

BULLETIN ROOM
LIBRARY, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Library
SEP 21 1976
ST. PAUL CAMPUS LIBRARIES

Supplement to the 1938 ⁽⁴⁾ *Misc* ⁽⁵⁾
Agricultural Extension Conference

Complete speeches given by:

Director Paul E. Miller

Dr. A. A. Dowell

Edmund deS. Brunner

Miss Minnie Price

J. W. Burch

Published in furtherance of Agricultural Extension Acts
of May 8 and June 30, 1914, P. E. Miller, Director,
Agricultural Extension Division, Department of Agriculture,
University of Minnesota, Cooperating with U. S.
Department of Agriculture. ⁽¹⁾

This archival publication may not reflect current scientific knowledge or recommendations.
Current information available from University of Minnesota Extension: <http://www.extension.umn.edu>.

In the Development of a Farm and Home Program,
What Outstanding Problems Confront the
Agricultural Extension Service in Minnesota?

Paul E. Miller

To accurately predict the major problems that Extension must face during the coming years, calls for a greater degree of prophecy than most of us are capable of in a time when changes are both rapid and profound. If 25 years ago we had ventured to predict the present agricultural situation, few of us would have foreseen the trend that has taken place. This is not the time to appraise the part that we have had in this picture or the contribution that Extension has made. We do know that during these 25 years the Agricultural Extension Service has come to be a necessary organization in almost every rural county in America. The county office is the accepted nucleus around which rural programs are being developed, and our leadership, although much of it is unofficial in nature, has had a vital influence upon the welfare of rural people.

That changes will come in the future we can take for granted. That we may make wise contributions to those changes is both our opportunity and our obligation. We cannot live on our record of past years nor accept programs that were ample then as the pattern of the future.

PURPOSE

Our primary objective has been to put a sound economic base under the farm business, with the purpose of building a more secure and satisfying rural life. We have land, resources, and people capable of supporting a high type of commercial agriculture. Because much of our product is sold outside the boundaries of our state, and must enter into interstate and world competition for markets, the welfare of the Minnesota farmer is vitally influenced by the ability of consumers in other areas and in other hands to buy food products at prices that will allow a fair return to our producers.

PROBLEMS

Farm Income

Thus one of the foremost problems we will continue to face is that basic factor of farm income. A more complete knowledge by farm people of the factors that make up and influence farm income and purchasing power of consumers would do much to make for greater stability and security in the farm business. The situations of rising tenancy and increasing mortgage indebtedness are a result of our failure to understand basic economic factors that largely determine farm income. This type of information and education effectively used and widely understood by farm people would do much to prevent a repetition in the future of the disastrous conditions that have occurred in the past two decades. I doubt if there is any greater service we can render than to assist farmers to thoroughly understand the income possibilities of their business, the conditions that effect that income, what may reasonably be expected over a period of years and to base their plans and long-term commitments on the income that may be expected. Our economists and farm management specialists have an opportunity to orient our entire Extension program in this direction, and to bring greater security to farm people. I would consider this to be a major problem of the future. It is the type of educational work that should engage our best effort.

Production and Marketing

Profound development has taken place in the field of production and marketing. The engineer has mechanized agriculture; the plant breeder is rapidly taking the hazards out of crop production; the geneticist is opening up new vistas in livestock

production. Sanitation and disease control are eliminating hazards that in the past caused great losses and economic waste of farm products. Soil management and better land-use are safeguarding the fertility of our soils. Extension workers have been criticized by some groups in the past for too great interest and effort to bring the benefits of science to the farmer and assist him to effectively use them in his business. We know that if he is to stay on the land he must be able to keep pace with modern progress in production. We will continue to direct much effort in this direction and it will be demanded by Minnesota farmers. We can with reasonable assurance assume that there will be more rather than less of this type of Extension work.

The same situation is true in the field of marketing. Minnesota long was the pioneer in the field of cooperative marketing. For many years it led all states in number of producers using the cooperative method to market farm products. More recently the same instrument has been used to purchase farm supplies. Today Minnesota stands second in volume and number of cooperators. The need for sound management is greater than ever before. The educational job is not completed. The Extension Service should be the agency to furnish disinterested technical advice to farm people in developing the most efficient and useful types of cooperatives.

The years ahead of us will also witness a more determined effort to produce and market farm products of high quality. Competition will force this action. While Extension has incorporated this type of educational effort in all of its programs in the past, the time is here when producers must make the marketing of high quality products a reality if we are to hold our markets. Already various producer groups are asking for specialists in this type of work.

A Broader Base of Extension Influence

A problem that I would especially call to our attention is the necessity of developing a broader base of Extension influence. In every county a limited number of farm people avail themselves of the benefits of Extension work in all possible ways. A larger number have more limited contacts and great numbers no contact at all, or if so, in a very indirect way. Year after year the same faces appear at planning meetings, accept committee assignments, and are counted on for leadership work. A Washington supervisor recently told me that the same people with almost no change were still making up the personnel of program planning sessions each year that were doing the work years ago when he was agent in the county. I assume this is not the case or at least not in the same degree in our state. It is, however, a serious problem and one to which we must address much of our thought and attention. Any organization that fails to attract new leadership, develop enlarging spheres of influence and a constantly increasing number of people who use its services, is standing still and that can only result in retrogression. We must analyze our objectives, examine our techniques, and develop ways and means of reaching in an effective manner more and more farm people.

I was interested in reading a specialist's trip report recently in which she states that "one interesting feature was the fact that 26 of the 41 leaders called in for an organization meeting had never acted as leaders, and 11 of them had never been in any Extension work." Here is an example of attracting new leadership and new cooperators that should mean much for that particular Extension project, and what is more important, will bring the personal gains and benefits of Extension work to more people in that county.

I would like to set up as one of our definite goals in the years ahead of us this objective of developing new leadership and a broadening of the influence of Extension work among greater numbers of rural people.

Coordination With Other Agencies

During the early years of Extension work we had the field very largely to ourselves. This is not the case at the present time. Paralleling Extension work in almost every county are several other programs, both educational and administrative. While it is assumed that there is ample work for all of them and that they may be more or less permanent, it does mean that in the public interest, coordination, elimination of duplicated effort, and more uniform administration will be demanded. Extension has both an opportunity and a challenge to develop the necessary leadership and give the required direction to a more effective coordination of effort. We have long been in the field; we understand the problems of rural people; we have developed successful organization methods and should be in a position to make a worth-while contribution to this needed adjustment. If we cannot measure up to this task, other agencies will do the job and no longer will Extension maintain its strategic position. This is a major problem that Extension will face during the immediate future and one that will require our best thought and action.

Personnel Training

The duties and responsibilities of Extension workers have changed rapidly during recent years. The problems and responsibilities have grown apace. Well balanced, well poised, and thoroughly trained men and women are required for successful Extension work. In no profession is it more necessary to keep educationally as well as physically fit as it is in Extension. The agent or specialist who loses step with educational progress in his field soon becomes ineffective.

Public school administrators have long required people in the teaching profession to attend summer school sessions, take additional professional training, and are constantly stepping up the requirements for entering the teaching field. I wonder if we will not have to come to some similar program for workers in our field. It may be that the time is here when we will require more than a minimum of 4 years of college training for entering the Extension field. The whole question of personnel selection, training and improvement on the job, with constantly rising standards of professional qualifications is a problem that will demand and must receive more attention in the future than it has in the past.

The New Tools of Education

The demonstration type of teaching has been traditional in agricultural extension work. Farmer meetings addressed by specialists or agents have been a standard method of procedure in reaching farm people. They will continue to be effective teaching methods as they are adapted to new methods of Extension organization.

At the same time we must learn to use the new types of educational technique and fully explore their possibilities for advancing our programs. Chief among these are the radio, and the various types of visual educational aids. Rapid progress is being made in this field and during the year we have seen some splendid examples of these techniques. The entire staff will have to give this phase of our work careful study and make it a reality if we are to improve our teaching methods.

The problem of reaching more people already referred to can only be done by using more of our time to train local leaders who in turn will carry on with community groups. The club people and home demonstration folks are ahead of the rest of us in this regard. This is a problem for us to face and find the correct solution.

Extension work is educational work. We must be alert to keep our tried and proved methods up to date, to learn to use new methods as they are developed and to analyze our form of organization to make possible the most effective type of educational work. The discussion method has received much attention by the speakers at this conference. It presents almost unlimited possibilities for effective use in our service.

Measurement of Results

The time is here when we must develop methods of sampling and testing the effectiveness of our work. Only in this manner can we accurately measure progress. The Washington office has recently added a specialist in this field and we hope to profit from his advice and counsel in this phase of our work. Projects and programs must be set up on the basis of surveys giving accurate data and conditions existing at the start of a given piece of work. As progress is made we should be able to look back and see the results of our efforts. We have made a small beginning in this field and will continue to study this important problem. While the beginning has been made in the state office, we can and should develop methods of measuring the results that Extension work has achieved and the influence that it has had in the communities, both in the lives of people and the things they work with. If we can look into the future with any degree of certainty we can be sure that any agency that will continue to live must render definite services. Those services cannot be assumed or taken for granted. They must be self-evident and capable of measurement. Numbers participating, letters written, meetings held, etc., are poor criteria of accomplishment. They will not be accepted in the future as proof of our worth or as standards of measurements.

The Larger Objectives

The problems thus far briefly discussed are after all minor in their relationship to the large problem of keeping our organization and our effort geared to the larger objectives of Extension work. Our end result is farm family living that as nearly as possible represents our ideal of country life. Family living includes the home, the farm enterprise, and most important, the people living in the home. Our programs touch all of those activities that go into farm family living. Club work, Rural Youth, and home demonstration work have the opportunity to develop farm people and bring about desirable changes in people themselves. After all these are among our highest purposes.

The coordination of all our efforts, our projects and our programs to make possible and develop a higher standard of rural living and greater resulting satisfactions to the farm family is the larger objective of Extension work. In this coordinated program we all have an important part. To make this program a living, effective, forward-moving force is our major problem and our greatest opportunity. It will demand loyal consecrated service, a forward-looking personnel, creative work, constructive leadership, and sound administration. If we can keep our service equipped with these tools, we should succeed.

Economic Factors and Their Influence on Extension Objectives

Dr. A. A. Dowell
Agricultural Economist, University Farm

In the preparation of this address it has been assumed that the chief objective in all agricultural extension activities is to assist farm people in the realization of a richer and more satisfying rural life. One of the factors involved in the attainment of this goal is that of income, for a satisfying rural life depends in large part upon the ability of the individual to obtain sufficient income with which to purchase those things which he or she deems necessary. These desires will of course vary from individual to individual and from region to region. There are no doubt many in this audience who are in almost daily contact with farm people who, though somewhat removed from the subsistence level, receive extremely modest incomes as compared with commercial farmers, and yet they are reasonably well satisfied with their mode of life. Income that may be fully adequate to meet the desires of one individual may be quite inadequate for others.

Since income is essential to the maintenance of living standards which are considered necessary under conditions that prevail in this country, much of our extension activities are directed towards maintaining or improving farm income. This requires a thorough knowledge of the technique of production, that is, of the choice and combination of the factors of production. A certain ration may be found to result in more rapid gains than other rations. However, not only the rate of gain but the very life of the animals may depend upon factors other than the ration, such as the rearing of turkeys under confinement to prevent losses from blackhead, or the rearing of young pigs under proper sanitary conditions to prevent losses from necro, round worms and the like. Those who are familiar with the spring wheat growing areas of the state have often witnessed serious losses from rust in wheat several years after suitable rust-resistant varieties became available. These few examples will suffice to indicate the importance of a knowledge of the technique of production.

However, a thorough knowledge of the technique of production is not all that is required in the effort to maximize income. It must be accompanied by an equally thorough knowledge and constant study of production costs, of marketing methods, and of present and probable future demand. While a certain ration may result in the greatest gain in weight, or greatest output of butterfat, or eggs, or wool, costs may be such that some other ration would be more economical. Though picking corn by hand may result in leaving less corn in the field, wages may be so high or labor so unsatisfactory that a mechanical picker may increase income. Marketing methods likewise need careful scrutinizing. Changing conditions may require changes in methods of transporting the product to market or in the choice of market outlets. Demand, as reflected at the market place, is not constant from year to year. The per capita consumption of such farm products as corn meal, wheat, and potatoes, has been declining for many years, while the demand for fruits, vegetables, sugar, and milk, have been increasing. However, these long-time trends are not immune to fluctuations and are greatly influenced by general business conditions at home and abroad.

These simple illustrations indicate the value of extension activities in general, including the work of the extension agents in the field, and the various extension specialists, in assisting rural people to maintain income at the highest possible level. They will also serve as a background for this discussion on economic factors and their influence on extension objectives.

We are living in a dynamic age. Economic forces are constantly pressing down upon old customs and methods. Some of these forces flow from changes in the technique of production, while others are the result of government or group action.

Changes in technique often have far-reaching economic consequences. For example, changes in methods of transportation have had a profound effect not only upon the income of various transportation agencies, but upon marketing methods, market outlets, marketing agencies, and location and size of processing establishments. Other changes in technique have had a marked effect upon the competitive position of farmers in different regions. This leads to inter-regional adjustments which involve the utilization of land and other factors of production.

Examples of government or group action which affect farm income include the tariff; reciprocal trade agreements, the agricultural adjustment program, the ever-normal granary, monetary reform, the activities and policies of federal lending and relief agencies, and the like.

Regardless of the origin of these forces, they often lead to pronounced changes in methods, and change is painful to many individuals and to many groups. Vested interests frequently attempt to prevent or delay the changes through legislation or group action. This leads to the activities of pressure groups. Few experienced extension workers have not, on more than one occasion, been asked to assist some pressure group in its effort to maintain the status quo or to improve its economic position by bringing its viewpoint to the attention of rural people.

Since the extension force serves as the medium through which the knowledge of improved techniques and sound economic information is carried to rural people, it is extremely important that extension workers have the fullest possible understanding of economic factors and their probable effect on farm income. It will not suffice to appraise the effect entirely on the basis of present farm income, for an increase in farm income in the short run may result in a more than proportional loss of income in the long run.

Attention will first be directed to a few examples of changes in technique that have had, and will continue to have important economic consequences for rural people. The first of these involves dairy producers, the second, livestock producers, and the third, corn producers. These changes, therefore, affect the majority of Minnesota farmers.

Developments in the field of transportation have set in motion economic forces that greatly affect dairy producers. For example, during the early years of the cooperative creamery movement, whole milk was commonly delivered by wagon to the local creamery, and the skimmed milk hauled back to the farm. With the horse and democrat as the only means of conveyance, it was essential that the creamery be located near the source of supply. It required an hour to travel a distance of three or four miles, and a 10-mile trip required a good portion of the day. As a result, creameries were erected in almost every town and village, and at many interior country points. The available type of transportation consequently led to the establishment of many small creameries. This development was ardently supported by extension workers of that day, for it was in line with the objectives of increasing farm income.

Shortly after the turn of the century a new type of transportation appeared on the scene in the form of the automobile and motor truck. This led to a demand for better highways. The result has been a rapid increase in the mileage of all-weather hard-surfaced roads and an equally marked improvement in the economy and flexibility of the motor truck. Today a farmer who is located 30 or 40 miles from a creamery is no further removed, in point of time, than a farmer who was located 3 or 4 miles away a quarter of a century ago. The introduction of the cream separator has made it possible to retain the skimmed milk on the farm and transport only the cream. Thus a more condensed product can be transported greater distances than formerly. Furthermore, the creamery is a type of enterprise that operates within limits, at decreasing cost. That is, as volume increases, the cost per pound of manufacturing butter de-

creases. The larger creamery is also in position to do a more effective job of merchandising the finished product. In a recent study made by Dr. E. Fred Koller and Dr. O. B. Jesness of the Division of Agricultural Economics, it was found that creameries handling less than 125,000 pounds of butterfat actually paid, on the average, 2.2 cents per pound less for butterfat than creameries handling 625,000 pounds and over. Due to more economical production and more effective merchandising, the larger creameries could have returned 2.8 cents per pound of butterfat more to their patrons than the smaller creameries. These figures indicate that many of our creameries are too small to be efficient. Hence, the problem of the future will not be to build more creameries, but to close many of those now operating, and concentrate processing in fewer but stronger plants. Thus the method followed a generation ago in reaching extension objectives, no longer applies. Changed conditions necessitate a new approach. This move will no doubt meet with vigorous opposition on the part of small town merchants and others who take special pride in the local creamery. Only those who have lived or worked in small towns can appreciate all that this implies. However, the trend is inevitable. Extension workers will need to face this situation and, armed with all available facts, press toward the extension objective of obtaining the highest possible income for Minnesota farmers.

Transportation developments have likewise profoundly affected the local cooperative livestock shipping associations in Minnesota. Prior to the advent of the motor truck, all livestock moved to market by rail. Producers with less than carload lots were not able to take advantage of the full car rates. Furthermore, with inadequate market news and poorly developed grade standards, farmers were not able to keep in close touch with the market. Consequently, it was felt that the local dealers, who obtained most of the small lots of livestock were taking advantage of the farmers' lack of knowledge. Thus there developed a demand for the organization of local cooperative livestock shipping associations and the extension service took the lead in this movement. The local shipping associations enabled the individual producer to consign small lots whenever they were ready for market. Upon arrival at the market they could be sold separately, and the producer paid for his particular shipment. The first association was organized at Litchfield in 1908. By 1913 there were 115 associations and by 1919 there were 655. During the latter year about 61 per cent of all the livestock marketed by Minnesota farmers was handled by the local shipping associations, and approximately 124,000 farmers or nearly 70 per cent of all the farmers in the state were members.

Viewed in retrospect it appears that the underlying principle back of the cooperative livestock shipping association movement was fundamentally sound. However, there has been a sharp decline in the number of associations, in the number of members, and in the volume of business handled. During 1936 there were only 262 active associations in Minnesota and these associations handled less than 13 per cent of the livestock marketed by Minnesota farmers. The total number of members had declined to about 45,000.

The decline in number of local shipping associations was due in large part to the motor truck and improved highways. The first shipment of livestock by truck to the South St. Paul market was made on September 17, 1912. As late as 1920 only 1.8 per cent of the cattle, 2.5 per cent of the calves, 1.6 per cent of the hogs, and 0.4 per cent of the sheep and lambs or 1.5 per cent of all livestock were transported to the South St. Paul market by truck. During 1937 about 57 per cent of the cattle, 80 per cent of the calves, 83 per cent of the hogs, and 42 per cent of the sheep and lambs, or 65 per cent of all livestock were delivered to that market by truck. A few truck shipments came from as far west as the state of Montana.

With the advent of the motor truck, farmers found that they no longer required the services of the shipping association merely to transport their livestock to market. They could call the local trucker by telephone and ship any number of animals any time they desired. Furthermore, telephone, radio and numerous market releases brought market information to the farmers' door. With an increasing number of market

outlets, that were made available through the use of trucks, and with improved news service the farmer placed less reliance on the forwarding service provided by the shipping association and took charge of the marketing of his own livestock. For example, during 1937 Minnesota packers purchased 23.7 per cent of their cattle, 35.5 per cent of their calves, 57.5 per cent of their hogs and 24.0 per cent of their sheep and lambs direct from producers, or dealers.

This move away from the local shipping associations does not mean that farmers are not confronted with marketing problems. It does mean that, in many parts of the state, the old type of local association, that merely forwarded livestock to a particular market, has passed its period of usefulness. If these farmers are to be given assistance in the future, a different type of marketing organization will need to be organized. It must be a merchandising rather than a forwarding association. It will need to be large enough to employ a competent manager who can keep in touch with all available outlets and sell each class and grade of livestock at the particular market where it is in most demand. The time has come when this matter should be given careful study on the part of extension workers. It would seem that livestock marketing should be given a more prominent place in the country extension program in many parts of the state. This would be in line with the objective of obtaining greater net returns for livestock producers.

Another excellent example of the effect of a change in technique on extension objective has been supplied by the introduction of hybrid corn. This is perhaps the most far-reaching of the many contributions that have been made by plant breeders. It will effect not only the 100,000,000 acres normally devoted to corn, but react upon other crop land as well. Consequently, it is of interest not only to corn belt farm operators but to commercial corn growers in other regions, to producers of other grain, forage, food and fiber crops both within and without the corn belt, to farm land owners, and to farm mortgage lending agencies.

Hybrid seed corn was first used by a small number of commercial corn growers in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana and Iowa between 1923 and 1936. By 1937 hybrid corn was being produced commercially in each of the 12 states that comprise the American corn belt, although there was a marked variation in the rate of income and in the percentage of corn land planted to hybrid seed. From the standpoint of acreage comparatively little progress was made during the earlier years. This was due both to the time required to secure the adoption of new developments by farmers in general, and to the scarcity and hence high price of the hybrid seed. This is shown in the accompanying chart which represents the estimates of corn breeders in the states indicated. Granting the possible inaccuracy of the acreage figures, it is believed that they represent the trend that has taken place.

The most rapid increases in acreage of hybrid corn have taken place in Illinois and Iowa. In the former the percentage of the total acreage of harvested corn that was planted to hybrid seed increased from .2 per cent in 1934 to 59.5 per cent in 1938. In Iowa the increase was from 1.4 per cent in 1934 to 50 per cent in 1938. The relatively small increase in the acreage of hybrid corn which took place in Missouri and in the great plains states from Kansas north through the Dakotas, was due primarily to the drouth, which interfered greatly with the work of the corn breeders in developing hybrid strains adapted to the various areas, and also made it difficult to measure the advantage of the hybrid seed over the open pollinated varieties. The unsatisfactory results which were obtained from some of the imported seed also tended to prevent an increase in the use of hybrid seed in these states.

According to these estimates, only about 143,000 acres or .3 per cent of the corn acreage harvested in these 12 corn belt states were planted to hybrid seed in 1934. This increased to about 14 or 15 million acres or over 25 per cent in 1938. As these figures apply only to the corn belt, and since the use of hybrid corn has so far been confined largely to this area, the percentage of the total national acreage

of harvested corn that was planted to hybrid seed was less than 4 per cent in 1937 and about 15 per cent in 1938.

Corn breeders in the 12 corn-belt states were also asked to supply a conservative estimate of the percentage increase in yields per acre that can be obtained from hybrid seed that is available at this time, and the percentage increase that may be expected in the future. These estimates are shown in the accompanying chart. According to these estimates it appears that a 20 per cent increase in yields may be expected in the future.

Estimates were also supplied as to the percentage of the total corn acreage that would ultimately be planted to hybrid corn and when this goal was likely to be reached. These estimates, which are shown in the accompanying chart, indicate that the probable maximum of 80 per cent in Illinois will be reached in 1939, and that the probable maximum of 90 per cent will be reached in Iowa in 1944. In general the maximum acreage will be reached about 1945.

From these figures it is clear that the probable economic consequences of the introduction of hybrid corn are not problems that may need to be forced in the distant future, but that they confront us here and now. Had it not been for the prolonged drouth which delayed progress in the western part of the corn belt, the problem would have been a moderately pressing one by 1938, and would have assumed even greater importance in 1939 and 1940. As it is, the necessity of facing the situation has merely been delayed.

That hybrid corn will exert a marked influence on the total production of corn in the United States in the future is shown in the accompanying chart. If the plant breeders' estimates of the probable percentage of total corn acreage planted to hybrid corn are realized, and the same acreage is devoted to corn as the average from 1929-33, the 12 corn belt states would produce over 2.2 billion bushels or 300 million bushels more than with open-pollinated seed. This would be only 65 million bushels less than the present agricultural adjustment goal of about 2.3 billion bushels for the entire country, and only about 360 million bushels less than the national average from 1900 to 1933.

This marked increase in corn production, resulting from the introduction of hybrid seed, may have a profound effect on inter-regional competition. This will necessarily follow if the corn breeders are correct in their assumption that hybrid seed will give the same percentage increase in yields in both high yielding and low yielding areas. This is shown in accompanying chart. Prior to the introduction of hybrid seed, the yield per acre in Iowa for the period 1923-32 averaged 15 bushels more than in Kentucky and 27 bushels more than in Georgia. By using hybrid seed in each state, yields in Iowa would be 18.5 bushels per acre higher than in Kentucky and 32.9 bushels higher than in Georgia. Thus hybrid corn will increase the competitive advantage of Iowa over Kentucky by 3.1 bushels per acre and over Georgia by 5.5 bushels per acre. The same situation would prevail within a given state and between farms within a given district. For example, there would be a greater increase in bushels per acre in southern Minnesota than in the northern part of the state.

Thus, there will be a tendency for corn production to be concentrated in the better areas. This would be a reversal of the trend prior to the drouth when the corn belt was moving to the north and west into relatively less productive areas.

The agricultural adjustment program has been justly criticised on the grounds that a flat percentage reduction in acreage, regardless of the productivity of the region, tended to freeze production into a fixed mould and to maintain or increase the cost of production. This situation will be aggravated by the introduction of hybrid seed. A continuation of the policy of a uniform percentage reduction in acreage would tend to prevent the concentration of corn production in those areas where corn can be produced most economically.

In the past it has been assumed that a 10 per cent reduction in acreage or the withdrawal of about 10 million acres would result in an average output of about 2.3 billion bushels. By 1945 or earlier it will require the withdrawal of about 10 million additional acres or a total of 20 million acres or 20 per cent, if production is to be held to this figure. These figures are on the basis of a uniform acreage reduction program. If the reduction is confined to the least productive land, a total of 25 to 30 million acres or 25 to 30 per cent or more will likely be required.

There is of course the possibility that corn breeders may be able to develop hybrid strains that will give a greater percentage increase in yields in low yielding areas, than in high yielding areas. If this should be accomplished, the effect on inter-regional competition would be quite different. For example, if drouth and frost resistant strains are developed so that yields could be increased as much in bushels per acre as in the more favored areas, the competitive position in the different regions would not be changed. Some progress has apparently been made in this direction, but most corn breeders hold the view that the percentage increase from hybrid strains adopted to low yielding areas is not likely to exceed the percentage increase that can be obtained from the high yielding areas.

The desirability of using hybrid rather than open-pollinated seed depends upon the price of hybrid as compared with the open-pollinated seed, the increase in yield from the hybrid seed, and the market price of corn. The price of seed has been declining steadily and corn breeders are of the opinion that a price of about \$5.00 per bushel will insure an adequate supply in the future. At \$5.00 per bushel the cost of seed per acre, assuming that one bushel will plant 7 acres, would be \$.714. At \$1.50 per bushel for open-pollinated seed the cost would be \$.214 per acre. Hybrid seed would thus cost \$.50 per acre more than open-pollinated seed. At \$.50 per bushel for commercial corn, an increase of one bushel per acre would just pay for the extra cost of seed. At \$.25 per bushel it would require an increase of two bushels to cover the extra cost. In low producing areas there would thus be less incentive to plant hybrid seed than in high producing areas, providing the same percentage increase could be obtained in each area. In extremely low producing areas the increase in yield might fail to cover the additional cost. In the higher producing areas, on the other hand, it will be to the advantage of the operator to use hybrid seed. This accounts for the rapid increase in acreage planted to hybrid seed during recent years and is the basis for the belief that most of the corn produced in the more productive areas of the 12 corn belt states will be planted to hybrid seed within the next few years. Farmers on good corn land cannot afford to use the open-pollinated varieties.

Attention should also be called to the possible effect of the introduction of hybrid seed on land values. In general, any improvement which increases the output from a given amount of land has the same effect as increasing the supply of land. Increasing the supply of land, demand remaining the same, tends to depress land values. Consequently, the introduction of hybrid seed may be expected to affect land values adversely. But will this effect be the same in all regions and on all farms within a given region? From what has been said it seems clear that this will not be the case. The more productive corn land will benefit more or suffer less than the less productive land. Hybrid corn will thus bring about a readjustment in land values, and this is of importance both to land owners and lending agencies.

In a discussion of economic factors and their influence on extension objectives, a prominent place should be given to the relationship between governmental or group activities and farm income. However, time will permit not more than a brief statement regarding this important phase of the subject.

For generations the American farmer was asked to support the tariff on the grounds that it was essential to the maintenance of the American standard of living. Producers of such export products as wheat, pork and lard, tobacco and cotton were told that only by maintaining a high tariff could American labor be employed at high wages and thus be in position to buy these agricultural products at satisfactory pri-

ces. The simple fact that domestic prices of export products were determined by world prices was apparently overloaded in assembling arguments in support of the tariff. Prior to and during 1930 these arguments were again brought out of the closet, and presented in their most attractive form. The result was the highest tariff in our history, which was passed and approved by the president over the protest of a large number of American economists. The result is now history and we do not need to cover that ground. What we do need to focus our attention upon, is the effort that is now being made to repair the damage caused by the passage of the all but insurmountable tariff schedules by this and other governments. The Secretary of State has had a clear grasp of the fundamental problem, namely that so long as we have land and people engaged in the production of export products, and no alternative uses for either the land or the people, the sensible approach is to attempt to recapture export outlets. If these outlets can be recaptured in whole or in part, it will do much towards the attainment of our extension objectives. It is for this reason that extension workers should familiarize themselves with this problem and ascertain the relationship between export outlets for surplus products and the well being/rural people.

We have had no end of shallow thinking with respect to the agricultural adjustment program, the ever-normal granary, federal loans on major crops, and a host of other problems. One may well question the wisdom of dressing a reduction program in the guise of the conservation of natural resources. One may question the economy of the proposal to develop an ever-normal granary in a country that had ample food supplies after a series of the worst drouths on record. One may ask whether excessive loans on surplus crops are conducive to the disposal of these surpluses either at home or abroad, and whether they are in the best long run interest of those whom the loans are intended to benefit. One may question the wisdom of making farm mortgage loans at less than the market rate of interest, which, if continued over a period of time, may result in a recapitalization of land values at the lower rate and thus place the burden of present benefits on subsequent purchases in the form of higher land values.

In short, one may well ask whether this country has as yet made an attack on the real heart of the problem, or whether we have been devoting our attention too closely to the side shows and overlooking the main tent. The real problem is to get people to work producing those goods and services that the people want and need, and at a price that they can afford to pay. This country should be interested in a program of plenty, not one of scarcity. The real heart of the problem traces back to the relations between capital and labor, rather than farm surpluses. Capital has given too much attention to profit and too little attention to production. Excessive profits, whether due to size of plants or patent rights, are not conducive to social well being. Excessive wages and inefficient work likewise raise prices and restrict output, and thus injure farmers by widening the disparity between farm and urban incomes and compelling a surplus farm population to remain on the land.

Thus there appear to be two avenues of approach to the solution of the farm surplus problem. The first, and by far the most important, is for American labor and capital to get to work. This will require concessions on the part of both groups. If accomplished, it will allow the surplus farm population to move into those occupations where the resulting goods and services are not in excess of desires and thus reduce the pressure of the surplus of farm products. The second is to leave no stone unturned in the attempt to expand export outlets so that the pressure of the surplus on the domestic market can be reduced.

This problem is not confined to American agriculture. It affects all groups and classes. The delay in its solution is not only affecting the living standards of our people, but is pushing us steadily in the direction of more rigid controls. If pushed too far, this will lead to the breakdown of our traditional form of government and result in some form of dictatorship, the exact type depending upon which groups within our population are in position to seize control.

These illustrations will suffice to indicate the relationship between economic factors and extension objectives. Extension workers can do much toward the formulation of sound policies by supplying farm people with fundamental economic information

Problems Confronting the Extension Service
As An Educational Agency

Edmund deS. Brunner
Teachers College, Columbia University

When the President's advisory committee on education looked at the history and achievements of Agricultural Extension over your quarter of a century of service, we saw among other things:

1. A federally-aided agency in which federal influence had been exerted by leadership not dictation, in which the interests of state and county had been respected to a singular degree. So impressed were we in this respect that, especially in public expositions and defences of our program, we have used your experience as a guide and model in showing how the proposed federal grants for other educational purposes could be safe-guarded from abuse.
2. A service which in contrast with 1912 had produced a revolution in Rural America. Agricultural Extension is the proof par excellence that education does produce social change. Your example proved our hope and often our guide when we considered the problems with which general and vocational education must grapple in the immediate future.

But there were some criticisms, some misunderstandings, and some honest questions among my late colleagues on the committee as to Agricultural Extension. One had never even heard of it! Another had heard too much! (Perhaps such persons will be the rarer now that Allen Smart has given such an effective picture of Agricultural Extension in his "R. F.D.") Finally, I have but recently returned from Australia and New Zealand where Agricultural Extension is in its infancy and where I was given the opportunity to advise on its next steps, which meant, among other things, asking myself what I would do if suddenly and miraculously endowed with the power to turn back the clock 25 years and remake the pattern of your development. Out of these things, then, perhaps I may bring something of value. Here's hoping!

I shall approach this problem by means of five questions. They are designed, as my own treatment of them will be, to stimulate discussion. To this end even temporary over-statement has its uses.

The first of these questions is, of course, rooted in the situation created by the present administration when it came into power 5 and one-half years ago. Possibly, however, the administration is not wholly responsible. Possibly Agricultural Extension must take part of the responsibility. For it is a fair question, whether the A.A.A. could have been passed, whether the farmers would have stood for it, if there had not been an Agricultural Extension Service operating over the previous 20 years. Not only had the possibilities of that service been demonstrated during the World War but the exploration of the causes and remedies for the agricultural depression which went on all through the 1920's was also often under Extension auspices, as had been the teaching about cooperative marketing; and you will recall that the number of co-operators increased four-fold in the first decade of Extension activity. So then came the A.A.A. with the overwhelming support of the growers in all crops affected.

The Department of Agriculture faced, as you know, the question as to whether it should use Agricultural Extension for the work entailed by this program or build an entirely new field staff on a county basis. I would remind you that some of the new federal agencies dealing with rural people chose the latter alternative. At one time the Resettlement Administration had a field staff 50 per cent larger than Extension's. Moreover, it wasn't very popular with the colleges of agriculture or with Extension in many states. The A.A.A. chose the other alternative for numerous reasons of which three may be mentioned.

1. The Extension Service was a pioneer agency which had the confidence of the farmer.
2. Speed was of the essence. To build a totally new field staff on a county basis would have delayed the operation of the A.A.A. program beyond the possibility of its functioning in the first crop year.
3. Economy. The Extension Service was already federally subsidized. Duplicating overhead would have certainly aroused criticism, might even have raised questions as to why there should be an Extension Service. Moreover, the Extension Service would not have been happy if it had been overlooked.

But the new responsibilities were different. They involved far more administration and they were to eventuate in action by democratic mass decision rather than by the individual judgment of particular farmers. Hence we come to our first question. Had Agricultural Extension shifted from an educational to an action agency? If so, can desired actions be secured without education? If not, are changed educational procedures and techniques called for?

Now there are some who answer the first part of that question with an unqualified affirmative. They aver that the old functions of Agricultural Extension are dead beyond possibility of resurrection; that we are in for a planned, controlled agricultural economy and that the logic of events and trends implies that the whole gamut of activities that can be lumped under the phrase of "increasing agricultural efficiency" are no longer needed.

I cannot share this view. I take it you do not either, or we would not be discussing the problems of Agricultural Extension as an educational agency. But lest there be heretics present let me record my conviction that the type of action desired by the adjustment and soil conservation programs cannot be permanently secured without a thoroughgoing, continuing educational program--unless we adopt the loathsome techniques of European dictatorships.

But I think we must record a danger here. Washington is looking for results. It is quite convinced the present programs are the best obtainable, are essential and are workable. The local administrators of whatever title, from committeemen on up, have in one sense of the word the power of the federal treasury behind them. Agricultural Extension used to come to the farmer with a "Please do this for your own good" approach. There are too many instances today where the approach is, "Come across or don't ever expect anything more from us."

But there is no denying that the situation has changed and the last part of the first question, as to whether changed educational procedures and techniques are therefore called for, is highly pertinent to our theme. I suppose we would all agree to answer this question with a "yes". But when we ask what new procedures and techniques are to be used our trouble begins. For purposes of discussion let me suggest one or two.

In terms of the newer aspects of the program there must be less demonstration, more discussion. You can demonstrate what the results of various types of fertilizer are on a given crop but an understanding of the raison d'etre of the A.A.A. is a vastly different thing. Discussion, too, means social organization. Groups are involved and so are the problems of group management.

This means dealing no longer with purely local conditions such as soil and kitchen stoves, but bringing knowledge of state, national and world conditions. There must be broader knowledge, but with local implications stated as clearly as possible by methods and techniques we discussed yesterday.

The newer program as it develops may call for a new and different type of training for those who are to lead in it. President Friley of Iowa has already indicated this to his Extension staff in no uncertain way.

Now these new tasks, this expanded program, raise the second question. Does the new situation call for greater cooperation with other federal and state-aided agencies with similar interests? Here the President's Committee has made one general and one specific proposal. It deplors the competition that exists in some states between Agricultural and Home Economics Extension and the Smith-Hughes vocational teachers. It points out that they are both federally supported agencies and concludes that any such competition is a waste of the tax-payer's money. It urges cooperation especially since the adult program is rapidly becoming the more important half of the Smith-Hughes work. Specifically, it suggests that the club work eventually be consolidated under the schools so far as local programs go. It did this despite the fact that there are nine times as many 4-H members as there are vocational club members, because most of the boys and girls concerned are already in the schools and with the understanding that the channel between the agricultural college and the local clubs should be kept clear and wide open.

To me there seems to be no argument against cooperation. The situation in some states is scandalous and the tax-payers are beginning to sit up and take notice.

Speaking just for myself, this present situation seems to offer an extraordinary opportunity for establishing a permanent basis of cooperation between these and other agencies. The vocational teachers in their adult work can take over some of the functions now performed being neglected by Extension. I would like to see the two groups of workers operating as a single staff with the vocational teachers, the local or community representatives of the county agents, members of his staff. Eventually this would require a change in the law but the President's committee has already proposed drastic revision of the Smith-Hughes law. But cooperation need not wait upon legal compulsion. It can begin now as it has in Iowa, Mississippi and a few other states by cooperation at state headquarters, by cooperating staff committees and the like. Thus all functions can be cared for and expansion of service in terms of the total rural needs can be effected with a minimum of effort and a maximum of economy.

To date, the major job of both these services has been to increase income. Please understand I have no quarrel with that objective. It is highly necessary, indeed essential, to have an adequate economic basis on which to sustain our rural civilization. That base has been too weak, too small. But I think the time has come, especially with the changing program of Agricultural Extension in these days of the A.A.A., to raise a question as to the proportion of time given to this objective as compared to some other possible ones. Man lives not by bread alone even though he starves without bread.

Is it probable that the family size farm will never be a great money maker for the operator? If so, should the Extension Service put more emphasis on the good life and less on the techniques of raising cash crops, i.e. on commercial agriculture?

I think we must begin our approach to this question by admitting that there is an upper limit of net income for the average family size farm in any given county. It might be possible to increase production or gross income on any such farm by using tractors, more fertilizer or a number of other devices. But it might not be economic. The increased returns might not be sufficient on such a farm to carry the increased cost. The net income might drop. Probably we all know farmers who would have been better off if they had never bought a power tractor.

Why do we want a larger net income on every farm? Not for the sake of a larger bank account as such! We want that larger income in order to have a better standard of living, a better life for the farm family. There are some farms or groups of farms where a community canning factory and increased acres given to vegetables or fruits would be far more economic than more tractors or fertilizer, especially in the South.

Remember also--and this is extremely important--that increased net income does not necessarily mean a better life. We need more education to go along with more dollars. There is no automatic correlation between economic and social progress, highly interdependent as they are. The high tenancy ratios in some of our best middle western and middle atlantic agricultural counties are one proof; so is what Henry Wallace once told me in the early days of the master-farmer and master-homemaker movement, namely, that he was interested to see that those honored by their neighbors with these designations were by no means always the best money-makers or the most efficient individuals. They graded well but not first on these points. Rather, they were the best citizens, the leaders in good works and community enterprises.

I am asking if this has any meaning for Agricultural Extension; I am sure the home demonstration agents will agree that it has. I think they have seen this point for years better than us men. I am about convinced that they are right. When I read Marjorie Patten's "The Arts Workshop of Rural America" (which I think every Extension worker should read and know), I am persuaded that under so-called rural sociological extension and under comparable activities under the leadership of our regular agents, but especially of the home agents, something is happening that is of vastly more significance for the nation, the community and the home, than raising average farm income a few dollars a year if that is all we do.

Moreover, I believe under our new conditions this is of real importance. In raising my first question, I alluded to the danger of using pressure rather than education in the new agricultural programs we have had since 1933. Broadly conceived cultural activities of the type Miss Patten describes, of the type extension sociologists are putting on in Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, New York, South Carolina, Louisiana and so on will be one of the strong safeguards for our rural, yes our national, democracy.

Well, when and if we get our average farm about at the best economic level, or perhaps a bit before, isn't it time to give attention to the other aspects of the good life? And with the new federal programs and the promise they give of a strong national agricultural policy, isn't that time now here? Or if that time is only approaching, isn't it time to get ready for it? The experience in the states I've already named seems to indicate that it is.

Educationally, this means less attention to vocational education which was rightly the sum and substance of the original program and far more to the cultural and social. It calls for discussion. It means assembling data--teaching material--from a far wider range of sources, from agricultural economics and rural sociology as well as from agricultural science. It involves in its techniques some of the things we discussed in considering Question 1.

And why not? The land-grant colleges were founded for "liberal and practical education". Similar phraseology occurs repeatedly in the discussions about, and arguments for, the Smith-Lever bill. As a part of the agricultural colleges, is the extension service bound by this educational philosophy and objective? If so, are any changes in program necessary? If not, should some other agency be created to do what Extension does not?

In considering this question I go back to my experience in Australia, a year ago. Here is a country with the area of the United States and the population of less than 7,000,000 or a bit less. It is divided into six states. The urban-rural ratio is about like yours; in fact Australia is a bit more urban though there are barely a score of cities over 20,000 population. Despite the urban population Australia's prosperity is built on the backs of sheep. They count their farms by square miles in the outback. I visited ten "stations" 400 miles northwest of Sydney in one of their "closer settlement" areas. The smallest was 1800 acres, the largest 4400. Yet in a tiny community hall in that community, built by the Agricultural Bureau, I talked one cold winter's night to 95 Australian farmers, their wives and older children, half of whom used American cars to come to the meeting. This was in New South Wales, which covers one-seventh of the area of Australia and has a rural population of less than one million. For this huge area they have 37 district agricultural leaders, comparable to our agents and one home demonstration worker--the only one in Australia. For good measure, she helps out sometimes in the adjoining state of Victoria, its border an overnight ride from her headquarters.

These colleagues of yours in the Antipodes are a fine, intelligent lot. In fact they made me homesick! A number of them have travelled in the United States, as have many of their big farmers. They know that in a sparsely settled country like theirs, with agriculture and government as closely tied up as they are (more so than here), they must conserve their time and energy. They know a lot about our Extension Service.

After this trip I was called into a conference as to their future program, both by their state leaders and by political leaders. To cut a long story short here is the plank on adult education of the U.A.P. (conservative) in the national election held just after I left the country.

The party proposes "an agricultural extension system comparable to that which works with such success in the United States . . . to provide technical assistance to primary producers, advice on home economics and to supervise the provision of good libraries and cultural developments in music, drama and art, etc."

The United Australian Party won the election.

If Australia with its huge distances, its heavy government program and its pressing economic problems, because of its almost complete dependence on a market half way across the world, decides that these are the lines along which it must develop extension, I think we might ourselves consider carefully our own program in the light of the "liberal education" originally contemplated through our agricultural colleges. This does mean an expansion of some of our newer lines of effort which we discussed previously.

I think we should undertake serious consideration of this point, not only because our rural people are responding to an expanded program but because there are many evidences that they are earnestly seeking a higher standard of community living and better social utilities. They are likely to look to Extension for help. If Extension cannot give it, its weight should be thrown in the direction of building some other agency to do the job. My own hope is that Extension will assume the leadership and make the necessary changes in its program, just as it has done in the emergency, now rapidly becoming the permanent job, resulting from the building of an implemented national agricultural policy. This seems to be a logical next step, educationally, for you, involving methods and techniques now familiar in the field of general adult education.

Whichever way this issue is decided, it raises the final question of how Extension's field shall be defined, its objective determined. Is the proper approach for

an educational agency one cast in institutional terms, or should the approach be functional in terms of need and therefore as varied as the conditions faced? What implications for the determination and phrasing of your educational objectives has your answer to this question?

Agricultural Extension is a great institution, the largest of its kind in the world and also the largest adult education enterprise. Now the tendency of institutions, as time goes on, is to forget their original purposes and live for their own self-perpetuation. On the basis of their early achievement, they begin to feel that they know the answers. They "put over" programs or "sell" them and become so involved in the administration of their enterprise that they no longer keep in close touch with their constituencies and the changing needs of the times. In some ways this was true of the public school until a decade ago. The paramount illustration of this at the present time is the rise of the C.I.O. and its revolt against the A.F. of L.

Now Agricultural Extension has been thus far singularly free from this fault. It is one of many things to its credit that this is so. But it is a danger ever to be guarded against and it is all the greater just now that the agricultural branch of the service, as contrasted with the home economic, has come to be responsible for an action program that entails administration as well. I should not be surprised if, in some states, real conflicts did not develop between those who wished to put over programs and those who wished to continue an educational approach, and unfortunately this conflict may find the men on one side and the women on the other. The men will be wrong--of course! But they will call the girls impractical and other harsh terms. Now it will be highly unfortunate if this happens, if the increasing inclusion of home, family, social and cultural interests in the outlook reports and in the consideration of the county planning conferences suffers as a result. For the end result and objective of improving agricultural income is to improve family and community living. That is an obligation and an interest as binding on the men agents as on the women, only their approaches differ. Basically the justification of all branches of your service is the same.

I have obviously revealed my answer to this last question. To me, the only safe approach, especially for an educational agency, is that which asks what the needs are, makes some judgment as to their relative importance and then goes out to meet as many of them as possible.

How these needs are to be determined was discussed somewhat yesterday.

It is a peculiarly appropriate time for Extension to cast an appraising glance backward over its history and a long look forward into a future it is helping to form and re-evaluate and rephrase its objectives in the light of a democratic, progressive, philosophy of education.

I fear that perhaps I have only been saying the same thing in several different ways. Let me try, in conclusion, to summarize in terms of suggested goals for Agricultural Extension.

1. Maintenance of democratic, educational procedures in federal-state and state-county relationships.
2. In line with this, continued development of volunteer leaders, because this is now of proven value in the program, helps keep the service democratic and close to its constituency and because of the great indirect benefits to the community in developing qualities of, and facilities for, leadership.

3. The use of the leadership and prestige of Extension in the maximum development of all the resources of a county, economic and social, human and inanimate, for the achievement of the highest level of life possible. This means cooperation with all like-minded agencies.
4. Courageous experimentation in methods and techniques for teaching the newer, less tangible content demanded by the new programs and newer emphases. This involves recognition of the fact that this is a pioneer field requiring the courage of the pioneer, charity toward mistakes and a willingness to learn from them.
5. Unfailing effort to achieve an optimum economic basis for rural life, for the winning of social parity, along with economic, for Rural America. This necessitates a recognition of the basic objective of all extension work, namely, the winning of the good life, with adequate security and opportunity for the fullest expression of human personality.
6. This implies support for, and assistance to, all efforts for bringing to rural people the social utilities they desire, by educational methods, whether the problem be electrification, a drama guild or what not.
7. The frank avowal of a functional approach through the whole program, involving program determination on the basis of ascertained needs and problems rather than on the basis of stereotyped activities that may have worked somewhere.
8. A continuing effort to re-examine, and re-evaluate on the basis of experience and criticism the philosophy of extension adult education, and the constant checking of activities and programs in the light of the objectives and philosophy.

Such an educational program seems called for by the logic of our present circumstances, which create for extension even larger opportunity for service, influence and achievement in its second quarter century than it has enjoyed in its first twenty-five years.

The Fundamental Objectives of Agricultural Extension Work

Miss Minnie Price
State Home Demonstration Leader, Ohio State University

"Meanings" do not remain constant, for which I am thankful. And the humblest citizen of this United States, thanks to our democratic system, has the right of speech and can attempt interpretation. Out of such attempts new meanings emerge, and that to me is one of the great advantages of conferences such as this. My statement of objectives may not pass muster here in Minnesota at all. But my viewpoint and my statement, coming out of my own experience, bolstered up to as great a degree as I could bolster it through talking with others and reading, is all I have, and so it is what I shall attempt to give. One year--6 months--6 weeks from now my statement would probably be different because objectives are constantly subject to modification and to enrichment by new experience. If this presentation stimulates your thinking, leads you to differ with me or to depart from your previous thinking, perhaps my coming here will have fulfilled its purpose.

Much of the misunderstanding regarding objectives arises because we do not make it clear as to whether we are talking about comprehensive objectives--general statements of values to be achieved--or specific objectives which we might define as desired outcomes in the experience of those dealt with, and which are the necessary steps in achieving the comprehensive objectives. These comprehensive objectives grow out of life and are worded in terms of one's philosophy of life. Specific objectives or immediate objectives are a part of every life situation. We may speak of them as goals which the individual desires to achieve.

I would also like to recognize at the outset that the objective is not an arriving at, and remaining at, a specified place, but is in the process of going on, with each step of the process contributing to the next. In such a "going on" process, objectives and means of attaining objectives are not sharply distinguished at all times. Means and ends are constantly shifting, with an end, when attained, becoming a means toward a more remote end. This makes the question of methods used in extension of great significance and I am glad to see that your program provides for consideration of that tomorrow.

Is extension work in the field of education? Perhaps one of the first questions is whether or not extension work is an educational endeavor. The report of the President's advisory committee on education seems to have no question regarding this. On page 144 it states: "If the cooperative extension service continues to be primarily an educational agency administered by the land-grant colleges....etc." Note the wording, "Continues to be primarily an educational agency." And in another place: "The committee believes that the federal grants for instruction in the land-grant colleges and for the related activities of research and extension have been justified by their demonstrated contribution to agriculture and rural life." Quotations from other sources of authority could be given indicating that today extension work is definitely listed as an educational movement.

What then do we mean by education? Education, as we have all been told, is literally a "leading-out". The true educator is concerned with human beings, with the development of human beings, with their growth. Another person has worded it, "We can legitimately expect that education shall add to our knowledge, improve our skill, enlarge our appreciations, train our power to think and judge in theoretical fields of knowledge, give us such social contacts and ideals as will fit us to live in harmony, fairness, and comfort with our fellowmen, and furnish a stimulus for creative work." Such a process would lead to the development of inner resources and to an appreciation of things that enrich life.

Education must help life to be lived on an increasingly high level. This means, to me, a life so lived that more life comes out of it, richer in content and broader in scope with an increasing sensitiveness to situations faced and with increasing ability to surmount difficulties or to reduce conflicts. This means also that the one living such a life increasingly recognizes his relationship to society and meets his responsibility to the groups of which he is a part.

It means that one participating in an educational procedure grows more and more able to guide his own actions, to meet unusual situations, to contribute more intelligently to the life of which he is a part and to gain satisfactions in so doing. It surely means increased ability to stand on one's own feet.

It would be an interesting exercise for each of us to check our activities as extension folks to see what provision we make for those who constitute our "pupils" to do these things--to grow more and more able to guide their own actions, for example. In a class several years ago I heard extension folks referred to as "animal trainers", which is quite different as a process from the sort of thing just described, and because of this difference, I wish to take time to read the following statement from one of our leaders in the field of education:

"Between education and training there is a vast distinction. Education is an intellectual and spiritual process. It has to do with opening the windows of the human mind and the human soul. It involves the effort to understand, to comprehend, to be sensitive to ideas, aspirations, and interests to which the individual might otherwise be indifferent. Not so, training.

"Training connotes improved ability to do something, without deepened understanding, widened sympathy, or heightened aspirations. One can train a bricklayer to lay 300 bricks instead of 150. One can train a stenographer to increase her speed and skill. One can train a cook or a butler.

"But one educates in the realm of thought, feeling, and intelligence. Occasionally, to be sure, training must precede education. One must be trained to read before one can become educated in literature; one must be trained to add and multiply before one can be educated in the higher mathematics; one must be trained to use a fever thermometer before one can be educated as a physician. But always training concerns itself with tools and devices, while education concerns itself with something that has intellectual or spiritual content and motive. Training is means; education is end." Is our objective in extension, I would ask, both training and education? (Quotation from Alexander Flexner.)

There are a number of questions which I am ignoring today due to time limitation and which may seem illogical to ignore. One's conception of how changes are possible in folks, whether or not adults learn, recognition of the changed conditions under which we are living--all these affect and are affected by one's objectives in education.

We have indicated that we hold extension work to be an educational procedure and we have endeavored to say something of what education really means. From here we will attempt to see with which phases of education this extension service is concerned. The easiest way to get at this is to present the thinking of some other folks. I am making such presentation, recognizing limitations of this procedure. But leaders and those in authority are helping to formulate this movement, just as the thousands of men, women, boys and girls whom you and other staff members meet year by year are helping to formulate the movement. The thinking of those leaders must therefore be recognized. (Some quotations.)

"The fundamental purpose of Smith-Lever extension education is the development of rural people themselves." I am quoting from Dr. A. J. Klein in his report of the survey of land-grant colleges. "This is accomplished by fostering attitudes of mind and capacities which enable them better to meet the individual and civic problems with which they are confronted. Unless economic attainment and independence are regarded chiefly as means for advancing the social and cultural life of those living in the country, the most important purpose of extension education will not be achieved."

And again from the same source: "Cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics established under the federal Smith-Lever Act 'cannot be considered exclusively vocational. To consider it so is to miss entirely the humanistic and social purpose which should constitute the basic foundation of all education.'" These two quotations definitely center attention upon what extension work does in the development of rural people themselves, and enlarges the field beyond the vocational.

From an editorial by Dr. C. B. Smith in the Extension Service Review of March, 1938, we quote the following: "If agriculture is to be helped to develop to its highest levels, it must be given assistance in the development of right national and state policies, right national and state laws, fundamental agricultural research, fundamental education, and stimulation of rural people to achieve. Extension must help, directly and indirectly, in every one of these five fields. This, says Dr. Smith, is a larger concept than we had of Extension when the Smith-Lever law was passed.

"The new order is here--the old order has not passed away but is being re-made. Extension has been a help in bringing about a new outlook and in putting into effect new agricultural policies; but it has not begun to play the part it is capable of and should be playing."

Here Dr. Smith gives us the objective of leading on into an area of education which has a broad social objective, namely intelligent participation of farm people in the development of national and state policies, laws, research, and education.

From an article by F. W. Peck, former director of the Minnesota Extension Service, in the April, 1937, Extension Service Review, we have the following:

"Emphasis of tomorrow will be upon making the most of rural opportunities in the field of the best use of leisure time, training in self-expression, experience with music and dramatics, cooperation in business and social services, and in community and civic enterprises." Another emphasis is revealed here in addition to some already mentioned--that of making the most of rural opportunities.

And this statement from Director Warburton in the January, 1936, issue of the Extension Service Review: "Abundant living in better homes, with suitable food, modern conveniences, wholesome recreation, and social opportunities, are just as much our problem (in extension) as adjusted agriculture, efficient marketing, soil conservation, and farm management." Abundant living, whatever that includes, or however it is to be attained, is the watchword here along with production, marketing, conservation and management.

And from rock-ribbed Vermont--J. E. Carrigan, director of extension, in the Extension Service Review of July, 1938, says: A staff committee reported that "our program should be based on the problems connected with bringing to the rural people a richer and more satisfying life. The steps leading to a rich and satisfying rural life were set down as: economic welfare, health, satisfying family relationships, constructive social-civic contacts and recreation. This study led to a realization among our workers that whatever was the problem of the rural people might well be the concern of the extension service."

Much the same thought as voiced in the preceding quotations is expressed here. But note the liberality of that conclusion and agree or differ as you wish--"that whatever was the problem of the rural people might well be the concern of the extension service."

And next a quotation from F. D. Farrell, President of the Kansas State College, in the Extension Service Review, May, 1938. President Farrell lists five general objectives, acknowledging that there are probably others: "To develop understanding and appreciation of rural values; to promote understanding of rural problems; to develop practicable methods of solving rural problems; to make rural life more satisfying and more beautiful; and to promote improved integration of farming and rural life with other activities and interests of the nation."

When I talked with Director Ramsower and learned that he was here for your conference last year, I immediately was concerned for fear what I would say would be an old story. And then as I assembled material, I realized it would be rather bad if I interpreted objectives differently.

So the following statement of objectives in agricultural extension work, voiced by a group of our staff members in Ohio, both men and women, several years ago, is included:

"To develop, or provide for, the continuous growth of socially-minded individuals through healthful living, intelligent participation in community life, desirable home life, right use of leisure, adequate income, cultivation of spiritual values, and appreciation of aesthetic values."

The significant thing here is emphasis on growth and on social, with the explanation that these are affected by various things--income, leisure and what not.

Perhaps this recital has seemed tedious. But these statements are significant in several respects. They are of fairly recent date, they come from those in positions of leadership in this realm of education, and they all stress enriched living. Extension work as described is not to be considered exclusively vocational. Farm people are to gain in ability to contribute to the development of national and state policies, agricultural research, laws, and education. Emphasis is given to the making of the most of rural opportunities. Constructive social-civic contacts and recreation are objectives. Another objective is definitely emphasized--to promote the integration of farming and rural life with other activities and interests of the nation. An attention to the aesthetic, as well as the ethical, was voiced as an objective along with interest in fine home standards. Adequate income is recognized as essential.

I probably would not have the courage to make my comments after hearing the discussion of economic and social factors as they affect extension objectives. There are factors beyond individual and group control, as these speakers will no doubt indicate, which influence today's extension program. On the other hand the objectives which are held today in extension, if sound and clear-cut and worthy of attention and support, can affect over a period of time these same economic and social factors. Dr. Giddings, in a discussion of standards of living, voices this far better than I can when he says: "In a word, the standard of living is not the sum and substance of what a population actually has. It is literally what the word means--the standard, the ideal of comfort and luxury which a class or people is striving to realize; not its day-dream of what some fairy godmother might provide, but its sober estimate of what it believes to be possible, and is determined by all reasonable effort to try to secure. So defined and understood, the standard of liv-

ing is beyond question the cause and not the effect of production. (From Studies in the Theory of Human Society, page 30.) And someone else has remarked that automobiles came by the thousands and thousands, not because there was money in the hands of these buyers, but because there was desire in their hearts. It is a circle with the situation affecting objectives, and objectives in turn affecting the situation. (Story "Raising rabbits.") To create a desire for a fine standard of living is essential then along with the means for attaining it.

But more of that from these other folks after I sit down. I wish next to consider somewhat more in detail some of these objectives which these various leaders have voiced and which are more and more in the foreground of our thinking.

I. What is meant by "the good life" or the abundant life, as President Farrell, Director Warburton, and others speak of it? This question is important enough for any state extension staff to spend some time in arriving at its own interpretation for that specific state.

In thinking of the objective of "the good life" in extension, we would probably first think in terms of a family group for that is the group with which we deal, and that is the group through which the individual person works out his life problems.

This phase "the good life" is probably the most difficult item in this list to tackle. It's a fine-sounding phrase. But just what do we mean by it anyway? If it is as highly desirable as these leaders whom I have quoted and hundreds of others think it to be as an objective, we should be able to break it down into terms more easily visualized. Such breaking down would mean we could more definitely work toward achievement.

I had an opportunity to discuss with Dr. Falconer of our staff the "Land-Use Program" in Ohio this week. We agreed that we need an index to place alongside the two with which our Ohio staff and Ohio farmers are working in development of plans for land use in Ohio. We have "labor income" which is a measure of income from the farm. We have derived a productivity-balance-index, developed within the last 2 years, which considers what is done to the soil under various conditions of production. The index which is lacking is the one which would stand for what happens to the family as this production process is going on. Until this is developed, we are unable to proceed with an adequate land-use program, either by regions or farm by farm. The research and application of mathematics which has gone into the development of a productivity-balance-index seems almost beyond comprehension to me. Yet the index has been reached. On the side, an objective for extension staff members might well be adequate research pertaining to various phases of life as affected by conditions of labor, housing, numbers in family, opportunity for participation in community life, land ownership, etc., in order that we might arrive at this third index. The type of homes and type of life lived in homes is the real test of our program and this is not revealed by analysis of labor-income and is not revealed by the productivity-balance-index. Neither is it revealed by a summary of some of the things with which we are concerned in home economics--jars of fruit canned, etc.

We would probably agree that this fine life for this farm family should include some of the following:

1. Adequate income with understanding of how it may contribute to the good life. The agricultural group produces more of the primary wealth of the world than any other group. "The good life" would allow for a larger proportion of the gifts which come out of the things thus produced to be enjoyed by the producers.

Much stress in Extension has been put in times past on increased income which is a means to an end. We need to see more clearly the use of this means to achieve

the end. We need to stress other values along with income. We have never set ourselves strenuously to solve the question of how to maintain the best possible standard of living on various incomes or on the least possible money. If we should attempt this, we would have our attention turned to non-material things along with the material things. We would give attention to what people live with under varying circumstances. It would be a difficult undertaking but not much more so than the application of present day knowledge to soil conservation and adjustment of crops to meet soil needs. Its difficulty should be a challenge to us and not a stumbling block.

2. As great a sense of security as we can have in an insecure world. We can at least move in the direction of security. This sense of security is not based alone on income and ownership of farm. We need not only the economic but the social and psychological security which we had when an agriculture of self-sufficiency prevailed. This is not a question alone of economic return. O. E. Baker, at our extension conference, made a definite plea for "prosperity plus". As he outlined it, prosperity alone would lead to larger farms with further commercialization with accelerated migration of rural wealth, rural youth and rural activities to the cities. Pride in family ownership of the farmstead, he feels, needs to be instilled into our present farm people.

The Iowa proposal about which I have been hearing, whereby farm land on which the owner lives is exempt or partially exempt from taxes would be a step toward retaining rural wealth and rural leadership or a part of it in the area where that wealth and leadership is created, all of which would contribute, it seems to me, to this sense of security.

3. Security for social institutions on which we are dependent. They should not be threatened with disruption whether this be credit or something else.

4. This broad objective of fine life for every individual and for every family includes attention to healthful living. If all of us would accept this, we would quickly be made aware of specific times and places at which, and procedure through which, attention could be given to the conservation of health. And this attention to health can be given through a wide range of activities--agricultural engineering, the "production plan" for that farmstead, civic problems involving town or village, expenditures for water systems, sewage disposal and what not--to say nothing of the vast opportunity in the homemaking activities.

We would not ignore attention to mental health and wholesome development. One half of the people who seek medical attention, we are told (Thorndike, E.L. and Gates, A.J., Principles of Education) are suffering from no physical illness that medicine or surgery can help.

5. Mutual respect is essential between the various members of that family group--The old for the young, the young for the old, the men for the women. A group in which the old idea of the father as dictator is eliminated and the worth of each as an individual is recognized. Extension work in our state has only scratched the surface of possibilities here, although dozens of activities with which the farm family is concerned provide rich opportunity for such attention.

6. An opportunity for personalities to grow within the limit of their capacities. This is basic to democracy. The democratic ideal emphasizes above all else the importance of persons. Persons are always "ends" and never used as "means". This democratic concept assumes the right of the individual to attain his fullest development and to participate in carrying responsibilities and in managing affairs related to the collective aspects of life. America's greatest contribution to education is perhaps this thought of unlimited education or of education up to the limit of individual capacity. The concept of democracy prescribes participation.

7. The good life would make provision for leisure as well as industry with understanding of the value of each.

We have two standards of values in relation to leisure carried over from early life in America which we could well question today--the first one that there is virtue in hard work, and second that all leisure-time activities are foolish or sinful. Real play can help to restore self respect, restore tolerance, and put zest into living. Our camps for farm women offer abundant proof of this.

Positive values in play need attention. Often we plan to avoid the harmful outcomes. How much better to plan for the good outcomes of recreation or play. Grace Abbot makes the plea, "tempt the child to do right."

Leisure is not a static thing, not the opposite of activity; but is, rather, another kind of activity. The education of the rising generation in the intelligent, purposive use of leisure is a task involving skill and knowledge and is closely related to the objectives voiced earlier.

8. "The good life" would include more of the richness of rural life which music, drama, and other creative arts bring to other countries with a different type of agriculture than ours. No place offers so fine an opportunity for creative living as the farm, provided there is adequate income, security, and that appreciation of the values inherent in rural life mentioned by President Farrell.

I often wonder if we would be willing to have extension work judged on the basis of homes dealt with. After all, these homes and the life lived in them, are the test.

We cannot afford to let beauty become the possession of only a few. I mean beauty in the broad sense of all those things which make life worth living. Dunsany somewhere speaks of the villages that had no song and thought they hadn't time. He says: "Alas, they are already damned."

We have been considering some aspects of this improved rural living in relation "to the farm family" with which we are all acquainted. That farm family lives in a community, involved in many relationships there. It is a part of a nation, influenced by national movements and philosophies and in turn influencing these same movements and philosophies. Consequently, I wish to mention four rather important issues or methods which affect extension objectives and which in turn are affected by our objectives. These four are: Scientific habits of thinking; inter-relationships between groups; democratic procedure; and our need of a better philosophy of rural life or our need of a clearer understanding of what our rural life is to be and what its contribution is to our whole national structure.

1. Scientific habits of thinking. More scientific habits of thinking will be arrived at by farm folks as they have increased contact with the outcome of the work of scientists. Should an objective of extension be to arrive at an inherent respect for the blessings which science can confer on man? Should all education strive to go further to see that science unharnessed may be good or bad, or harnessed with selfishness becomes a national and international problem?

Luck and miraculous performances are not much in the foreground of any of our industries or professions. The scientific interpretation of happenings and the scientific control of outcomes is recognized in agriculture as in industry. Respect for the contributions of science, concern for adequate use of the contributions of science, and a desire for attention to be directed to additional fields--all these are being affected to some degree through Extension. Even partial attainment

here could do something surely toward a situation such as we faced recently when in connection with the proposed revision of the food and drug act, private interests fought for the privilege to continue to misrepresent their products to the public.

Dr. C. J. Galpin said, "The average farmer today knows more of the science on which his industry rests and brings it into constant application than the scientists knew 50 years ago." Should an objective be to utilize this general application of scientific procedure and to strive toward clear-cut thinking in other realms?

2. Inter-relationships. Most thoughtful leaders concerned with fine living for rural folks seem agreed that the solution of rural problems will not be arrived at by those within the farm community, nor by those who live on the outside of the farm community. The solution or partial solution depends upon inter-relationships. We know that agriculture cannot be abstracted from its interdependence with all other phases of our national life. Perhaps the greatest obstacle faced is the lack of understanding on the part of non-rural groups. Groups, both rural and urban, need an understanding of their inter-dependence and integration. Rural people are people as well as farmers with broad interests cutting across many areas.

Cooperation is built on mutual trust and this harks back to land ownership also. Extension work may contribute to or detract from such mutual trust or understanding between groups. There are some questions of broad scope and some very common everyday ones involved here--taxes, and how spent, sweat-shop conditions, recreation centers, etc. Activities leading to better understanding of this inter-dependence are receiving attention at numerous places in extension programs. Other activities help to build lines of demarcation more firmly into existence.

3. Democratic Procedure. Individual development and participation was mentioned earlier as a principle of democracy and in relation to the satisfactions in life which come to an individual through participation. There are other implications of national significance in this question of democratic procedure. We live in a country pledged to democracy and must therefore avoid the dictatorial regulatory procedures possible in countries with a different national philosophy.

What do we mean by democratic procedure? Democracy is based on two things. (1) A belief in the uniqueness and worth of the individual and his right to develop his natural capacities; (2) the "power of pooled and cooperative experience" as contrasted with authoritarianism as a "guide to collective action". John Dewey has pointed out that "the fundamental beliefs and practices of democracy are now challenged as they have not been since the rise of democratic institutions." If this be true, we might well ask the question, do we in extension provide opportunity for practice in the democratic way of life?

Leaders in the educational world are pointing out that the future for America offers two possibilities, either a democratic educational movement or a regulatory overhead movement. Extension work has unusual opportunity to go far in strengthening movements pertaining to rural life. This is true because we can make opportunity for adults to participate in the planning and the conduct of the program. The injection of the thinking and opinions of vast numbers of intelligent thoughtful citizens can do much to give in the long run, which is our responsibility, better national policies, laws, education, and even better agricultural extension work.

C. C. Taylor said several years ago that extension folks had not shown a faith in the knowledge and the capacity for leadership among rural people--and had therefore not even attempted to use such leadership. We all know of places where we have used it, but his charge implies that by and large we have failed.

In this connection, Secretary Wallace has this to say: "The strength of the extension service is in its capacity to think through with the members of farm families

and with one another the problems of rural life....I would suggest that they vigorously seek the truth in terms of advantages and disadvantages, and in this way draw intelligent conclusions. I hold that these conclusions should not be crystallized, but remain fluid and flexible in the face of constantly changing economic conditions. ...leaving to the farmers the course of action to be taken after obtaining a clear conception of the situation." (H. A. Wallace, Extension Service Review, December 1935.) This is in regard to agricultural policies, but it applies elsewhere.

The report of the President's advisory committee on education mentioned earlier says: "The committee is impressed with the obvious fact that few social problems can be solved by the federal government alone. In all the social services, and particularly in education, a high degree of intelligent local initiative is essential. A major endeavor of all national action in those fields should be to foster and preserve the strength of local democratic action."

Such an undertaking is impossible, however, without an understanding of "the slow, tolerant, patient, understanding ways of democratic action by which people bend their common will and strength to the solution of common problems." (Quotation is from Wallace, Extension Service Review, April 1938, page 62). Most of us are too impatient for this.

Education should result, as was discussed earlier, in intelligent participation by individuals in the management of conditions in which they live. There should be constantly increasing ability on the part of a constantly increasing number of folks to do this. And extension staff members, unless they assume the role of dictators, must work with rural folks to this end.

To the extent that we treasure more and more the democratic ideal, will we provide experiences in practice of initiative, in the carrying of responsibilities, in the making of decisions, in the formation and execution of plans, and in the evaluation of outcomes.

Such a procedure, along with the technical education which we have long stressed, could create a worthy farm population, technically equipped and with greater insight into the great flow of political and economic life. Furthermore, it would help to broaden the extension program to meet the genuine intellectual interests and curiosity of many farm people not now interested in the more technical aspects of farming. Education in a democracy dare not be purely technical. It must lead on to the development of inner resources, to an appreciation of things that enrich life, and to intelligent participation in those movements which govern the type of life possible. This applies to farm folks as well as to others.

4. Objective of trying to have rural folks see where we are headed. Another objective with which it seems to me we as staff members should be concerned is that of having many rural people endeavor to see where rural America is headed. This is a part of the plea for democratic procedure voiced a bit ago and part of the plea for the intelligence and level-headedness which rural folks can contribute to the direction of a stream along which they are being carried.

We need to iron out some differences of opinion such as that "all culture originates in the city" and the opposite, that "all culture comes from the soil". We know that out of rural life comes a type of mind and adjustment to life different to that of the city. It is unwise therefore to attempt to carry over an urban culture to a rural mind. Other nations have plans (right or wrong) for rural life. We have made some headway but neither the majority of rural folks nor the majority of urban folks seem able to day to see very clearly into the future regarding it.

What are the fundamental purposes of life as lived in the country? That is one aspect of this question. We are not agreed and perhaps it is well that we are not. But there are enduring satisfactions to those who live in the open country. There are contributions to national life of tremendous significance made by these same peo-

ple. Can we be made more aware of these satisfactions and contributions? Carrel in "Man the Unknown", speaking from his fine scientific background, makes a plea that mankind have opportunity for periods of relative isolation and discipline, for rejection of the habits of the herd, for nervous strength and agility. The September, 1938 issue of Rural America has three splendid contributions dealing with this question.

Some summary remarks about objectives.

Broad viewpoints regarding objectives are essential. "Without a vision the people perish." But a platitudinous mouthing of phrases gets us nowhere. Objectives are not stationary but are constantly shifting. Even the Supreme Court of the United States changes its interpretations occasionally. We may need a different wording of objectives for different areas or for different groups of people within the same area.

We need many viewpoints. I am thoroughly convinced that the objectives as voiced by staff members in Ohio are not as fine as guides to action as those we arrive at in a farm home when 20 or 25 council members seriously consider what this program should achieve.

We are apt to plan on rather a limited time basis. Americans are charged with being skittish about long-time planning. We want quick remedies, a bottle of pills with the prescription pasted on the outside. We forget that life is complex and that difficulties faced now are an accumulation in many cases, carried over from several generations.

We need to gain a sense of time--that we are fitting into a place, building upon what has gone before and influencing what comes after, remembering always that ~~changes~~ involving people, standards of living, environment or conditions of living will come slowly and must come from or be influenced by the people as well as by the leaders.

There are many things I have not touched upon. There are many questions in my own mind. The following are some I would leave with you:

Is extension work education and/or training?

To what degree are we dealing with "tools" without getting deeply into education?

Do we have faith in the contribution of the rural man and woman and boy and girl with whom we deal--or do we think someone with a different type of knowledge, training, and skill must do the planning and make the decisions affecting his welfare?

What is our objective as teachers regarding the future of rural life? Is the rural area to be the breeding ground for our nation? To what degree must it share in the good things of life which its land and labor produces? To what degree and by what means must a larger portion of the wealth and leadership which is produced on the land be retained there to enrich the life of these producers?

Do our methods of teaching provide opportunity for acquisition of skill in scientific habits of thinking, for understanding of the inter-dependence of groups, and for participation of individuals in planning, etc. (democratic procedure.)

I heard a story over the radio of a country boy who went to the circus for the first time. He arrived as the parade was going on. He enjoyed it thoroughly. He encountered the clown and asked the clown whom he should pay. The clown said, "Pay me," which the boy did. It was not until years later that he learned that he missed the circus. Some folks say that in extension we are ignoring the deeper possibilities - are satisfied with too little - perhaps with the parade. The tragedy of life is always in unrealized possibilities. May we each one strive more clearly to see and more earnestly to achieve objectives worthy of the group with whom we are working.

Coordination of Activities in a Well-Balanced Farm and Home Program

J. W. Burch
Assistant Director in Charge of Extension
University of Missouri

In developing a well-balanced farm and home program, it appears essential that each extension worker carry in his or her mind an ideal farm home. I carry in my own mind the picture of a white house with a white fence around it, set well back from the road in a grove of trees. It is a snug well-built house, compact and well-arranged so that it is not a woman killer. The barns beyond the house are adequate and well-painted but not too big and showy. The fields show, even to the casual observer, that there is a well-planned rotation on that farm and that the soil is in a high state of fertility. The corn is a dark green, the clover field is even throughout, with no sour thin patches showing up. The wheat is tall and even. The cattle and sheep back on the permanent pasture where the tree studded slope runs down to the stream are sleek and fat and show evidence of good breeding. The fences are up in good shape, the weeds are cut out of the fence rows.

The farmer himself impresses you with the independence that comes from a feeling of security. It is evident that he has a well-ordered life, that he knows where he is going, that his farm plan is not one of chance but one worked out from careful study and experience. The farm wife impresses you because she doesn't appear tired. She is alert and happy. The children are husky and deeply interested in all the farm problems that you discuss with their father. They are splendid demonstrations of the value of 4-H club work in creating interest in the farm itself. The home atmosphere is one of hope and happiness that can only come in a home that is not shadowed by a dark cloud of debt. It is a home in a community where there is a good church, where there are good schools, where there are good neighbors, where there is community spirit and interest and opportunities for recreation.

If all of us have a picture of an ideal farm and farm home in our minds, we are then intensely interested in determining why so many of our farm homes in no wise approach this ideal. Upon determining these reasons we will want to set about to correct those things that are preventing the fulfillment of this ideal.

It is our thought that the way to get coordination of activities on the part of extension workers and farm leaders in a well-balanced farm and home program is to go directly to the farm and farm home and find out from those people what their problems are and why they do not have the things they desire.

In the development of a county plan of work, I would suggest that a man and woman be invited in from each community to give their ideas as to the problems on the farms and in the farm homes of their communities. These community representatives should be selected with great care. Before being asked to attend the county meeting, they should be sent a list of questions, which will stimulate their thinking about their problems. Such questions might be: What do you and your neighbors think could be done in 1939 on the farms in your community that will give you better incomes, conserve your soil and its fertility and furnish better living conditions for farm families?

At the meeting of the county committee, comprised of local leaders, the members will: (1) List the problems of the county. (2) Determine which of the problems should receive major emphasis in 1939.

In our experience with such program planning groups we find that it is necessary to present certain background information such as the size of farms in the county, the average income, the source of this income, trends in population and other infor-

mation of that kind. We find that farm women are just as much interested in problems of income as are the men. We find that the men speak up about the necessity of home conveniences just as promptly as the farm women. We find both men and women almost without exception stressing the need for more work with boys and girls in both the 4-H and older youth groups. We find them pointing out the recreation needs and the community development needs of which just a few years ago I do not believe they were conscious.

It will probably be necessary for extension workers to make sure that farm people think of their problems long enough to really get the fundamental needs and problems. I can remember quite distinctly in my own county agent experience of calling my county board together to form a plan of work on very short notice and without giving them any background information as to just what was going on in the county. They decided one of the things I should work upon was the pruning of fruit trees as a major project. We had a couple of dozen home orchards in the whole county. There was a tremendous need for improvement of crops and livestock and for community development, but my board was entirely oblivious of that fact and it was my own fault. It is necessary for us to stimulate their thinking. Farm women may decide that it is entirely all right for the home demonstration agent to spend her time on bedroom accessories when the time is right for putting over a rural electrification program that will really supply a need and solve a problem in the way of home conveniences on the farm.

In years past we have failed to discover the needs for recreation and community development. In the years ahead there is danger that some of our people will be carried away with the need of this type of work and forget that perhaps fundamentally our greatest problem is still one of increasing farm income by sound, constructive work on soils, crops and livestock. Farm people will find these problems, but enthusiasts along one line will come to the top from time to time, and we must be wise enough to bring out the other needs so that we may attack these problems in a well-balanced as well as in a coordinated manner.

My point is that as far as the farm people themselves are concerned, they are working together and desire to work together in the solution of their farm and home problems. We as extension workers are the ones who think in terms of projects and fail to coordinate our efforts in solving these problems. I continue to be amazed throughout the years at the long suffering and kindness of farm people in putting up with us as we each parade our pet projects before them in an unrelated and confusing manner. The maze of new federal agencies has added immeasurably to the confusion in later years. This makes it imperative that we simplify our own approach, that we talk in terms of problems and in farmer language, and that we drop the "professional lingo" we too frequently use.

The county agent should put together the problems as determined by the farm leaders and send them to the state extension office. It then becomes the responsibility of the county agent supervisors and specialists to determine how the extension service, through its specialists and county agents, can assist farm people in solving the problems that exist out in the communities - problems which these people realize exist and with which they want assistance in effecting a solution. It is going to be difficult for specialists to think in terms of problems instead of projects. It will require the change of many sub-projects and the creation of some new sub-projects to get something that will actually bear upon the problem that exists. As a simple example of what I mean, we had for many years carried a sheep project in one of our counties. We called it the Missouri Plan of Sheep Improvement. Farm people were supposed to use purebred rams, produce early lambs, feed grain to the lambs and market them in May and June. The thing failed to go over. In a recent meeting the farm people themselves pointed out that they couldn't raise sheep because they didn't have fences, and if they had fences the dogs and wolves would take the sheep. The problem was one of fences and one of eradication of dogs and wolves. Though the specialists knew this was good sheep country and each year sold the county agents

on the idea of conducting a sheep project, the job simply did not get done because we had failed to get at the problem that had to be solved before any improvement in sheep production could be effected. All of you are familiar with simple illustrations concerning the liming project. In many counties we held numberless meetings and demonstrations and wrote thousands of circular letters and newspaper articles on the value of lime. For some reason the land for the most part remained unlimed until someone discovered that the reason the land wasn't limed was because there was no place to get the lime. The problem in many counties was a source of limestone at a reasonable cost and until that problem was solved, volumes of conversation and reams of literature were of no avail.

One problem that comes up in most county groups is that of low income. This may be looked upon, in a broad sense, as a farm management problem. The problem will probably not be solved until certain adjustments have been made in the farm plan. It may not be solved until improved practices within certain enterprises have been adopted; this calls for commodity specialist contribution. It may not be solved until the outgo for expenses has been reduced to within the income. This may require the attention of the garden and nutrition specialists. Lack of good pasture may be the thing that is causing the trouble. Farm people themselves can break down these problems and give a picture to the county agent who in turn can give it to state extension workers; with such a picture we can coordinate our activities.

What we have said is that we believe the key in arriving at a coordinated plan of action is to get farm men and women to determine their own problems with what assistance we can give them, after which extension workers can work on those problems, forgetting our projects and developing a plan of work for that county, using information and suggestions by the specialists who have something to contribute to the solution of those problems.

For many years our home economics workers did a better job than our agricultural workers in developing plans of work. It is difficult now, however, for them to change their plan of program making to fit into one of problem solution. The womens' clubs in the counties have selected their projects from the list sent to them or carried to them from the state office. Eventually that plan of program building, I believe, will be abandoned and their programs and plans of work will be developed at the same time and in the same way as the agricultural plans are developed.

The coming of the land-use planning project may be useful in furnishing us a basis upon which to build extension programs. The work that has been done up to date on the county agricultural planning project has been too mechanical and has consisted too largely in simply answering a list of questions to be particularly useful. Unless this newer plan actually develops farmer thinking and thinking in terms of problems and how to solve those problems, we may waste a lot of time and effort in this new land-use planning.

We must also guard against devoting all of our energies to land-use planning and thereby fail to develop the home side of the program. It is our hope that in our state we will be in position to continue the work that we have developed in nine of our counties where already we have committees of farm men and women working on all phases of their community problems. In getting at their problems they may decide that their outstanding need in a particular community is one of roads or of churches, things that could hardly be called land-use and things that the extension service may not feel are within its scope of activities. Nevertheless, if these are problems, they should be brought out and laid on the table and extension should assist in seeing that these problems are presented to those groups that may have some assistance. Extension can assist in planning meetings so that these things may be discussed and solved by the farm people themselves. In our thinking we hope

in a few counties to make the land-use planning committee a definite sub-committee of this broader rural planning committee. We hope to get at all the problems within a given county and to move upon those problems at the same time and in a coordinated way.

Perhaps the greatest function that extension can perform is to assist farm people to help themselves. After all is said and done, we know that when farm problems are eventually solved, that by and large, farm people will solve them themselves. If we can stimulate their thinking and offer them hope and encouragement and some suggestions as to the solution of these problems, and bring to their attention whatever our colleges of agriculture and experiment stations have in the solution of those problems, we will perhaps have fulfilled our responsibility.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA



3 1951 D00 369 852 A