

# Better Organization

## NEEDED AMONG BEE-KEEPERS.

Two articles in this issue of *The Review*, those of Messrs. Case and Marks, touch upon the matter of organization, and what it may accomplish. The topic is not a new one. Beekeepers have long recognized the necessity for better and more thorough organization. It has long been deplored that the North American is not a representative body, and many are the schemes that have been devised for bringing about this most devoutly to be wished for consummation, but so far they have come to naught. The sending of delegates from the county societies to the state societies, and from the states to the North American is not possible on account of the expense. Perhaps the expense would be borne if there were sufficient incentive, such, for instance, as there is in politics. But political organizations are conducted on a different basis, and with different ends in view than is the case with agricultural organizations. The half a dozen or dozen members of a county society do not feel like going down into their individual pockets and paying \$1.00 each to send one of their members to the meeting of the state society. There is a feeling that the delegate is a favored man (and he is) that he is going to the state meeting at their expense, and that no benefit will come to them from his attendance. And there would be no direct benefit. A prosperous and powerful state organization of beekeepers is a benefit to the beekeepers of that state, and a national organization of this character is a national benefit, and a local beekeeper who helps to build up a local society that sends its delegate to the state society that in its turn contributes to the prosperity of a national organization, indirectly receives a benefit for the money and time so spent; but said benefits seem so far away in the dim and misty future, while the hard earned dollar resting so snugly in the pocket seems too near and tangible to be parted with. Having the local societies auxiliary to state societies, and the latter auxiliary to the North American is the plan that has always been proposed, and always failed—failed, I think, for the reason that I have given. Except in an indirect way the North American has nothing to give in return for the support that might come from the state societies, and the latter have nothing

to give in return to local societies for sending delegates. In mutual insurance companies, and other similar orders, each "lodge" is dependent on the others, and all upon the grand "lodge" for existence; there is a direct, tangible motive for the building up of other "lodges," and a general support of the "order." There is a certain amount of selfishness in human nature that must be recognized in all successful attempts at organization. A man does not use his money, time and influence in perfecting and building up an organization, unless there is at least a hope that he may reap some reward. One reason why the Bee Keepers' Union has met with the success that it has, is because each member is privileged to call for help should he at any time suffer persecution. It is true that this was not only motive. Professional pride, sympathy for a brother in trouble, a natural resentment against persecution, and acknowledge that such an organization would work to the good of bee-keeping in general, all had their weight, but would not have been sufficient in many instances. There was needed a personal, selfish interest.

The primary object of apicultural conventions is supposed to be that of discussing subjects pertaining to bee-keeping with a view to improvement. So thoroughly have the journals done their work, that, especially with leading bee-keepers, this motive for meeting is not a very strong one. The leading motive now is the social feature—to see the "boys" and have a good time.

To bring about a strong, efficient national organization of bee-keepers, every possible obstacle and cost should be removed, and every possible motive appealed to as an inducement for giving it support. For these reasons I think it would be better if the North American and the Bee-Keepers' Union were merged into one society. As it now is the members and officers of the Union never hold any meetings. All discussions are made either in the journals or by mail, and all voting is done by mail. To the plan of voting by mail, I see no objections, but I do think it would be an advantage if the officers and leading members, or as many as wish to attend, could meet in convention once a year and discuss ways and means face to face. When there was a change made in its constitution three years ago, the subject was first discussed in the jour-