Again it should be noted that most of the agents studied were located in the strongholds of the Association.

During the season 1928-29 cotton was received by the Association from approximately 360 towns. Table 20 shows these shipping points grouped as to the number of bales delivered.

Not Adapted to all Conditions.

The compensation of local receivers is based on a uniform commission of 40 cents per bale. Evidently it would be difficult to get well qualified agents, in the shipping points with small association delivery, who would be willing to spend the time and energy necessary to bring about increased receipts.

The greatest weakness of the local receiver system, as it now functions, is that it can and will operate successfully only where the Association is relatively strong and where present deliveries are large enough to attract a capable man. This weakness is more pronounced
Table 20. 360 Receiving-points Grouped as to Bales of Cotton Shipped to the Association. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bales Shipped</th>
<th>Number of Towns</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 100</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 500</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 - 500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 - 2500</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501 - 5000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 - 7500</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 7500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in Eastern Oklahoma where local conditions are such that it is very difficult to get new members.

Analysis shows that the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association has followed the lines of least resistance and has spent its energy in developing the more favorable sections of the state. This is a very effective method to increase business and perhaps should not be condemned as a policy until the organization had maintained a volume of business requisite to economical operation.

A long time viewpoint will show that progress under this procedure is limited. The time has come when the management should seriously consider ways and means to develop the "weaker" sections of the state.

(1) Data from Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association.
A Lack of Uniformity.

There is little uniformity in the manner in which the local receivers function. Even though local conditions are such that duties and procedure must be elastic, standardization and uniformity should be followed as far as expediency will allow.

Thus far the individual receiver has been placed almost entirely upon his own resources. Such a course of action has allowed local men knowing local conditions to work unhampered and perhaps no other procedure would have brought about such notable results. These successful and resourceful local agents have been and are the very strength of the organization.

At present it is difficult to remove all inefficient local receivers and replace them with more promising timber - also it is difficult to properly supervise and advise those receivers who have the latent possibilities of success. This especially applies to the districts of large area.

There is no established Association policy as to the method of selecting qualified agents or in the manner of appointment - neither is there any defined policy as to retention and replacement. The fact that as the receivership at a given town, (because of increased deliveries),
carries with it a greater visible money reward for services, tends to complicate the situation at practically every point of large deliveries within the state, more or less pressure was put upon the directors to make replacement. The directors are to be commended on the way they met the issue, as only seven replacements were made in points of large deliveries during 1929.

Certainly the establishment of an Association policy — not policy of separate directors, would make it much easier for a director to handle and pass on these applications without much probability of creating personal antagonism in the local points. The director is elected annually.

There are some who maintain that the receiver should be elected annually by the local members. In a few points elections were called by the directors to settle the receivership. In other points changes were made upon the numerical basis of petitions.

**Election of Receivers.**

The strongest argument in favor of the policy of selecting the local receivers by means of annual elections is that such procedure will delegate a specific function to the local membership. This is indeed weighty argument for the reason hitherto set forth that the greatest weakness of a centralized cooperative association is the lack of
local membership activity. The mere election of a receiving agent certainly will not revive and maintain a definite local organization nor should any attempt be made to build up a local around this or similar functions. However, it would give all members a voice in a strictly local affair.

Another angle is that election of the receiver would tend to relieve the director of a duty which might cause local opposition toward him - an elective officer. Along the same line it would tend to curb the danger of the director building up a political machine.

The present system is impregnated with this political danger in that the director, annually elected, has absolute power of removal and appointment of paid representatives in every shipping point within his district. Not only does this embrace the incumbent but any opponent with a distorted vision of cooperation (by promises of receivership appointments) could carry on a campaign which would be very injurious to membership morale and if elected he could cause irreparable damage.

The present directors of the association have been in office for extended terms - and so long as they remain in office, little danger of abuse of authority exists. They have created the system and work under a "code" or agreement which is very worthy. The greatest question is
would newly elected directors fit into such a system without abuse of power or would an incoming director, elected on a platform of reform, be content to go slow in making appointments until he really understood the receiver system and had carefully consulted local opinion and investigated the receivers as to their proficiency.

There is however some important and convincing argument against this method of selecting receivers. Investigation of election at one point where deliveries approximated 5,000 bales showed that all candidates considered the appointment from a monetary viewpoint. There was considerable local feeling that the winning candidate was elected because of ability to split the vote of his leading opponent.

It is thus contended that a local annual election might tend to create a serious disturbance in the membership.

From previous discussion it has been pointed out that the services of the receiver are more than merely handling and shipping cotton. The system capable of the maximum efficiency will function only when the machinery will tend toward permanent retention of the successful receivers and replacement of the unsuccessful. It can be well questioned if the local members, as a voting body, would supply such machinery.

It is apparent that a receiver might be very satisfactory to the local membership and still be an inefficient
agent. He might be congenial and likable and might give satisfactory service to the present membership — and still be lacking in the necessary industry and initiative that is necessary to obtain new members. Such a receiver would be hard to remove by local vote of the membership. The average director would also hesitate to make such a replacement. Such cases show the need of some kind of central office machinery capable of measuring and rating the various agents.

There are many weaknesses and dangers in the present machinery which controls and governs the receiving agents. This fact, however, does not warrant the advocacy of setting up an entirely new machine.

Field service has been greatly decentralized — with more and more emphasis placed upon district organization vested in the separate directors. This system though imperfect has produced results and is now in successful operation in the western side of the state.

A Suggested District Board.

In view of these conditions it might be more advantageous to modify the present system rather than set up a new and separate supervisory organization centered in the Director of Field Service.
The writer is of the opinion that the decentralization of the field service and membership contact from the central office to a district basis is a step toward progress and harmony, however it is questionable if it should be centered entirely in the director.

It is suggested that District Boards should be set up in order to effectively allocate this decentralized power and function. Such a board of 5 or 7 members could be elected by the membership in the district conventions or by ballot at the time of regular election of directors.

This board could resolve itself into an official body with the director at set intervals of time - and pass upon the selection of local receivers, the problems of local membership relations and other problems pertaining to the district. In the event of local dissention the board could meet at call of the director or upon a representative petition of members in the community in question. Such a board could also be of great benefit in taking back to the membership the policies and rulings of the Central Board of Directors. In addition it would act as a training place for the future directorate of the Association and should eliminate the possibility of directors building up political machines.
Definition of Field Service Duties of Local Receivers.

There is need of a clearer understanding as to the field service duties of the local receivers. Their present status in this respect is indeed vague. The greatest difficulty in concisely setting forth these duties arises from the fact that there is great variation in the amount of money these agents receive from the Association. Even so the Association is certainly not utilizing these agents to the fullest extent of their possibilities.

The field service and membership relations status has two demands. One, the demands of the receiver to the Association; the other, the demands and obligations of the central office to the receiver. The receiving agent should so work as to carry information from the members to the central office and visa versa. In the Oklahoma Association it is easier for information, ideas and attitudes to go from member to the central organization than for unbiased information to travel from the central organization outward to the members.

No house organ can explain matters in sufficient clearness or detail to satisfy the average farmer. There is much the local receiver could and should do toward disseminating accurate information to the members. Seemingly the tie-up between these agents and the central office has
never been very complete. The more active receivers have made an effort to always keep informed about the Association and its activities, however some have not.

The conference of the local receivers held in connection with the A. & M. College Summer Cotton School was indeed commendable; likewise the effort made by directors and management to get a large attendance of receivers in the Cotton School. Forty-two local receivers were enrolled in this Cotton School during July, 1929, and thirty-eight of them received diplomas signifying completion of the work in cotton classing.
CONCERNING THE DIRECTORATE AND ASSOCIATION

GOVERNMENT.

Previous reference has been made concerning the "three-way-function" of directors in the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association. Discussion has been given concerning the relationship of the directors to the local receivers and the membership under the present plan of operation.

It has been generally accepted that the board of directors of a business organization, and especially a cooperative organization, should act only as a body which decides upon and determines the general policies of the organization.

Experience has shown that sooner or later trouble develops when directors hold other salaried positions or receive remuneration either directly or indirectly from the association. Sometimes this trouble is well founded being based on sharp practices entered into by directors to increase their compensation or to keep up political fences in order to remain in office; other times the trouble is only imaginary. However, it is indeed hard to disprove or refute charges that the director in question, voted thus and so because of the effect, such a ruling or policy would make in his remuneration.
Because of this condition many honest and well meaning officials have been falsely accused also directors are often prone to vote against meritorious measures because they are afraid some members might think they so voted because of their monetary connection with the organization.

Unquestionably the ideal director is a man of wide experience and sound judgment - who is in no way dependent upon his position with the organization for a livelihood. The greatest danger in allowing the directorate to carry with it a monetary consideration is that sooner or later the quality of the directorate will depreciate. Woe unto the organization and especially a widely flung centralized cooperative association with a decadent directorship.

The directorate and government of the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association presents another general problem.

A cooperative association has often been likened unto a democratic form of government - being termed a democracy in the business activities of farmers. This parallel with democratic government is pronounced and is note worthy. "Cooperative or group effort in government, why not cooperative business?" The appeal and logic of such a slogan is irrefutable.

The executive branch of our government has a two fold emphasis or check regarding representation, namely,
geographical units (the states) and the general population. The Senate was so created as to allow parity among those colonies or states making up the union. At the present time the Senate tends to represent the nation as to geography while the House of Representatives tends to represent the nation as to distribution of population. As the difference between the political parties become less pronounced, this tendency becomes emphasized. Without the Senate agriculture (as a group) would be entirely at the mercy of the manufacturing and industrial groups. Industry carries with it the preponderancy of population; agriculture the majority of states.

Abolish party organization and activity which strives to control both chambers of our legislative department; give either Agriculture or Industry a great balance of power in both houses, and the other group will suffer; give one group a pronounced geographical advantage (Senate) and the other a pronounced advantage in population (House) and legislation would be blocked or passed only upon compromise.

Oklahoma as a state has little homogeneity. When considering cotton it quickly divides itself east and west. These areas are distinctively diverse in matters of productive methods and costs, land valuation, credit methods and demands, marketing habits and conditions, type
of farmer, percent of tenancy, insect pests, etc.

Without further elaboration it is perhaps pertinent to note that in 44 counties of Eastern Oklahoma 90.3 percent of the cotton crop is purchased by the gins of which approximately 50 percent of the total crop is bought "in the seed". The farmers of this section are predominated by a vicious ginner-banker-credit merchant combine. Western Oklahoma presents a different picture.

The Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association is therefore made up of two divergent groups of farmers - two distinct geographical areas.

The initial districting of the Association was mainly on basis of counties or geography. Production of cotton has shifted westward. The westward shift of the balance of power or distribution of the directorate has been even more pronounced. Western Oklahoma in 1938-39 produced approximately 65 percent of the cotton of the state. Yet the Association received about 94 percent of its receipts from the 7 western districts. If there was a re-districting strictly as to membership the west would gain another director at the expense of the east - 8 versus 2.

Representation in the directorate of the Association is based upon membership, furthermore the directorate is composed of men who also act as district managers and supervisors which condition intensifies their interests upon their respective districts. It is but natural that
these directors think in terms of "my district" when considering, deciding upon or formulating policies pertaining to the association. It is but inevitable that the individual director will tend to lose his perspective of the Association as a whole. Thus with a division of seven districts (and directors) with similar problems and conditions against three other districts (or directors) more or less unified, policies will be promulgated which will favor the major division and especially so when this major division (western) covers even less geographical area than the minor (eastern).

The Oklahoma Association at present clearly portrays the weakness of a large-scale centralized cooperative association embracing specific membership groups or areas having different relative advantage in participation, such advantage being either natural or acquired. In this case the weakness has been intensified because of the nature of the directorate. From an analytical viewpoint the Association (viewed as a Statewide organization) needs a check in representation as to geography; that is, if it is to continue as an active statewide institution.

This check must be either in form of numerical representation on the board of directors or else in the viewpoint and perspective of the directors which under the present mode of operation seems very improbable.
Unless there is some check or change of policy or unless given an outside stimulus from the Federal Farm Board, the Oklahoma Association will become virtually a Southwest Oklahoma Association - if not actually so, through cleavage at the expiration of the present membership contract.

The creation of such a regional organization would in many ways be desirable. The area covered and the membership thereof would be homogeneous. Owing to the density of membership and the large percentage of the total crop which would be handled, the handling charges and overhead expenses could be reduced.

If such a division did take place the east side would be in a confusing situation and unless given much help by the Federal Farm Board and by the State agencies cooperative marketing of cotton would undoubtedly be abandoned.

The question or problem before the membership and directorate is whether or not they desire to continue the policy of applying little concerted effort in Eastern Oklahoma. The local receiver system is very successful in the western part of the state and with directors (as supervisors) covering but small districts, the field service is adequate. The system, however, will not be successful in eastern Oklahoma unless modified. The writer
is of the opinion that in order to make advances in this section the Association must:

1. Enter into some plan which will break down the gin "combine" and establish farmer-owned gins.

2. Place salaried local agents or receivers in selected points and let the advance be made out from these points - first concentrating effort in these given places.

3. Modify the field service so as to give more adequate supervision and contact. (A system which allows the same supervision in a two-county district as in one of 20 counties is indeed inadequate and unfair).

4. Actively enter into a drive to change the marketing habit of selling "in the seed". The Extension forces of the State should and must be enlisted in this effort, also the Federal Farm Board could give valuable aid.

There is something amiss in the centralized cooperative pattern which allows widely flung organizations to be governed and managed on the basis of districts apportioned entirely on the membership contained therein with no appreciation as to area. Eventually some scheme must be evolved which will give some weight to areas and groups or else such organizations must be broken into smaller, more homogeneous units.
SUMMARY.

The cooperative wave of the previous decade in so far as the cotton belt is concerned, started before the crash in cotton prices in the year 1920. The "Oklahoma plan" was written and passed on by the farmers of the state while cotton prices were still at a peak. The successful drive for members, however, was conducted in the midst of the debacle.

The Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association has been the outstanding organization among the cooperatives connected with the American Cotton Growers Exchange either when measured in membership, volume of business, or in the percentage of cotton handled as to total state production. This success has been more pronounced under the second contract period beginning with the crop of 1927.

The Oklahoma organization structurally differs from the other associations in the policy of neutrality to general farm organizations, subsidiary activities, functions of the directors, and in the plan of field service.

These, together with a number of other factors and conditions, have seemingly brought about the success which is very pronounced in the southwestern part of the state. The local receivers have undoubtedly played an important part in this success.
The local receiver system has evolved from a very inauspicious beginning in the initial year of association activity to one of the main cogs in the machinery of the organization. The orthodox field service pattern of the cotton cooperatives has been completely abandoned and the local receivers together with the Directors comprise the contact machinery.

The local receiver system centers around the directors acting as district managers to a greater degree, than around the Field Service Department of the central office.

The truly successful receiving agent must understand the set-up of the organization he represents and must believe in the theory and practices of cooperation. A young or middle-aged man who has had farming experience with enough education to keep office records, is ideally fitted for the position. He should maintain his office independent of a gin preferably near the gin yards or on or near the railway or compress dock - depending upon local marketing habits and the amount of cooperation received from the ginners. He should know about cotton and cotton marketing. Above all a pleasant personality is desirable.

The receiver has both direct and indirect relations with the members. Directly, he is the contact between the members and the central office and in this capacity performs numerous services - direct services. Through
his activity and dealings with the local ginners, bankers, merchants, railway officials and the civic organizations, he indirectly affects membership relations.

The membership of any Cooperative Association must feel a high degree of ownership and interest in the organization before successful operation can be expected. How to obtain this desired relationship is one of the greatest problems facing associations of the centralized type.

It is usually considered that the most logical way to create and hold the interest of the individual in a cooperative organization is by actually engaging that person in the work of the association. The local receiver of the Oklahoma Cotton Growers Association, however, is tying the membership to the Association by performing a definite personal service for each member.
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