

Chapter 3

KSU Cooperative Extension III

The Crisis Years—1930-1949

Contents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension Programs—1930-3392 Wheat Belt Program—1930.....92 Correlated Programs—1930.....92 Home Economics Programs—1930.....93 Farm Cooperatives—193093 Rodent Eradication—1930.....93 Discontinue Millinery—1930.....93 New HE Positions—1930.....93 Long-Time Programs—1930.....93 Reaching Unorganized Counties—1930.....93 4-H Club Program—1930.....93 County Program Evaluation—1930s.....93 Extension Outlook—1930.....94 Fair Exhibits—1930.....94 Agricultural Trains—1930s.....94 Extension Organization—1930-3694 Six Farm Bureaus Organized—1930.....94 AAA Adds Incentive to Organize—1933-36.....94 County Farm Bureaus—1930s.....95 Extension Home Economics—1930s.....95 Budget Law—1931.....95 State Staff Adjustments—1932.....95 County Staff Adjustments—1932-33.....95 Changes in Contract Agreement—1932.....96 Additional Counties Organized—1933-36.....96 Economic Conditions Affect Budget—1934.....96 Staff Expands—1935-36.....97 Extension Projects Organization—1935.....97 Farm Bureau Dues—1933.....97 County Appropriations—1935.....97 Membership Campaign—1935.....98 Bankhead-Jones Act—1935.....98 Status of Extension Organization—1935-.....98 Status of Extension Organization—1936.....98 Program Coordination—1930s.....99 Extension Administrative Handbook—1933.....99 Planning by Sub-Districts—1934.....99 Invite Farm Bureau Presidents—1933.....99 Joint Conferences—1930's.....99 Drought—1931.....99 Feed and Seed Loans—1932.....99 Emergency Drought & Economic Relief —1934.....100 Homestead Rehabilitation—1934.....100 Livestock Distribution & Maintenance—1934.....100 Subsistence Gardens—1934.....100 Food & Clothing Relief—1934.....100 Meat Preparation and Utilization—1934.....100 Clothing—1934.....100 Homestead Rehabilitation Corp.—1934.....100 Emergency Crop and Livestock Loans—1934.....100 Water Conservation Program—1934.....100 Emergency Drought & Economic Relief—1935.....101 Cattle Buying—1935.....101 Sheep Buying—1935.....101 Emergency Feed Program—1935.....101 Reduced Freight Rates—1935.....101 Seed Stocks—1935.....101 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farm Record Books—1935.....101 Emergency Loans—1935.....101 Rural Rehab—1935.....101 Emergency Gardens—1935.....101 Soil Wind Erosion—1935.....101 Wheat Allotment Contracts—1935.....102 Wheat Referendum—1935.....102 Corn-Hog Program—1935.....102 Agricultural Adjustment Admin. (AAA)—1933-34.....102 Agricultural Adjustment Admin.—1933.....102 Administration of Kansas AAA—1933.....103 AAA Funds for Administration—1934.....104 AAA Funds for Corn-Hog Program—1934.....104 AAA Funds for Drought Relief/Cattle—1934.....104 Wheat Program—1933.....104 Wheat Adjustment Activities—1933-34.....104 Emergency Hog Buying Program—1933.....105 Corn-Hog Program—1934.....105 Corn-Hog Contracts—1934.....105 Cattle Buying Program—1934.....105 Sugar Beet Adjustment Program—1934.....105 Cotton Acreage Reduction Program—1934.....105 Tobacco Adjustment Program—1934.....106 Special Extension Staff—1933-37.....106 Emergency Agricultural Agents—1933.....106 Agents/Ag Adjustment Adm.—1934 (AAA).....106 Assistant County Agents—1935.....106 Cow Testing Agents—1937.....107 Soil Conservation Agents—1937.....107 Extension AAA Programs —1934.....107 Adjustment Payments—1934.....107 AAA—1934.....107 Rural Organization/Farm Finance—1934.....108 Production Credit Associations—1934.....108 Outlook Material—1934.....108 PCA Loans—1934.....108 Emergency Economic Relief Activities—1936-37.....108 AAA Ruled Unconstitutional—1936.....108 Soil Conservation Act—1936.....108 Extension Assumes Planning Role—1936.....108 Create State AAA Committee—1936.....109 Co. Ag Program Advisory Committees—1936.....109 State Ag Program Advisory Comm.—1936.....109 State Ag Conservation Program—1936.....109 AAA Payments—1937.....109 AAA Activities—1937-38.....110 Ag Conservation Meetings—1938.....110 AAA Organization—1938.....110 State AAA Costs—1938.....110 AAA Payments to Farmers—1938.....110 Publicity Materials for Conservation—1938.....110 Agricultural Projects—1940.....110 Agents' Time for AAA—1940.....111 Soil Conservation Service—1935.....111 Soil Conservation Surveys—1935.....111 Soil Conservation Associations—1935.....111 Conservation Memorandum—1935.....111
--	--

Extension Soil Conservation Staff—1935.....	111	Extension Personnel in Wartime—1941-45.....	120
Soil Conservation Act—1936.....	111	Agricultural Production Goals—1942.....	120
Extension Conservationists—1937.....	111	Special Wartime Projects—1941-45.....	121
State Ag Conservation Committees—1939.....	111	Neighborhood Leaders—1941-45.....	121
Publicity Materials for Conservation—1938.....	112	War Boards—1941-45.....	121
Docket of Conservation Practices—1938-39.....	112	Over-All Effort.....	121
Wind Erosion Counties—1939.....	112	Victory Gardens Conference—1942.....	122
Rural Electrification Administration—1935.....	112	Neighborhood Leader Program—1941-45.....	122
Farmers Home Administration—1935.....	113	Food Production Agents—1941-45.....	122
Farm Credit Administration—1935.....	113	Oil Crops for War Effort—1941-45.....	122
Farm Credit Administration—1935.....	112	War Food Assistants—1945.....	123
Farm & Home Week—1935-46.....	113	Extension Programs—1941-45.....	123
Special Features—1935.....	113	Labor Shortage—1941-45.....	123
Continued Growth—1939.....	113	Weather and Production—1941-45.....	123
New Program Features—1940.....	114	Post-War Problems—1946-59.....	123
Radio Week—1945.....	114	Work With Urban People—1940s.....	123
Split Program—1946.....	114	Asst. Agents for Urban Clientele—1943-49.....	124
Attendance Recap—1935-46.....	114	Administrative Effectiveness—1940.....	124
District Conferences—1947.....	115	Staff Growth Continues—1944.....	124
Extension Lay Leaders—1935-40.....	115	Extension Finances—1940s.....	126
Role of Volunteer Leaders—1935.....	115	Extension Budgets Improve—1940s.....	126
Train County Executive Boards—1939.....	115	State/Federal Funds to Counties—1940-46.....	126
Volunteer Leaders—1940.....	116	County Ext. Budget Sources—1940-64.....	126
Fall (Anniversary) Festivals—1939.....	116	County Appropriations—1940-64.....	127
Extension Schools—1936.....	116	Collect Dues by Mail—1942.....	127
Five Year School Summary—1941-45.....	117	County Farm Bureau Dues—1943-46.....	128
County Educational Meetings—1936-88.....	117	Notices Mailed & Percent Collected—1943-46.....	128
Short Courses for Young Farmers—1938-40.....	117	Aid to Low Valuation Counties—1946-64.....	128
Two-Day Short Courses—1938.....	117	Aid to Low Valuation Counties—1946-50.....	129
Four-Week Short Courses—1940.....	118	Valuation Reduces Eligibility—1949.....	130
Housing for Division of Extension—1930's.....	118	Balanced Farming Program—1945-48.....	130
Lease Housing Space—1936.....	118	Training Schools.....	130
Cooperation with Other Agencies—1930's-80's.....	119	Assigned to Farm Management—1958.....	131
World War II—1941-45.....	120	Extension Project Organization—1946.....	131
Extension's Strategic Position—1941-45.....	120		

Extension Programs—1930-33

In spite of a period of economic distress, there was no decline in the Kansas Extension program during the 1930's.

Six new County Farm Bureaus were organized, in 1930, the greatest number for any year up to that time. They were: Grant, Greeley, Thomas, Norton, Ellsworth and Mitchell counties.

Less difficulty was experienced in securing additional funds than in the past. The year 1930 also marked additional progress in coordinating Extension projects.

Wheat Belt Program—1930

The five-year Wheat Belt Program was brought to a successful conclusion and a new program, broader in scope, developed for western Kansas. The original program correlated agronomy, entomology, plant pathology, and marketing.

The new program also included farm management, agricultural engineering, livestock production, dairying, poultry, home economics, and boys' and girls' work.

For eastern Kansas, another correlated Extension program was being organized to include all of the Extension projects. The first coordination was a closer working relationship between agronomy and animal science Specialists. More legumes were needed, for example, before dairying could be effectively developed in southeast Kansas.

The Agricultural Economists divided the state into twelve economic areas known as "Type-of-Farming Areas." Extension Specialists began to plan programs to fit each area.

Correlated Programs—1930

Correlated programs in effect during 1930, and the projects involved were:

- 1) Wheat Belt Program—Agronomy, Marketing, Plant Pathology, Entomology.
- 2) Soil Improvement—Agronomy, Rural Engineering, Dairy, Animal Husbandry and Utilization.
- 3) Legume Production—Agronomy, Rural Engineering, Dairy, Animal Husbandry and Utilization.

- 4) Beef Production —Animal Husbandry, Marketing, Agronomy, Veterinary.
- 5) Profitable Pork Production—Animal Husbandry, Agronomy, Veterinary, Farm Management.
- 6) Horticulture—Horticulture, Entomology, Plant Pathology.
- 7) Potato Production—Plant Pathology, Horticulture, Entomology, Marketing.
- 8) Fruit and Vegetable—Gardens & Nutrition, Horticulture, Entomology, Nutrition.
- 9) Poultry Production—Poultry, Rural Engineering, Veterinary.

Home Economics Programs—1930

Farm women took a greater interest in planning their county Extension program in Home Economics in 1930 than in any previous year.

The program was conducted in 63 organized counties, 13 of which were organized for the first time in 1930. Membership of women was 11,286 in 1930, 1,746 more than the previous year.

Farm Cooperatives—1930

National legislation pertaining to cooperative marketing caused cooperative leaders to look to Extension for assistance in marketing, leadership training, and organization.

Rodent Eradication—1930

"The Eradicating Rodent Pests in Kansas Project," conducted for several years in cooperation with the Biological Survey, USDA, was officially discontinued June 30, 1930.

Discontinue Millinery—1930

The Millinery Project was discontinued November 30, 1930, and a new project, "Home Furnishings" became effective on December 1, 1930.

New HE Positions—1930

In 1930, a position in Extension Home Economics, that of Assistant Home Demonstration Leader, was established. The person in that position was responsible for supervising the Home Demonstration Agents.

A second Assistant Home Demonstration Leader was appointed and assigned part-time to do organization work in counties without Home Demonstration Agents and part-time as an Extension Clothing Specialist.

Long-Time Programs—1930

Long-time programs were being continued (1930), with major and minor projects, according to the long-time plan. Specialists were correlating their field work with the county long-time plans.

In 1930, the total men's membership was 18,540, with dues generally at \$5, but a few counties at dues of \$2, \$3 and \$4. Women's membership totaled 11,189, with dues at \$1 generally, although a few had dues of \$2, and one county \$5.

Reaching Unorganized Counties—1930

One home economics project was carried in each county that did not have a Home Demonstration Agent.

The Wheat Belt Program, involving crop, entomology, plant pathology, and marketing, was carried in these counties unorganized for Extension: Barber, Hamilton, Haskell, Kiowa, Republic, Scott, and Trego. An animal husbandry program was carried in Wabaunsee County.

4-H Club Program—1930

The 4-H Club program in 1930 was conducted in 78 organized counties and 15 unorganized counties. There were 625 clubs with 13,224 members, of whom 9,199 members completed their project reports. There were 225 demonstration teams, and 287 judging teams.

Nineteen 4-H camps were attended by 1,184 members. There were 2,169 entries at the Topeka Free Fair, and 2,909 at the State Fair.

County Program Evaluation—1930's

Two means of evaluating county Extension programs were used during the late 1930's.

A satisfactory Extension program was reflected by the number of Farm Bureau members and the adequacy of the county appropriation.

New counties organized during 1936 were Morton, Decatur, Phillips, and Wabaunsee. Each became fully operative on January 1, 1937. Gove and Trego counties remained unorganized for Extension programs at that time.

By 1937, the use of local leaders continued to be very important due to the increased scope of Extension programs. Too many leaders had too many different responsibilities. Therefore, more leaders were recruited.

The Agricultural Adjustment Program helped to discover many local leaders. In 1937, there were 14,639

leaders in the agricultural programs, and 13,809 in home economics programs.

Extension Outlook—1930

In his report for 1930, Director Umberger, commenting on the Outlook for Extension Work in Kansas, said:

A balanced and effective program in every county is the ultimate goal of the Kansas Extension Service. During 1930, marked progress was made toward attaining this objective.

This is indicated by the increased enrollment in Boys' and Girls' Club work, by the increased number of counties carrying an adequate club program, and by the accelerated interest in all of the projects relating to the development of rural homes and communities.

The demand for assistance in Agriculture, Home

Economics, and 4-H Club Work is increasing faster than funds permit the development of Extension work.

Fair Exhibits—1930

In 1930, a fair exhibit was prepared and shown at the Free Fair at Topeka, the Kansas State Fair at Hutchinson, and the Kansas National Livestock Show at Wichita.

The exhibit consisted of 96 panels, four by four feet in size. Each of the fairs contributed \$400 toward the expense of preparing and displaying the exhibits. The Santa Fe and Rock Island railroads provided the transportation from Manhattan to the fairs and return.

More than 150,000 persons viewed the exhibits. The State Fair exhibit was continued on the same cooperative basis for several years.

Agricultural Trains—1930's

By the 1930's, the agricultural trains were being challenged by other information delivery methods as ways to reach Extension audiences.

Only three such trains ran the circuit during these final years of traveling exhibits, but still they were able to draw creditable audiences.

However, the train companies were beginning to lose interest in providing the amount of support needed to continue this popular Extension approach to taking the educational message to those portions of the state where the people lived.

The three major trains that ran during this fourth decade of agricultural trains were:

1930 - Wheat Festival Train, over Santa Fe and Rock Island Lines. Fifty-eight stops, 106,150 in attendance.

1931 - Beef Cattle Festival Train, in cooperation with the Santa Fe Railway. Twelve days, 34 stops, 109,135 in attendance.

1937 - Better Farm Homes Train, in cooperation with the Santa Fe Railway. Thirty-seven stops, 67,192 in attendance.

Extension Organization—1930-36

Six County Farm Bureaus Organize—1930

Six additional counties organized in 1930. These included:

Greeley Co. Jan 28, 1930
 Grant Co. Mar 14, 1930
 Norton Co. Mar 29, 1930
 Mitchel Co. Apr 13, 1930
 Thomas Co. Apr 18, 1930
 Ellsworth Co. Apr 26, 1930

Kiowa Co.	Nov 4, 1933
Steven Co.	Dec 20, 1933
Seward Co.	Dec 29, 1933
Logan Co.	Jan 12, 1934
Rush Co.	Jan 12, 1934 (reorganized)
Republic Co.	Jan 19, 1934
Rooks Co.	Jan 25, 1934
Scott Co.	Jan 25, 1934
Wallace Co.	Jan 26, 1934
Kearny Co.	Feb 1, 1934
Stanton Co.	Feb 2, 1934
Haskell Co.	Feb 14, 1934
Barber Co.	Feb 15, 1934 (reorganized)

AAA Adds Incentive to Organize—1933-36

Following the incentive provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program, the following counties were organized:

Hamilton Co.	Feb 15, 1934
Wichita Co.	Mar 8, 1934
Graham Co.	Jun 26, 1934
Ellis Co.	Aug 15, 1934 (reorganized)
Osborne Co.	Dec 5, 1934
Elk Co.	Feb 26, 1935
Pottawatomie Co.	Jun 27, 1935
Chautauqua Co.	Dec 29, 1935
Decatur Co.	Feb 19, 1936
Morton Co.	Mar 26, 1936
Phillips Co.	Apr 2, 1936
Wabaunsee Co.	Apr 10, 1936

Extension Home Economics—1930's

The Extension Home Economics program was conducted in 63 organized counties in 1930, 13 of which were organized for the first time. Women's membership in the program was 11,286 in 1930. It had increased by 1,746 members over 1929.

The total men's membership in the County Farm Bureaus was 18,540, with dues generally at \$5. Some counties had dues at \$2, \$3 and \$4.

County Farm Bureaus—1930's

During 1930, the District Extension Agents met with the Executive Boards of the County Farm Bureaus to discuss administrative duties, and present a new constitution which would cover a number of points not mentioned in previously adopted constitutions.

Out of those conferences came many questions:

- 1) What will we do with the non-member who says, "I can get just as much out of the Farm Bureaus as you do?"
- 2) Should the Home Demonstration Agent, or a local leader, give the home economics subject matter?
- 3) Is it possible to conduct an agricultural program without a personal contact? How is this best secured?
- 4) Why do we not have a set of directions for board members?
- 5) More training for male project leaders is desirable. Why don't give it to them? How could it best be given?
- 6) How can we hold the interest of a community 30 miles from the office and separated by topographical barriers?
- 7) How can we make people like the Farm Bureau program?

8) Should the County Agent have more than one office day per week?

9) How can we use group meetings to promote our program?

10) Why don't we have a group of men equal in number to the Farm Bureau board members, who will give as much time to each of the projects in the program as board members give to administration?

11) Why don't the Agricultural Specialists meet with project leaders on every trip to the county?

12) How can we develop community interest?

13) Should the County Agent be a high-priced delivery boy? How can he avoid it?

14) Couldn't we have a more effective agricultural program by training leaders in the counties instead of holding general meetings?

15) How can we develop a membership consciousness?

16) Are there politics in the Farm Bureau?

17) What should the Agent get from the Specialist's visit?

18) What should the Agent get from the training school?

19) What contribution to the program is made by a Specialist's private inspection tour?

20) Why isn't the Farm Bureau financed entirely by taxation?

Budget Law—1931

A law passed by the 1931 Kansas legislature, House Bill 484, provided that each taxing unit in the State should publish its proposed budget for the year, include the itemized expenditures for the previous year, and call a hearing upon the budget prior to the time that the levy was to be certified to the County Clerk.

State Staff Adjustments—1932

Retrenchment of Federal and State funds required discontinuing the following Central Office positions, July 1, 1932:

Specialist, Livestock Marketing

Instructor, Horticulture—Home Study Department

Instructor, Animal Husbandry—Home Study Department

Instructor, Home Economics (half-time)

Office Clerk—Bulletin room Home Study Department

One stenographer—Rural Engineering Department

One stenographer—Home Study Department

Also reduced were one stenographic position to half-time in Director's Office, and one clerk to half-time in bulletin room.

County Staff Adjustments—1932-33

Decreased support from county funds required the dropping of 10 county positions between December 1, 1931 and November 30, 1932, as follows:

<u>County</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Date</u>
Clay	Home Demonst. Agt.	Dec 15, 1931
Dickinson	Home Demonst. Agt.	Nov 30, 1932
Marion	Home Demonst. Agt.	Dec 31, 1931
	Home Demonst. Agt.	Sep 26, 1932
Saline	Home Demonst. Agt.	Dec 31, 1931
Kingman	County Club Agent	Dec 31, 1931
Saline	County Club Agent	Dec 31, 1931
Atchison	Assistant Co. Agent	Dec 31, 1931
Doniphan	Assistant Co. Agent	Dec 31, 1931
Leavenworth	Assistant Co. Agent	Dec 31, 1931

In 1933, an Assistant Extension Editor was added full-time, and one clerk in the bulletin room was changed from half-time to full-time.

At the end of 1932, the Club Agent position in Butler County and the Home Demonstration Agent positions in Cherokee, Douglas, Kingman, and Morris counties were discontinued. An Agricultural Agent position was added in Kiowa County, November 13, 1933.

Changes in Contract Agreement—1932

On January 15, 1932, the contract agreement form used for the employment of County Agents was revised by eliminating the "60-day clause."

Previously, the contract provided that an Agent must notify the County Farm Bureau Executive Board at least 60 days before he expected to resign, or the Farm Bureau Board was required to notify the Agent at least 60 days before it desired to discontinue his service.

A few very unsatisfactory situations developed during that 60-day period when an Agent whose employment had been terminated by the Farm Bureau Board caused some trouble and embarrassment to the County Farm Bureau Board.

Additional Counties Organized—1933-36

The stimulus for county organizations to provide supervision for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program in addition to sponsorship for a County Extension program brought about the organization of the following counties late in 1933 and during 1934:

1933:	Nov 4	Kiowa Co.
	Dec 20	Stevens Co.
	Dec 29	Seward Co.
1934:	Jan 12	Logan Co.
	Jan 12	Rush Co. (Reorganized)
	Jan 19	Republic Co.
	Jan 25	Rooks Co. (Reorganized)
	Jan 25	Scott Co.
	Jan 26	Wallace Co.
	Feb 1	Kearny Co.
	Feb 2	Stanton Co.
	Feb 14	Haskell Co.
	Feb 15	Barber Co. (Reorganized)
	Feb 15	Hamilton Co.
	Mar 8	Wichita Co.
	Jun 26	Graham Co.
	Aug 15	Ellis Co. (Reorganization)
	Dec 5	Osborne Co.

In 1935 and 1936, the following counties were organized:

1935:	Feb 26,	Elk Co.
	Jun 27,	Pottawatomie Co.
	Dec 29,	Chautauqua Co.
1936:	Feb 19,	Decatur Co.
	Mar 26,	Morton Co.
	Apr 2,	Phillips Co.
	Apr 10,	Wabaunsee Co.

Economic Conditions Affect Budget—1934

In 1934, the condition of Kansas agriculture appeared more optimistic than in any year since 1931.

In 1933, the products from Kansas farms brought \$240 million.

The estimate for 1934, including AAA benefit payments, was \$240 million. The 20-year average was \$437.71 million.

While the 1931 corn-hog crop brought \$42 million, the 1934 corn-hog crop, including benefit payments, was estimated at \$50 million.

The 1931 wheat crop of 239 million bushels brought \$81 million, and the 1934 crop of 80 million bushels was estimated, including benefit payments, at \$87 million.

Staff Expands—1935-36

Three new Agricultural Extension Specialists were employed in 1935: an Agricultural Extension Economist in Farm Management, November 11, 1935; an Extension

Horticulturist, December 1, 1935; and an Extension Landscape Gardener, December 1, 1935.

An Extension Specialist in Marketing Poultry and Dairy Products was employed June 5, 1936; and an Extension Specialist in Rodent Control, on a temporary basis, December 20, 1935 to May 31, 1936.

Extension Projects Organization—1935

In 1935, the organization of Extension projects was:

- 1) Administration
- 2) Publicity
- 3) County Agent Work
- 4) Home Demonstration Work
- 5) Boys' and Girls' Club Work
- 6) Extension Schools in Agriculture and Home Economics and the Supervision of Agricultural Extension Specialists
- 7) Soil Management and Crop Production
- 8) Plant Pathology
- 9) Horticulture
- 10) Animal Husbandry
- 11) Dairying
- 12) Veterinary Medicine
- 13) Poultry Husbandry
- 14) Entomology
- 15) Eradicating Rodent Pests in Kansas (Inactive since 1930)
- 16) Farm Management
- 17) Marketing
- 18) Extension Schools in Home Economics and the Supervision of Home Economics Specialists (Discontinued, 1926)
- 19) Foods and Nutrition
- 20) Clothing
- 21) Millinery (Discontinued, 1930)
- 22) Home Health and Sanitation
- 23) Home Management
- 24) Rural Engineering
- 25) Home Study Service
- 26) Radio
- 27) Home Furnishings
- 28) Rural Organization and Farm Finance
- 29) Farm Forestry (Adopted, 1935)

Farm Bureau Dues—1933

The collection of Farm Bureau membership dues was slow in 1933. Many farmers planned to pay their dues when they received their wheat allotment checks. Many farmers had not produced crops for two years due to the severe drought.

County Appropriations—1934

County appropriations improved in 1933 for 1934. In 1932, only three counties showed an increase over the previous year, 69 showed a decrease, and six remained the same. For 1933, seven counties showed an increase, 63 made a decrease, and eight remained the same.

For 1934, 29 counties gave an increase in appropriations, only 33 decreased, and 18 remained the same.

The decreases were comparatively small as the average reduction was only \$75. However, the average per county for 1934 was \$2,137, \$1,870 under 1930, the highest to that day.

During those years, several positions were dropped from the county budgets. Thirteen counties appropriated the minimum provided by law, \$1,200.

During 1933, a total of 10,621 farmers secured emergency loans for spring crop and summer fallowing of wheat lands for \$2,091,110. Repayment of the loans were started several weeks before they were due.

County Appropriations—1935

The County Budgets (for 75 counties) totaled:

Source	Amount	Averages
Federal, State & College	\$112,950.00	\$1,506.00
County Appropriations	293,822.68	3,917.54
Membership Dues	94,644.41	1,261.93
Other Sources Budgeted	<u>5,406.98</u>	<u>72.00</u>
Total	\$506,824.07	\$6,757.57

Expansion of the Extension Service program because of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (i.e., 25 additional Kansas counties organized from 1933 to 1936) created a need for additional Federal funds if the established pattern of allocations to the states was to be continued.

Membership Campaign—1935

The membership campaign procedure was revised at the Annual Extension Conference and the annual meeting of the Kansas Farm Bureau.

The revised plan provided that district meetings be attended by the County Agent and a membership committee from each county. The District Agent and a representative of the Kansas Farm Bureau were to conduct the meetings.

Each county then organized a "hop-off" meeting the night before, or the noon of the day the campaign was to start. Each township vice-president was to take

the responsibility of selecting a team to help him and bring them to the hop-off meeting. This plan worked quite successfully for a number of years.

In 1935, the number of men signed for membership on May 1, was 31,878, of which 6,384 were still deferred for payment on October 31. Women's membership was 18,823 signed by May 1. Of these, 1,906 were still deferred on October 31.

Total resources for the county Extension budgets were:

Federal and State funds	\$125,237
County appropriations	227,773
Membership Due Budgeted	56,509
Other sources budgeted	<u>23,762</u>
Total Resources	\$433,281

Bankhead-Jones Act—1935

The need for more Federal funding support for states was met by passage of the Bankhead-Jones Act, on June 29, 1935. The funds from this act included those previously provided by Supplementary Smith-Lever, Additional Cooperative, Agricultural Adjustment Ad-

ministration and Federal Cooperative Demonstration funds, plus \$154,000 of additional funds.

The allocation of Federal funds to the states was on the basis of 50 percent on farm population and 50 percent on rural population.

Status of Extension Organization—1935-36

The wheat crop for 1935 was a complete failure west of the 100th meridian and a very material failure in central Kansas. Only 57,409,000 bushels were produced in 1935, which was only one-fourth of the past five-year average.

Grain sorghum production was estimated at 12 million bushels for 1935, four-fifths of the five-year average. The State as a whole was aggravated by continuous dust storms throughout April and May.

The resulting emergency activities to aid farmers were distracting to the Extension program. However, membership in the County Farm Bureaus showed a substantial increase and the total county appropriations increased \$20,502 over the previous year.

In 1935, the total county appropriations were \$239,145 for the 99 organized counties with an average of \$2,416; the highest \$7,460; the lowest \$1,200.

During 1935, four County Farm Bureaus were organized: Chautauqua, Elk, Osborne and Pottawatomie.

Status of Extension Organization—1936

In 1936, the average resources for the 103 organized counties were:

One-agent counties (71)	\$ 3,665
Two-agent counties (29)	6,628
Three-agent counties (3)	11,369

The average County Agents salary was \$2,030 on November 1, 1936.

Four additional counties were organized during 1936. They were:

Norton Co.	March 26, 1936
Phillips Co.	April 2, 1936
Decatur Co.	February 19, 1936
Wabaunsee	April 20, 1936

Program Coordination—1930's

Extension Administrative Handbook—1933

An Extension Service Administrative Handbook was prepared by the Clearing-House Committee for use of all Extension personnel as a method of being informed on policies. The Clearing-House Committee was first appointed in 1933 to prepare instructional materials for the Agricultural Adjustment Program.

The plan for the Handbook included provisions for replacement of materials, and for inspection by the Supervisor to be used when visiting county Extension workers. The Handbook, with appropriate updates and revisions, has continued to be used up to the present time (1989).

Planning by Sub-Districts—1934

Another new feature in Extension program planning used in 1934, was division of the state into 21 sub-districts for major program planning.

The Extension Agents and Farm Bureau Presidents from each of the five counties within a sub-district sat around tables in conference with Extension Specialists, who were scheduled to work in those counties during the following year.

This plan for county program development was

followed until county program planning through use of committees was started.

Monthly conferences of the entire State or Central Office staff were inaugurated in the early 1930's. Weekly conferences were held by the Extension Supervisors in each district, at which time they prepared a report of their activities.

An agreement was reached with the Experiment Station so staff members could do Extension work if and when needed. The Extension Service paid the travel expenses of the Experiment Station workers on these assignments.

Invite Farm Bureau Presidents—1933

In 1933, County Farm Bureau presidents were invited to attend the Annual Extension Conference to contribute to the discussions on county program planning.

Joint Conferences—1930's

In 1934 the Kansas Farm Bureau and Extension planned their programs together and provided for one joint session.

The County Farm Bureau presidents, after contributing to Extension program planning, attended the State Farm Bureau sessions.

Drought—1931

Early in 1931, Congress provided for drought relief loans to distressed farmers.

A State Drought Relief Committee called a meeting, which included District Extension Agents, to select counties to be eligible for loans.

Counties designated as eligible for drought relief by the committee were Cowley, Butler, Lyon, and all counties directly east of them; and Barber, Comanche, Clark, Ford, and Hodgeman counties.

Each of those counties designated a Drought Relief Committee to receive applications for loans and forward them to a St. Louis office for seed loans.

At the close of business on December 5, 1931, applications totaled \$145,69.16, and \$20,087.63 had been remitted on the applications.

The drought situation brought about decreases

in Federal and State appropriations, requiring an adjustment in budgets and a reappraisal of proposed expenditures.

Feed and Seed Loans—1932

In January, 1932, Congress passed the Feed and Seed Loan bill which provided low-cost loans to farmers in need of credit. Applications for loans were generally handled in the County Extension Agents office and referred to a County Seed Loan Committee of three men, one of whom was a key banker in the county.

Approved applications were sent to the Regional Feed and Seed Loan Office in St. Louis. The total number of loans approved was 2,154.

Very few applications were rejected. Some borrowers considered the loan a grant and, therefore, repaid it reluctantly—sometimes several years later with considerable interest.

Emergency Drought & Economic Relief Activities—1934

Because of a severe drought, and prevailing low incomes in 1934, the Extension Service was called upon to give assistance in a number of relief programs, including:

Homestead Rehabilitation—1934

Developed by the Kansas Emergency Relief Committee to aid families on relief with additional employment, development of new skills, and any other ways of adding to their income.

About 2,000 families used the opportunity to improve their income. The program was conducted by supervisors and assistants employed by the State Emergency Relief Committee.

Organization of the Homestead Rehabilitation program was based on a plan developed by the Extension Service.

Livestock Distribution & Maintenance—1934

Cattle and hogs purchased during the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) buying programs, under the supervision of the Extension Service, were turned over to the Kansas Emergency Relief Committee, for distribution or maintenance until their disposal. This program included 478,475 cattle and 7,979 hogs.

Subsistence Gardens—1934

Families of the unemployed were encouraged to use any plot of ground available to produce food for their family.

A temporary Assistant Extension Horticulture Specialist was employed from February 1 to November 15, 1934, to carry out the program.

County Commissioners furnished seed and plants, purchased through dealers, at a 25 percent discount.

If families did not have access to a plot of ground, an area for a community garden was found and made available.

In 88 counties, 14,581 gardens were grown under the plan, with a total value of \$99,970.79. However, the drought held down production.

Food and Clothing Relief—1934

Extension Specialists in Foods and Nutrition held training schools for Home Demonstration Agents on the preparation of low-cost meals. Canning was encouraged.

In a few cities, canning centers with large equipment were established. As a result of this program, 32,424 quarts of fruits and vegetables were canned;

97,375 pounds of fruits and vegetables were stored; 500 pounds of fruits and vegetables were dried; 17,154 quarts of meat were canned; and 126,571 pounds of meat were cured.

Meat Preparation & Utilization—1934

Training meetings were held for the County Extension Agents who in turn conducted meat cutting demonstrations, using relief funds to purchase animals for relief families, and packing houses who processed the animals for the families.

Clothing—1934

Twelve counties organized and equipped sewing rooms for the use of families in repairing and renovating clothing. Extension Home Demonstration Agents and volunteer leaders provided supervision.

Homestead Rehabilitation Corp.—1934

A corporation was organized to buy, sell, hold, and deal in livestock, machinery, agricultural products, and other commodities, to be distributed to families on relief.

Milk cows purchased in the AAA cattle buying program were received and distributed to families who were in a situation to adequately care for them.

Emergency Crop & Livestock Loans—1934

The government provided \$45 million to loan to farmers in the drought areas. Loans were made largely through the County Extension Agents' offices.

Spring crop loans were made to 1,993 farmers for \$234,205, 11,657 summer fallow loans for \$2,109,100, and 125,200 livestock feed loans for \$879,388.

Water Conservation Program—1934

The possibility of ponds constructed in the relief program becoming silted in, as a result of soil erosion above them, brought about a need for a protective program.

Extension Engineers actively participated in a program of terrace construction and contour farming above the ponds.

The Relief Committee employed seven District Engineers to assist with the program. Extension Specialists gave training and demonstrations to assist the Relief Committee District Engineers with their program.

By the end of 1934, 29 counties were active in the program. There were 317,840 feet of terraces surveyed; 123,890 feet of terraces constructed; 683 acres of land

protected by terraces; 1,452 farm ponds locations surveyed; 525 wells completed; and 11 municipal lakes under construction.

Emergency Drought & Economic Relief Activities—1935

In 1935, the Emergency Drought Activities continued, and included:

Cattle Buying—1935

Cattle buying terminated January 12, 1935, after purchasing 521,041 head for \$7,523,942. By counties, the number of cattle purchased ranged from none in Allen County to 17,774 in Osborne County. Some of the best dairy cows were retained and turned over to rehabilitation families.

Sheep Buying—1935

Sheep bought numbered 9,569 head. Of that number, 2,704 were condemned as unfit for food.

Emergency Feed Program—1935

This program became effective in April, 1935, and was handled by the Kansas Homestead Rehabilitation Corporation.

The Feed purchased and distributed consisted of 170 railroad cars of cereal hay, 137 cars of legume hay, 128 cars of corn fodder, 45 cars of molasses feed, and 30 cars of horse and mule feed.

The program extended to 36 western drought designated counties.

Reduced Freight Rates—1935

Reduced freight rates were obtained for drought counties starting June 4, 1935, and continuing throughout the year.

The designation of drought counties changed during the year as moisture conditions changed.

The reduced freight rates were 50 percent of the regular rate for straw, hay, and roughages, two-thirds for grains and mixed feeds, 85 percent on livestock going to pasture in another area, and 15 percent for the return of the same cattle.

Seed Stocks—1935

Extension cooperated with the Federal Seed Stocks Committee to distribute 52,607 bushels of oats, 4,932 bushels of barley, and 670,000 pounds of sorghum seed of adapted varieties.

Farm Record Books—1935

The AAA Farm Record Book program, started in 1934, was continued in 1935. District Extension leader training meetings for Agents and leaders were held in

each five-county district on keeping and summarizing the books. There were 66,254 books distributed, 14,250 were summarized.

Emergency Loans—1935

Emergency loans to farmers, first made available in 1934, were continued in 1935. These loans were for livestock feed, spring crops, and wheat seeding.

Rural Rehab—1935

The Rural Rehabilitation program, formerly the Homestead Rehabilitation Program, continued to reach farm families in the drought areas of western Kansas.

By August 27, 1935, there were 9,751 applications for feed, seed, and subsistence. It was estimated that 10,000 additional families would need some form of assistance before another crop could be produced.

County Extension Agents served on the county committees considering the applications. On July 1, 1935, the Rural Rehabilitation program was placed under the direction of the Resettlement Administration.

The Extension Service was asked to approve personnel to be employed in the program. County Extension Agents emphasized the development of long-time farm plans designed to repay the loans, and help farmers to recover as rapidly as possible from the drought situation.

Emergency Gardens—1935

For the fourth year, Extension personnel gave assistance to the Emergency Garden Program sponsored by the Kansas Emergency Relief Committee.

Reports, from 53 counties involved, indicated that 171,549 quarts of food were canned, and 16,012 bushels stored for winter use.

Soil Wind Erosion—1935

An Emergency Wind Erosion Control Program was administered cooperatively with the Kansas Emergency Relief Committee. Approximately 2.5 million acres needed emergency tillage to help control wind erosion because of the drought.

An allocation of \$250,000 was made to Kansas for this work. Since most of the work was done by tractors, a payment of 10 cents per acre was established. Applications for tillage payments were submitted to the County Relief Committee for approval.

Each county was given an allotment of money from the state fund. Urgent requests were made for increases in Kansas Allocations.

The requests were considered, and funds increased to permit tillage of 750,000 additional acres. A total of 3,287,700 acres were in the final Kansas county quotas.

Wheat Allotment Contracts—1935

According to reports from County Agents on October 31, 1935, there were 95,163 wheat allotment contracts in force. The farms had been inspected for compliance and proofs of compliance submitted for payments. Payments on wheat contracts had been as follows:

1933 - \$23,417,893.19
1934 - 22,627,657.67
1935 - 14,219,131.41
and second payment
for 1935 still due.

The administrative cost per contract was \$6.25 in 1935, \$3.50 less than in 1934.

A referendum was held on May 25, 1935, to determine the wheat growers interest in continuing the wheat allotment program. Those voting for the continuance of the program numbered 65,516 and the negative vote was 7,552. Non-contract signers also voted with 6,252 favorable and 2,739 opposed.

Wheat Referendum—1935

A referendum was held on May 25, 1935, to determine the wheat growers interest in continuing the wheat allotment program. The vote for continuing the program was 65,516 and the vote against it was 7,552. Non-contract signers also voted, with 6,252 in favor of continuing the program and 2,739 opposed.

Corn-Hog Program—1935

The Corn-Hog Program was launched in Kansas on December 17-18, 1934. During 1935, 62,507 corn-hog contracts were signed representing 2,566,791 hogs and 4,255,435 acres of corn. By the end of October 1935, \$3,859,793.40 had been paid on the corn-hog contracts. A total of \$10,486,870 was the estimate of the total payments of the year.

Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA)—1933-34

The Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) was passed May 12, 1933, to restore farmers' purchasing power and remedy the severe disparity between the prices of farm products and other products.

Between December 1, 1933 and November 30, 1934 County Extension Agents devoted 17,302 days to the adjustment program; 10,896 meetings were held with a total attendance of 400,195. Extension Specialists and District Extension Supervisors spent 4,907 days on the program, in the field and the central office.

Agricultural Adjustment Admin.—1933

In late 1933, the Extension Service was assigned the responsibility of administering the National Agricultural Adjustment Administration program.

This program required some supervision in every county. Because of this situation the state was redistricted. Each district was given 35 counties, or one-third of the total number of counties in the state.

At the same time, each of the three districts was divided into seven sub-districts of five counties each, for the purpose of scheduling those five counties into a week of travel for the Supervisor or a Specialist.

Additional supervisory responsibilities brought about by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program in 1933 were met temporarily by assigning most of the Agricultural Specialists to supervisory work during the last four months of 1933. Each such Specialist supervised from five to seven counties only.

On January 1, 1934, three additional supervisory positions were authorized, the salaries to be paid from AAA funds. The supervisory staff then consisted of:

Northwest District

John V. Hepler, District Agent

Harry C. Baird, District Supervisor

Southwest District

C. R. Jaccard, District Agent

E. H. Teagarden, District Supervisor
Eastern District
Frank O. Blecha, District Agent
Otis B. Glover, District Supervisor

Administration of Kansas AAA—1933

The Director of Extension was assigned responsibility for administration of the AAA in Kansas. The state was divided into 15 districts of seven counties each, with an Extension Specialist in charge of each district.

To conduct the program in the counties, Kansas was redistricted into eight districts on September 4, 1933. It was redistricted into 15 districts on January 16, 1934, with the advent of the corn-hog program.

The County Extension Agent was placed in charge in each county. In addition to the regular 78 County Agents, 21 Emergency Agricultural Extension Assistants were appointed to unorganized counties (without Farm Bureaus) and as Assistants in a few counties.

By January, 1934, there were 79 regular County Agents, 20 counties employed Emergency Agricultural Assistants, and six counties employed no Agents.

An Extension Specialist was placed in charge of each district. In April, 1934, the state was divided into seven districts, and on July 1, 1934, the work was assigned to each of the three District Extension Agents for their districts and each was given an assistant with the title of District Supervisor.

By March 15, 1934, 11 additional counties had organized County Farm Bureaus and employed regular County Agents. By November, 1934, 95 counties were organized for Extension work (with County Farm Bureaus) and were employing regular County Agents.

In the Central Office, an Agricultural Adjustment Administration office was organized with three departments: office organization, field organization, and technical information.

A classroom at the south end of the second floor of Anderson Hall (next to the District Agents' office) was made available for the office. Each department was headed by one of the regular District Agents.

Extension Service representatives attended a regional meeting in Kansas City on June 26 and 27, 1933, at which time the Washington officials gave informa-

tion on philosophy, organization and operation of the program.

Following that meeting a two-day training school was held at Manhattan for all the personnel who were to assist with the program.

District meetings were then held to discuss the program with County Extension Agents and leaders or committeemen.

County Extension Agents then held meetings to present provisions of the program to the wheat growers in their counties.

Up to November 18, State Supervisors devoted 1,163 field days to the program, holding 114 district meetings with an attendance of 3,396 leaders.

County Extension Agents and Emergency Agents worked 6,627 days between July 10 and November 1. County and community committeemen devoted 19,083 days to their work.

An Interpretation Committee met daily to study and interpret the regulations coming from the Washington office.

The Interpretation Committee, consisting of the Director of Extension and the persons in charge of each phase of the adjustment program, was organized February 6, 1934. Its purpose was to interpret all rules, regulations and policies pertaining to the adjustment program in the counties.

With the inauguration of handbooks for each AAA project, a clearing house committee was appointed consisting of the Extension Editor, L. L. Longsdorf, L. C. Williams, in charge of Agricultural Specialists, and C. R. Jaccard, District Extension Agent.

A handbook was designed in which every person, state or county, could keep in a classified manner, the regulations and interpretations for their use.

A Clearing-House Committee was designated to supervise the distribution of information as it become available for personnel and the press.

Four counties had formed a temporary organization and were employing Assistant County Agents. Six counties were not organized and the work was being handled by committees only.

Federal funds for the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment program were allocated to Kansas on a six-month basis, or for shorter periods for the drought relief program.

Proposed budgets were submitted and used as the basis for the allocations. Funds actually expended in 1934 were:

5 District Supervisors: Salary (\$1,200 per annum, AAA)	\$3,000.00
12 Extension Workers: Salary (\$1,200 per annum, AAA)	6,600.00
59 County Agricultural Agents: Salary (\$900 per annum, May 16-Jun 30, 1934)	6,637.50
Emerg. Agricultural Assistants, Assist. County Agents and County Agents	15,133.78
101 County Office Assistants	26,260.00
Clerical Assistants, State Office	7,971.91
Clerk, State Office, AAA funds	560.66
1 Editor, State Office	639.97
Travel	66.08
Telephone, Telegraph, Supplies, Rent on Equipment, and Postage	<u>658.06</u>
Total Expenditures	\$67,527.96

AA Funds For Administration—1934

1 Administrative Assistant—State Office Salary— \$900 per annum AAA	\$ 450.00
22 Clerks— State Office (Average Number) Salary	10,313.84
99 Clerks— County Offices Salary \$150 per county	14,650.00
2 Clerks— County Offices (Sugar Beet) Salary— Estimated for December	150.00
7 District Supervisors (Including Ryan) Salary— \$1,200 per annum AAA	3,226.63
2 Editors — Salary, \$1,200 and \$1,080	1,113.00
78 County Agricultural Agents Salary—\$600 per annum AAA	23,400.00
23 Assistant County Agents and County Agents Salary-\$1,080 per annum AAA	11,520.00
8 Counties with short-term Assistant Agents Salary - \$1,080 to \$1,552.63 per annum	2,754.00
Telephone and telegraph	509.11
Supplies, equipment, etc.	<u>1,348.78</u>
Total Expenditures	\$69,635.36

AAA Funds For Corn-Hog Program—1934

Engineers - Salary	\$8,016.34
Travel - Turner, Willoughby, Leker	2,200.00
Estimated expense for December	<u>3,750.00</u>
Total	13,966.34

Total Expenditures (6-months) \$83,601.70

AAA Funds For Drought Relief/Cattle—1934

County Clerical Assistants	\$ 7,559.37
County Committeemen, Appraisers	43,974.52
State Office, Clerical Assistants	876.50
2 District Supervisors (Morgan/Taylor) Salary \$386.97 Travel \$647.42	1,034.39
Telephone, Telegraph, Supplies	<u>667.63</u>
Total Expenditures	\$54,112.41

June 1, 1934 to August 30, 1934

County Clerical Assistants	\$20,458.10
County Committeemen, Appraisers	54,833.39
State Office, Clerical Assistants	1,744.84
2 District supervisors (Morgan/Taylor) Salary at \$150.00 per month	900.00
5 District supervisors (Lumb, Elling, Moxley, Morgan, and Taylor), travel	2,226.77
Telephone, Telegraph, Supplies	<u>1,050.32</u>
Total Expenditures	\$81,243.42

Wheat Program—1933

By December 31, 1933, 97,812 applications for wheat allotment contracts had been signed in Kansas, involving 12,535,192 acres of wheat land. A total of 92,974 contracts had been signed providing for benefit payments of \$7,437,059.

The estimate was that the total payments to Kansas would be \$24 million; two-thirds to be paid on December 1933, and January 1934, and the balance the following September 1934.

The supervision of the wheat adjustment program was the responsibility of L. C. Williams, then in charge of Agricultural Specialists. On July 5, 1934, M. L. Robinson, McPherson County Agent, was appointed to handle the responsibility of the administration of the wheat adjustment program.

Wheat Adjustment Activities—1933-34

A summary of the wheat adjustment activities in Kansas, from December 1, 1933 to November 30, 1934, shows that 97,357 wheat allotment contracts were in force, representing a base acreage of 12,396,345 acres of wheat.

Only 1,122,072 acres were not under contract. By November 30, 1934, \$35,416,227.44 in wheat adjustment payments had been made to Kansas farmers.

Emergency Hog Buying Program—1933

On October 18, 1933, AAA announced a Pig and Sow Buying Program designed to improve the sale price of hogs.

Spring pigs weighing 25 to 30 pounds were bought at \$9.50 per cwt. The price decreased 25 cents per cwt. for each five-pounds of increase in weight, down to a minimum of \$6 per cwt. for pigs weighing 95-100 pounds.

Range pigs and razorbacks were bought at a discount of \$3 per cwt. Packers handled and processed the hogs at cost. The better parts of the carcasses were processed for food which was sold to the Federal Relief Administration. The balance was tanked to avoid competition in the food market.

One Extension Animal Husbandryman devoted 20 days in Kansas City as a coordinator between the Government and County Extension Agents. From August 23 to October 7, 1933, 698,830 head of pigs and sows weighing 43,255,001 pounds were purchased for \$3,081,984.55.

Corn-Hog Program—1934

Walter G. Ward, Extension Architect, was first placed in charge of the State Corn-Hog Adjustment program. Assisting him were Carl Elling, Extension Animal Husbandry Specialist, and Vance Rucker, Extension Marketing Specialist.

A state Advisory Committee for the Corn-Hog program consisted of W.W. Behrens of Osage County, E. H. Hodgson of Rice County, and H. C. Umberger, Director of Extension.

On July 1, 1934, Otis Glover, a newly appointed Extension District Supervisor, was assigned responsibility for general administration of the Corn-Hog program. At that time Walter Ward was assigned to the State Board of Review along with Hodgson and Floyd Reed, State Agricultural Statistician.

The Board of Review examined requests from counties for allotments, compared them with past production statistics, and determined the final county allotments, within the total Kansas allocation.

Corn-Hog Contracts—1934

The Corn-Hog program was launched in Kansas on December 17-18, 1934. There were 79,109 hog and corn producers who signed Corn-Hog contracts, representing 3,698,625 corn acres and 2,538,128 hogs.

The drought practically ruined the corn crop but the sign-up showed the popularity of the program in Kansas. Up to November 30, 1934, \$7,503,187.76 were paid Kansas producers for cooperating in the program. A total of almost \$16 million was paid when the final payments were made.

In 1935, 62,507 corn-hog contracts were signed representing 2,566,791 hogs and 4,255,435 acres of corn. By the end of October 1935, \$3,859,793.40 had been paid on the corn-hog contracts. A total of \$10,486,870 was the estimate of the total payments of the year.

Compliance work on the wheat and corn-hog programs was assigned to E. H. Leker, Extension Plant Pathologist, assisted by A. F. Turner, District Extension Agent at large.

Cattle Buying Program—1934

The Emergency Cattle Buying Program was administered by J. J. Moxley, Extension Animal Husbandry Specialist. On October 15, 1934, Howard Jackson was employed as a supervisor in charge of all drought activities.

Sugar Beet Adjustment Program—1934

The Sugar Beet Adjustment program was started late in 1934. E. H. Teagarden was placed in charge. He attended a regional meeting in Fort Collins on October 15, 1934 on the program.

On November 20, 1934, a district meeting was held at Garden City with H. H. Simpson representing the Sugar Beet Section of AAA. The program centered around the Garden City Sugar factory.

The factory had all of the production data for the counties involved which were: Edwards, Finney, Ford, Gray, Hamilton, Hodgeman, Kearny, Ness, Pawnee, and Rush.

A sugar beet program in 10 counties involved 416 contracts, on which advance payments of \$117,375 had been made by the end of 1935.

Payment were at rate of \$1.55 per ton, less the administrative expenses of 1.37 cents per ton.

Cotton Acreage Reduction Program—1934

The program on Cotton Acreage Reduction and Tax Exemption Certificates reached only Montgomery and Chautauqua Counties. All of the office work was handled in the Montgomery County office.

Twenty contracts were signed involving 815 acres and 115,998 pounds of lint cotton.

The cotton program, handled in the Montgomery County Extension office, represented 115,000 pounds of cotton, with adjustment payments of \$5,726.16 by the end of 1935.

The base acreage of 1,414 acres was adjusted downward to 983.65 acres planted.

Tobacco Adjustment Program—1934

The Tobacco Adjustment program reached Doniphan, Atchison, Jefferson, Leavenworth, and Linn counties with 74 contracts. This program including 268.6 acres of tobacco in these participating counties.

Special Extension Staff—1933-37

Emergency Agricultural Agents—1933

Late in 1933, a U. S. Civil Service examination was given for positions as Emergency Agricultural Assistant, designed primarily to secure people to work in the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) program.

The first Emergency Agents were employed from the eligible candidates on the Civil Service list. Some of those Agents were not qualified for County Agricultural Agent positions. When the Civil Service requirements were lifted, some of the Emergency Agents were replaced with men from the list of qualified applicants for County Agent work.

During 1934, 11 County Extension Agents left the Extension Service and five Agents were moved to State Office positions.

Those 16 men were replaced, in addition to 16 others, as Agents for an equal number of new counties organized during the year. All new Agents were given some training to a limited degree.

Agents/Ag Adjustment Adm. (AAA)—1934

At the beginning of 1934, 79 county Farm Bureaus had been organized and were employing County Agents. With the establishment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act Program in 1933, Emergency Agricultural Assistants were employed with AAA funds and placed in each of the other 26 counties.

Because of the adjustment program several counties realized the need for a regular County Agent. The leaders in such counties proceeded to organize a County Farm Bureau, qualify for county financial support, and employ a County Agent.

Those 26 counties were given these alternatives:

- 1) Form a permanent organization (Farm Bureau) and establish a permanent Agent.
- 2) Provide a temporary organization to consist of the allotment committee of the AAA, and employ a temporary Agent for six months.

- 3) Carry the adjustment program with no trained assistance.

The following 16 counties organized County Farm Bureaus in 1934:

Barber	Ellis
Graham	Hamilton
Haskell	Kearny
Logan	Republic
Rooks	Rush
Scott	Seward
Stanton	Stevens
Wallace	Wichita

Those counties employed Emergency Agents until a Farm Bureau organization was completed. The following counties employed Emergency Agents:

Chautauqua	Decatur
Elk	Gove
Pottawatomie	Wabaunsee

The following counties decided not to employ an Agent of any kind:

Norton	Osborne
Phillips	Trego

Interest in the Agricultural Adjustment program brought a great increase in County Farm Bureau membership. In 1934, 30,205 men signed for membership, although 7,777 had not yet paid their dues by the end of September.

Women members totaled 14,741 with 2,811 not paid by September 30.

Assistant County Agents—1935

During 1935, 28 Assistant County Agents were employed. Of that number:

- 12 became County Agricultural Agents.
- 1 became a County Club Agent.
- 3 resigned.
- 2 went into soil conservation work.

- 1 started graduate study.
- 2 became Dairy Herd Improvement Association Assistant Agents.
- 1 was transferred to the State AAA office.
- 19 were assigned to counties as Assistant Agents.

During the year, 17 County Agents resigned. Eight joined the Soil Conservation Service, nine went into other fields of work, two agents joined the central office staff and two deaths resulted from automobile accidents.

Cow Testing Agents—1937

During 1937, Assistant Agents were employed in cooperation with the Cow Testing Associations. The tester was given the title of Assistant Agent and paid \$25 per month from Extension funds.

The association name was changed to Dairy Farm Record Association. The Assistant Agent helped dairy-

men keep a complete set of farm records in addition to their herd performance records.

This program continued until 1947 when the cooperative agreement was discontinued because of insufficient Extension funds.

Soil Conservation Agents—1937

In 1937, Assistant County Agents were employed to work in counties where a Soil Conservation District had been organized. Assistant Agents worked largely with County Agents in promotion of soil conservation practices.

This program was continued until the first years of World War II. At that time personnel qualified for the work were impossible to employ.

After the war, the Extension Soil Conservation program had developed to the point where the employment of an assistant was not feasible.

Extension AAA Programs—1934

The great involvement of the Extension Service in the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program curtailed somewhat the regular Extension program.

The effect of that diversion is indicated in the opening paragraphs of Director Umberger's report for 1934:

During the year 1934, the regular Extension production projects continued without material change in the original plans of procedure. The proportion of time devoted to emergency projects was greatly increased.

For the past year and a half the Extension Service has been engaged with the Agricultural Adjustment programs, and it, of course, has been necessary to defer for a time the regularly established programs in production.

The economic situation of the Kansas farmer still continues to be difficult not only because of low prices, but particularly so because of the state-wide drought which most seriously affected cash income and the production of essential feed crops.

Adjustment Payments—1934

Adjustment payments made available through the year in the wheat, corn-hog, and cattle programs very materially counteracted a situation which would otherwise have been most serious.

The expenses of the farm which includes taxes, interest on indebtedness, and other items still continue

to be relatively high and consequently it is still important to give attention to such Extension programs as will assist in promoting efficiency.

As a result of these influences there is an increasing insistence that the so-called regular Extension programs be re-established in order that definite programs for the solution of these difficulties can be continued.

The philosophy of the Extension program has been materially changed by the influence of the Agricultural Adjustment program and that which it introduces, namely, curtailment or control of production.

Even though this legislation and the necessity which prompted it should result in permanently changing the production program of American agriculture, it is probable that the time and resources diverted as a result from production will be devoted to increasing the efficiency in methods.

AAA—1934

Although a much greater proportion of time has been devoted to the Agricultural Adjustment program because of the added commodities control programs being introduced, it is planned not to divert the endeavor of the Extension Service permanently from those projects which promote efficiency.

It is expected that these projects will become increasingly important when time has allowed a better opportunity to properly estimate the relationship

between agricultural adjustment and increased production. Consequently, any change in those projects looking to efficiency in production are being considered temporary and not permanent.

Rural Organization/Farm Finance—1934

In 1934, a new project, "Rural Organization and Farm Finance," was established. Frank Blecha, District Extension Agent, was transferred to serve temporarily as Extension Specialist for the project. It was divided into two subprojects:

- A) Organization of local Production Credit Associations for the financing of the farmers.
- B) Educational information on economic production, market trends, and financing.

During 1934, 15 Production Credit Associations were organized, each with its officers including an Executive Secretary.

Production Credit Associations—1934

The Production Credit Associations were organized as a part of the National Farm Credit system with the Ninth District being headquartered in Wichita.

In 1934, the local Associations were affiliated with

the Production Credit Corporation of Wichita which later became a part of the Intermediate Credit Bank.

Outlook Material—1934

The Sub-project B of the Rural Organization and Farm Finance project included preparation and use of economic outlook materials, and with meetings of borrowers, grouped according to their major fields of production.

Four meetings were held each year with the borrowers by commodity areas. One of the meetings included a review of the Association business.

PCA Loans—1934

By the end of 1934, 1,898 loans totaling \$1,787,096.97 had been made. There were 3,321 Production Credit Association loans outstanding on October 31, 1935, in Kansas.

Loans were for a total of \$2,456,527.34, an increase of 80 percent in number over 1934, and a 58 percent increase in dollars.

The Rural Organization and Farm Finance Project was suspended in 1936, and Frank Blecha, Specialist on this project, returned to his duties as District Agent.

Emergency Economic Relief Activities—1936-37

AAA Ruled Unconstitutional—1936

The Wheat Allotment Program and the Corn-Hog Program were abruptly discontinued on January 6, 1936, when the Supreme Court declared the Agricultural Adjustment Act to be unconstitutional.

Congress almost immediately passed the Agricultural Conservation Act.

Soil Conservation Act—1936

New legislation was written and passed the Congress on February 29, 1936, as the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. Payment to be made to cooperators in the new program allowed participants to adopt soil-building and soil-conserving practices.

The objective of the program was to divert land from soil-depleting crops to soil-conserving crops and practices. Of 27,900,000 acres of crop in Kansas, 19,338,000 acres were included in the agricultural conservation program work sheets.

Extension Assumes Planning Role—1936

Agricultural Planning, as advocated by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, became a responsibility of the Extension Service.

Meetings were held with leaders, by Type-of-Farming Areas, to determine the direction the new conservation program was to take; and where the money should be spent to bring about the greatest amount of agricultural improvement.

The summary of that work recommended that Kansans should:

- 1) Plant one million additional acres of alfalfa and 700,000 more acres of sweet clover.
- 2) That one-fourth of the land should be contour-farmed.
- 3) That 16 percent of the land in western Kansas should be summer fallowed.
- 4) That deferred grazing should be practiced on all pastures until they recovered from the drought.

- 5) That one-fourth of the pastures should be mowed for weed control.

Create State AAA Committee—1936

A State Committee for Administration of the AAA program was created in 1936 and an executive officer employed. From its beginning the Director of Extension served on the State Committee.

District Agents, relevant Extension Specialists, and County Agricultural Extension Agents assisted with education concerning the various programs conducted by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS).

It was estimated that if the available funds were applied according to the above budget, it would provide only 30 percent of the needs for any one year.

Co. Ag Program Advisory Committees—1936

In order to correlate the interests of all Extension activities in the state and the counties, County Agricultural Program Advisory committees were established.

Those committees consisted of the president of the Farm Bureau, the president of the Agricultural Conservation Association, the chairman of the planning committee, and the chairman of the women's advisory committee of the Farm Bureau.

State Ag Program Advisory Comm.—1936

At a series of Type-of-Farming Area meetings conducted in August and September, those county representatives selected four members of their group in each area to represent them on the State Agricultural Program Advisory Committee.

The State Agricultural Program Advisory Committee was assigned to plan future agricultural programs and fit those programs into the on-going permanent Extension Service activities.

State Ag Conservation Program—1936

The State Agricultural Conservation Program was under the direction of the Director of Extension, with the aid and assistance of a State Agricultural Conservation Committee consisting of six men.

Educational features of the program were the responsibility of Extension personnel, with the State Agricultural Conservation Committee acting in an advisory capacity.

The regulatory features, such as the establishment of bases, adjustment of complaints, checking of performance, and approval of applications for grants and pay-

ments, were under the direction of the State Agricultural Conservation Committee.

Five representative farmers, the Director of Extension, and an executive secretary appointed by the Director of the Western Division, made up the personnel of the State Agricultural Conservation Committee.

After considering the work sheets signed by farmers and reviewing all available statistical data, a county soil-depleting base was established. This county soil-depleting base, established for by the State Agricultural Conservation Committee, was then put into effect in each county.

A total of 116,865 work sheets were listed, representing a total of 29,069,216 acres of farm land and 18,995,187 crop acres. The approved ratio of soil-depleting crops to crop land plus wild hay for Kansas was established as 89.5 percent.

An approved soil-depleting base of 17,321,261 acres for the state as a whole was established from the work sheets.

AAA Payments—1937

An estimated \$18 million was available for Agricultural Adjustment payments, budgeted as follows:

Seeding new alfalfa	\$1,800,000
Seeding red clover	30,000
Seeding sweet clover	630,000
Seeding vetch	28,000
Seeding lespedeza	148,000
Liming legumes	480,000
Fertilizing legumes	1,432,000
Seeding perennial grasses and new pastures	2,442,000
Pasture fertilizers	83,000
Terracing	1,500,000
Contouring	1,000,000
Cover crops (East)	1,068,000
Cover crops (West)	348,000
Fall listing (wind erosion control)	117,000
Strip crops and fallow	640,000
Summer fallow	1,407,000
Reseeding pastures	824,000
Deferred grazing	3,330,000
Mowing pasture weeds	420,000
Go-back land	345,000

AAA Activities—1937-38

Activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration from November 1, 1937 to October 31, 1938, included:

- 1) Completed the 1937 agricultural conservation program.
- 2) Put the 1938 agricultural conservation program in the field and carried out its activities, including submission of applications for payments that were certified for payment prior to November 1, 1938.
- 3) Established Federal Crop Insurance program for wheat under Title 5 of the Act of 1938.
- 4) Carried out the 1938 Wheat Loan Program under the Act of 1938 and made loans available to cooperators with the 1938 Agricultural Conservation program. The loans being on the wheat produced in 1938.
- 5) Processed Corn loans under the 1937 corn loan program. They were either liquidated or the corn resealed according to the resealing provision of the loan program.

Ag Conservation Meetings—1938

The educational program for the Agricultural Conservation Program during 1938 included four series of district meetings. There were usually nine to 12 meetings in each series. Meetings were conducted by the Extension Service in cooperation with the state office of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

County Extension Agents and County Committees then conducted county and community meetings to reach farmers. In district meetings, Extension Agronomy and Engineering Specialists discussed how their Extension programs correlated with the Agricultural Adjustment programs.

The Extension Publicity Office made 111 releases during the year pertaining to the various phases of the Adjustment Program.

AAA Organization—1938

During the year 1938, a few changes in organization for AAA were made:

- 1) The title of the Executive Secretary, E. H. Leker, became Executive Officer.
- 2) The educational program was the responsibility of the Director of Extension.
- 3) The State AAA committee, that formerly consisted of five farmers, was changed to four farmers and the Director of Extension.

- 4) The state technical committee consisted of representatives of the Agricultural Experiment Station with the Director of the Station as chairman. The committee was advisory to the executive officer and the state committee.
- 5) The State Planning Committee consisted of 45 men and women who served in an advisory capacity to the State Committee (AAA) in planning future programs.
- 6) The field administration was under the direction of Field or District Supervisors who were responsible to the executive officer.

State AAA Costs—1938

Administrative costs for administering the AAA program at the State Office, for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1938, were \$177,621.56— 1.23 percent of the payments to participants in the program.

The County Association expenses totaled \$980,520.20, which was 6.84 percent of the payments.

AAA Payments to Farmers—1938

Payments to farmers were: \$14,230,964.82 for conservation practices; \$105,205.47 for 219 sugar beet payments; and \$3,023.46 for 37 cotton adjustment payments.

In 1937 the soil-conserving acreages eligible for payment included: 35,523 acres of perennial legumes, 39,835 of biennial legumes, 18,573 of annual legumes, 4,927 of perennial grasses, 1,861 of legume and grass mixtures, and 262 acres of other crops.

Publicity Materials for Conservation—1938

Press and radio releases and handout materials were prepared for use throughout the year. Frequent conferences (twice a month) were held between AAA administrators, Extension administrators and Extension Specialists to correlate the recommendations of the Specialists with the conservation practices included in the ACP program.

Agricultural Projects—1940

In 1940, 12 agricultural projects were conducted by 25 Extension Specialists. To provide more correlation in program planning, the 12 projects were correlated under six major agricultural programs.

These were:

- I. Soil Management and Crop Production
- II. Horticulture

- IIIa. Animal Husbandry
- IIIb. Dairying
- IV. Poultry Husbandry
- V. Miscellaneous (Other agricultural and engineering projects)

The correlation enabled County Agricultural Agents and project leaders in counties to concentrate their

efforts in reaching the major objectives established at the beginning of the year.

Agents' Time for AAA—1940

There was concern about the amount of time County Extension Agents devoted to the AAA program. A study in 1940, indicated that Agents devoted 85.8 percent of their time to the Extension programs and 14.2 percent to AAA programs.

Soil Conservation Service—1935

Soil Conservation Surveys—1935

Early in 1935, the Forest Service asked the Extension Service to assist with surveys relative to the need for soil conservation work in the areas of Kansas where work camps had been established.

Soil Conservation Associations—1935

During the winter of 1935-36, five county soil conservation associations were organized by the Extension Agronomy Specialist assigned to that work. The conservation associations were mostly around the work camps.

Conservation Memorandum—1935

In September, 1935, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the Kansas Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service.

Extension Soil Conservation Staff—1935

Two Extension Specialists, L. E. Willoughby, Agronomist, and Hal Eier, Engineer, were employed on a cooperative basis.

An Assistant County Extension Agent was assigned to each county with a Soil Conservation Association. By November 1, 1936, 228 farms were under agreement involving 55,994 acres.

Farm plans provided for whatever soil conservation practices that seemed necessary to control erosion.

During 1936, the Extension Service provided an Assistant County Extension Agent to cooperate with the Works Progress Administration on a project for the protection of the watershed above the Atchison County State Lake. Fourteen farmers with 2,641 acres of land were cooperating in that project.

Soil Conservation Act—1936

The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was passed by Congress on February 29, 1936. Payments

to be made to cooperators in the program allowed participants to adopt soil-building and soil-conserving practices.

The objective of the program was to help farmers change from soil-depleting crops and practices to soil-conserving crops and practices.

Extension Conservationists—1937

Following passage of a Standard Soil Conservation District law by the Kansas legislature in 1937, the Extension Soil Conservationists, employed cooperatively with the Soil Conservation Service for a time, directed an educational program to organize Soil Conservation Districts. A District was organized in each Kansas county, the last district organized in 1954.

During the intervening years and to the present time (1988), Extension Soil Conservationists worked closely with the Soil Conservation Districts and the County Extension Agents to plan and implement programs for the districts. The Director of Extension and the Senior Conservationist served as members of the State Soil Conservation Committee.

State Ag Conservation Committees—1939

In 1939, the State Agricultural Conservation Program committee was composed of: A. L. Criger, Elk County, Chairman; H. L. Cudney, Edwards County; Emmett Womer, Smith County; C. E. Klingensmith, Pottawatomie County; and H. J. C. Umberger, Director of Extension. E. H. Leker, Executive Assistant for the committee, served as secretary.

Members of the Technical Committee, which advised the State Agricultural Conservation Program committee with respect to approved soil conserving practices and specifications, were: L. C. Williams, Assistant Director of Extension; R. I. Throckmorton, Head of Department of Agronomy; W. E. Grimes, Head of Department of Agricul-

tural Economics; and Walter Ward, Head of Department of Rural Engineering.

That Technical Committee called on other departments of the College, and other State and Federal agencies for consultation and technical assistance.

The committee worked in close cooperation with the State Coordinator of the Soil Conservation Service; the State Director of the Prairie States Forestry Project; the Kansas State Board of Agriculture; and the state representative of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, USDA.

Keith Dusenbury of the State Agricultural Adjustment Administration office served as secretary for the committee.

Docket of Conservation Practices—1938

The State Agricultural Conservation Program committee, in close cooperation with the Technical Committee and many other persons and agencies, prepared a docket of approved soil conservation practices adapted to Kansas conditions.

For Eastern Kansas, all possible emphasis was given to growing of legumes, conservation of soil and soil moisture, and the improvement of range land and pastures.

For Western Kansas, the docket included practices designed to control wind erosion and other practices especially adapted to that area including strip cropping, listing and planting on the contour, sorghum cover crops, and basin tillage.

A. F. Turner, District Agent at Large was in charge of the educational program for the agricultural conservation program. He was assisted by the District Extension Agents in charge of the AAA program in each district; Harry Baird in the northwest; E. H. Teagarden in the southwest, and Otis Glover in the eastern district.

Publicity Materials for Conservation—1938

Press and radio releases and handout materials were prepared for use throughout the year. Frequent conferences (twice a month) were held between AAA administrators, Extension administrators and Extension Specialists to correlate the recommendations of the Specialists with the conservation practices included in the ACP program.

Wind Erosion Counties—1939

In 1939, to assist with organization of wind control associations in interested counties, of those that had been designated as special wind control counties, Director Umberger assigned Walter Ward, Head of the Department of Rural Engineering, to work on the program.

It was found that the Kansas law prohibiting corporation farming made it illegal to issue charters to the proposed associations. However, the Kansas legislature was in session at the time. A bill was written and promptly passed by the legislature legalizing the wind control associations.

County-wide wind erosion control associations were organized in Kearny, Logan, Greeley, Stanton, and Stevens counties; and township associations in Cimarron, Jones-Taloga, Rolla, South Westola, North Westola, and Richfield townships in Morton County.

Each of the associations was granted a charter under provision of the law. Although organized and ready to function, no land was tilled to prevent wind erosion during 1939 under the plan.

Climatic conditions improved and the wind erosion associations did not have to function. The wind erosion law gave them authority to lease, or otherwise gain management control of land subject to wind erosion, but not sell cover crops.

Rural Electrification Administration—1935

The REA was created in May of 1935. An Extension sub-project in Rural Electrification was organized in 1936.

Beginning in 1936, Extension Specialists cooperated in organizing Rural Electric Cooperatives, and assisted

with their educational programs.

Educational work was done in wiring, small appliance selection and repair, electric power, hay and grain drying, and other uses of electricity to increase farm income.

Farmers Home Administration—1935

Early work was done with the Rural Rehabilitation Administration and the Farm Security Administration,

the fore-runners of the Farmers Home Administration.

This agency provided financial assistance to many families who had developed plans for an improved farm and home under the direction of Extension personnel.

The Director of Extension served on the State FHA Advisory Committee which met twice each year.

Farm Credit Administration—1935

The Production Credit Associations, the Federal Farm Loan Associations, and the Bank for Cooperatives gave assistance to many individuals and local cooperatives when credit was needed to organize and/or conduct a sound farming and business program. Contacts were frequent and relationships excellent.

Farm Credit Administration—1935

In 1935, there was a follow-up of the work done by Frank Blecha, who was on leave with the Farm Credit Administration in 1934.

A series of 10 district meetings were held for farm leaders and the work of the Farm Credit Administration was discussed. The leaders were asked to hold similar meetings in their counties.

The leaders reported later that they held 214 meet-

ings with a total attendance of 10,079 people. Production Credit Corporation loans during 1935 numbered 3,321 as of October 31, for a total amount of \$2,456,527.

Two kinds of local leadership grew out of the work with the Agricultural Adjustment and Relief Programs—those who received pay for their services, and those who served without pay.

At times, some misunderstandings occurred between the County Extension Agent and adjustment program committees about the responsibilities of the County Extension Agent to the adjustment program.

District Extension Agents were able to harmoniously resolve the differences of opinion in most cases.

Farm & Home Week—1935-46

Special Features—1935

By 1935, special features during Farm and Home Week included:

- 1) The Little American Royal Livestock Show.
- 2) Home Talent Night.
- 3) Blue Ribbon Seed Corn Show.
- 4) Kansas Premier Seed Growers awards for the fifth year.
- 5) Kansas Poultry Championship awards.
- 6) Kansas Beef Production awards.
- 7) Master Farmer awards to 10 farmers.
- 8) The County Attendance award to Comanche County.

Continued Growth—1939

In 1939, there was an attendance of 2,011 people at the 4-H Club Roundup. This was the largest attendance since its separation from Farm and Home Week activities.

At the home economics program, a significant development was a constant increase in attendance. That program had been stressed as a "leaders training" conference.

The Little American Royal Livestock and Dairy Show which was staged by students in the Division of Agriculture, was also an outstanding event on the program and attracted state-wide attention.

The foreword for the 1939 Farm and Home Week printed program was written by President F. D. Farrell, Kansas State College of Agriculture, and was descriptive of the important position occupied by the event in the educational programs cooperatively conducted by the College and the rural leaders of Kansas. It read:

Farm and Home Week at Kansas State College is an important and interesting event in the progressive farmer's year.

Since 1868, when the first Farmers' Institute in Kansas was held at the College, the event has developed into an exceedingly valuable institution for ambitious men and women who live in the Kansas countryside. It brings together at the College each year hundreds of leading farmers and rural homemakers.

In 1939, Farm and Home Week will be observed February 7, 8, 9 and 10. The program is varied and interesting. It included popular lectures, demonstrations of

scientific and artistic facts and principles applicable to farming and homemaking, musical, artistic, and literary entertainment, campus tours, and achievement banquet, and other valuable and interesting features.

The attendance at Farm and Home Week includes some of the best farmers and rural homemakers in the state. There are many men and women who attend year after year. There are some who have attended each year for a quarter century or more.

Seventy years of experience and the testimony of regular attendants prove that the event is one which progressive rural men and women find profitable. Farm and Home Week in 1939 promises to be even better than usual. A large attendance of enthusiastic rural people is confidently expected.

New Program Features—1940

Other features added to the Farm and Home Week, by 1940, were:

- 1) Kansas State Market Turkey Show.
- 2) Pasture Improvement Contest awards.
- 3) Certified Seed Show.

The advent of World War II slowed the participation in Farm and Home Week but the program was continued until war conditions necessitated changes in program plans.

Radio Week—1945

The 1945 Farm and Home Week was planned, scheduled, and programs printed for distribution. However, when the Office of Defense Transportation requested that the event not be held (because of World War II), the event was cancelled.

Cancellation of Farm and Home Week was a great disappointment to many people who annually visited the College for a program of inspiration and education.

Immediate plans were made to broadcast as many of the programs as possible over Radio Station KSAC, the College station. All of the College speakers cooperated to the fullest extent and many favorable comments were received from listeners in Kansas and neighboring states.

The radio programs started on Tuesday, February 6, and continued through Saturday, February 10. University President Milton Eisenhower officially opened the program at 9:30 a.m. Tuesday.

The five-day radio series included 74 scheduled numbers or program topics consisting of talks, panel discussions, and other features.

Split Program—1946

The 1946 Farm and Home Week program was planned for February 5-8. It became apparent early in January, however, that housing facilities would not be adequate for all the people who planned to attend.

The College Farm and Home Week Committee decided to hold the program in two sections.

The first section was held February 5-8, and included the topics relating to poultry, dairy, agronomy, animal husbandry, beekeeping, rural pastors, and the annual meeting of the Kansas State Horticultural Society.

The programs in journalism and home equipment were cancelled.

Awards were made in the Kansas Poultry Champion Contest, the Kansas State Dressed Turkey Show, the State Corn Show, the Kansas Swine Production Contest, and the Blue Ribbon Wheat Quality Show.

The home economics section of Farm and Home Week was held May 21-24, 1946. The program was built around the theme, "Preparing for the Years Ahead."

Subjects for discussion groups were:

Financing the Modernizing or Replacement of Farm Homes.

Problems in Remodeling.

Cooking Frozen Foods.

Flower Arrangement.

How Can Rural People Wisely Help with Reconversion Problems So Rural Families Will Share Better Living in the Postwar Period?

Fitting the House to the Family.

Recreation—Folk Dances.

Six hundred seventy women participated from 78 counties. Five hundred seventy men attended the February sessions in 1946.

Attendance Recap—1935-46

Attendance during previous years had been:

Year	Men	Women	Total
1935	N/A	N/A	1,052
1936	N/A	N/A	1,099
1937	N/A	N/A	1,398
1938	699	1,207	1,906
1939	732	1,279	2,011
1940	631	991	1,622
1941	698	1,252	1,950

1942	514	978	1,492
1943	331	512	843
1944	508	677	1,185
1945	Cancelled - Held by Radio		
1946	570	670	1,240

District Conferences—1947

The 1947 Farm and Home Week program was further decentralized because of the housing shortage in Manhattan.

Three sections were held as follows: Agricultural Week, February 4-7, 1947; Rural Pastors Conference, February 11-12, 1947; State Assembly (Home Economics), June 11-14, 1947.

In addition to the three sections mentioned, six district Farm and Home Conferences were held as follows:

Topeka	December 5-6, 1946
Coffeyville	January 21-22, 1947
Hutchinson	February 11-12, 1947
Dodge City	February 13-14, 1947

Colby	February 25-26, 1947
Beloit	February 27-28, 1947

The general theme for the District Conferences was "Balanced Farming and Family Living." In addition to general assemblies, sessions were held for agriculture, home economics and rural youth. Total attendance was 5,744 people, an increase of 4.6 times as many people as the previous year at Farm and Home Week.

The attendance for the sectional meetings held at the College was: 419 for the Agricultural Week, 130 for the State Assembly, and 110 for the Rural Pastors' program.

In 1948, a pattern similar to that for 1947 was followed. That was the 80th year in which the College had provided a Farm and Home Program for the people of the State.

The attendance was 527 for Agricultural Week, 180 for the State Assembly, 150 for the Rural Pastors' Program, and 3,023 for the six District Conferences.

Extension Lay Leaders—1935-40

Role of Volunteer Leaders—1935

By 1935, local volunteer leaders had become an important factor in the Extension educational program. The County Agents' time had become somewhat limited because the work with the Agricultural Adjustment Program had taken much time away from other Extension projects.

Leader training meetings were conducted by the Agents and Specialists after being selected at meetings or by personal contact by the Agents. By the end of the year, 20,478 leaders in agriculture and home economics had been selected and trained.

Those leaders held 15,071 meetings with an attendance of 311,780 persons. Club leaders held 7,214 meetings with an attendance of 151,606 persons. Also, 6,348 leaders were assisting with the Agricultural Adjustment Program.

Train County Executive Boards—1939

Early in 1939, training schools for the County Farm Bureau executive boards in the southwest district were conducted by E. H. Teagarden, District Agent.

Experience revealed that many board members did not fully understand their responsibilities. Since each

board had a number of new members at the beginning of each year that was an appropriate time to conduct the training schools.

The training schools were well received and were continued each of the following years.

A mimeographed handbook was prepared in sufficient quantity so that each board member would have a copy for reference and study. The front page of the handbook indicated the content and the material that was included in the training school, as follows:

HANDBOOK OF INFORMATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE BOARDS OF COUNTY FARM BUREAUS IN KANSAS

CONTENTS:

- The Purpose of Extension Work
- The History of County Agent Work
- The History of Home Demonstration Work
- The History of 4-H Club Work
- The Smith-Lever Act of Congress
- The Kansas Farm Bureau Law
- Constitution of the County Farm Bureau
- Diagram of the County Organization

County Organization of Home Economics	2,360 Horticulture
County Organization of Boys' and Girls' Club	705 Animal Husbandry
Work	428 Dairying
Preliminary Plans for Developing a Community	110 Veterinary Medicine
Program	995 Poultry Husbandry
The County Agents' Contract	576 Entomology
Conditions of Cooperative Employment of	1,243 Farm Management
Agents	1,283 Marketing
Finances of the County Farm Bureau	2,078 Foods and Nutrition
Cooperation with the State Board of Agriculture	1,810 Clothing
Volunteer Leaders—1940	2,130 Home Health and Sanitation
By 1940, the use of volunteer leaders had increased	1,354 Home Management
to these numbers:	964 Rural Engineering
939 Publicity and Information	1,736 Home Furnishings
3,056 Boys' and Girls' Club Work	<u>789</u> Recreation
1,694 Soil Management and Crop Production	25,287 Total Number
1,069 Plant Pathology	

Fall (Anniversary) Festivals—1939

Since 1939 was the 25th year following the passage of the Smith-Lever Act, it was suggested that each county hold a Fall Festival. Many counties followed the suggestion and organized some outstanding programs.

Usually the Festival was a two-day program involving all phases and activities of the Extension program. Exhibits were displayed by 4-H Clubs, home demonstration units, and representatives of agriculture.

Crops exhibits were quite common but some counties also brought in livestock exhibits and conducted livestock judging contests. Many exhibits were designed

to show the progress experienced as a result of the Extension program.

One day of the Festival was devoted to the annual meeting of the County Farm Bureau. The other day's program included numbers by 4-H club members, home demonstration unit members, and special speakers.

A feature of the Festival was a dinner with guests from other organizations and businesses. The entire festival program served to bring to people's attention the scope of the Extension program and its values to the people of the county.

Extension Schools—1936

During the 1936 report year, 909 Extension Schools were conducted on a community, county or district basis. The attendance at those Schools was 43,196. The 725 Extension Schools held on a county basis were as follows:

39 Forestry	70 Poultry
33 Bang's Disease Control	3 Commercial Vegetable Production
60 Farm Management	41 Discussions and News Writing
60 Entomology	53 Dairy Feeding and Breeding
14 Farm Account Summaries	18 Orchardling
49 Landscape Gardening	7 Sheep Production, Lamb and Wool Marketing
	56 Vegetable Gardening
	2 Plant Pathology
	25 Pork Production
	24 Beef Production
	169 Agronomy
	The total attendance in the above Schools was 30,075

at 1,348 sessions.

District Extension Schools conducted during 1936 were:

- 34 Outlook Information
- 20 Sheep and Wool Marketing
- 12 Elevator Directors
- 20 Farm Inventories
- 6 Poultry
- 13 Dairy Farm Record Associations
- 5 Turkey Production
- 26 Dairy Breed Associations
- 3 Discussions and News Writing

6 Gardening

A total of 145 District Schools were held with 312 sessions and 12,130 attendance.

Five Year Summary—1941-45

Reports for 1945 gave a five-year summary of Extension Schools:

Year	Number	
	Held	Attendance
1941	616	35,066
1942	486	24,847
1943	1,326	35,774
1944	1,148	43,932
1945	855	50,005

County Educational Meetings—1936-88

Educational meetings of all kinds were continued through the years from 1936 to 1988, with various titles, such as winter schools, leader-training schools, communications for livestock marketing personnel, groups discussions, etc. but without reference to the previous designation as "Extension Schools."

Such meetings were scheduled and organized by County Extension personnel and/or the Extension Specialists or Supervisors.

In 1926, the project entitled "Extension Schools in

Home Economics and the Supervision of Home Economics Specialists" was discontinued.

At the same time a similar project for Agricultural Extension Specialists was changed to, "Extension Schools in Agriculture and Home Economics and Supervision of Agricultural Specialists."

That project nomenclature continued until 1943 at which time (although the reports do not specifically give the change) the project title was changed to "Agricultural Specialists."

Short Courses for Young Farmers—1938-40

Two Day Short Courses—1938

On February 24 and 25, 1938, a short course was held at Colby for young men beyond 4-H club age but not yet on their own in farming. The Extension Service and the Branch Experiment Station cooperated in presenting the course.

Sixty-one young men from 12 northwest Kansas counties attended. Instruction included: row-crop production, small grain production, farm crop disease control, conservation of soil and water, and costs of tillage.

An examination ended the two-day session and Certificates of Merit were presented to those who successfully completed the work.

Plans were made for a second year, to be devoted to livestock production and management. Further, three similar schools were planned to be held in other

portions of the state in 1939.

Four two-day short-courses for young farmers 20 to 30 years of age were continued in 1939 as follows:

Colby	Feb 20-21	Second Year Animal Husbandry
Hays	Feb 23-24	First Year Agronomy
Pratt	Feb 13-14	First Year Agronomy
Garden City	Feb 15-16	First Year Agronomy

One hundred and forty-nine young farmers from 38 counties attended the four schools. Extension Specialists and Experiment Station staff members cooperated in serving as instructors.

In February, 1940, six two-day short courses were held in cooperation with the experiment stations at Colby, Hays, Garden City and Manhattan, and with the experiment field superintendents at Greensburg and Wichita. Approximately 200 young farmers attended the short courses.

Four of the schools were devoted to livestock production and feed utilization; one to crop production and soil management, and one to farm organization.

Several County Agents indicated an interest in holding similar short courses in their counties. During the week of October 21-25, 1940, six two-day schools on Sorghum Storage and Utilization of Feed Crops were held in Edwards, Pratt, Stafford, Barber, Rush, and Pawnee counties.

Ten counties expressed an interest in holding similar schools in 1941.

Four Week Short Courses—1940

In addition to the two-day short courses held in the counties, a four-week short course was organized to be held at Kansas State College early in 1941 with 60 enrollments from 51 counties in the eastern half of the state. Funds sufficient to provide a \$50 scholarship to each participant were provided by the College.

In 1942, 25 two-day short courses were held in counties. Such short courses were discontinued in 1943 so that more meetings could be held on a community basis.

In January of 1943, 60 young farmers from the western part of the state attended a four-week short course at the KSC, each on a \$50 scholarship. This completed the two-year plan started in 1941.

Housing for Division of Extension—1930's

On September 1, 1932, the office for the home economics staff was moved from the first floor, southeast corner of Anderson Hall, to the second floor, southeast corner.

The new space allowed an additional office for a supervisory officer and a separate room for the Specialists. Previously the District Supervisor's and the Specialists' desks were in the general office room with the secretaries.

The move of the home economics offices vacated space which permitted the State Club Leader to have a private office. The Assistant Club Leaders' desks were in the same room with the clerks and files.

From an early report made by the Director of Extension, these paragraphs are quoted:

Ample office room for the Division of Extension is provided in the several buildings on the campus.

The office of the Dean, the Department of Home Economics, the Department of Home Study Service and the Rural Service Department, as well as the offices for the State Leader of Agricultural Agent Work and the State Leader of Boys' and Girls' Club Work, are located in the Administration Building (Anderson Hall), nine

rooms being provided for this purpose.

A bulletin and store room and a room used for mailing out bulletins, for the mimeograph and for chart making also are located in this building. The Department of Rural Engineering is well located in offices in the Engineering building. The specialists in the Department of Institutes and Demonstrations are located in the offices of the departments of the Division of Agriculture which they represent.

Lease Housing Space—1936

About 1936, the Manhattan Bible College building was leased and many of the Anderson Hall office personnel moved to the Bible College building. Later, when further changes in location became necessary and new buildings were being considered, the policy of where to house specialists was given much consideration by the College administration.

The Council of Deans' committee on this subject made a study of the policies followed in other states. The Council of Deans then approved the policy of housing Extension specialists with their respective subject-matter departments as far as space was available.

Cooperation with Other Agencies—1930's-80's

Many other agencies and organizations have cooperated with the Extension Service with its educational programs. The following list is incomplete, but it illustrates the variety of organizations interested in the Extension program:

- 1) Local Chambers of Commerce.
- 2) Local civic clubs.
- 3) County Agricultural Extension Councils.
- 4) Kansas Livestock Association.
- 5) Kansas Crop Improvement Association.
- 6) Kansas Poultry Improvement Association.
- 7) Kansas Swine Improvement Association.
- 8) Kansas Sheep Breeders Association.
- 9) Kansas State Board of Agriculture.
- 10) Kansas State Home Demonstration Council.
- 11) Kansas Agricultural Council on Research and Education.
- 12) Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Council.
- 13) The Endowment Association of Kansas State University.
- 14) Kansas Wheat Improvement Association
- 15) Kansas Turkey Federation.
- 16) Kansas State Horticultural Society.
- 17) Kansas Seed and Feed Dealers Association
- 18) Kansas Conservation Contractors Association
- 19) Kansas Federation of Beekeepers.
- 20) Kansas Sanitary Livestock Commission.
- 21) Kansas Entomological Commission.
- 22) Kansas Chamber of Commerce Agricultural Council.
- 23) Kansas Committee of Federal and State Agricultural Agencies.
- 24) Governor's Watershed Review Committee.
- 25) Governor's Interdepartmental Committee on Aging.
- 26) Kansas Rural Areas Development Committee.
- 27) Kansas Rural Defense Advisory Committee
- 28) Kansas Medical Association.
- 29) Kansas Committee of Farm Organizations.
- 30) Kansas Farm Bureau (Commodity program and Safety).

Cooperation with other State and Federal Agencies included:

- 1) Agricultural Adjustment Administration—

Educational program and encouragement in use of conservation practices.

- 2) The National Poultry Improvement Plan—Extension Specialists worked with USDA Bureau of Animal Industry, the Kansas Poultry Improvement Association, and the Kansas Livestock Sanitary Commissioner to implement the plan.
- 3) Rural Electrification Administration—Extension Specialists organized and conducted schools on the selection and care of electrical equipment and proper lighting, in addition to work on adequate wiring and economic uses of electricity.
- 4) Farm Credit Administration—Cooperation in organization and work with Farm Improvement Clubs on use of credit, accounts, and analysis of the farm business; preparation of farm plans with borrowers; and work with cooperatives for revision of by-laws and business analysis.
- 5) Farm Security Administration—Assistance in farm management work with clients, keeping accounts and plans for repayment of loans.
- 6) Tennessee Valley Authority—Extension Specialist cooperated in the establishment of demonstration farms in Coffey, Neosho, and Jefferson counties. TVA provided the phosphorus for use on the demonstration farms. Farmers kept accounts which were analyzed at the end of the year by Extension Farm Management Specialists and Experiment Station personnel.
- 7) Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Grasshopper control programs successfully conducted with Extension Entomologists supervising and the Bureau furnishing materials and equipment.
- 8) Works Progress Administration—WPA provided clerical assistance for the summarization of AAA farm account books, and farm account books of the Farm Management Associations and TVA farms.
- 9) Bureau of Plant Industry—Extension Landscape Specialist used materials from the Woodward, Oklahoma Station for demonstrational planting in Comanche, Rice, Ford and Pratt counties.
- 10) Forest Service—Cooperated with the Prairie States Forestry Project in an educational program for planting and care of shelterbelts in 40 central Kansas counties. Assisted in the selection of local leaders for the project and trained

them. Prepared and released publicity for press and radio use.

- 11) State Board of Agriculture —Noxious weed control, wind erosion control under the Kansas Soil Drifting Law, and the State Fair.
- 12) Soil Conservation Service—An Extension Conservationist was cooperatively employed; a State Advisory Committee

was used; Soil Conservation Districts were organized; and an educational program on the use and value of soil conservation practices was implemented.

- 13) Kansas State Vocational Agriculture—Conferences held on various programs and supplies of bulletins and other materials provided for use by vocational teachers.

World War II—1941-45

The Kansas-United States Department of Agriculture Defense Board held its first meeting July 15, 1941, with Roy Wilson, Hiawatha, as chairman.

The meeting was called to report to the Secretary of Agriculture the progress Kansas farmers were making in increasing their production of dairy, pork, and poultry products.

Extension's Strategic Position—1941-45

The Extension Service was in a strategic position to give aid in the National Defense program.

Agricultural Extension Specialists intensified their efforts to increase production of milk, milk products, beef, pork, mutton, and eggs. County programs were revised where needed.

Emphasis was also placed on the producing and using feed grains and producing edible cereals. An intensified publicity program was developed using all available means of mass media.

Lists of farmers specializing in the various enterprises were compiled in the counties. Those producers were given special assistance designed to secure increased production.

Extension Personnel in Wartime—1941-45

As the war progressed, many County Extension Agents went to military service. Often a County Extension Agent position was vacant for several months, or was filled with inexperienced people.

In two counties, women were employed as County Agricultural Extension Agents for a year or more.

In other counties, the Extension Home Demonstration Agents did noble work in carrying on the agricultural program during the absence of the Agricultural Extension Agent.

During the war, Extension Home Economics Specialists and Extension Home Demonstration Agents devoted their attention to food conservation, home gardens, food

preservation, and other programs that contributed to the program of supplying military forces with necessary food and clothing.

Extension Engineering Specialists directed their attention to the care and repair of farm machinery, irrigation, and soil conservation.

Safety and conservation of labor were also important factors in an all-out defense program.

Agricultural Production Goals—1942

Agricultural Production Goals and Accomplishments in the war effort were summarized as follows:

Goal & Commodity	% over 1941	1942 production
	(in thousands)	
3.380 billion lbs. milk	7	3,301,000
765 milk cows	4	786
154,583 dz eggs	16	165,000
638,307 lbs. pork	45	640,000
1,914 slaughter cattle	52	1,816
43,000 lbs. mutton	11	64,500
180 acres flax	18	280
125 acres soybeans	166	290,000
3,722 acres corn	N/A	3,254
11,372 acres wheat	N/A	11,116
95 acres rye	16	230
2,100 acres oats	22	1,970
1,573 acres barley	8	1,803
1,750 acres sorghum	12	1,574
115,00 farm gardens	35	129

The Extension Service geared each project to the war effort. All channels of communication were used, including press, radio, publications, discussions, and visual aids.

Farm labor was recruited from the cities, women were given training when needed, and Extension Farm

Management Specialists gave attention to both efficient operations on the farm, and labor-saving practices.

Special Wartime Projects—1941-45

Extension Marketing Specialists were included in anti-inflation discussions, transportation problems, orderly livestock marketing, overcoming the labor shortage, price regulations and selling prices, government wheat loans, and quality production.

Engineering activities included a program of fire prevention, use of native materials for farm structures, terracing to combat soil erosion, conservation and repair of farm machinery, and the care and use of electrical equipment.

The objectives in the nutrition program were to teach people the requirements of an adequate diet, production, preparation, and serving of food, and food preservation coordinated with the garden program.

Clothing specialists directed special attention to helping people with care of textiles, leather, fur, and rubber footwear, repair of clothing, and remodeling for maximum use.

Maintenance of family health and care of the sick, when necessary, were given much attention.

Special emphasis was placed on the upkeep and repair of home furnishings.

Family recreation was encouraged as a means of reducing travel by auto to reduce wear on automobile tires.

Neighborhood Leaders—1941-45

The Neighborhood Leader program was an organized effort to convey important information to every family. The township vice-presidents of each County Farm Bureau divided each township into neighborhoods of not more than six to 10 families and secured one person to serve as a Neighborhood Leader.

Topics of concern included:

- 1) Victory gardens.
- 2) Transportation of farm products to market.
- 3) Control of inflation.
- 4) Farm labor.
- 5) Custom equipment for harvesting.
- 6) New crops to meet war needs.
- 7) Rural fire prevention and control.

The work of Neighborhood Leaders was accomplished by neighborhood meetings and family visits.

Printed materials were provided by the Extension Service, and the telephone was used freely for consultations.

War Boards—1941-45

Extension Service personnel actively participated in State and County War Boards and the State Council of Defense. The latter also had County Councils of Defense.

Those organizations initiated programs involving fire prevention, farm safety, health protection, and salvaging of materials such as aluminum, iron, waste paper, and fats.

With 8.5 million men in the armed forces, there were many problems in agriculture, to which Extension gave all-out assistance.

These included:

- 1) An acute manpower shortage, especially of trained men to operate machinery.
- 2) A serious shortage of farm machinery.
- 3) A shortage of food and fiber storage facilities.
- 4) A shortage of equipment for food preservation.
- 5) Difficulty transporting crops and livestock to terminal markets. Local transportation was handicapped by a shortage of tires, gasoline, and broken-down trucks.
- 6) A need for shifting acreages of commonly produced crops to those needed for wartime use, such as oil crops.
- 7) The threat of serious inflation.
- 8) A need to correlate activities of agencies in the U. S. Department of Agriculture to obtain optimum efficiency in operation.

The Extension Service gave its full attention to these problems and directed all phases of the Extension program to an all-out war effort.

Over-All Effort

The 1944 report of the Extension Dean and Director, Harry J. C. Umberger, summarized the success of the Extension Service in the war effort:

Farm production planning under wartime conditions has proved to be most important for the proper adjustments in crops and livestock in meeting production goals, at the same time insuring stability in the farm business.

The Extension Service in cooperation with the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station prepared a suggested adjustment pattern for 1945, which is designed

to maintain a balance between livestock, feed grains, and food grains, and thus promote the most effective use of land and labor.

A few of the more important goals in reaching and maintaining the desired pattern of production were:

- 1) Avoid excessive wheat acreage that might endanger the fallow program.
- 2) Attain suggested acreage of oil crops.
- 3) Encourage Victory Gardens for production of food.
- 4) Increase rotation of pastures and alfalfa.
- 5) Study carefully any adjustment in livestock and poultry numbers.
- 6) Continue good practices of crop production, and safe guard seed supplies.
- 7) Obtain an adequate supply of specialized equipment, particularly labor-saving harvesting machines.
- 8) Avoid a jam in livestock marketing.

Victory Gardens Conference—1942

On January 12, 1942, the Governor of Kansas, Payne Ratner, as Chairman of the Kansas Council of Defense, called a victory garden conference. The Governor assigned to the Extension Service the responsibility of conducting the victory garden program.

The success of the program was assured when the following organizations offered their cooperation:

Vocational Education Department
Kansas State Teachers Association
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation
KSU Horticulture Department
State Agricultural Adjustment Adm.
Flower Lovers Club
Kansas Congress of Parents and Teachers
State Works Progress Administration
Kansas State Employment Service
Associated Garden Clubs of Kansas
State Department of Education

The Extension Horticulture Specialist solicited the cooperation of the Kansas Greenhouse Association and seed dealers to provide seed and plants of recommended varieties of vegetables. Leaders were trained, subject matter material was prepared and distributed.

The people of Kansas were encouraged to grow a home garden to supply food for their families to release other food for the armed forces.

Neighborhood Leader Program—1941-45

One method used during World War I to reach a maximum number of persons effectively was the Neighborhood Leader program. Each county was divided into neighborhoods, made up of groups of eight or 10 families who had ready means of communication, either by telephone or otherwise. There were 4,912 neighborhoods organized, with 2,718 men and 7,469 women leaders.

In February, 1943, a study was made of the effectiveness of the neighborhood leaders in Pawnee, Hamilton, and Greenwood counties. The study showed that as many as 11 different wartime activities had been successfully executed by the neighborhood leaders. Those leaders also assisted with the planning of county Extension programs.

During World War II, District Extension Agents cooperated with officials of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in holding county and district meetings. The purpose was to acquaint leaders with the food production goals which had been established for the state, and methods by which those goals could be reached. Surveys revealed that most of the goals were exceeded during each year of the war.

District Extension Agents also worked with Farm Labor representatives in familiarizing County Extension Agents with the manner in which the available farm labor could be most advantageously distributed over the state at the times when it was needed most.

Food Production Agents—1941-45

Special Food Production Agents were available part of the time during the war. These Agents were assigned to some of the more populous counties and worked under the supervision of the regular Extension Agents in the county.

They worked on programs of assistance in cattle grub control, garden production and food preservation, food projects with 4-H club members, seed treatment for the prevention of plant diseases, and other work of a similar nature.

This special war work proved that the larger counties with more extensive Extension programs could use additional agents in the planning and execution of programs to meet the needs of people.

Oil Crops for the War Effort—1941-45

During the first years of the war, in an effort to produce oil crops, Kansas Farmers increased the acreage of flax and soybeans 200 percent, although those crops were

not always the most profitable to grow.

Immediately after the war, the acreage of oil crops returned to pre-war numbers, and in their place more soil-building crops were established.

War Food Assistants—1941-45

During the late part of the 1940's, Federal funds continued for short-term food production staff member:

1945—Eight Special Food Production Assistants were employed in counties with a larger number of farmers. They gave special assistance in cattle grub control, garden programs, food projects with 4-H club members and seed treatment dem-

onstrations.

1946—To assist County Agricultural Agents with the heavy programs experienced in counties, part-time Emergency Agents were employed in several counties for short periods of time ranging from 30 days to eight months. They provided a total of 10 man-years during the year.

1948 — There were from six to 19 Emergency Agricultural Agents on the payroll throughout the year with an average of 12. In home economics there were eight to 14 with an average of 10. There were two to 33 Emergency Club Agents, an average of 20.

Extension Programs—1941-45

During the years of World War II, the Extension Service program was geared to an "all-out" war effort. Recognition was given to food as a weapon of war. Production goals were established through agricultural planning, and determination of needs by the Defense Board each year. Those goals were exceeded in most cases.

Labor Shortage—1941-45

Because of young farm men being needed in the military services, thousands of older men, many women, and men recruited from cities gave every ounce of energy to produce food and fiber for the war needs.

Weather and Production—1941-45

Climatic conditions were favorable during the war years and that aided Kansas farmers to produce record yields of wheat, flax, soybeans, hay and the feed crops. Chicken and egg production, milk supplies, and gardens reached record production.

Educational programs were conducted on topics such as properly maintaining farm machinery, how to preserve food, the need for scrap metal, and the need or help in financing the war by the purchase of savings bonds.

Post-War Problems—1946-50's

High production and commodity price supports during the war years resulted in post-war problems of surplus production and declining prices. The Extension Service gave this situation serious attention.

By close cooperation with the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), educational programs were conducted with farmers in an effort to

help them to make the necessary adjustments from maximum production to production to meet the market needs at that time.

Diversion of crop land to grass, heavy culling of cow herds, and market studies were emphasized in educational programs. But efficiency of production continued and surplus commodities became a depressing factor in the markets.

Work With Urban People—1940's

Work with urban people began to increase greatly following World War II. During the war years Extension conducted an extensive Victory Garden campaign among urban families.

Many farm families moved to the cities during the war to work in industry, or because of the shortage of manpower on the farm to operate it effectively.

Those farm families did not want to sever their connections with the Extension Service. They told their city neighbors about the Extension Service and the assistance available from Extension personnel.

As a result, County Extension Agents began to receive many inquiries from urban people, particularly those who owned farm land in the county.

Three business agricultural clubs were organized to meet for lunch once each month to hear discussions of particular interest to them. The 4-H Club Department began to organize projects that would be suitable for urban boys and girls, especially the boys.

An increased number of Extension home demonstration units were organized among urban women seeking assistance in their homemaking problems.

Other activities aided in the development of a more complete understanding between the city dweller and the farm family.

Furthermore, the city taxpayer was being given some service for his tax dollars appropriated to the support of the Extension program.

More counties with urban areas considered employing more Assistant Extension Agents to provide a larger staff to more adequately serve urban clientele.

Asst. Agents for Urban Clientele—1943-49

It became apparent in the larger population counties in the 1940's, that additional county personnel was needed to work with programs designed to give special assistance to urban clientele.

The first counties to take action in securing Assistant County Agents to meet this need were:

Sedgwick Co.		
Asst. Home Economics Agent	Apr 26, 1943	
Sedgwick Co.		
Asst. Agricultural Agent	Jan 28, 1946	
Sedgwick Co.		
Assistant 4-H Club Agent	Dec 20, 1948	
Barton Co.		
Asst. Home Economics Agent	Feb 15, 1949	

Administrative Effectiveness—1940

During 1940, conferences to increase the efficiency of administration continued. They included:

- 1) Extension Executive Council — composed of department heads and all District Agents and Supervisors who met the third Monday of each month.
- 2) Agricultural and Engineering Specialists who met at frequent intervals for the purpose of correlating project activities including radio and publicity.
- 3) Monthly luncheons to provide Extension workers, the Director, and other administrative officers an opportunity to discuss policies and procedures. Members of the State Agricultural Adjustment program staff also attended the luncheons.
- 4) County Farm Bureau presidents were used in their counties on Land-Use Planning committees and Type-of-Farming committees.
- 5) Extension-Agricultural Adjustment Administration conferences for field workers or supervisors held monthly to permit them to stay up-to-date on the progress in the program.

Staff Growth Continues—1944

By June 30, 1944 the Central Extension Office staff consisted of 78 individuals, listed below. The dates given indicate their first appointment to an Extension Service position.

<u>Appointment</u>	<u>Name and Position</u>
Administration	
Feb 1, 1915	H. Umberger, Dean and Director
Jul 1, 1915	L. C. Williams, Assistant Dean and Director
Apr 1, 1920	Clara M. Siem, Assistant to Director
Extension Publicity and Information	
Jul 1, 1927	L. L. Longsdorf, Extension Editor and Radio Program Director
Jul 10, 1934	Jean Scheel, Extension Editor
Aug 31, 1942	W. Lowell Treaster, Assistant Extension Editor
Aug 7, 1943	V. Bernard P. Holbert, Radio Operator
Nov 9, 1942	Eula Mae Kelly, Assistant Extension Editor

Apr 1, 1944	Miriam Dexter, Assistant Extension Editor
Feb 15, 1935	Eugene D. Warner, Assistant Extension Editor
Jan 1, 1943	Harold Shankland, Assistant Extension Editor
Nov 1, 1943	Carol Borrego, Assistant Extension Editor
County Agent Work	
Aug 1, 1916	A. F. Turner, Field Agent
Feb 1, 1919	Frank O. Blecha, District Agent
Jan 10, 1929	Earl H. Teagarden, District Agent
Feb 1, 1929	Harry C. Baird, District Agent
Aug 1, 1923	M. L. Robinson, District Supervisor
Apr 15, 1929	Otis B. Glover, District Supervisor
Oct 15, 1924	Leonard F. Neff, District Supervisor
Boys' and Girls' Club Work	
May 20, 1922	M. H. Coe, State Club Leader
Jul 1, 1927	J. Harold Johnson, Acting State Club Leader

Sep 16, 1929	Mary Elsie Border, Assistant State Club Leader	May 1, 1924	James W. Linn, Dairy Husbandry Specialist
Mar 1, 1934	Roger Regnier, Assistant State Club Leader	Jun 14, 1927	Ray L. Stover, Dairy Husbandry Specialist
Aug 17, 1933	J. D. Smerchek, Assistant State Club Leader	Jul 1, 1924	J. W. Lumb, Veterinary Specialist
Home Demonstration Work			
Dec 12, 1924	Georgiana H. Smurthwaite, State Home Demonstration Leader	Dec 11, 1924	J. J. Moxley, Animal Husbandry Specialist
Sep 1, 1919	Ellen M. Batchelor, District Home Demonstration Agent	Sep 1, 1926	E. A. Cleavenger, Crops Specialist
Jun 10, 1943	Margaret Burtis, District Home Demonstration Agent	Mar 12, 1930	L. L. Compton, Crops Specialist
May 11, 1932	Ella M. Meyer, District Home Demonstration Agent	Aug 1, 1933	R. C. Lind, Agronomy Specialist
May 20, 1929	Gertrude Allen, Foods and Nutrition Specialist	Dec 19, 1934	E. R. Halbroom, Poultry Husbandry Specialist
Jun 15, 1936	Mary G. Fletcher, Foods and Nutrition Specialist	Dec 1, 1935	W. G. Amstein, Horticultural Specialist
Jun 15, 1919	W. Pearl Martin, Home Health and Sanitation Specialist	Aug 1, 1928	M. A. Seaton, Poultry Husbandry Specialist
Nov 1, 1939	Laura I. Winter, District Home Demonstration Agent	Aug 16, 1941	Lloyd M. Copenhafer, Landscape Gardening Specialist
Jan 25, 1939	Mae Farris, Home Furnishings Specialist	May 15, 1936	A. G. Pickett, Marketing Specialist (Livestock)
Feb 17, 1930	Christine Wiggins, Clothing and Textiles Specialist	Aug 1, 1944	Dwight S. Tolle, Marketing Specialist (Grain)
Jul 1, 1930	Gladys Myers, Home Management Specialist	Aug 28, 1935	Paul W. Griffith, Farm Management Specialist
Sep 1, 1939	Vera Mae Ellithorpe, Home Management Specialist	Jun 1, 1936	Karl Shoemaker, Marketing Specialist (Dairy)
Aug 11, 1941	Doris Compton, Recreation Specialist	Dec 1, 1932	J. H. Coolidge, Farm Management Specialist
Mar 1, 1944	Naomi M. Johnson, Clothing and Textiles Specialist	Jan 1, 1922	C. R. Jaccard, Agricultural Economics Specialist
Sep 1, 1943	Elizabeth Randle, Foods and Nutrition Specialist	Jul 21, 1934	Lot F. Taylor, Fieldman, Farm Management Association No. 1
Sep 1, 1943	Carol Theim, Foods and Nutrition Specialist	Jun 1, 1936	Gerald J. Brown, Fieldman, Farm Management Association No. 2
Feb 13, 1943	Dora Aubel, Foods and Nutrition Specialist	Feb 11, 1935	Ray M. Hoss, Fieldman, Farm Management Association No. 4
Agricultural Specialists			
Jul 1, 1915	L. C. Williams, In Charge (also Assistant Dean & Director)	Aug 9, 1931	R. L. Rawlins, Fieldman, Farm Management Association No. 4
Oct 1, 1914	C. G. Elling, Animal Husbandry Specialist	Engineering Extension	
Aug 16, 1917	L. E. Willoughby, Crops Specialist	Oct 18, 1937	John M. Ferguson, in charge
Apr 15, 1918	E. G. Kelly, Entomology Specialist	Feb 15, 1935	Eugene D. Warner, Extension Architect
Nov 17, 1935	John O. Miller, Plant Pathology Specialist	Jan 1, 1936	Harold D. Stover, Extension Engineer
		Jul 10, 1942	Robert G. White, Extension Engineer
		Oct 29, 1944	Walter E. Selby, Extension Engineer
		Aug 21, 1944	A. K. Bader, Extension Architect
		Home Study Service	
		Aug 1, 1918	George Gemmell, in charge

Dec 15, 1919 Floyd Pattison, Engineering
 Sep 1, 1921 Ada Billings, History and Civics
 Sep 1, 1921 B. H. Fleenor, Education

Sep 1, 1931 Jesse M. Schall, English
 Nov 1, 1936 Chester B. Billings, Agriculture

Extension Finances—1940's

Extension Budgets Improve—1940's

By 1940, the heavy responsibility of Extension workers for the adjustment and drought programs had passed. Primary attention was being given to a sound educational program, well planned with the people, for the development of farm business and home life.

Financial support for the county programs was being received in increased amounts, about twice the amount available from state and federal sources.

County commissioners were making appropriations largely as requested in the budgets prepared by the county farm bureau executive boards.

The five year record was:

1937 - \$257,805
 1938 - \$287,661
 1939 - \$307,997
 1940 - \$321,916
 1941 - \$325,424

The average county appropriation per county (103 counties) for 1941 was \$3,159; the highest was \$12,743; and the lowest, \$1,200.

County Farm Bureau membership for 1940 was: 34,773 men and 21,793 women as of October 31, 1940. Membership dues collected were \$93,260.

The total financial resources in 1940, as shown by the budgets of the County Farm Bureaus, was \$608,903. A portion of the dues money was used to pay memberships in the Kansas Farm Bureau, therefore was not budgeted for Extension work in the counties.

The sources of the 1940 budget were:

\$175,400	Federal and State
321,916	County Appropriations
69,175	Membership Dues
<u>18,330</u>	Other sources
\$584,821	Total Resources for 1940

State/Federal Funds to Counties—1940-46

The law pertaining to County Farm Bureaus provided that Kansas State University should grant to each county funds, so far as available, to apply to the salary of the County Agents employed.

In keeping with that provision, the amounts per agent from 1940-1946 were:

Years	Amount
1940-45	\$1,000 for all agents
1946	\$1,000 for Home Agents and Club Agents \$1,200 effective July 1, for Agricultural Agents
1947	\$1,000 for Home Agents and Club Agents \$1,200 for Agricultural Agents
1948	\$1,200 for Agricultural Agents \$1,200 for Home Agents and Club Agents effective July 1
1949	\$1,200 for all Agents first half of year \$1,500 for all Agents last half of year
1950-56	\$1,500 for all Agents
1957	\$1,650 effective July 1
1958	\$1,830 effective September 1
1959	\$1,962 effective July 1
1960	\$1,962
1961	\$2,076 effective July 1
1962	\$2,160 effective July 1
1963	\$2,244 effective July 1
1964	\$2,340 effective July 1

County Ext. Budget Sources—1940-64

Beginning in 1915, County Extension Programs were supported generously by county appropriations. Other sources of revenue were Farm Bureau membership fees, unencumbered balances and miscellaneous receipts.

The amounts were:

Year	County Appropriations	Total Co. Resources
1940	321,915	608,902
1941	325,424	607,212
1942	325,127	617,561
1943	342,590	618,581
1944	398,890	710,323
1945	448,900	739,261
1946	523,618	873,933
1947	625,555	1,048,055
1948	761,324	1,214,420
1949	901,092	1,420,064
1950	981,343	1,602,921
1951	1,038,483	1,688,398
1952	1,435,843	1,879,209
1953	1,545,823	2,052,363
1954	1,567,083	2,153,474
1955	1,661,124	2,211,315
1956	1,719,900	2,306,668
1957	1,777,794	2,356,206
1958	1,797,242	2,371,817
1959	1,804,612	2,447,811
1960	1,868,284	2,559,003
1961	1,926,175	2,671,458
1962	1,979,614	2,759,445
1963	2,019,122	2,811,288
1964	2,117,479	3,006,174

County Appropriations—1940-64

County appropriations made to support county Extension programs from 1940 to 1964, by five-year periods, were:

Year	Total	Average	Highest	Lowest
1940	\$321,915	\$3,125	\$12,106	\$1,200
1945	448,900	4,358	16,190	1,700
1951*	1,038,483	10,082	39,030	1,200
1952	1,435,843	13,805	53,850	5,550
1955	1,661,124	15,825	57,986	8,105
1960	1,868,284	17,793	65,905	8,443
1964	2,117,479	20,166	88,424	12,016

* 1951 was the first year of operation of the County Extension Councils.

Total resources to Extension from county budgets were:

Year	Total	Ave.	High	Low
1940	\$618,902	\$5,912	\$16,857	\$2,407
1945	739,261	7,177	22,440	3,398
1950	1,602,921			
1955	2,211,315	(Data not given in reports)		
1960	2,559,003			
1964	3,006,174			

Collect Dues by Mail—1942

Due to tire and gas rationing as well as limited time on the part of farm leaders, collection of county farm bureau dues by mail was studied. It was agreed to try collection by mail.

Leonard Neff, District Supervisor, and L. L. Longsdorf of the Publicity Department, prepared a series of three letters and cards which were reviewed with the Extension Agents at the summer conference.

At each county Farm Bureau board meeting after the summer conference, the County Extension Agent reviewed the collection of dues by letter plan and ordered whatever supplies the county needed. The letters were then printed commercially and mailed at intervals of two weeks beginning early in October.

Collection of County Farm Bureau dues by mail in the fall of 1942 for the 1943 year proved to be very successful. When the campaign was completed questionnaires were sent to the County Agents to determine the results in each county.

It was found that although a series of four letters and post cards had been prepared for use in the counties, the Agents used a variety of methods in handling the collection by mail campaign.

The questionnaires were returned by 42 Agents who had participated in the plan. The following information was obtained:

- 1) Over 40 percent of the members receiving letters paid their dues without personal solicitation.
- 2) Prospective members were also mailed notices and 8.8 percent paid their dues; the highest county result being 45.5 percent.
- 3) The best results were obtained by mailing the first notice the first week in October rather than in November.
- 4) Mailing the notices at seven-day intervals gave just as good results as mailing at 14-day intervals. Thus the mail

campaign was completed soon enough that any personal solicitation could be completed before the end of the year.

- 5) The more notices mailed, the more dues collected. The four notices gave the more complete results. No information was available as to the benefit of additional notices.
- 6) Postcard notices were as effective as letters. Results indicated the letters or postcards were only reminders rather than a selling campaign on the value of the membership.
- 7) More dues were collected when blank checks and return envelopes were enclosed. The envelope seemed to be more effective than the check.
- 8) Satisfactory results were obtained in all areas of the state.
- 9) A higher percentage of dues payment by mail was experienced in two-agent counties than in one-agent counties.
- 10) The cost was about 22 cents per member of those who paid their dues.
- 11) Eighty percent of the agents replying to the questionnaire desired that letters or cards be prepared for their use another year.

Fifty-one counties ordered letters and cards for collecting County Farm Bureau dues for use in the fall of 1943 for 1944 dues.

Collection of County Farm Bureau dues by mail continued in a majority of Kansas counties until the fall of 1951. At that time, County Agricultural Extension Councils were organized in lieu of Farm Bureaus as the Extension program sponsoring agency.

District Agents considered the number of County Farm Bureau members and the ease of securing county appropriations as important factors when evaluating county Extension programs in 1940.

County appropriations plus membership dues constituted about three-fourths of the total budget. Therefore, the willingness of people to support the county Extension program financially was seen as an expression of their satisfaction and positive evaluation of the Extension program.

County Farm Bureau Dues—1943-46

Certain membership requirements needed to be met before a County Farm Bureau was entitled to a county appropriation to aid in the support of the county Extension program.

To meet this requirement the Executive Boards of the County Farm Bureaus and the District Agricultural Extension Agents annually organized a campaign to collect dues from men in the Farm Bureaus.

Women paid their dues largely through the home demonstration unit where their membership was held.

Membership campaigns required a lot of time by volunteer workers. However, those personal contacts had great value in identifying criticisms of the county program, providing an opportunity to secure new members and give an explanation of the county program to those persons otherwise uninformed.

In 1943, a program to collect dues by mail was organized. A series of four notices were prepared by the Extension District Agricultural Agents. Orders from the counties were pooled to reduce printing costs.

A number of notices to be used and the interval of time between notices varied with the counties but the results were very successful. A summary of the use of the collection by mail notices was made in 1946. The results were:

Notices Mailed & Percent Collected—1943-46

Year	One	Two	Three	Four
1943	24.3	35.8	54.6	46.9
1944	48.3	57.0	76.7	74.3
1945	29.9	63.3	72.7	76.1
1946	80.0	79.1	66.6	69.4

About 75 of the 103 County Farm Bureaus used the notices in 1946.

Aid to Low Valuation Counties—1946-64

A plan was devised in 1946 to give additional aid to those counties unable to budget sufficient funds to employ two full-time Agents. Help was needed because of the continually rising costs of materials and services, and the limitation on the county levy provided for Extension work.

The plan provided that a county levying the full amount permitted by law (one-half mill) would be granted additional aid to:

- 1) Raise the county portion of the budget to \$5,000 if an Agricultural Agent was employed full time and a Home Demonstration Agent one-half time.
- 2) Up to \$6,000 if the county was to employ two Agents full-time.

The plan was altered from time to time to permit any county to employ two full-time Agents. From 1946-1961, special aid was granted to counties as follows:

Year	Number of Counties	Amount of Aid
1946	8	N/A
1947	6	12,815
1948	N/A	N/A
1949	16	21,171
1950	22	24,800
1951	21	24,750
1952	2	N/A

1953	7	8,000
1954	7	10,950
1955	9	14,810
1956	13	20,800
1957	17	27,670
1958	8	18,511
1959	4	13,390
1960	4	14,224
1961	7	16,267
1962	N/A	N/A
1963	N/A	N/A
1964	N/A	N/A

Aid To Low Valuation Counties—1946-50

Due to inflation during and following World War II, some counties with comparatively low tangible valuations found that the one-half mill levy, authorized in the County Farm Bureau law, provided insufficient funds to adequately support two Agents in a county.

Federal funds from the Federal appropriations for allocation to the states were available to the Secretary of Agriculture to grant to states to meet special needs. A justification for such a grant to Kansas was made in an effort to obtain funds to give low valuation counties additional aid. The District Extension Agents' report for 1946, stated:

The assessed valuation in a number of counties in Western Kansas is too low to enable them to maintain an effective Extension program even though they levy the maximum amount allowed by law.

A program in operation at the present time provides that when a county will levy funds equal to what a half mill will raise, then additional funds will be supplied to make up the difference between the amount raised by the county and \$5,800. Such a program makes it possible for the counties to have a County Agricultural Agent and a Home Demonstration Agent.

The average number of farms per county in western counties is relatively small. Two full-time Agents can carry fully as effective a program as three Agents could carry in counties farther East where the number of farms is much greater.

Even though certain counties in the western part of the state have a low valuation, they produce a large percent of the State's wheat crop, a large amount of milo, and in years when conditions are favorable furnish

wheat pasture for wintering large numbers of cattle and for fattening thousands of lambs.

They contribute a great deal to Kansas agriculture and are deserving of the necessary aid to carry on an effective Extension program.

The average amount of county appropriations in counties that employed two Agents, was \$5,800 at that time, as mentioned above.

In 1947, 26 counties were eligible for additional aid under the policy established in 1946; however, only six of the counties levied the full half mill to make them eligible. Those counties were:

Cheyenne	\$	1,682
Comanche		678
Greeley		3,169
Hamilton		2,142
Hodgeman		1,246
Morton		<u>3,898</u>
Total		\$12,815

By 1948, the average county appropriation for two-agent counties had risen to \$7,000. The additional aid became the difference between what a half mill levy would raise and \$7,000. Twenty counties qualified in 1948.

Valuation Reduces Eligibility—1949

By 1949, a general increase in county assessed valuations reduced the number of eligible counties to 19. Ten of those counties were grouped into five two-county districts for home economics work.

The five 2-county districts were composed of: Greeley-Wallace, Scott-Wichita; Hamilton- Kearny, Grant-Haskell, and Stanton-Morton.

The salary and travel expenses of the Home Demonstration Agents employed in the two-county Districts were paid entirely from Kansas State College funds.

Further, in 1949, the average county appropriation for a two-Agent county was \$8,264. The additional aid provided in 1949 was:

County	Amt.	Agent receiving special aid
Clark	\$ 670	Home Demonstration Agent
Cheyenne	1,582	Home Demonstration Agent
Comanche	1,720	Home Demonstration Agent
Decatur	915	Home Demonstration Agent
Graham	705	Home Demonstration Agent
Greeley	1,800	County Agent
Hamilton	300	County Agent
Haskell	460	County Agent
Hodgeman	1,300	Home Demonstration Agent
Lane	2,370	Home Demonstration Agent
Morton	2,400	County Agent
Rawlins	1,225	Home Demonstration Agent
Sheridan	1,148	Home Demonstration Agent
Stanton	2,100	County Agent
Wallace	1,276	County Agent
Wichita	<u>1,200</u>	County Agent
Total	\$21,171	

The 1948 report of the District Extension Agents stated:

Balanced Farming Program—1945-48

In 1945, the Federal appropriations were increased and carried reference to a program in Farm and Home Development.

In Kansas the program was called Balanced Farming and Family Living. (The program is explained in more detail in the Farm Management chapter of this history.)

Training Schools

A State Committee was organized, two-day training schools were conducted for the specialists and district schools for the county personnel.

An effort was made to not attach the program to any one project but, rather, to have all projects contribute to the over-all program of organizing and balancing the

The table of county tangible valuations tells a clear story and points directly to a need. The story is that under the present law 25 percent of the counties cannot support a County Agent and a Home Demonstration Agent continuously.

More than one-half of the counties cannot support three Agents. The need is that the law should be changed in order that more state aid can be secured to finance low valuation counties.

In 1949, an additional two-county district for a Home Demonstration Agent was established—Woodson and Chautauqua counties.

The 1950 rules governing aid to counties were:

- 1) For counties employing only a County Agricultural Agent and having assessed valuations of \$8.5 million or less, the College may pay not to exceed \$3,600 per fiscal year on the salary for such Agent provided the county appropriates an amount equal to the half mill times the assessed tangible valuation of said county as of November 1, of the prior calendar year.
- 2) For counties employing both a County Agricultural Agent and a Home Demonstration Agent and having an assessed valuation of \$16 million or less the College may pay \$1,500 toward the salary of the County Agricultural Agent and \$2,500 toward the salary of the Home Demonstration Agent providing the county has made the maximum levy.

In 1950, the counties that received special aid included the 16 listed for 1949 and in addition were: Chautauqua, Grant, Kiowa, Scott, Sherman and Woodson Counties.

farm business in all respects and that the family enjoy a balanced living program.

An award program was initiated for progress made in the program by families but the selection of awardees was considered by many as a contest.

For this reason the award program moved slowly for a couple of years, but in time it maintained a place in the development and recognition for the program.

Assigned to Farm Management—1958

In 1958, the Balanced Farming and Family Living program was assimilated into the Farm Management project.

Extension Project Organization—1946

By 1946, the organization of Extension programs in Kansas included the following 34 projects plus sub-projects:

- 1) Administration
- 2) Extension Publicity and Information
 - A. Publicity
 - B. Radio
- 3) County Agent Work
 - A. Supervision of County Agents
 - B. Organization of non-Farm Bureau counties
- 4) Home Demonstration Work
 - A. Supervision of Home Demonstration Agents
 - B. Supervision of home economics program in non-home demonstration agent counties
 - C. Supervision of home economics specialists
- 5) Boys' and Girls' Club Work
 - A. Club Organization
 - B. Beef
 - C. Swine
 - D. Sheep
 - E. Dairy
 - F. Poultry
 - G. Corn
 - H. Sorghum
 - I. Wheat
 - J. Potato
 - K. Garden
 - L. Clothing
 - M. Food Preparation
 - N. Food Preservation
 - O. Home Improvement
 - P. Miscellaneous
- 6) Agricultural Specialists — (discontinued, 1938)
- 7) Soil Management and Crop Production
 - A. Crop improvement
 - B. Legume production and soil improvement
 - C. Pasture improvement
 - D. Soil management
 - E. Weed control
 - F. Soil conservation
- 8) Plant Pathology
 - A. Vegetable disease control
 - B. Grain crops disease control
 - C. Disease control of trees, ornamentals, berries and miscellaneous plants
- 9) Horticulture
 - A. Fruit production
 - B. Landscape architecture
 - C. Commercial vegetable production
 - D. Fruit and vegetable gardens and nutrition
- 10) Animal Husbandry
 - A. Beef cattle Production
 - B. Horse production
 - C. Pork Production
 - D. Sheep and wool production
 - E. Home preparation of meats
- 11) Dairying
 - A. General dairy program
 - B. Dairy farm record associations
- 12) Veterinary Extension
 - A. Cattle disease and parasite control
 - B. Poultry disease and parasite control
 - C. Swine and sheep disease and parasite control
 - D. Veterinary extension with veterinarians
- 13) Poultry Husbandry
 - A. Chicken production
 - B. Turkey production
- 14) Entomology
 - A. Staple crop insects
 - B. Horticultural insects
 - C. Livestock insects
 - D. Building and lumber insects
 - E. Household insects and insects affecting sanitation and health
- 15) Eradicating Rodent Pests in Kansas — (Suspended, 1942)
- 16) Farm Management
 - A. Specialized farm accounts
 - B. Complete farm accounts
 - C. Farm management and dairy farm record associations
 - D. Land tenure
- 17) Marketing
 - A. Marketing of livestock
 - B. Marketing of fruits and vegetables
 - C. Marketing of grain
 - D. Marketing of poultry and poultry products
 - E. Marketing of dairy products
 - F. Agricultural Outlook
- 18) Extension Schools in Home Economics and the Supervision of Home Economics Specialists (discontinued, 1926)
- 19) Foods and Nutrition
 - A. Foods for health
 - B. Adequate food at low cost

- 20) Clothing
 - A. Clothing construction
 - B. Self expression through dress
 - C. Care of clothing
 - D. Buying clothing
- 21) Millinery— (discontinued, 1930)
- 22) Home Health and Sanitation
 - A. Home nursing
 - B. Sanitation
 - C. Personal development
- 23) Home Management
 - A. The family and its homemaking
 - B. The family and its business
- 24) Engineering Extension
 - A. Farm architecture
 - B. Land reclamation
 - C. Farm power and farm machinery
 - D. Rural electrification
- 25) Home Study Service
- 26) Radio—(Discontinued, 1936)
- 27) Home Furnishings
 - A. Furnishing the livable home
 - B. Selection and conservation of furnishings
 - C. Crafts
- 28) Rural Organization and Farm Finance —
(suspended, 1942)

- 29) Farm Forestry
 - A. Farm woodlots
 - B. Shelterbelts and windbreaks
 - C. Cooperative farm forestry
- 30) Agricultural Planning
- 31) Recreation
 - A. Dramatic production
 - B. Speech education
 - C. Music
 - D. Games
- 32) Farm Labor
- 33) Emergency War Food Production and
Conservation (discontinued June 30, 1945)
- 34) Family Life
 - A. Understanding the members of family
 - B. The family plans its finances
 - C. The family's place in the community
 - D. Family plans for enjoying each other

Contributing Author: The primary contributing author to this overview summary of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service organization, administration, and program emphasis for this 1930-49 Era was Earl H. Teagarden, who first recorded his compilations in the publication, Kansas Extension Service—from 1868-1964. His observations have been revised, consolidated, and adapted to a new format for inclusion in this update publication.