


1986

Historical analysis of the development of County Agricultural Extension Councils in Iowa

Albert Daramanu Nuhu
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Adult and Continuing Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nuhu, Albert Daramanu, "Historical analysis of the development of County Agricultural Extension Councils in Iowa " (1986).
Retrospective Theses and Dissertations. 8104.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/8104>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a manuscript sent to us for publication and microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. Pages in any manuscript may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.
2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.
3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or in black and white paper format.*
4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, all photographs are available in black and white standard 35mm slide format.*

*For more information about black and white slides or enlarged paper reproductions, please contact the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

U·M·I Dissertation
Information Service

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

8627139

Nuhu, Albert Daramanu

**HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF COUNTY
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION COUNCILS IN IOWA**

Iowa State University

PH.D. 1986

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**Historical analysis of the development of
County Agricultural Extension Councils in Iowa**

by

Albert Daramanu Nuhu

**A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Adult and Extension Education)**

Approved:

Members of the Committee:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In/Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

**Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
1986**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	vi
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	1
Significance of the Study	3
Objectives of the Study	4
Background of the Study	5
An overview of the development of the United States Cooperative Extension Service and the Iowa Extension Councils	6
Historical Science	9
Theoretical Framework	11
Limitations of the Study	15
Procedure	16
CHAPTER II. THE FARM DEMONSTRATION MOVEMENT	19
Nation-wide Farm Demonstration Movement	20
The discovery of an idea	20
The spread of the demonstration technique and the establishment of county agent work	26
General Education Board's contribution	34
Initiation of full-time county agent work	37
Cooperative expansion of county agent work	39
The Demonstration Movement in Iowa	42
Extension and demonstration work in Iowa	45
Agencies and Organizations Promoting County Agent Work	50
Organization of Farmers for Extension in Iowa	52

Summary	55
Application of Grounded Theory	59
Categories and properties	59
Conjectures	66
CHAPTER III. FARM AID ASSOCIATION ACT AND THE FARM BUREAU	68
The Evolution of the Farm Bureau Movement	68
Farm organization preceding the Farm Bureau	68
Beginning of the farm bureau movement	74
Federation of county farm bureaus into state farm bureaus	77
The national federation	78
Farm Bureau in Iowa	82.
Extension Service and Farm Bureau Relations in Iowa	88
Summary	101
Categories and properties	103
Conjectures	108
CHAPTER IV. THE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION COUNCILS	110
Introduction	110
Extension-Farm Bureau ties	110
Breakaway of Farm Bureau from Sponsoring Extension in Iowa	115
The national struggle	115
The dilemma of the county agent in Iowa	123
The upsurge of the national struggle	126
Intensified struggles in Iowa	133
Beginning of legislative struggles in Iowa	144

Farm bureau before national Congress	149
Intervention by Department of Agriculture	154
Final legislation in Iowa	159
The County Agricultural Extension Councils	164
Foundations of the Iowa councils	166
Present Organization and Functioning of County Agricultural Extension Councils	168
Summary	172
Categories and properties	175
Conjectures	178
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	181
Summary and Conclusions	181
Evolution and growth of county extension council idea	183
Forces contributing to the evolvement of councils	189
The county councils and delivery system in extension	190
Organization, structure and functioning of councils	192
Further improvements in the councils	195
Grounded Theory	197
Categories and properties	198
Conjectures	205
Synthesis of conjectures	210
Implications for Extension in Ghana	212
Further Research	221

BIBLIOGRAPHY	224
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	233

DEDICATION

Dedicated to
Akosua Ameyaw
Nuhu Atchulo
Mama and Co.

(Mom, Dad and children)

and to the memory of my beloved brother,
Jackson Seidu Nuhu (1955-1984).

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Several attempts to adapt the United States Extension system model in various countries have been made (Pender, 1954; Leagan, 1959). These attempts have succeeded in giving new directions to university extension in Western Europe and the Eastern world.

However, this adaptation movement is very slow in coming to Africa, especially Ghana. In Ghana, one can see excerpts of United States foreign agricultural programs, but such programs are isolated and general. Such examples are experimental and do not seek integration with the existing system of Extension services directed from the Ministry of Agriculture. In the long run, they do more harm than good because of the basic lack of continuity after their "experimental period." Ghana may benefit from the great wealth of knowledge about Cooperative Extension Services, especially its organization, administration and functioning. However, the different orientations and goals of Ghanaian and American policies may require much modification. This study seeks to learn what can and what cannot be transferred.

Need for the Study

The United States Extension system has been widely copied throughout the world (Prawl et al., 1984, p. 158). Given the truth of this statement, there seems to be ample reason to

focus attention upon the manner in which the Extension Service is organized, and the way it administers its programs. This focus should help to identify common and desirable features of organizational development pertinent to the Extension Service in the United States, and provide insights for developing and modifying organizational structures and administrative procedures suitable to varying situations and conditions.

A historical study of the development of Extension in the United States should reveal indigenous factors that facilitate the existence and creation of various institutions and facilities. No doubt, in Ghana there are also indigenous institutions and other natural facilities that could be effectively utilized to develop a kind of Extension Organization suitable for those peculiar conditions and needs of the country. A study, therefore, of how certain indigenous institutions helped to promote the building of such a viable and strong extension system in the United States will be very valuable knowledge for the improvement of Extension Service in Ghana.

Finally, students of Extension Education have been exposed to many theories and principles about human interactions, the teaching learning process, programming patterns and various methods and techniques applied in Extension Education. The one important ingredient not covered comprehensively is a full appreciation of the organization, administration and functioning of the United States Extension Services. This know-

ledge can be grasped effectively through a painstaking and thorough historical study of one of the fundamental functioning units of the Cooperative Extension Service. The County Agricultural Extension Council is the fundamental unit which supervises the functioning and operations of Extension work in each county in the United States. An historical study of its development and growth will give insight into requirements for developing and incorporating a similar unit in countries interested in modeling Extension Services after that in the United States.

Significance of the Study

One way historical research should be judged is by how well it shows professionals in the field an alternative way of thinking about research (Carlson 1980, p. 49). This "alternative way of thinking about research," as a first step, leads us to other significant issues of this study.

There is a considerable volume of literature dealing with public administration, theories of organization, education and extension in general, but there appears to be a rather limited body of information about how the County Agricultural Extension Councils came into being, as a central part of the overall Extension Service. Knowing the inter-relatedness of the activities and functions prompting the growth and development of the County Extension Councils is indispensable

knowledge if integrating the United States Extension model in other countries systems is to be most successful.

It is generally recognized that there is no one organizational and operational plan that could be applied to all states or countries, for situations tend to differ too widely to make this feasible. On the other hand, adaptations and applications of general principles to varying situations and conditions has been a significant vehicle for the promotion of science. This can only take place if a critical study, such as an historical evaluation of ideas and practices, can be done of specific issues. This study will, therefore, make an effort to trace the important steps and principles involved in the development of County Extension Councils in Iowa.

Finally, it is hoped that this study will inspire others to look back into other extension functions, organizations, personnel and administrative procedures, and other pertinent ideas, theories and philosophies of Extension, to build a cohesive literature base for use by those interested in incorporating Extension in other countries.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives are stated in the form of questions to be answered through this study. They are:

- (1) How did the idea of the County Agricultural Extension Council evolve and become related to other segments of the Cooperative Extension Service?
- (2) What forces and indigenous organizations contributed to the evolvement of the County Agricultural Extension Councils?
- (3) How has the County Agricultural Extension Council contributed to the delivery system and functioning of Extension?
- (4) What is the present organization, structure and functioning of the County Agricultural Extension Councils?
- (5) What further modifications, if any, can be suggested for the organization and functioning of the County Agricultural Extension Councils?
- (6) What can be learned as guidelines in developing and improving extension services in Ghana, or places other than the United States?

Background of the Study

The County Agricultural Extension Councils are a part of the larger organization of the Cooperative Extension Services. It seems most appropriate, therefore, to start with a brief overview of the events leading to the creation of the United States Cooperative Extension Services. Against this background, specific issues pertaining to the growth of County

Agricultural Extension Councils in Iowa will be sifted out to give expression to the main thrust of the study.

An overview of the development of the United States Cooperative Extension Service and the Iowa Extension Councils

Extension work is a major part of the system of agricultural education throughout the United States. As True (1928) stated,

"it is however so large and complex an enterprise in its organization and line of work and has passed through so many phases of development peculiar to itself that it seems best to record its history more fully in a separate publication" (p. 2).

An excellent presentation of its structure and functions is provided elsewhere (Ross, 1942; True, 1928; Eddy, 1957; Lord, 1939, Smith and Wilson, 1938; and Kelsey & Hearne, 1955). This study will only attempt to identify some of these phases that seem most relevant to examining the forces behind the development of one segment of this great enterprise, County Agricultural Extension Councils.

The American Philosophical Society, founded in 1743, with such founders and long-time leaders as Benjamin Franklin, is acknowledged by many as the first United States organization to informally disseminate information on agriculture (Vines and Anderson, 1976, p. 2). In the same vein, True (1928) records that extension work has "its beginnings in early agricultural societies from the time of the organization of the Philadelphia Society in 1785" (p. 3). Among the

objectives of such societies, they intended to acquaint their members with improved ideas in agriculture, to bring about local agricultural organizations, and to disseminate agricultural information through their publications. This movement flourished for over 75 years, reaching its peak about the same time the Civil War began.

This role was further advanced by State legislatures who established State boards of agriculture. The first was in New York in 1819 (Vines and Anderson, 1976, p. 2). State Boards were primarily responsible for the establishment of farmers' institutes, one of modern extension's most direct predecessors. Finally, in 1857, Vermont Congressman Justin Smith Morrill introduced a land-grant college bill.

"The Morrill act provided for at least one college in each state, where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts" (Vines and Anderson, 1976, p. 3).

The bill was signed on July 2, 1862, by Abraham Lincoln. However, before this act was signed, Lincoln signed two other historical bills. On May 15, 1862, he signed the Organic Act creating the United States Department of Agriculture (U.S.D.A.), an action that had been proposed 70 years earlier by George Washington. Five days later, he signed the Homestead Act, which made millions of acres of land available to the public at virtually no cost.

To build agricultural education on a firmer foundation of science, legislation was introduced into Congress to establish Experimental Stations at one land-grant college in each state in 1882. In 1887, this bill, sponsored by Missouri Representative William Henry Hatch, was signed by President Grover Cleveland. Thus, research was firmly established as a recognized function of the land-grant colleges and universities. Farmers' institutes became one of the primary means of disseminating research findings of the Experimental Stations to the general public.

In 1906, Smith County in Texas, became the first county to hire a full-time County Agent (True, 1928). Concurrently, youth activities in agriculture were growing. In 1907 the first federally sponsored club was organized in Mississippi. These clubs spread and eventually assumed the name 4-H clubs.

With increased extension activities, it became apparent that even greater federal support was needed, since state funds were relatively small. Through a series of legislative battles, the Smith-Lever Act, was signed on May 8, 1914, by President Woodrow Wilson, providing for mutual cooperation of United States Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges in conducting agricultural extension work.

Immediately after passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, questions arose concerning its implementation. To establish a framework for such action, a memorandum of understanding was

developed, with Federal, State, and local governments having a well-balanced part in its administration.

Iowa's Cooperative Extension Service is an integral part of the Land-Grant College System. Iowa's Farm Aid Association Law, enacted in 1913, and the Federal Smith-Lever Act, passed in 1914, provided the basic legislation under which extension work was conducted.

For more than 35 years, the Cooperative Extension Service was sponsored in Iowa Counties by County Farm Bureau Organizations. These organizations cooperated with Iowa State University and the United States Department of Agriculture. In 1955, the 56th General Assembly of Iowa passed a new extension act, the County Agricultural Extension Law. This legislation created county extension districts and transferred responsibility for conducting the Extension program within the county to elected County Agricultural Extension Councils. It is the development of these councils that will be the focus of this study.

Historical Science

Historical science is viewed positively as the reasoned argument regarding the past, based on evidence, to create or discover patterns in thought, action, motivation, and relationships that occurred in the past. It is an interpretation of the past (Carlson, 1980, p. 42). History also serves a number of other functions, among which are: 1) initiating

social reform by sensitizing society to unjust and misguided practices in the past; 2) helping to predict future trends, even though not perfectly due to change in political, social and economic conditions (Borg and Gall, 1983, p. 802).

However, to grasp the essence of historical research, Cohen (1972) states that:

To Freud, neurosis is the failure to escape the past, the burden of one's history. What is repressed returns distorted and is eternally reenacted. The psychotherapist's task is to help the patient reconstruct the past. In this respect the historian's goal resembles that of the therapist - to liberate us from the burden of the past by helping us understand it (p. 7).

Thus, one can view historical research as a "continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past" (Carr, 1965, p. 50). This "interaction" gives fullness and maturity to historical science.

Historical research is, therefore, the process of collecting, examining, selecting, verifying and classifying facts in accordance with specific standards; and interpreting the past by sifting through the available relevant evidence, mixing this information with the historian's own values and philosophy (Carlson, 1980, p. 42; Van Dalen and Meyer, 1960, p. 177). An elaboration on the author's philosophical orientation is not necessary here. However, the theoretical orientation adopted for the study will be discussed briefly.

Theoretical Framework

The concern here is to adopt an approach which will aid the researcher to formulate a theoretical position from the data and information pertaining to the evolvement of county extension councils.

The approach adopted is the method of grounded theory, as elaborated by Glaser and Strauss (1980) in their book The Discovery of Grounded Theory. According to Glaser and Strauss (1980), grounded theory is "the discovery of theory from data - systemically obtained and analyzed in social research" (p. 1). This approach aims at arriving at theory suited to its supposed purposes. It is a process of research which emphasizes "that not only should most of the hypotheses and concepts come from the data but should be systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research" (Glaser and Strauss, 1980, p. 6).

Grounded theory as a methodology in contrast to logical deductive processes, takes the position that the adequacy of a theory is dependent upon the degree that it has been inductively developed from social research. However, it also has the potential to be used as a further test of a logico-deductive theory. Thus, according to Glaser and Strauss (1980), if a theory is confirmed by the method of grounded theory (in an area where there is a previous speculative theory) this discovery will give a theory that fits or works

in a substantive or formal area, "since the theory has been derived from data, not deduced from logical assumptions" (p. 30).

It is important to note that the process of generating theory (or grounded theory methodology) is independent of the kind of data used; be it qualitative or quantitative, or even historical data. The emphasis is on the systematization of the collection, coding and analysis of the data for the generation of theory.

The main strategy of this approach is the general method of comparative analysis. It "involves the systematic choice and study of several comparison groups of any size, large or small," (Glaser and Strauss, 1980, pp. 9 and 21). The comparative analysis strategy views "theory as process; that is, theory as an ever-developing entity, not as a perfected product" (Glaser and Strauss, 1980, p. 32).

The comparative analysis method is used to generate two basic kinds of theory - substantive and formal. Substantive theory is that developed for a substantive, or empirical area of inquiry; and formal theory is that developed for a formal or conceptual area of inquiry. The elements of theory that are generated are conceptual categories and their conceptual properties; and hypothesis or generalized relations among categories and their properties (Glaser and Strauss, 1980, p. 35). Accordingly, a category is a basic theoretical concept,

standing by itself as a conceptual element of a theory, enabling the researcher to predict and explain behavior. A property is a conceptual element of a category that serves to define or elaborate the meaning of the categories (p. 36).

The underlying principle in this approach is the joint collection, coding, and analysis of data - thus the term "constant comparative method." As a first step, comparison groups have to be determined or selected based on a criteria of theoretical relevance. This implies selecting "groups that will help generate to the fullest extent, as many properties of the categories as possible, and will help relate categories to each other and to their properties" (Glaser and Strauss, p. 49).

After the selection of comparison groups, four processes remain in operation simultaneously throughout the analysis. Each one provides a continuous development to its successive stage until analysis is terminated. These processes are:

- (1) Comparing incidents applicable to each category. This involves coding each incident into as many categories of analysis as possible. The constant comparison of incidents soon starts generating theoretical properties of the categories; which brings into focus the full range of types or continua of the categories, their dimensions, the conditions under which they are promoted or minimized, major consequences, relations between

categories and other properties. Also, two kinds of categories and properties will be observed in the process - those constructed by the researcher and those abstracted from the language of the research situation (Glaser and Strauss, pp. 106-108).

- (2) Integrating categories and their properties. This involves a change from comparison of incident with incident, to comparison of incident with properties of the category that resulted from initial comparison of incidents, causing the accumulated knowledge pertaining to a property of the category to start becoming integrated. These properties become related in many different ways resulting in a unified whole; categories become integrated with other categories, making sound theoretical sense (Glaser and Strauss, 1980, p. 108-9).
- (3) Delimiting the theory: this occurs at two levels; the theory and categories. The theory solidifies with major categories becoming fewer and fewer with further comparison of incidents of a category to its properties. Then, at a second level, the list of categories is reduced for better ordering of the qualitative data, and thus getting committed to the growing theory. This leads to saturating, theoretically, the categories, where the next applicable incidents do not point to any new categories (Glaser and Strauss, 1980, p. 110-111).

- (4) Writing the theory: putting together the major themes, being certain that the analytic framework forms a systematic substantive theory; a reasonably accurate statement of the matters studied. This is couched in a form that others going into the same field could use (Glaser and Strauss, 1980, p. 113).

Glaser and Strauss also emphasize that:

The constant comparison of incidents in this manner tends to result in the creation of a "developmental" theory This method ... especially facilitates the generation of theories of process, sequence, and change pertaining to organizations, positions, and social interaction In comparing incidents, the analyst learns to see his categories in terms of both their internal development and their changing relations to other categories (p. 114).

They also caution that grounded theory must be developed:

with at least four highly interrelated properties: the theory must closely fit the substantive area in which it will be used; ... it must be readily understandable by laymen concerned with this area; ... it must be sufficiently general to be applicable to a multitude of diverse daily situations within the substantive area, not just to a specific type of situation; ... it must allow the user partial control over the structure and process of daily situations as they change through time (p. 237).

These are very sound guidelines, but the ultimate product of the study will have to be judged against these stipulations to justify the worth of the study.

Limitations of the Study

This study will be confined in its main thrust to Iowa, even though once in a while, nation wide experiences of

comparative value will be recounted. Thus, no generalizations will be made for the United States Extension Service. The County Extension Councils in Iowa themselves have a rather short history. They came into being in 1955 and such a short period of existence makes it difficult to make definite assertions.

Procedure

In order to initiate an accurate picture of the phases, processes, and forces that contributed to the development of County Agricultural Extension Councils, the following procedure was followed. Gaining familiarity with secondary sources on the organization and functioning of the Cooperative Extension Services of the United States was done first. This involved an extensive review of books, special County Extension Council handbooks, and other extension materials.

Through this review objectives for the study were developed. The six main objectives were stated in the form of questions to be answered by the study. To answer these questions various primary sources were consulted.

These primary sources included:

1. Government documents. These are mainly legislative debates on Agriculture and Extension, various laws and enactments passed by the Iowa Legislature, and the United States Congress related to Extension. They are found in the Iowa State University Library, Ames.

2. Extension permanent files. These include "Historical Statements of County Extension Work." They are available in Curtiss Hall.
3. Extension annual reports. They are also found in Curtiss Hall.
4. Various newspaper reports found in the archives and University Library in Ames.
5. Farm Bureau reports and files, that report the activities and decisions influencing the Farm Bureau interests in Extension. They are found in Story County Farm Bureau Offices.
6. County Extension offices (Story and Boone counties in Iowa) were consulted to review their annual reports over the period of the development of the Extension Councils.
7. Interviews were conducted with certain individuals known to have played a part in the development of the Councils. They included:
 1. Dr. Marvin Anderson, retired Extension Director.
 2. Dr. Ross Talbot of the Political Science Department.

The researcher also made an attempt to conclude the study with a theoretical proposition in relation to the genesis and development of organizations. These propositions were derived from the data and materials studied, without formally starting with any hypothesis or conjectures. The principles of grounded theory were applied to arrive at the proposition.

As a key guide in the application of grounded theory to this study, Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss' (1980) book entitled The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research was consulted.

CHAPTER II. THE FARM DEMONSTRATION MOVEMENT

The decision of a point in time from which to start tracing the development of the county councils is difficult.

However, in describing the unique pattern of organization of the Iowa Cooperative Extension Service, Crom (1984) indicated that "the roots for this type of organization go back to 1903 when the first county-wide demonstration was established in Sioux County." More significantly, Crom clearly stated, among other things, that "this demonstration was established: 1) at the request of an organization of farmers, 2) with substantial financial support from the county government" (p. 8). Further, as will be made apparent in the following pages, the system of county agent work evolved from the demonstration movement. Now each county in Iowa has a cooperative county extension agent supported by county, state and federal funds. In addition, elected township representatives constituting the extension councils have been established in each county to help the agents in programming and supervising county extension activities. As a special point of interest to the researcher, the demonstration program is not only still going on in the United States today, but is also the basis of some of the most promising activities in the foreign-aid program of technical assistance to underdeveloped nations.

This chapter will, therefore, briefly examine the growth of the demonstration movement as the roots of county extension work, and its contribution in laying down a tradition of involvement of county people in extension activities in Iowa.

Nation-wide Farm Demonstration Movement

For about 10 years, between 1887 and 1897, Dr. B. T. Galloway was in charge of the work of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to plant diseases. Galloway directed that agents should be employed to demonstrate methods of treating diseases affecting grapes and potatoes in New Jersey, Missouri, and Virginia, and nursery stock in New York (True, 1928, p. 58). During this period, True (1928) records that thousands of farmers were cooperating in this work; sometimes as many as 5,000 growers of potatoes and grapes at one time (p. 59). Such demonstrations were carried out by hired demonstrators, a highly significant difference from the broader extension enterprises inaugurated later on as cooperative demonstration work. These later enterprises will be the focus of this chapter.

The discovery of an idea

In 1874, Seaman A. Knapp resigned as superintendent of the State College for the Blind in Iowa. He started raising general crops combined with livestock, primarily Berkshire hogs and Shorthorn cattle. This led him to become a member of

the first Iowa Fine Stock Breeders Association. A little later he established "The Western Stock Journal and Farmer," at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Through this journal he started advocating a diversified agriculture.

In 1886, Knapp went to Lake Charles, Louisiana, where he was put in charge of the agricultural development of a large tract of land in western Louisiana. Rice farming with modern methods and machinery was the focus of the enterprise. It was so successful that it was soon extended into Texas and other adjacent states. Secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson, a long time acquaintance of Knapp, sent Knapp to Japan, China, and the Philippines in 1898 to investigate rice varieties. Working at that time with B. T. Galloway, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Knapp established a number of demonstration farms in the gulf states in an attempt to show how his favorite theory - the advantages of diversified agriculture - could be carried out practically by adding other crops to growing cotton.

Following Knapp's second trip to the Orient in 1901, he made a number of recommendations regarding new rice varieties in the South to the Department of Agriculture. In the summer of 1902, Knapp was appointed Special Agent for the Promotion of Agriculture in the South. This program involved the adaptation of various rice varieties to conditions in the Gulf Coast. A number of farms were to be located at accessible

points near the center of large-scale farm problem areas. There were prime areas where demonstrations of good management and up-to-date methods of seed selection and cultivation, and particularly, careful rotation and diversification of crops, could be done.

According to Bailey (1945), the diversification demonstration farms produced very little except a series of disappointing lessons as to methods which would not work. The farms were operated by the government, who paid for the labor, seed, fertilizers, and also provided expert supervision. The farmers were only to loan or lease the land that were furnished with buildings, tools, and teams (Bailey, 1945, p. 147).

The practices pursued at these farms were of no influence whatsoever on the usages prevailing in the community. Knapp then realized how worthless it was to teach farmers anything on "government farms" operated by salaried managers. However, despite failures, there was wide publicity surrounding the demonstrations in the Gulf Coast, due to the boom in land prices and the successful importation of more productive varieties, among other things. This drew attention to the activities of agents of the United States Department of Agriculture in the South.

A group of farmers in Kaufman County, northeast Texas, facing problems with a potato growing venture, thought it

reasonable enough, therefore, to get one of the experts who had done such wonders for rice planters to come to their aid. The secretary of this group appealed to the president of Texas Midland Railroad. The president, "Colonel" E. H. R. Green, responded to their appeal and enclosed their letter with his request to the Secretary of Agriculture. The request was passed on to Dr. Galloway as a matter concerning his bureau, and he, in turn, mailed it to Dr. Knapp to answer, enclosing a note expressing his doubts about the practicability of giving such aid. Knapp declined Green's invitation and also explained to Galloway that small scale problems were contrary to the purpose of his appointment.

This did not discourage Green, and he renewed his invitation when he met Knapp personally in New York in the winter of 1902-3 (Bailey, 1945, p. 150). This also met with very little success. At the initiative of certain citizens of Terrel and their neighboring town of Greenville, the invitation was again extended to Knapp. This time he agreed and on February 24, in Greenville and on February 25, in Terrel, agreements were set on paper. The first condition was to select a committee that would accept responsibility and work at seeing that the plans laid down by the Department's expert, Knapp, were faithfully followed out on the selected farms. Each community also agreed to shoulder all expenses connected with its own demonstration farm.

There were, however, differences in the agreements made between Terrel and Greenville. In Terrel, following Knapp's recommendation, an indemnification was pledged against any loss to the experimenting farmer. On the other hand, in Greenville a group of merchants in the town rented 50 acres of land and hired a laborer to try out the methods about which they were curious.

Thus, in Terrel, Dr. Knapp's proposal was accepted. An executive committee of seven members was elected and the farm of Walter Porter was approved. Another committee reported \$450 pledged to cover any losses sustained. The committee at Terrel had no authority over the farmer nor over the land he tilled. There was no hired labor or rented land by the committee; neither did they advance any cash, and had no claim for recompense in money or in crops. However, they could decide, with Dr. Knapp, whether the farmer had made an acceptable effort to fulfill his instructions before paying for any losses. The farmer had his prestige at stake, as well as profit. The government had been eliminated completely in order not to distort the lessons to be demonstrated; only some instructions from Dr. Knapp as a government agent.

At harvest, the guarantee fund of the townspeople of Terrel was intact. Not a penny of government money had changed hands. Their demonstrator, on the other hand made \$700 on his 70-acre experiment (Bailey, 1945, p. 155). It was

at this juncture that Dr. Knapp made the observation that "what a man learns he may doubt, what he sees he may possibly doubt, but what he does himself he cannot doubt," (Bailey, 1945, p. 155; Weeks, 1972, p. 7). It was this realization that gave Knapp impetus for an "agrarian reform that rescued and established the economy of the south so successfully that the movement soon spread over the entire country" (Weeks, 1972, p. 7). Dr. Knapp, at that time, confirmed his belief that farmers, generally, would not change their practice from observing what could be done on farms operated at public expense. There must, therefore, be demonstrations carried on by farmers themselves on their own farms and under ordinary farm conditions.

Knapp also discovered that by eliminating the government from the venture, he was able to tap the enthusiastic cooperation of the townspeople. The Terrel experiment also stimulated a widespread demand for its extension to other communities in that part of Texas. As Knapp wrote to Secretary Wilson in March 1903,

The demonstration farms ... are proving such a success, that the principal effort must be directed to holding them in check rather than promoting them The people have entered upon it with great intelligence and an immense amount of enthusiasm. I charged them particularly to keep it quiet and declined all interviews, but it got out and as a result they have organized in Paris, at Ennis, at Sulphur Springs and at a number of other points. They have pledged the money and asked for directions It would require however, only a word and all

Texas and Louisiana would be on fire for these demonstration farms (p. 231).

The discovery on the Porter farm of Terrel ended the usefulness of farms operated by Dr. Knapp with government support.

To make this new means of demonstration available locally to farmers across the United States was the biggest task facing the "Columbus" of this method. "But calamity" as Bailey (1945) describes it, "in the form of the Mexican boll weevil opened the way for a diffusion of the 'Terrel farm technique' that for speed and reach would be equaled only in times of war" (p. 161). The growth of the demonstration movement will be examined briefly below.

The spread of the demonstration technique and the establishment of county agent work

In the summer of 1903, there was general panic and mass hysteria over Texas because of the disaster caused by the Mexican cotton boll weevil to the cotton industry. Knapp (1906), who had toured the area of full infestation some time earlier, described the situation so vividly and sympathetically, that no one would miss the point. He said,

I saw hundreds of farms lying out; I saw a wretched people facing starvation; I saw whole towns deserted; I saw hundreds of farmers walk up and draw government rations, which were given to them to keep them from want (p. 320).

There was a general clamor for federal aid. Participants in these agitations included principal planters, bankers,

merchants, publishers, railroad officials, agricultural college teachers and experiment station workers, as well as officials and legislators of the state. In 1903, Secretary of Agriculture Wilson visited the devastated region. He also became personally acquainted with the methods and results of the demonstration in Terrel. After the survey, Secretary Wilson recommended an appropriation of \$500,000 for various scientific practices in the control of the weevil. The recommendation also indicated that three agencies would be entrusted with the control business. These were the diversification work of W. J. Spillman "to demonstrate the value of the diversification of crops"; an undertaking labeled General Propaganda under S. A. Knapp "to bring to cotton planters everywhere the latest results as to methods of meeting the present emergency"; and a third, listed as Direct Work on Cotton Boll Weevil, under W. D. Hunt, comprising a series of experimental fields "grown in such a manner as to constitute demonstrations of the means that are necessary in order that cotton may be produced profitably in spite of the weevil" (United States Department of Agriculture Yearbook, 1903, p. 209). In 1904 Congress finally approved the plan and \$250,000 was appropriated to use in the eradication exercise of the weevil. After the measure had been signed by President Theodore Roosevelt, the sum was divided equally among two

bureaus - The Bureau of Entomology and the Bureau of Plant Industry.

In the Bureau of Plant Industry, \$40,000 was assigned to Professor Knapp to determine what could be done by "bringing home to the farmer on his own farm information which would enable him to grow cotton despite the presence of the weevil" (True, 1928, p. 60). Dr. Knapp established headquarters at Houston, Texas, on January 27, 1904, and set about organizing the Farmers' Cooperative Cotton Demonstration work. He immediately took counsel with farmers, bankers, merchants, railroad presidents and other businessmen, explaining to them the Terrel plan of demonstration and asking for their cooperation. One of the important functions of the industrial agents was to find men qualified to organize local committees to aid and encourage farmers in their vicinity who agreed to participate in the demonstration exercises. They were recommended to Dr. Knapp for appointment as special agents of the Department of Agriculture. He next turned to the principal cities such as San Antonio, Fort Worth, Waco, Terrel and Palestine and organized strong central committees of landowners and businessmen to supervise the territory tributary to their respective towns. This method of organization enabled him to reach a large amount of territory in a very short time. Knapp had learned earlier on, in Terrel, the

very usefulness of businessmen in his work. As Bailey (1945) comments:

One vital lesson from the experience at Terrel was at once turned to advantage in this initial work: use of the local businessmen. Not only were they placed on all committees, appealed to for funds, and expected to observe and support the work of the local agents, but Dr. Knapp went a step further: the leading merchants and bankers were requested to tell farmers that they could obtain credit only if they used the varieties of cotton and cultural methods advised by the Department. This move was made largely as a matter of necessity, for when overwhelming demand forced the spread of the demonstration work over all the infested area in Texas it became impossible to provide an indemnity fund for each of the 7,000 farmers who conducted a full-scale 10- to 20-acre demonstration or cooperated by attempting closely limited small-scale demonstrations" (p. 178).

This is very significant in the development of the demonstration movement. Originally, Galloway and Knapp planned to follow strictly the Terrel model with all its guaranteed funding. They did not visualize that more than 200 farmers would be involved. Thus, free distribution of selected seed and fertilizer was soon discontinued. The community idea involving an indemnity fund collected by a committee of local businessmen was also displaced by simple agreements between individual farmers and the Department's demonstration agents. This modification of the Terrel plan was given the name Cooperative demonstration. The Department supplied instructions and supervision, while the farmer cooperated faithfully by following all directions given.

Knapp worked very hard to ensure that there was a special cotton demonstration farm near every market town in the state for accessibility to farmers visiting the county seat. He sent the agents directly into each community to make personal contacts, and assemble and activate the farmers and their local leaders for local support. He really believed this was the only way to get to the farmers whom he thought were "inaccessible to all influence except that generated in [their] own circumscribed locality" (Bailey, 1945, p. 179).

In his own words, Knapp (1906) indicated that:

Some of the primary groups appear to be attached to no system of influence, and hence cannot be reached influentially except by direct contact. Rural society in the south is largely based upon this plan. There is a public opinion emanating from and molded by the limited number in the canton, but rarely reached or moved by the larger public opinion of the state or the nation, and then only by personal contact (p. 11).

Knapp very sincerely believed that it was time to pursue the goal of reaching rural farmers more directly than had been practiced. His concern for the masses was immense. As he himself later wrote in 1908,

For many years the United States Department of Agriculture, the agricultural colleges, the experiment stations, the agricultural press, the farmer's institutes and national and state bulletins upon agriculture have thrown light upon almost every topic relating to the farm. These have been of great assistance to farmers who are alert and progressive, but the masses, especially in the south, have scarcely been affected (p. 8).

Knapp emphasized that it was very important initially to arouse public opinion and sentiment in favor of doing a good job on the farms. He, therefore, advocated that it was essential that each Congressional District in the state receive at least two competent organizers to visit every town and village to organize the public's opinion. He also emphasized that such a campaign should be made very

forceful by the support of the press and the cooperation of the best farmers and the leading merchants and bankers. [He called for the organization of] a committee ... of three of the best progressive farmers and three merchants and bankers of standing, who [would] hold monthly meetings at the call of the traveling agent and greatly assist in carrying out the reforms (Knapp, 1908, p. 8).

Knapp, highly motivated by these lofty ideals, set out to prove them practically in the field. He solicited and received contributions of money, railroad trains, passes and other aids.

On February 19, 1904, W. D. Bentley was appointed as agent and served on an agricultural train of the Fort Worth and Denver Railroad for two weeks (True, 1928, p. 60). Meetings were held along the route and lectures were delivered on cotton, corn, fruit and forage and other crops. Mr. Bentley did not have it smoothly at first. Farmers were not very enthusiastic. Mr. Bentley, therefore, joined the local farmers union and had better access to most of the farmers. He then started demonstrations in about 10 counties in the northwest part of the cotton section in Texas. As True (1928)

records, over 20 agents were employed in Texas in 1904, over 1,000 meetings were held, and 7,000 farmers agreed to have demonstration plots. In the fall of that year, according to True again, "a meeting of agents and more than 200 representatives of farmers was held at Houston," (p. 60). At that meeting, profits from the demonstrations and secrets of success (the cultural and improved husbandry practices) were discussed.

A spark had been started and there was no way to stop the blazing fire. It is appropriate to indicate at this juncture that a thousand mile journey starts with the first step. The first step had been taken in Terrel in 1902, and in 1905 the work was expanded to include Oklahoma and Mississippi. Demands for demonstration farms from farmers was overwhelming. In fact, each town or village, and nearly every farmer, wanted to take part in the demonstration.

In those days, agents worked in districts of 10-20 counties, and demonstrations were carried on largely along railroad lines. Agents contacted representative farmers personally to obtain their cooperation as demonstrators. Each demonstrator was furnished with working plans and instructions on record keeping and the compilation of weekly reports. These demonstrators were expected to grow from 5 to 20 acres of cotton under the direction of an agent, who visited them at least once a month. Farmers within the vicinity met to see

demonstrations carried out by their fellow farmers who had volunteered to be demonstrators. Soon, many of those attending demonstrations started to agree to manage a part or the whole of their land under directions sent out by the Department. Such farmers were called "cooperators" to distinguish them from the "demonstrators." Their number grew with every demonstration, from county to county. The agents were dividing their attention very thinly among farmers and counties.

Knapp, assailed by a popular demand for demonstrations far beyond his ability to supply, was impatient to expand. In efforts to enlarge his appropriations, he frequently fell back on his major source of strength - popular support. However, Secretary Wilson and the Chief of Knapp's own bureau, Dr. Galloway, favoring more appropriations were heavily opposed in Congress; "because of jealousy and opposition of other Departments" (Bailey, 1945, p. 197). Thus, Knapp wrote letters to his agents disclosing the situation and "adroitly and wisely suggested methods by which the people benefited by the work might let their Congressmen know about it" (Martin, 1941; p. 35).

Knapp also wrote directly to a representative in Congress from Texas and asked him to introduce a bill making a special appropriation of \$50,000 for the demonstration work. The representative did introduce the bill and also followed

Knapp's suggestions to solicit the support of other Congressmen whose areas were infested, and further, to lobby members of the Committee on Agriculture.

Knapp's efforts to expand his enterprise were to yield good results soon. In 1905, Dr. David F. Houston, the President of the Texas Agricultural and Mechanic College made a remark to Dr. Wallace Buttrick, Secretary of the General Education Board, who was on tour of the continent searching for a method to render greatest immediate help to education in the south that: "There are two universities here in Texas, one is at Austin; the other is Dr. Knapp" (Bailey, 1945, p. 214). This remark attracted Dr. Buttrick's attention so much that he arranged immediately to make the acquaintance of Texas' other university.

General Education Board's contribution The General Education Board was established by John D. Rockefeller in 1902 and incorporated by Congress, January 12, 1903, "for the promotion of education within the United States of America, without distinction of race, sex or creed" (General Education Board Report, 1915). It was given broad powers to establish schools of any grade or description, cooperate with associations, collect and publish statistics and other information, and use other means for public education. In pursuance of these broad objectives, the Board surveyed and collected information regarding economic and educational

conditions in the southern states. The surveys revealed that the average farmer's income in some southern states was about \$150 per annum, as compared to more than \$1,000 in Iowa. Officers of the Board, therefore, concluded that more favorable economic conditions must be attained if comprehensive school systems supported by taxation were to be instituted. Thus, it was essential to provide practical education for adult farmers of the south to enable them to secure larger returns for their labor. To determine what could be done, Dr. Wallace Buttrick, then Secretary of the Board, with his Chairman, Mr. Gates, visited agricultural schools in the United States and Canada, and State Agricultural Colleges in Wisconsin, Texas and Iowa. During their visit to Texas A & M College, they attended a lecture by Dr. Knapp regarding his work in demonstration plots. They were favorably impressed with Knapp and his plans for demonstration work. The Board reasoned that if the demonstration work paid off in dealing with pest-ridden farms, it should pay still more handsomely where no such devastation occurred. A series of conferences were held with Knapp and Secretary Wilson in Washington by Gates and Buttrick. These conferences dealt with: extending Knapp's method as an educational measure; attracting community support and thereby enabling a private, outside agency ultimately to withdraw its aid; and arranging with the government for Knapp to supervise such work

in noninfested regions where government money could not be applied (General Education Board, 1915, pp. 24-27). Knapp was also concerned with the seriousness of the group, being afraid that the idea would be dropped after he had gotten into it with the necessary publicity. He, however, assured the Board that if demonstration work could be started in a state, county, or community with outside funds, it would soon get local support and would spread, with the ultimate result that the teaching of agriculture and domestic arts would become an accepted feature of rural education (Buttrick, 1913, p. 28).

Government funds available to Knapp were only for combating the cotton boll weevil, and not for general educational purposes in which the General Education Board was particularly interested. The Board determined, therefore, to supplement the Government funds, and also to work on the same plan in the general field of Agricultural Education. Based on this understanding on April 20, 1906, an agreement for this purpose was signed by Wallace Buttrick, Secretary of the Board, for the General Education Board, and by Secretary James Wilson, for the Department of Agriculture (True, 1928, p. 61; Bailey, 1945, p. 218). This agreement made the General Education Board "a silent partner with the United States Department of Agriculture and the Knapp movement became possible" (Buttrick, 1913, p. 28). This silent partnership could be seen clearly in the content of the agreement. The

agreement provided that the cooperative work of farmers, in which the Board was interested, shall be distinct in territory and finance from that carried on solely by the Department of Agriculture. It also stipulated that the United States Department of Agriculture would appoint and supervise all agents and work for the extended territory in the same way that they were being done, and will have full control over the agents in every respect. Finally, the agreement stated that work in weevil-infested states was to be paid for, as before, with government funds, while demonstration work in noninfested states was to be paid for by Board funds. The whole enterprise was managed as an administrative unit in the Bureau of Plant Industry, with Knapp as the special agent in charge.

The Board's first contribution was \$7,000 in 1906, and was increased year by year reaching a peak of \$252,000 for 1913-1914.

Initiation of full-time county agent work Shortly after the participation of the Board began in 1906, agents were given annual salaries. On November 12, 1906, W. C. Statlings was appointed as the first county agent in Smith County, Texas, because of local demand for more demonstrations and more information than could be given by agents covering several counties. That year the weevil infestation was so severe that many farmers in Texas and Louisiana were giving up farming. Businessmen came forward with proposals to pay a

large share of the expenses involved in employing agents to give their whole time to a single county. This urgency was very real and Knapp referred to the matter in his report to the Department. Knapp indicated that:

A few demonstration farms scattered throughout the county - say five or six, such as would be the case where one agent had charge of seven or eight counties - do not create sufficient public sentiment and moral force to change the long established usages of the masses. There must be at least five or six demonstration farms and quite a number of cooperators in each township so that practically we reach every neighborhood, arouse interest and competition everywhere and arouse the whole community. To do this requires at least one agent in each county (Martin, 1941, p. 80).

There was, in fact, public response to this silent appeal. In three counties in Texas and two parishes in Louisiana, businessmen offered from \$100 to \$1,000 to obtain services of an agent (True, 1928, p. 63). "The name county agent, coined at this juncture, gained currency and superseded the earlier terms of government or special agent" (Bailey, 1945, p. 219). There was also a rapid spread of tax support appropriated by county commissioners or local school boards to enable each county agent to intensify and localize his efforts within one county.

This was a significant milestone in the development of county work. Public support was indispensable in the attempt to solidify county extension work. Voluntary contributions by appreciative beneficiaries and residents of the counties where the work was conducted, beginning with the guaranteed funds

pledged by the community at Terrel, took unprecedented dimensions. Individual businessmen, bankers, chambers of commerce, farm equipment and fertilizer companies pledged cash subscriptions to obtain full-time services of an agent for a single county. As Bailey (1945) reports;

It is amazing, but true, that local contributions of this nature, first offered in 1906-1907, surpassed the amount given by the Board in 1911-1912, and two years later were nearly as great as the combined funds of the Board and Congress. When the Board terminated its contributions in 1914, unknown and not wealthy individuals and local tax units throughout the south had provided a greater sum than the Rockefeller agency (p. 221).

Cooperative expansion of county agent work Efforts for more funds and greater local support increased the number of agents. Knapp had additional plans ahead. In 1909, he participated in a conference called to allocate existing spheres of cooperation between his work and the state Agricultural Colleges in the south. In 1912, the first comprehensive arrangement was made with Clemson College in South Carolina to carry on all its extension work jointly with the demonstration work conducted by the Department of Agriculture (True, 1928, p. 72). At that same time, Knapp took advantage of another opportunity to solicit further advances of his enterprise. He arranged to place three of his assigned ten agents in Congressman A. Frank Lever's district, (who was then on the Committee of Agriculture in the House), while one each was placed in the districts of other

congressmen (Martin, 1941, p. 114). This arrangement was an invitation to Lever to cooperate in securing state funds.

In 1908, Mississippi passed a law which authorized county supervisors to appropriate funds for part payment of the salaries of county agents. Four other states provided funds directly from their treasuries for the same purpose, and other state governments soon followed suit (True, 1928, p. 70). As Bailey (1945) commented,

Knapp now had procured "assistance from everybody" quite literally: national, state, and county governments, large corporations, private philanthropists, local associations, and private individuals.

Knapp now broadened his base greatly. After his first visit to Tuskegee Institute and Hampton Institute in Virginia, he made another proposal for cooperation. He suggested cooperating with Tuskegee to unite forces and funds, and urged them to employ an agent on demonstration work to work among Negro farmers. Two Negro agents were, therefore, added to his body of agents (Bailey, 1945, p. 228).

With all these developments in connection with the expansion of the enterprise, Knapp was building a concrete structure to stabilize his work in all the states in which it was introduced. In the 1909 yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, Knapp (1906) explained the general plan of organization and administration of his work as follows:

The farmers cooperative demonstration work is conducted by a special agent in charge, who reports

directly to the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry. There are five general assistants and a full office force; also a corps of field agents is employed, classified according to territory in charge, as state, district and county agents. These agents are selected with special reference to a thorough knowledge of improved agriculture and practical experience in farming in the sections to which appointed. The county agent has in charge the practical work in one or more counties, strictly under such general directions as may be issued from the central office at Washington, D. C. District agents are expected to have not only a knowledge of scientific agriculture, but to be practical farmers and to have had considerable experience in the demonstration work. State agents are strong and capable men, who have shown their ability to carry out successfully the instructions of the central office over a large territory, and they are especially qualified for the work by the possession of the tact necessary to influence men (p. 120).

This structure was very carefully worked out. A district agent served as supervisor of 15 to 25 county or local agents. There was an overall directing agent for each state. The state and district agents helped the county agents with their problems. Conferences were arranged to promote exchanges of views and experiences that were valuable in clarifying issues and inspiring the men in the field. This arrangement established county agent work and its basic features in the United States.

Bailey (1945) gives a description of the structure, as narrated by one of Knapp's early agents, as follows:

Dr. Knapp, you must be a Methodist. You have your organization just like the Methodist Church. You are the Bishop. Mr. Bentley [the state agent] is the presiding elder, I am the local preacher or pastor, the demonstrators are the Amen brethren, the

cooperators the common members while the rest of the people are the unconverted friends (p. 220).

This basic structure is exactly the same in present day extension organization in each state including Iowa. In True's words (1928):

the demonstration system ... brought to light certain fundamentals which permanently enriched agricultural extension work. The most important of these contributions were (1) the emphasis laid on the active participation of the farming people in demonstrations conducted for their benefit and (2) the establishment of the county agent system, under which farming people make use of trained official helpers permanently located near them, from whom they may receive the useful knowledge possessed by these agents and also instruction from the institutions which the agents represent (p. 86).

The Demonstration Movement in Iowa

Important historical events occasionally occur by a rather peculiar process. Demonstration in Iowa is one such event, and it is quite appropriate to look back to a few situations in the past leading to its development.

Morgan (1934) observed that:

The present Extension Service is a logical outgrowth of many activities and events, extending over a long period of time, but all representing an attempt on the part of farmers and their wives to set up ways and means of providing themselves with up-to-date scientific information (p. 32).

As the focus of this study, the indigenous people's contributions are of paramount importance.

On October 12, 1842, the first settlers moved into Dubuque after the French Settlement there had been abandoned.

Consequently, they organized an agricultural society in Van Buren County and held a county fair (Iowa State Agricultural Society, 1858, p. 410). This, for the first time, brought farmers together to exchange views on agriculture. The county fair and agricultural society ideas spread rapidly throughout the state. As a logical outgrowth, the Iowa State Agricultural Society was organized on December 28, 1853, at Fairfield, by representatives from five counties - Henry, Jefferson, Lee, Van Buren and Wapello. It held its first annual fair at Fairfield in October, 1854 (Iowa State Agricultural Society, 1875, p. 485). The fair was moved from county to county for many years.

These fairs stimulated the need for specialized instruction in fruit growing and other horticultural practices. This gave birth to the Iowa State Horticultural Society on June 26, 1866, at Iowa City. Its objective was the promotion of horticulture and arboriculture, by collection and dissemination of correct information concerning the cultivation of such fruits, flowers and trees as are adapted to the soil and climate of Iowa. Such objectives were the beginnings of high sounding yearnings for an extension service.

Significantly, the General Assembly assisted the Horticultural Society with appropriations for expenses and even furnished space in the State House for offices and a library. The society also expanded its influence by

affiliating with other special commodity associations like the Beekeepers' Association of Iowa, Nurserymen's Association, etc. This development is significant in that the Iowa State Horticultural Society became "the forerunner of a number of tax-supported organizations" which sprang up later. Such organizations included Iowa State Dairy, Corn and Small Grain Growers, Beef Producers, and the Draft Horse Producers Association (Morgan, 1934, p. 5).

The State Agricultural Society became the spokesman of the people, and agitated very strongly for a college. The bill for the college was introduced in the Sixth Iowa General Assembly, in 1856. On March 22, 1858, the bill was signed by Governor Lowe, providing for a State Agricultural College and Farm (Brigham, 1916, p. 403). Due to lack of scientific material of instruction in the field of agriculture, experimental work was started. Dr. S. A. Knapp, who became the chairman of agriculture and later president of the college was the leader of the experimental work. He was instrumental in getting Congress to pass the Hatch Act in 1887. This Act provided funding for experiment stations in the Land Grant colleges.

The farmers did not rest at just having a college devoted to teaching and experimentation. They wanted useful information disseminated among them for their farming purposes. They, therefore, set up organizations for their mutual self-

improvement. The first one was formed at Newton on May 2, 1868, called the Grange. A State Grange was later organized on January 12, 1871.

Following The Grange, various other farmers' organizations appeared. The Farmer's Alliance was formed which emphasized education for the farmers in addition to its other political and social activities. Later, the Alliance became very active in politics, joining with other farmer's organizations. It merged, to a large degree, into the Populist Party, met defeat in 1892, and gradually faded out of existence (Morgan, 1934, p. 20). By 1906, when the final extension act was passed in Iowa, less than 5% of the farmers belonged to any formal farm organization.

Extension and demonstration work in Iowa

In 1902, D. G. Holden, from Illinois, was invited to become Professor of Agronomy of Iowa State College. Holden accepted the offer, making it very clear to Dr. Beardshear and Dean Curtiss, who had approached him with the offer, that he intended to do something different. His basic assumption was that "every person that lives in the State is in reality a pupil or a student of the College." Therefore, in order to spread the benefits of the college to all its students he intended to "go to the people and help them where they are, as they are, under their own conditions with their own problems" (Morgan, 1934, p. 23).

However, prior to Holden's appointment in 1901, a farmer's short course of two weeks duration was organized through the efforts of Dean C. F. Curtiss. This short course was to be held at the college in Ames. During the winter of 1901, this short course was held at the college, and was confined to livestock. The course was so successful that the college authorities started thinking of organizing one for corn. Holden was invited to make the trial because of his previous experience with a corn school for farmers at the University of Illinois. The farmers, after the course, demanded more time for the study of corn. They even selected a committee to meet Holden to discuss the possibility of getting more time for the study of corn. Holden agreed to their request if only they could have the class between 2:00 a.m. and 8:00 a.m. The farmers enthusiastically agreed on 5:00 a.m. and actually started the course with lanterns (Bliss et al., 1952, p. 46). This show of enthusiasm by the practical farmers impressed President Beardshear so much that he talked to Holden to come over to Iowa State College. Thus, in the Fall of 1902, Holden came to Iowa State College as Vice Dean and Professor of Agronomy.

Now, as noted earlier, farmers were not very satisfied with the activities of the College being confined to teaching and experimentation. Thus, they demanded involvement and made recommendations to President Welch for winter sessions for

farmers. In a report to the trustees of the college in December 1870, President Welch indicated that:

It is not thought to promise better results to the farmers, that farmer's institutes somewhat similar in method to the teacher's institutes should be held by a few of the older members of the faculty in different sections of the state. We propose that each institute shall last five days, and that its program shall consist of lectures for day and evening sessions, on stock breeding and management, fruit culture, farm accounts and kindred topics Now it is desirable that this new experiment should be tried without much expense to the farmers in attendance and if the trustees should see fit to appropriate a moderate sum for traveling expenses, it would, I have no doubt, be wisely expended (Morgan, 1934, quoting from minutes of Board of Trustees, p. 13).

According to Morgan (1934), the committee to which the president's report was referred responded favorably as follows:

In regard to the farmer's institutes, without hesitation we entirely coincide with the president's plans, and believe that great good will result therefrom, and most earnestly desire that a sufficient amount may be appropriated to defray the necessary expenses thereof (p. 13).

Thus, the first institute was initiated by President Welch and held at Cedar Falls in December, 1870 (True, 1928, p. 11).

These institutes became a permanent feature of Iowa State College in response to farmer's demands for a direct share in the benefits of the College.

In the winter of 1903, during one such farmer's institute in Hull, Sioux County, Iowa, the farmers were debating whether experiments conducted on the experimental farm at Ames would

apply equally well to conditions about 200 miles distant in Sioux County. Holden, who happened to go to the institute at the time of the discussion was called upon to give his opinion. According to Bliss et al. (1952), Holden replied that "You are discussing a matter of great importance in agriculture" (p. 47). Holden held the view that local crop demonstrations close to the people were of tremendous value.

As a result, a county demonstration was established near Orange City in Sioux County in 1903 (Morgan, 1934, p. 24). A group of farmers and interested businessmen met with the County Board of Supervisors to discuss the generation of funds locally for the enterprise. The Board had no authority to make an appropriation, but as Bliss et al. (1952) put it, "the evident interest of the farmers induced it to provide land, labor, storage space and a cash fund for local expenses" (p. 47). This was also the beginning of substantial county tax support for extension in Iowa, and over 100 farmers cooperated in this first demonstration. The plan thus provided for county funds and for state and federal funds through help furnished by the college. The plan spread rapidly. In 1904 five counties cooperated, and in 1905 ten counties cooperated (Morgan, 1934, p. 24).

The demands for help from outside the college became unbearable. This necessitated the creation of a separate department for extension bearing the same relations to the

college authorities. The first extension act was then passed by the 31st General Assembly and was approved on April 10, 1906. This Act authorized a system of agricultural extension work. The Act carried an appropriation of \$15,000 (Iowa State College, Annual Report for the period 1906-1910).

From the beginning, the trustees of the Iowa College demanded that local expenses of lectures, demonstrations, short courses and other forms of agricultural education would be borne by the communities concerned.

While Dr. Knapp was organizing the county demonstration work in the south, similar significant events were taking place in Iowa. Holden organized a state-wide meeting in Des Moines to consider a "state organization of clubs for mutual help and advancement." This was when the county agent idea gained notice, and in 1912 another meeting was held to consider the issue. The first county agent was employed in Scott and Clinton counties on September 1, 1912 (Morgan, 1934, p. 38). The organization of county work followed exactly the model structure initiated in the south by Knapp. Two years after the first field agents were employed in Iowa, the federal Smith-Lever Act was passed, making more funds available for the employment of more agents.

Traditionally, however, Iowa always made use of local people in carrying on extension work. Local involvement was through various farm organizations. In 1913, "county farm

improvement associations" were legalized by the Iowa General Assembly. Sponsoring agencies grew up in various parts of the state. These county farmers organizations played significant roles in promoting extension work and involving local people in extension activities.

Agencies and Organizations Promoting County Agent Work

Extension work naturally involves farmers, and their concerns. The whole history of extension work is centered around the organization of farmers in various forms. The first organizations were at the initiative of the farmers, starting with the early agricultural societies from the time of the organization of the Philadelphia Society in 1785. These societies stimulated the formation and growth of agricultural societies throughout the nation. That was the genesis of "farmer participation," in the involvement and creation of a broad based organization or institution to cater to their peculiar needs, especially in the area of education.

It is also significant to note that railroads, businessmen and their associates, bankers, and prominent academicians featured very prominently in organizations lending a helping hand to the promotion of education for farmers. Dr. Knapp's call on these various groups was a healthy gesture, and since then an unquenchable thirst has been aroused for active participation in agricultural affairs by all sectors of the community. Agencies like the General Education Board, with an

ambition beyond just education for farmers, cooperated and sponsored early extension work. Joint enterprises with special commodity groups like breeders, vegetable growers, cow-testing associations were not uncommon. These cooperating ventures with extension were for their mutual benefit. As Brunner and Yang (1949) commented, "businessmen in these counties are fully aware that their own prosperity is related to the well-being of the farmers in their trade area" (p. 65).

With the establishment of the county agent system, cooperating agencies started formalizing their relationship with county extension. County agents became welcomed and often invited speakers before village and town Chamber of Commerce and luncheon clubs. Of particular interest, in this case, were the farmer's organizations which had as one of their purposes the improvement of agriculture through cooperation with the agent. These farmer's associations differed in form and in methods of organizing from state to state throughout the nation. Thus, at the beginning of county agent work these associations could be distinguished into four basic groups as described by Lloyd (1915):

- (1) Those having a central organization with a representative membership of farmers scattered generally throughout the county and paying an annual membership fee of from \$1 to \$10 each. Associations of this sort usually hold meetings annually and have a board of directors or an executive committee for carrying forward the business of the organization and an advisory council or other group of elected or appointed officials, who meet at stated intervals, usually

- monthly, to consult with the county agent in regard to the conduct of his work. Many of the organizations of this type are incorporated.
- (2) Those having a central organization made up of delegates from township groups or other subordinate units. These local groups usually meet monthly and discuss matters of community interest, the county agent being present whenever possible. The central or delegate organization meets usually on the call of the president whenever there is important business to transact.
 - (3) Those having a central organization made up of delegates elected from various rural organizations already in the county, such as farmer's clubs, granges, farmer's unions, gleaners, the equity, etc. Such an organization is sometimes called a federation. These various associations hold their regular meetings and the federation committee which makes up the central association meets at stated intervals or on the call of the president, and exercises the functions of the advisory council in plan No. 1.
 - (4) Dissociated farmer's clubs without a central organization through which the agent extends his work (p. 10).

These organizations sought to bring together interested people with whom the agent could work directly, and who would provide him moral and financial assistance. Such organizations were indispensable to the county agent as illustrated by a quote from one agent by Morgan (1934); "a county agent without an organization to back him is like a lone jack rabbit in front of a pack of hungry hounds - just a question of which hound catches him first" (p. 39).

Organization of Farmers for Extension in Iowa

Local people in Iowa have always been a tremendous resource for extension work. This can be traced back to

county fairs, farmer's institutes, and county farm demonstration work. When county agent work started in 1912 in Iowa, there existed farmer's clubs, local granges, farmer's elevator groups, creameries, and county fair associations. These associations enrolled less than 10% of the farmers in the state (Morgan, 1934, p. 39). However, the Extension Department tried to use some of the existing farm organizations to aid their work. The first attempt was at reviving the Grange, but the secrecy aspect of the association made it not very convenient to work with. There was therefore an attempt to unify the existing organizations, since no existing organization fully met the needs of extension. Some of the counties who were very eager to have agents solely committed to their counties formed what were known as "County Crop Improvement Associations." Out of these "County Farm Improvement Associations" were later developed, which were legalized in 1913 by the Iowa General Assembly. The act authorizing these associations was first amended in 1919, and has since been amended several times.

However, in the meantime, about 1910, at the initiative of the Chamber of Commerce in Binghamton, New York, an organization for farm improvement was formed. This organization employed a county agent based on the principles of local control and local responsibility. This organization was formally put into full operation on March 20, 1911, being the

first farm bureau in the nation (Kile, 1922, p. 96). The farm improvement associations in Iowa soon adopted the term farm bureau. In 1919, when the Farm Aid Association Law was amended, the Iowa farm bureaus qualified as farm aid associations and became the only group in Iowa with a free hand to sponsor extension work in the counties. This cooperative venture will be the discussion of the next chapter.

It is important to note that the farm bureaus were organized along the lines of the first group described by Lloyd above. They were, to a certain degree, more successful considering the length of time they were with extension - from 1919-1955.

Lloyd (1916) also indicated in his report that:

The success of the organization of whatever form is dependent on the following factors:

- (1) The association should be made up essentially of farmers and managed by farmers. Urban people may be members but should not be officers and should not seek to control its policy or interfere in the execution of its plans.
- (2) The association must have a serious purpose, a well-developed plan, and an active part in the execution of the projects undertaken by the county agent. It stands for organized self-help.
- (3) The association of whatever type should be organized before the county agent begins work, and a committee appointed for the purpose should cooperate with the state county agent leader in the selection of the agent (p. 11).

These and other factors will be covered in the next chapter to identify successes and failures, and why.

Summary

The events recounted above were of importance not only to the southern states, or even Iowa, but also to the nation, for they reflected a new orientation to the organization of "farmer's education" and helped to shape that form of extension system now practiced throughout the nation. Of particular interest to this study is how those events helped to sow the seeds of the organization of county extension councils.

From the narration, it is obvious that all institutions, agencies, and individuals involved were in favor of working out a system that could promote agricultural productivity. The farmer's interest was at stake, but unfortunately the farmers did not constitute a dominant force. This was because they lacked economic power, they lacked any direct control over decisions made at the federal level, and they did not have cohesive organizations that stood for all farmers in all matters. They were, however, organized in various forms around different issues - commodity issues. Nonetheless, they attracted highly vocal spokesmen outside them, both within the elites, the business community, and other social institutions. The role of spokespersonship matured into Knapp, who, from the start advocated farmer participation, control, and supervision of all activities related to farming.

On the other hand there was a latent conflict over the issue of how best to get agricultural information to the farmers. Farmer's institutes, county fairs, corn trains, and experimental stations were all techniques evolved to accomplish the same goals. These were all successful to limited extents in paving the way for more constructive strategies.

Knapp forcefully pushed forward the basic ideal of the farmers. He stood for direct control, not programs which made farmers only passive observers of government operated plots.

With all the enthusiasm and zeal of the Department of Agriculture, the Colleges of Agriculture and including Knapp himself, a meaningful system could not be worked out over and above the heads of the farmers. Knapp's own diversification plan, the Government financed and controlled demonstrations (usually with a hired demonstrator) and the work of experimental stations all failed to capture the farmer's attention. Interestingly enough, businesses and banks fell back not knowing which way to turn in order to get back loans to farmers and even promote their businesses.

At that time, there existed a number of opportunities that had been created for desperate farmers. None of these attracted the farmers, until they finally decided on Knapp's demonstrations. However, it is significant to note that the farmers asked for Knapp's help, and Knapp, from his earlier

failures and experiences, advocated full control and active participation of the farmers at Terrel. In the same vein, farmers in Iowa brought this idea home to Holden, who enthusiastically supported the movement. The success of both groups, especially at Terrel, suggested a few fundamental principles:

- (1) An institution or system to promote agricultural productivity must grow from the farmers' own experiences.
- (2) The farmers must have complete, indisputable control over all activities and participate as fully as possible.
- (3) Imposition of sophisticated techniques and strategies from university "ivory towers" or the Department of Agriculture only confuse the farmers and make them apathetic.

These lessons, once exposed, were only a starting point. The stage was set for creating the necessary alliances that would advance the good work started. In creating the alliances, Knapp and Holden kept the promotion of farmer control and supervision of all activities as a cardinal principle. As much as possible, businesses and other supporting groups remained at the periphery of affairs. These alliances created a funding source, secured public support both materially and morally, and enticed Congress to pass necessary legislature to promote the enterprise. Various campaign and lobby strategies

were worked out, but it still remained basic that farmer influence in the actual business must be maintained.

The final structures or organizational forms that evolved at the county level emphasized the dominance of farmer opinion in the functioning of extension. At this stage, certain important landmarks are worth noting:

- (1) There is overwhelming evidence that all social institutions favored the evolvement of a strategy that would bring home to farmers the benefits of modern science in farming.
- (2) Even though not initially uniform in relation to a strategy to adopt, farmers as a group came to embrace a system which worked out best for them. This decision was fundamentally motivated by the amount of control and participation that farmers could have in the system.
- (3) All alliances created during the development of the movement were naturally derived, and all worked together to support the issue of farmer education with a decisive role to be played by the farmers.
- (4) The final outcome was the creation of a demonstration technique. It developed into a system of county agent work to serve farmers, ensuring that farmers fully participated in the functioning of the system. This also set the precedent for the later development of extension, for carrying out its obligations to farmers.

The key issue is the part played by the main beneficiary of the services of extension - the role of the farmers in decisions and policies affecting Extension's relations with farmers. So far we have noticed the beginning of the organization of Extension based primarily on the interests of farmers. They opted for a strategy of operation well suited to their needs, being the ultimate decisive body in terms of direction and form of the delivery system. The following chapters will continue to trace the growth and development (or its destruction in the course of time as the case may be) of these basic principles, up to the creation and growth of county extension councils.

Application of Grounded Theory

The demonstration movement is one of the comparative units for this study. At this stage, therefore, isolation of categories and properties will be initiated.

Categories and properties

Social Urgency: This refers to circumstances that have developed and matured over a period of time, within a particular community. They are needs requiring immediate attention, without which stagnation or retrogression in social conditions will continue to plague the community in question. This category, in fact, refers to problems that engulf the whole community. They require a concerted or sustained effort

by a majority of the members of the community. The properties of this category are:

- a) Widespread poverty. This was the condition of the rural farmer. It was acknowledged by both the rural farmer, Department of Agriculture officials, private business interests and personnel of the universities.
- b) Non-scientific farming practices. This unfortunate tradition was probably one of the causes of widespread poverty. However, it was an acknowledged deplorable situation, despite the advances in scientific discovery in relation to agricultural production.
- c) Natural calamities. The cotton boll-weevil was a very conspicuous element. It was a menace that threatened Southern agriculture and the cotton industry particularly.
- d) Varying perceptions of needs. Aside from prominent problems which visibly confronted all members of the community, there were variations in needs of individuals. For example, unscientific farming could be blamed on lack of high yielding varieties, or lack of appropriate media and resources to extend scientific findings to the farming population. Others viewed the Department of Agriculture as a bureaucratic arrangement that wanted to impose its will on farmers, thus the lack of farmer response to its advocates. Availability of credit, cohesive farmers' organizations, necessary and essential applied research,

cost of production inputs, and various complaints made up the needs of the people. These, together with the other properties, caught the community in a state of confusion and desperation, thus the social urgency.

Social Intervention: It refers to processes initiated by groups or subgroups, institutions and even individuals within the community to address issues or problems shared by the whole community. It is important to stress that social intervention here is not a product. It is a process characterized by a sense of movement or direction, occurring over time or through a sequence of events, bringing into being different circumstances and conditions which, presumably, will be seen as an improved state of affairs (Davie, 1983, p. 96). In this category there were many actors bringing their resources to bear on the issues confronting the community. These actors, as MacKeracher et al. (1976) define them, are individuals, groups, subgroups and/or institutions or their representatives functioning within a community as if all individual members shared common goals and as if they were committed in their actions to reaching those goals (p. 9). In the demonstration era, the actors consisted of private business concerns, farmers, United States Department of Agriculture, the universities and colleges and their representatives, the local people and the legislature. The

specific properties of this category of social intervention are:

- a) Meetings. Local people and farmers, and all the parties mentioned were constantly engaged in meetings to discuss and find solutions to the issues of the day. This property also included a series of planning activities, and even the trial or implementation of various decisions.
- b) Creating groups. This refers to the process of bringing farmers together to embark upon common endeavors, working cooperatively with institutions and their representatives. The Terrel farmers and Knapp, Holden and Iowa farmers were some of the examples.
- c) Leadership training. This process was essential as was demonstrated by the first condition set at Terrel and in Iowa. Local people were required to adhere to instructions of Knapp and the Department of Agriculture representatives. The first demonstrators were given special training in performing functions on the plots. Demonstration groups were required to interact effectively to learn problem-solving skills and leadership qualities.
- d) Facilitating and supporting community organizations. Knapp, Holden, the United States Department of Agriculture, the Education Board, the universities and their experimental stations all assisted in this role. The continuity and sustained effort on the part of

farmers' organizations to carry on the work of demonstrations was the major emphasis.

- e) Technical assistance. This role was effectively played by university personnel in various capacities and United States Department of Agriculture agents like Knapp. It was an ongoing necessary process, required to meet the urgencies of the situation.
- f) Citizen initiative. This was demonstrated clearly by the citizens of Terrel in their persistent attempts to capture the attention of Knapp. Iowa farmers at Farmers' Institute initiated the process of experimentation and subsequently organized demonstrations on farmers land.

These processes were the necessary groundwork that led to the final category isolated in this case study.

Social action: Social action is here defined as the resultant model or configuration of approach, adopted and implemented as the final means of solving social issues. It is important also to note that social action encompasses both processes and products. Social action occurs when the affected community, its individuals, groups and institutions, participate in shared activities over time which move that community toward shared and commonly-defined objectives (MacKeracher et al., 1976, p. 10). The properties of this category are:

- a) Individual and collective responsibility. The farmers at Terrel were not only willing to heed the advice of Knapp, but in addition were ready to bear the responsibility of involvement in demonstrations, and the risks of any losses that might occur.
- b) Shared investments. The farmers and the business community were prepared and did actually invest their time and resources, including paying for an indemnity guarantee against the volunteer farmer, Porter, who was going to carry out the first demonstration. The communities, later, invested in the business of hiring agents and paying for all expenses connected with the agents work.
- c) Community ownership. The demonstration work became a product of the community. The communities involved saw it as their creation and investments, and, thus did everything possible to ensure its viability and survival; and most important, its continuity as a process of educational activity.
- d) Cooperative demonstration. This was a system created to aid the teaching of agricultural sciences to farmers. It involved the Department of Agriculture supplying instructions and supervision, and the farmers cooperating by faithfully following all directions given.
- e) Partnership. A partnership agreement was entered into by Knapp, the Department of Agriculture, the General

Education Board and the farmers to carry out general farmer education. This agreement provided for the payment of demonstration work in non-infested (weevil) states to be paid for by Board funds. The enterprise was managed as an administrative unit in the Bureau of Plant Industry, with Knapp as the special agent in charge. The United States Department of Agriculture appointed and supervised all agents and work of the demonstration enterprise, and made the farmers' cooperative demonstration work distinct, in terms of territory and finance, from all other works carried on solely by the Department of Agriculture.

- f) County agent work. The final property of this category is the resultant product of the establishment of county agent work. The business community together with local people, the legislation and institutions vigorously embraced the idea of hiring county agents permanently to be responsible for agricultural education in specific geographic areas. A hierarchy was worked out to ensure orderly performance and effective supervision and accountability of agent functions. Functions and roles were clearly defined.

These are the categories and properties so far isolated. An attempt will be made to construct a few conjectures from these categories and properties.

Conjectures

1. If social conditions become deplorable, creating an awareness in a community of its inadequacies, then the individuals, groups or subgroups, institutions and agencies within the community will be prompted to do something about the situation.
2. If community issues are comprehensively appraised, and a spirit of preparedness and interest is generated for purposes of sharing concerns of the community, then a process of organizing, seeking out, and agitating for concerted and sustained efforts to solve community problems will evolve.
3. If individuals or groups in a community identify their common concerns and set out to seek help from an outside agency or institution, then the chances of working out a cooperative undertaking for the solution of community problems becomes more feasible.
4. If coordination involves facilitative interdependence which permits two or more organizations to simultaneously maximize their goals, then the attainment of desired objectives becomes a reality.
5. If investments (i.e., money, land, time and services) and responsibilities are shared within a community for the purposes of evolving and adopting a strategy of social

action, then the foundations to ensure continuity will be effectively enhanced.

6. If continuity in any social action is ensured, the ultimate product is the institutionalization of the process.

CHAPTER III. FARM AID ASSOCIATION ACT AND THE FARM BUREAU

According to Director Crom (1984):

In 1913 the Iowa Legislature passed the Farm Aid Association Act To meet the requirements of the Farm Aid Law, each county was required to have a local organization which would be responsible for local financing and for assistance in the planning and supervision of county extension work. The County Farm Bureau met these requirements and were the sponsors of educational work in the field from 1918 until May 12, 1955, when the County Agricultural Extension Law became effective (p. 1).

This chapter will trace the evolution of the Farm Bureau and the contributions it made to county extension work, and the development of the County Extension Councils in Iowa. It is necessary to first examine its national character.

The Evolution of the Farm Bureau Movement

The Farm Bureau movement was not derived directly from the remnants of the breakdown of another movement. However, various farm organizations had been formed before it, and the crystallization of concrete issues facing the farmers, most of which had plagued farmers in earlier times, gave direct expression to the need for an organization; and consequently the farm bureau was formed.

Farm organizations preceding the Farm Bureau

One of the prevalent tendencies in American agricultural growth has been the attempt to unite farmers into one national organization, even during the times of the early settlers.

These initiatives for unification were often conditioned by the conspicuous situations of the farmers. In 1866 for example, Oliver Hudson Kelly, on a tour of the southern states to secure statistical data for the Office of the Commissioner of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. observed situations which were deplorable. Some of the distressing observations included farmers economic difficulties, their blind disposition to do as their grandfathers did, their antiquated methods of agriculture, and their "apathy" (Kile, 1922, p. 10).

The homestead movement which followed the Civil War spread very rapidly and, with the introduction of labor saving equipment (the McCormick reaper) helped farmers to increase their acreage. The rapid extension of the railways enhanced long distance marketing. All of these events led to overproduction, and, therefore, low prices for farm products. Farms were heavily mortgaged and money was not available to pay interest. Impoverishment of the farmers continued and was made worse by the fluctuations of the currency. Protective tariffs made costs of manufactured goods unbearably high. Thus, with the influx of immigrants after the Civil War, the rapid growth of the railroads, and the high protective tariff, manufacturing and trading usurped the dignity and wealth of the farmers who were once the nobilities in the community.

Kelly attributed all these misfortunes of the farmer to lack of social opportunities. Therefore, he anticipated that

the idea of organizing farmers into a secret organization like the Masonic Order (of which he was then a member) might serve to bind farmers together for progress and intellectual advancement. Thus, during the summer and fall of 1867, when Kelly had transferred to the Post Office Department as a clerk, he interested six associates in his plans. On December 4, 1867, these seven met (they included one fruit grower and two clerks each from the Post Office, Treasury and Agricultural Departments) "subscribed to a constitution, adopted a motto, *Este perpetua*, and constituted themselves the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry" (Kile, 1922, p. 12). Their main purpose was to advance agriculture through education. The first local Grange was established in Washington, D.C. and in February 1868, Kelly resigned his clerkship to give his whole time and attention to the development of the new order. In May 1868, a Grange was established in Newton, Iowa (Kile, 1922, p. 12).

The Grange spread as far to the east as Vermont and New Jersey, to the south as far as Mississippi and South Carolina, and was most active in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois and Indiana.

There were a number of reasons which sparked enthusiasm for furtherance of the order. There was a high spirit of unrest and discontent among the farming population following the civil war, as mentioned earlier. The farmers, joined in

ranks by the people, were dissatisfied with President Grant's administration. This period was one of prosperity for commercial, manufacturing and speculative interests, but a period of adversity for the farmers. Feelings of revolt against "monopolies" were generated especially against the railroads which were then undergoing very rapid and frequent reorganization and merging. By 1873, the government had given the railroads about 35 million acres of land and had also pledged to give the Pacific roads alone about 145 million more. Additionally, the railroads were levying exorbitant rates, contributing to farm crop profit decline. This was the period when Iowa farmers burned corn for fuel because at 15 cents a bushel it was cheaper than coal. During this same period, creditors who had hitherto willingly carried farmers' mortgages and other obligations demanded immediate payments. The farmer saw no hope for the future and turned to the only organ available, organized combat. Thus, by the end of 1873, the Grange was organized in all but four states of the Union - Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, and Nevada.

The seventh annual convention of the National Grange was held in St. Louis in February 1874 and adopted the "Declaration of Purposes of the National Grange."

According to Kile (1922) the grange had a general purpose "to labor for the good of our Order, our Country and Mankind."

He indicated that when translated into practical terms the purpose included:

efforts to enhance the comforts and attractions of homes, to maintain the laws, to advance agriculture and industrial education, to diversify crops, to systemize farm work, to establish cooperative buying and selling, to suppress personal, local, sectional and national prejudices, and to discountenance 'the credit system, the fashion system, and every other system tending to prodigality and bankruptcy.' As to business, the Patrons declared themselves enemies not of capital but of the tyranny of monopolies not of railroads but of their high freight rates and monopoly of transportation. In politics, ... the Grange was not to be a political or party organization, but its members were to perform their political duties as individual citizens (p. 45).

These were very lofty aims, but still certain farm factions were not completely satisfied. Some objected to its secrecy, others to its non-partisan character, yet others thought it was very radical and too political. Thus, splinter groups evolved, like the Farmers' Clubs, which were not secret and also had very ambitious political aims. Most farmers belonged to both organizations, and before long, the farmers decided to form their own political party. It was known by names like the Reformers, or Anti-Monopolies, Farmers Party. The party aimed at subjecting corporations like the railroads to the control of the state, and seeking certain reforms in the economy.

By 1876, when much of railroad regulation and control had been gained, the farmers interest in politics and the Grange started dying down. However, their fight against the

middleman became intensified. Grange stores sprang up to buy and sell farm products and machinery cooperatively. The Grange finally decided to enter into manufacturing resulting in the Grange in Iowa being the first to purchase a patent to make its own machinery and sold it at half the price of other manufacturers.

By the Iowa example, the National Grange decided in 1874 to embark upon manufacture of agricultural implements. These enterprises met with little success. The Iowa harvester factory failed in 1875, membership dwindled and progress became very slow.

Following the collapse of the Grange, other organizations sprang up, among which was the Alliance. The Alliance began gaining strength around 1885, incorporating many of the fundamental principles of the Grange. It also made attempts to unite the various groups into a national organization, with an aim to join forces with organized labor. These attempts were not very successful, and left the Alliance a weak organization until it dwindled away.

Other organizations including the Agricultural Wheel, the Brothers of Freedom, Farmers Union, the Equity and many others made various attempts to fight for farmer's rights. All these helped to lay a foundation for better organizations.

Beginning of the farm bureau movement

Farming conditions, at the time of the introduction of the Demonstration Agent System were very poor. In 1909, when James Wilson, then Secretary of Agriculture, made a tour of New York State he became very alarmed at the condition of abandoned farms and expressed great concern. At the same time, the report of the "County Life Commission" appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt was published, which expressed much concern for the rehabilitation of rural and farming communities.

These concerns caught the attention of Mr. Byers H. Gritchel, then Secretary of the Binghamton, New York, Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber already had a Traffic Bureau, a Manufacturers Bureau and other subdivisions. Mr. Gritchel, therefore, thought of creating another subdivision to be called the Farm Bureau, which was to be devoted to promoting the interest of agriculture in the surrounding area, especially Broome County. The Chamber thought that trade basically depended on the farming community and that urban life could not thrive if the rural community, which was basically a farming community, was not prosperous.

A committee on agriculture was appointed. Upon touring Broome and adjacent counties, the committee found farmers still lagging behind scientific agriculture. This committee, therefore, strongly recommended that it was time farmers were

opened to opportunities of modern farming techniques and all other developments in science related to agriculture.

These initiatives inspired some farmers to take membership in the Chamber. Mr. George A. Cullen, at that time traffic manager and industrial agent of the Lackawanna Railroads, became very interested in the initiatives, and pledged the cooperation of his road in any plan that might be devised. Mr. Cullen and two farmer members of the Chamber were added to the agricultural committee which became a bureau in the Chamber of Commerce.

The bureau, thus constituted through Mr. Cullen, contacted Dr. W. J. Spillman of the United States Department of Agriculture for expert advice on what plans and methods should be adopted to promote agriculture. Upon Dr. Spillman's advice funds were cooperatively provided by the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce, the U.S.D.A. and the Lackawanna Railroad to hire a county agent. On March 20, 1911, Mr. J. H. Barron was engaged as county agent, with the New York State College of Agriculture agreeing to give educational assistance. Thus, from the beginning, Mr. Barron, the agent, had a local governing body which included representatives of the farmers.

As a means of extending his work and intensifying interest Mr. Barron set about organizing groups of farmers in the six counties assigned him. He appointed chairmen from among the best cooperating farmers. He also utilized other already

existing farmer's organizations, especially the Grange. By July, 1912, Mr. Barron was limited to only Broome County, and by winter, in response to requests from the county, the New York State Legislature authorized county boards of supervisors to make appropriations for farm improvement.

On October 10, 1913, the Broome County Farm Improvement Association was organized. The following year it took over the agricultural responsibilities of the Chamber of Commerce and became the Broome County Farm Bureau. The cooperation of local chambers of commerce continued, but as far as local matters were concerned the farmers were in control. This pattern of local farmer control became a common feature.

By 1913, a number of states had made it a requirement that before a county agent would be assigned, a county organization of farmers must be formed on a membership dues basis. These organizations were known as Farm Bureaus in the north and Councils of Agriculture in the south. They were required to pledge a certain amount of financial support, assist the county agent in working out a set of demonstrations and to generally cooperate with the county agent in any way possible.

Most states adopted the Farm Bureau idea. The Smith-Lever Act made more funds available and helped to spread the idea. This brought up the question of control - state and federal funds on one hand and county funds on the other. In general, the state extension department of the College of Agriculture

retained full general control over the types of activities of the county agents. The boards of directors of the county farm bureaus decided what types of state approved activities shall be emphasized.

Federation of county farm bureaus into state farm bureaus

As county farm bureaus became numerous and active in every state, the idea of centralization began to agitate some of the members. It was the usual practice to invite county farm bureau presidents to attend conferences at the State Agricultural Colleges in connection with Farmers' Week or as part of the annual meetings of county agents. The presidents perceived advantages to their interests if the bureaus could organize into a state organization independent of the educational institutions. They saw possibilities of united action in getting financial support from the state for the furtherance of farm bureau work. State Extension Officials on the other hand visualized that a federation of farm bureaus at the state level would provide a powerful influence in securing liberal appropriations from the legislatures for further extension work.

On March 24-25, 1915, Missouri took the lead at Slater, to form a state organization or federation of its county farm bureaus. Massachusetts followed on May 11, then Vermont in October. In Illinois, 20 of the 22 organized counties effected the Illinois Agricultural Association on January 26,

1916. In February, 1917, during Farmers' week at the State College, the New York State Federation of county farm bureaus was formed with 39 active county farm bureaus. Several other States took similar steps, and by 1918, nine states had federations.

Leaders realized that funds for the state federations were not adequate. In January, 1919, the Illinois Agricultural Association changed from a nominal county association membership fee to an individual membership basis with each farmer paying a \$5 annual membership to the state association in addition to his local county farm bureau dues. Thus, for the first time a state farmers organization had adequate funds to carry on a substantial program.

The national federation

Two years after the New York State Federation was organized, the director of the federation sent invitations to the various states with federations to meet and consider the possibility of forming a national organization. Representatives of 12 states gathered at Ithaca on February 12-13, 1919, for the conference. Out of these, only nine states had state federations, the other three were in the process of organizing state federations. The states at the meeting were Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont and West Virginia.

At the meeting, a committee of five headed by O. E. Bradfute of Ohio, was appointed to outline plans and procedures to develop a national organization. The committee recommended that a meeting be held at Chicago on November 12-13, to set up the organization and also to encourage states which were not yet organized into federations to work hard to do so.

Five hundred delegates assembled in the Red Room of the LaSalle Hotel at Chicago for the convention. Regardless of farm bureau membership, one voting delegate was seated for each state represented. The major concern during the convention was what would be the functions of the organization. The educational groups associated with the colleges of agriculture, plus the eastern, southern, and western states championed the view that the prospective organization was to be primarily educational. The farmers from the midwest were interested in using the organization to bring about improved business and economic conditions. They were particularly interested in using it as an instrument to solve marketing problems on a nation-wide cooperative plan. Finally, a compromise plan was adopted. The compromise was reflected in the constitution, which stated clearly that its objectives were to promote, protect and represent the business, economic, social and educational interests of the farmers of the nation. The meeting closed with the election

of temporary executive officers, adoption of a constitution and by-laws, and selection of the name American Farm Bureau Federation. A ratification meeting was set for the following March 3.

At the ratification meeting, J. R. Howard of Iowa was confirmed as the first President on a salary, with J. W. Coverdale of Iowa as Secretary. It was decided to open headquarters in Chicago and a legislative office in Washington. Gray Silver of West Virginia was elected the Washington representative.

The new organization immediately implemented membership campaigns in well-organized states. In unorganized states, the national headquarters provided men to assist them in organizing and recruiting members.

The Farm Bureau Federation of America set out with the following objectives as recounted by Kile (1922):

General

1. To develop a completely unified organization to act as spokesman for the farmer and to adequately represent the farmer and the farmer's interests on all occasions.

Educational

1. To create in the urban mind a better conception of the farmer's relationship to other units in the social and economic structure.
2. To reestablish agriculture in the public mind as the foremost industry, on which all others depend, and, in the prosecution of which man reaches his highest plans of development.
3. To encourage and assist in the development of food production to its highest state of efficiency.
4. To foster and develop all those lines of endeavor which make for better homes, better social and

religious life, better life, and better rural living in every sense.

5. To conduct referenda on various national questions to determine farm sentiment before determining legislative action.

Legislative

1. To safeguard the rights and interests and to assert the needs of the farmer whenever occasion may arise.
2. To establish without question the legality of collective bargaining.
3. To insist upon the presence of "farmer minds" on all boards and commissions affecting agriculture, appointed by Congress or the President.
4. To defend the farmer's viewpoint on all matters relating to tax levies, tariffs, currency, banking, railways, highways, waterways, foreign markets, the merchant marine, territorial acquisitions and all similar legislative matters involving questions of policy, in any way affecting agriculture.
5. To insist on some arrangement between capitol and labor which will insure freedom from disrupting and criminally wasteful strikes.
6. To strengthen the Federal Farm Loan Act and secure in addition the establishment of a system of personal credits.
7. To demand the regulation, under government supervision, of all commercial interests whose size and kind of business enables them to establish a monopoly dangerous to the best interests of the nation.

Economic

1. To extend cooperative marketing of farm crops to the point in the distribution system that the maximum benefits are secured for the producer, and incidentally for the consumer.
2. To limit the profits and reduce the costs of distribution in all lines not handled cooperatively.
3. To so estimate the effective world supply of any farm product and to so regulate the flow to market as to eliminate sharp and extreme price fluctuations.
4. To establish new foreign markets for surplus American farm products.
5. To provide cheaper sources of fertilizer and more economical means of production (pp. 36-37).

These noble aims were integrated into the Farm Bureau program and various departments were created to carry out special assignments. It is important to note that these objectives reflect precisely the pseudo compromise reached between education and business ventures. Most farmers, however, were looking for practical training and the means of securing a better life for their families. As we probe the situation in the Iowa experience, evidence becomes clear as to how farmers fared with the Farm Bureau.

Farm Bureau in Iowa

Iowa farmers have been very active in farm organizations for a very long time. Iowa was, therefore, not left behind when agricultural societies started appearing in this country. By 1838, according to Groves and Thatcher (1984) 50 such societies existed in Iowa (p. 2). These societies held local fairs for educational and recreational purposes. The various county societies organized the Iowa State Agricultural Society in 1853. At their instigation, the General Assembly gave public support to supplement the educational efforts of farm organizations.

Legislation was passed in 1858 to establish the Iowa Agricultural College, at Ames. The Homestead Act made it possible for farmers to acquire 160 acres of government land at national price. In the same year, 1862, another act established the United States Department of Agriculture. Also, the

Morrill Act, signed by President Lincoln the same year, gave 3,000 acres of public land to each state to maintain at least one college. They are now known as the Land Grant Colleges. These national legislations activated programs to assist farmers. Farmers in Iowa became extremely zealous for information which would help them produce better crops and livestock.

Iowa State College helped out in numerous short courses, which had come to be very important extension enterprises, attracting large numbers of people. Local leadership was developed in communities holding short courses. According to Bliss (1960), this development of leadership in local communities promoted county farm improvement associations (p. 54). The college had also assisted with many county test plots usually located on county farms, and commonly devoted to testing grain varieties and cultural practices for raising corn and other grains. Both short courses and test plots required local sponsoring agencies. These gave impetus to the rise of various local organizations, which later combined into county organizations.

Specifically, Clinton County was the first to organize a County Farm Bureau in Iowa (Groves and Thatcher, 1984, p. 12, Davidson, Hamlin and Taff, 1933, p. 97). The Clinton Commercial Club, through its Agricultural Committee was very interested in promoting extension work within the county.

Better farming associations were organized in each of the 20 townships. Their elected presidents became members of the agricultural committee of the commercial club.

In 1912, this group (which included the county superintendent of schools and the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce) called on John W. Coverdale at his Clinton County farm to talk about organizing a crop improvement association. The organization procedures were carried out and the Clinton County Better Farming Association was established July 6, 1912. George Farrell, county superintendent of schools and chairman of the Commercial Club's agricultural committee, was elected as the association's first president. According to Groves and Thatcher (1984) at a meeting in September, 1913, Mr. Farrell declined re-election as the association's president. Mr. Farrell insisted that the president should be a farmer. The farm leaders present appreciated the efforts of the Commercial Club in getting the work started and agreed to Mr. Farrell's suggestions. Mr. E. C. Forrest, a full-fledged farmer was elected as chairman for the next year.

By 1914, the farmers were encouraged to get involved in organizing the farm bureau in order to function better. They, therefore, embarked on membership campaigns. The Commercial Club continued their financial support one more year by contributing \$1,000 to get the organization underway.

The Clinton association engaged M. L. Mosher, extension agronomist of Iowa State University as county agent. Scott

was the second county organized, in early September, with Albert K. Davison as president and G. R. Bliss as agent.

The movement spread throughout the state, with enthusiastic response from farmers. Schools and churches helped to organize farmers. Many non-farmers, commercial enterprises and their leaders, chambers of commerce, bankers, lawyers, merchants, real estate brokers, coal operators, editors and stock buyers helped to promote the organization, in order to promote a well-rounded community economy. They were aware that increased farm income would mean more dollars in the pockets of farmers to be spent in the market place. Twenty-five county Farm Bureaus were organized by the time the United States entered World War I in April, 1917, and by the following spring every county in the state had organized a Farm Bureau. One county, Pottawattamie, had two Farm Bureaus, making 100 in all.

Not all of the county organizations used the name Farm Bureau at first. Many were called Farm Improvement Associations, Agricultural Associations or Crop Improvement Leagues. Later the name "Farm Bureau" was uniformly adopted by all of the counties. Iowa was the first state to be totally organized, with a Farm Bureau organization and a county agent in every county.

Federating the county Farm Bureaus in Iowa became a lively topic at all county meetings early in 1917. Farmers lacked a

voice in legislation for their industry. They needed to improve the marketing of their products in order to receive a fair return for their labors. They visualized the need to present a united front at the end of the war, in order to have a voice in the reconstruction of their industry to peace time levels.

Fifteen county Farm Bureau presidents counseled together during the state fair that summer and F. D. Steen of West Liberty agreed to head the temporary organization which was formed. Because of war-time pressures the group was unable to bring forth a union of county Farm Bureaus.

However, their needs for unity intensified in 1918. Many tax reforms were being proposed to Congress. The manner of handling animals at the livestock markets was deplorable. Daylight savings laws were a nuisance to farmers. Looming on the horizon was the possibility of surplus food production when the war came to an end. These problems were often discussed when farmers got together. A state federation was conceived in the minds of farmers when they gathered in neighborhood, community and county meetings.

J. W. Coverdale, then state supervisor of county extension agents, was asked to prepare a tentative plan of organization to be presented at a statewide meeting. At the meeting, a committee consisting of J. R. Howard of Marshall County, Adam L. Middleton of Wright County and Frank Justice of Polk County

was asked to investigate the action taken in other states which were already organized. Missouri was the first state organized (March 25, 1915), followed by Massachusetts, second, and Vermont.

A date was also set for a meeting in Des Moines, but that city was attacked by a severe flu epidemic. Coverdale, therefore, arranged for the meeting to be held at Marshalltown, Iowa, on December 27, 1918. Seventy-two counties were represented for the purpose of effecting a statewide federation of their Farm Bureaus. Discussions focused on the marketing of crops and livestock, and improving relationships with the packers, the railroads and other organized interests. Those at the meeting were very concerned about the farmer's voice on vital public questions. When the question of the day was brought to a vote, they readily and unanimously favored joining hands in a truly representative association which would help crystallize their opinions and pursue their common objectives.

A constitution and by-laws were adopted and article IV of the constitution stated that:

The object of this federation shall be to effectively organize, advance, and improve, in every way possible the agricultural interests of the great commonwealth of Iowa, economically, educationally and socially, through the united efforts of the County Farm Bureaus of the state and to this end it may ... employ the necessary servants, stenographers, and other assistants for the operations, comfort and keeping of said corporate business (Groves and Thatcher 1984, p. 29).

A board of directors was to include 100 men, one director from each county. Only men actually engaged in farming were eligible. The affairs of the federation were to be conducted through an executive committee consisting of one representative from each congressional district elected by the directors in his district.

This marked the beginning of a statewide organization of Iowa farmers. It was to be non-political in nature and in no way was it to interfere with other agricultural organizations.

The 100 county Farm Bureaus limited their programs to education. Their involvement in education as a cooperator and coordinator of extension programs, which will be discussed next, was well-appreciated; but there was a general feeling that it was not enough. So, when the state federation was organized, the members moved deliberately into legislation, public relations, marketing and other business.

However, of particular interest in this study is the relationships that Farm Bureaus had with extension in Iowa. Special emphasis is on how county programs were sponsored, coordinated, and effected jointly by extension and the Farm Bureau.

Extension Service and Farm Bureau Relations in Iowa

Iowa has always made use of local people in carrying out extension programs. When county agent work started in Iowa in 1912, there were a few scattered farmers' clubs, local

granges, farmers' elevator groups, creameries, county fair associations and short course associations. A very small percentage of the farmers at that time were members of any farm organization, perhaps not more than 5% to 10% of all the farmers in the state.

At first, the Extension Department made efforts to use some of the existing farm organizations to aid in carrying out extension work. This led to the employment of J. W. Johnson, a former Grange organizer, to revive and extend the Grange throughout the state. Thus, a local Grange was organized on the Iowa State College campus with Holden as Master. Due to the secrecy of the Grange a need was soon recognized for a specific non-secret organization composed of farm families who were interested primarily in extension work. Therefore, an effort was made to bring together representatives of the existing local farm organizations.

Out of this effort some of the first counties employing agents formed what were known as "County Crop Improvement Associations." A little later the county organizations sponsoring the work of the agents were known as County Farm Improvement Associations.

In the earliest period, these organizations were of various types. When it became apparent that there should be some uniformity in the cooperating organizations, consideration was given to several possibilities. It was decided that

no existing organization fully met the needs, and plans were drawn for a new type of organization. In 1913, therefore, "county farm improvement associations" were legalized by the Iowa General Assembly. The act authorizing these associations was amended slightly in 1919 and again in 1927. The law relating to farm aid associations as set out in Chapter 138 of Iowa Department of Agriculture, 1927, states clearly that:

For the purpose of improving and advancing agriculture, domestic science, animal husbandry, and horticulture, a body corporate may be organized in each county of the state Such body corporate may be formed by the acknowledging and filing articles of incorporation with the county recorder, signed by at least 10 farmers, landowners or other businessmen of the county.

Only one such organization per county was authorized by law. When a county organization had a membership of at least 200, whose aggregate yearly membership dues and pledges amounted to not less than \$1,000, the board of supervisors was required to appropriate from county funds a sum double the amount of the aggregate of these dues and pledges. The total amount of county money which could be appropriated could not exceed \$5,000 in counties with populations of 25,000 or more or \$3,000 in counties with populations of less than 25,000.

The law also stated that:

The affairs of this corporation shall be conducted by a president, a vice president, a secretary and treasurer, who shall perform the duties usually pertaining to such positions, and by a board of not less than nine directors, which shall include the president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer as members thereof. Such officers and directors

shall be elected by the members of the corporation at an annual meeting on the third Monday of December of each year; their term of office shall begin on the first Monday in the next January after their election and they shall serve for a term of one year and until their successors are elected and have qualified. Not more than two of such directors shall be residents of the same township at the time of election.

The membership of the corporation was opened to any citizen of the county and any non-resident owning land in the county, provided that individual was ready to pay the annual dues and thereafter comply with the articles and by-laws of the corporation. These associations, according to the terms of the law, were given the following powers:

1. To establish and maintain a permanent agricultural school, in which agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry, and domestic science shall be taught.
2. To employ one or more teachers, experts, or advisers to teach, advance, and improve agriculture, horticulture, animal industry, and domestic science, in the county, under such terms, conditions, and restrictions as may be deemed advisable by the board of directors.
3. To use part or all of the sum annually received as dues from its members in payment of prizes offered in any department of its work, including agricultural fairs, short courses, or farmers' institutes.
4. To adopt by-laws.
5. To take by gift, purchase, devise, or bequest, real or personal property.
6. To do all things necessary, appropriate, and convenient for the successful carrying out of the objectives of the association.

Section 2931 of the law specifically stated that:

The only farm improvement association which shall be entitled to receive such county aid shall be one organized to cooperate with the United States Department of Agriculture, the state department of

agriculture, and the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.

Section 2935 also said that no salary or compensation of any sort shall be paid to the president, vice president, treasurer, or to any director of the association.

Further, a memorandum of understanding was agreed upon between the Iowa State College, the United States Department of Agriculture and the County Farm Bureau (organized in accordance with the state farm aid law) cooperating, authorizing them to conduct extension work in agriculture and home economics in Iowa. The memorandum emphasized that extension work should consist of giving instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to persons not attending or resident in the college. The extension work was to be solely educational, embracing instruction with respect to production, conservation, distribution, taxation, legislation, transportation, organization, home management, health, nutrition, recreation and community cooperation. Personnel of the service were to be available to all rural people and to all agencies, organizations and groups interested. Thus, while the Extension Service was legally associated with the Farm Bureau, it was also to work closely with many other types of organizations and agencies. Such institutions included farmers' elevators, county fair associations, cooperative livestock shipping associations, cooperative creameries,

livestock breeders' associations, local granges, members of local farmers' union organizations, schools, libraries and churches.

The memorandum of understanding (1927) stipulated that hired agents were to meet requirements set down by the Extension Service with approval of cooperating parties; and also to comply with laws governing cooperative extension work. It was emphasized that:

The general policies and procedures to be followed in planning and conducting cooperative extension work in the county shall be mutually agreed upon by the duly authorized officers and directors of the county Farm Bureau and the Extension Service representing the Iowa State College and the United States Department of Agriculture (p. 1).

The memorandum of understanding (1927) delineated very clearly the various functions that were to be handled mutually and cooperatively by Extension Service and County Farm Bureau.

These were stated as follows:

The Extension Service ... will:

1. Employ county extension personnel in accordance with a separate memorandum of agreement with the County Farm Bureau.
2. Provide educational and supervisory assistance through the services of members of the administrative, supervisory and technical staff of the college.
3. Cooperate in the initiation and development of the educational program in the county.
4. Give educational and advisory assistance to the County Farm Bureau Board, affiliated service boards and other farm associations on problems of organization, marketing, etc.
5. Furnish available printed material and supplies and give such other assistance that will aid in furthering the educational program.

6. Provide the franking privilege to county extension personnel in accordance with postal regulations.
7. Make available to county extension personnel the benefits of the United States Employees Compensation Commission in case of injury while on official duty and other benefits which may be provided.

The County Farm Bureau will:

1. Employ county personnel in accordance with a separate memorandum of agreement with the Extension Service and provide office facilities, clerical and stenographic assistance, transportation and other duly authorized facilities for carrying on the educational program.
2. Provide local leadership for educational activities.
3. Prepare each year in cooperation with the Extension Service a plan of work for the educational program.
4. Maintain adequate organization in the county in accordance with the state law which will best facilitate the development of the most effective educational program.
5. Prepare a budget at the beginning of each year showing estimated receipts and expenditures and forward copy to the Extension Service.
6. As required by the state law, the outgoing president and treasurer will, on or before the first Monday of January, file a financial report with the county auditor. A duplicate copy will be forwarded to the Extension Service.
7. Channel communications and transactions in relation to organization, legislation and service activities through responsible officials, committees, boards and personnel (pp. 2-3).

As referred to above, the memorandum of understanding (1927) also included conditions for employment of personnel to conduct cooperative extension work. This agreement stipulated that:

The County Farm Bureau agrees to pay from the County Extension Service Fund Account the difference between the total salary and the amount paid by the Extension Service. Should the amount paid by the Extension

Service be increased or decreased, the amount paid by the County Farm Bureau will be reduced or increased a like amount (p. 1).

The agreement also outlined the duties of cooperative extension employees as:

The employee shall devote full time to developing and carrying out the Cooperative Extension program; submit proposed plans to the County Farm Bureau Board of Directors for consideration and approval; maintain suitable records of work done and furnish reports to the County Farm Bureau and the Extension Service; provide an automobile and submit at the end of each month an itemized daily account of all expenses incurred, of mileage traveled and work done; comply with the laws governing cooperative extension work and with the general administrative practices and policies of the Extension Service, Iowa State College and the United States Department of Agriculture; give advisory assistance in relation to problems of organization to all farm organizations and agencies, channel communications and information pertaining thereto through responsible officials, committees, boards and personnel; and make the educational program available to all residents of the county (p. 2).

As separate county farm improvement organizations grew up under the law, they all took the name County Farm Bureau. These County Farm Bureaus, after federating, later affiliated with the American Farm Bureau Federation. These federations were, however not directly connected with the Extension Service and did not enter into cooperative agreements with the State College and the Department of Agriculture involving the use of federal funds and employment of extension agents. The College and the Department were not responsible for the activities of the Farm Bureau Federations. There was, however, much advisory consultation between representatives of

the Farm Bureau Federations and officers of the College and Department with reference to plans for advancing the agricultural interests of the state and the nation. Only County Farm Bureaus had legal status or a legal relationship with the Extension Service. The Director of Extension and the State Leader of County Agents, however, were entitled to sit as ex-officio directors of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, without the right to vote.

The above gives a general overview of the legal relationships established between Extension and County Farm Bureaus. The practical functioning of this arrangement will be examined briefly in order to complete the picture.

The sponsors of the idea of farm bureau had to demonstrate its greater effectiveness as an aid in carrying on county agent work, and its indispensability in reaching out to the rural people in totality. As indicated earlier, the bureaus were grouped in the category of county farm associations. The definition of the county association, which was later officially known as the Farm Bureau was:

A county farm bureau is an association of people interested in rural affairs which has for its object the development in a county of the most profitable and permanent system of agriculture, the establishment of community ideals, and the furtherance of the well-being, prosperity and happiness of the rural people through cooperation with local, state and national agencies in the development and execution of a program of extension work in agriculture and home economics (Burritt, 1922, p. 213).

The farm bureau idea embodied in this definition was characterized as: 1) a local association of rural people; 2) a broad program for the improvement of agriculture; and 3) a means of cooperation with state and national public agencies in the execution of such a program.

In Iowa, therefore, county farm bureau boards had full control over all local funds including appropriations from county commissioners or boards of supervisors. In each county, an executive committee of seven to nine members was elected. These members, as much as was possible represented the different sections of the county's farm interests. The members were also so located that they could meet once a month if necessary and be able to give the work of the bureau their time and best thought. The president and the secretary-treasurer were usually located near the office and not too far apart, to make it easy for them to see the agent frequently.

Having made a budget, the executive committee had as its first responsibility the task of raising the necessary funds to meet it. The committee was also supposed to supervise the expenditure of the money as well as to keep careful records of its disbursements. The executive committee had to determine the most urgent phases of the county work, confer with state leaders and adopt state policies to local needs.

Every rural community within the county also had a live representative committee, of from three to ten members, to

look after its interests with the county bureau and to promote the interests (sometimes called projects) of the bureau in its community. Its chairman, elected by the local members or appointed by the county president, presided at all local meetings. This committee largely determined the amount and character of the work to be done by the agent in its community. The full committee met with the agent at least twice a year, once to plan the years program and once to sum up the results. The committee's duties included planning and carrying out local membership campaigns and secure local quota of members, making a community map, defining its boundaries and locating all farmers and members, and listing bureau work.

The community committeeman was normally a recognized agricultural leader in his community; a successful farmer with influence. He was considered the local representative of the State College and the United States Department of Agriculture in extension work and of the state and national farm bureau federations.

There was also a county advisory council or committee usually made up of all the community committeemen in each community in the county, or in some of the larger counties, of the chairmen of these committees only. Due to limitations of distance, time and cost, the majority of the counties had one or two advisory council meetings a year. In smaller counties with centrally located offices and favorable transportation

the meetings were sometimes monthly, at least throughout the winter season.

The chief function of the advisory council was to recommend the county program of work based on community needs, and to advise the county committee on the larger or special county-wide problems which needed attention. It also helped to plan the membership drive.

There was also in almost every county a monthly paper known as "Farm Bureau News" or "Farm Bureau Bulletin;" printed and sent to members monthly as house journals.

Each county association (the County Farm Bureau) had an annual meeting at a suitable meeting place with a businesslike program. The annual meeting had two main functions: 1) to elect officers and transact the necessary business of the organization for the ensuing year; and 2) to furnish the occasion for a rousing get-together or mass meeting of farmers of the whole county to hear reports of accomplishment, discuss live problems, and make plans and record suggestions for the solution.

This working arrangement brought many advantages to the Extension Service and farmers. Some of the advantages were:

1. A ready source of funds for extension work. Farm Bureau member dues generated a substantial sum in the state as a whole; out of which a great percentage was made available for county extension programs. When farmers have a part

in the financing and management of the work, it creates a local responsibility, and hence a greater local interest in the programs planned.

2. Development of local leadership, and provision of means for the full utilization of local initiatives. This enabled extension education to reach a large number of people at low cost.
3. The arrangement made it possible to secure the counsel of the most able farmers in the counties, thereby bringing public institutions into direct contact with farmers and localities, and vice versa.
4. Provision for adequate local participation in planning and carrying out programs was emphasized. These programs thus became the programs of the local people and were not imposed from without.
5. There was a great deal of enthusiasm for extension programs among farmers, and the atmosphere generated interest among local persons who were not members of the county extension organization.
6. Permanency and continuity to the local extension programs was ensured.

While great strides were made in this cooperative venture, it was not without its shortcomings. These shortcomings which generated the need for improvement, revision of relationships and responsibilities and even the creation of completely new

structures, will be the focus of the next chapter. Suffice it to record here that the Farm Bureau-Extension mutual relationship advanced the extension organization to a higher plane.

Summary

At this point of the study, it is becoming clear as regards forces contributing to the evolvement of an idea that matured into the present County Extension Councils. The most important force was the will and enthusiasm of the people. This led to the shaping of a number of farm organizations to gain a positive directing voice in affairs affecting their well being. As a need for more coordination grew out of a diverse number of organizations, the idea of farm bureaus emerged. The bureau idea was conceived and hatched by a group of businessmen. Its final shape, structure, and functioning peculiarities were molded by the farmers.

The experiences gained were very profitable. These experiences pointed out one very important fact to farmers: with a strong independent and united front they could achieve educational and economic independence.

The State College was no less influential. With its cadre of devoted instructors and experimental stations, it tried to bring knowledge to the farmers. Thousands of valuable manhours were spent by college personnel to help farmers

organize fairs, corn trains, short courses, farmers institutes and most important, crop improvement associations.

Legislation helped in procuring abundant opportunities for farmers. The first public funds for agriculture were made available when the legislature, in the fifth year of Iowa's statehood, provided state money to match any funds the then existing agricultural societies raised. In 1853, the various county societies organized the Iowa State Agricultural Society and the General Assembly gave public support to supplement the educational endeavors of farm organizations.

In 1858, the State College was established by an act of the state legislature. At the national level, in 1862, national legislation activated programs to further assist farmers. The Homestead Act made it possible for farmers to acquire 160 acres of government land at a nominal price. Another act established the United States Department of Agriculture, which became a strong cooperating partner with the farm bureaus at the county level. The third was the Morrill Act, more often referred to as the Land Grant College Act, which gave 3,000 acres of public land to each state to be used to maintain at least one land grant college.

The Iowa legislature was very instrumental in getting extension into public service in Iowa. On April 10, 1906, the 31st General Assembly of Iowa passed and approved the first extension act in Iowa. This act provided that Iowa State

College should undertake and maintain a system of Agricultural Extension. It was this system that worked very hard with farm leaders in the various counties to build the Farm Bureau movement. The Farm Aid Association Act of 1913, which was amended slightly in 1919 and again in 1927 and 1951, resulted from a common desire to enhance farmers' education.

Thus, under the influence of the great force of the enthusiasm of the people, pressure groups evolved, pressing legislation to create and legalize various institutions. These institutions working together with farm groups generated and evolved working relationships which sowed the seed of cooperation that now characterizes extension in Iowa and the United States. Apart from initiating these cooperative relationships, legislature laid the foundation for continuity in farmer participation and involvement in extension programming and functioning.

Having briefly examined contributing forces to County Extension work, the study will proceed to isolate more categories and properties.

Categories and properties

The category of social urgency expresses itself very clearly in this chapter. This time its properties were documented by the survey of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, the Department of Agriculture through then Secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson, and the report of the Country Life

Commission. In fact, for the first time the properties of this category, as stated in Chapter II were brought forward as national concerns.

Additional properties of this category include:

- a) Organization for farmers. Even though farmers organized around demonstration work, there was still a lack of a coherent organization for farmers to handle the major problems facing them collectively. Each group within any locality was autonomous, and lacked the necessary linkages to other groups. This created lapses and in fact, created confusion. Some farmers abandoned their farms, and rural life became more unbearable.
- b) Support for industry and urban life. It was realized trade very much depended on the farming community, and that urban life could not thrive if the rural community, which was basically a farming community, was not prosperous.

In the category of social intervention, the properties derived from Chapter II are found in Chapter III. An additional property is: Committee formation. The Department of Agriculture and the Chamber of commerce of New York got concerned with the farmers' plight and formed committees to study the situation. The Country Life Commission is another example.

The previous chapter concluded with social action as the last major category. However, the prime characteristic of social action is dynamism. Short of total destruction of a particular social activity dynamism naturally propels social action for greater achievements in terms of both process and product. However, dynamism is not achieved; it is not an end, it is a means, and in fact, a process. Thus, with the establishment of the Cooperative Demonstration Movement with its associated county agent system, stagnation had to be avoided, consciously or otherwise. This leads us to the first category in this second case of the study; and that is social reaction. It involves activities which allow participants in social action to evaluate their action steps and reassess community needs, objectives, and plans based on what has occurred to date. As MacKeracher et al. (1976) put it, "the reaction phase is formative and prescriptive and usually leads directly back to need identification" (p. 11). They also indicated that "for communities which terminate their shared existence ... this reaction phase is seen as summative and descriptive" (p. 11). In other words, dynamism is killed and, therefore, destroys growth and continuing opportunities for social action.

The properties of this category are:

- a) Community surveys. This refers to structural investigations into community problems. These surveys

were extensive involving parties particularly interested in the farming community, the government, the business community, and the Department of Agriculture.

- b) Community concern. The worsening of the farming community drew the attention of other members and institutions. The railroads, the universities, the legislature and the Department of Agriculture expressed great desire to correct the poor agricultural situation.
- c) Will and enthusiasm of the farming community to participate in shaping the future farmer organizations was significant.

The last category in this chapter is social evolution. It refers to the growth processes within a community in an attempt to improve decision making for achieving desired goals. It is a continuous process and at every stage in the process excellence in performance is the ultimate goal. The properties of this category are:

- a) Organizational restructuring. This is the process of creating new structures within the community which will adequately take care of decision making procedures. For the first time, a local governing body was created made up of farmers and interested businessmen.
- b) Community leadership. This is the process of facilitating the emergence of local leaders within each county to share in decision making and problem solving of their counties.

This is exemplified by the formation of farm improvement associations which took over the agricultural responsibilities from the Chamber of Commerce.

- c) Strengthening cooperative relationships. States and businesses were more than ready to assist financially, provided county organization of farmers was formed on a membership dues basis. This was to aid the hiring of agents to get all parties involved in the process. Federal funds also became available through the Smith-Lever Act. Thus, broad general guidelines were provided through Extension Departments of the Colleges, and local governing bodies (Board of Directors of Farm Bureaus) decided on areas of emphasis in their respective counties.
- d) Institutionalization. State legislatures, particularly in Iowa, recognized the importance of giving these local sponsoring groups of extension work a legal backing. This created permanency and opportunities for growth, continuity and stabilization in their functions within well defined rules.
- e) Expansion and integration. Legal backing with accompanying funding aided widespread acceptance of the local sponsoring organization idea. Such groups did appear in every county, and also statewide and nationwide mergers started taking roots. Membership increased with zeal and enthusiasm.

- f) Specialization. Specialized departments were created in the farm bureau federations to deal with various issues of farmers, legislative needs, marketing, transportation, education, etc.
- g) Community responsibility. Support for these organizations gradually became community based, with special taxes, county appropriations and state and federal matching funds being made available. This further strengthened community involvement, activated the spirit of cooperation and volunteerism, and enhanced quality of decision making.
- h) Growth incentives and public relations. Officers of these sponsoring groups were continually charging, giving all opportunities to take part in affairs of the organization. Monthly papers were established in each county to give publicity to activities of the organization. These papers also served as means of ensuring accountability of officers and further generating interest in the work of the organizations.

At this point the researcher will again try to put forward a few conjectures to conclude this chapter.

Conjectures

1. If individuals and institutions deliberately and consciously undertake evaluative inquiries of the social processes in the community, then better and improved decisions can be arrived at.

2. If all institutions and groups realize the interdependence of their existence, then the chances of cooperation for effective social growth are increased.
3. If community agencies, institutions and individuals are ready to cooperate in terms of resources and commitment to community problems, then community stagnation and degeneration can be avoided, and a way paved for continued progress and growth can be achieved.
4. If community leaders work closely with public opinion and legislators, then viable institutions can be created with the necessary legal backing to enhance effective functioning.
5. If legal cooperation can be enhanced for the support of local initiatives, then genuine local creativity, support, enthusiasm and spirit of volunteering can be effectively harnessed to aid progress, stabilization and continuity in community growth processes.

CHAPTER IV. THE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION COUNCILS

Introduction

The creation of County Agricultural Extension Councils in Iowa was not a spontaneous act. It was the product of a long struggle by farmers to build an organization, or institutionize a system that would serve their prime interest. To this end, the Farm Bureau came into being. The Extension Service in Iowa played a decisive role in the organization of the Farm Bureau state-wide, as a vehicle for agricultural education. There were a number of factors which led to a marriage between Extension and Farm Bureaus. Some of the leading factors to linking Extension and Farm Bureaus will be highlighted in this introduction, before moving into situations leading to the need for separating Farm Bureau and Extension.

Extension-Farm Bureau ties

Even though Extension Service in Iowa had been very keen on developing cooperative relations with farm organizations which would expand and enhance its educational program, this interest intensified during the first world war. Following the entrance of the United States in the war on April 6, 1917, extension work changed. Many programs were changed to respond to the federal government's call for increased food production.

Governor Harding of Iowa, therefore, appointed a committee made up of one man from each congressional district, with President Pearson of Iowa State College as Chairman, for purposes of devising ways and means of increasing food production. This committee met and prepared a program titled "Iowa's War Duty." The program sought to mobilize all available hands to increase food production. This appeal of the Governor's Committee on the war food emergency met with a hearty response from all concerned. The burden of organizing and educating the farmers of the state, however, so that they would be able, with a decreased amount of labor, to produce an unprecedented amount of food, was left largely to the Extension Department of the College.

In order to meet its war obligations, the Extension Department set up within itself a central organization headed by J. W. Coverdale. Men were employed to go into all the unorganized counties of the state to help the people organize farm bureaus and to assist them in employing county agents. This vigorous effort to organize the local farmers resulted in an increase of farm bureaus and county agents from 24 at the beginning of the war on April 16, 1917, to 100 in March 1918. It also resulted in the placement of 41 permanent county home demonstration agents, 55 temporary county home demonstration agents, 3 county boys' and girls' club leaders, and 14,000

farm bureau cooperators, or one for each four square miles of land (Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall, Ames).

This systematic type of farm organization reached into each community and provided private funds, county funds and volunteer leadership which helped the Extension Service to carry out state wide programs with efficiency and at low cost to the government. Under war pressure to produce additional food and with the help of additional war funds from the federal government, the Extension Service in Iowa increased its specialist personnel until it represented all departments of the agriculture and home economics divisions, and also included specialists representing veterinary medicine, entomology, botany and music. Federal funds for war food production work became available in August, 1917, and during the last year of the war totaled \$220,000.

The work of organizing the counties was facilitated, no doubt, by the fact that there existed a national emergency - World War I. The fact that the federal government provided the salaries of the county agents also helped. The local people however had to pay the cost of maintaining the agent's office and meet his other expenses.

When the Armistice was signed, November 19, 1918, the Extension Service faced a new crisis.. Plans for extensive food production for the next year were discarded, and the \$220,000 war food production funds were withdrawn on July 1,

1919, by the federal government. This fund was used largely to support the county agent work and about three-fourths of the counties had employed agents with the understanding that they would receive such aid.

The withdrawal of this amount of money posed a difficult problem for the Extension Service. Funds had to be procured or else the services developed by extension would have to be sharply curtailed. In this emergency, Iowa's county farm bureaus, operating under the Iowa law, came to the rescue and provided enough funds so that extension personnel was not seriously reduced. According to Bliss (1960)

The farm bureaus, county and state, gave such effective help to extension work in this difficult period that they became an important part of the state extension educational activities and history (pp. 138-9).

However, certain developments in the activities of the Farm Bureau, particularly in connection with its relation to Extension, made certain individuals to caution against impending dangers. One of such people, Burritt (1922) observed that:

- 1) Local and national farm bureau federations which had developed, in various ways, seemed to be trying to take over the work of other farm groups of much longer standing and to speak for them. He indicated that the Farm Bureaus, through their financial support for Extension Service, "sometimes set themselves up, or seemed to do so,

as representing exclusively all farmers and all interests" (Burritt, 1922, p. 128). This, of course, was resented by other farm organizations.

- 2) The involvement of Extension and the Department of Agriculture in promoting and organizing farm bureaus had its shortcomings. One such shortcoming, according to Burritt (1922), was that "the delegation to, or assumption by the county agent of too much responsibility and too many duties" was, in effect killing local initiative and in the final analysis "making the agent a mere chore boy" (p. 128).
- 3) The newly formed state Farm Bureau Federation, in addition to setting up marketing and transportation, legislation, organization and education committees, began systematically to develop membership campaigns in each county (Bliss, 1960, p. 139). Again Burritt (1922) warned of impending dangers as:

The danger of becoming involved in political questions and engaging in politics. The danger that the local association may undertake enterprises, particularly of a commercial nature in which neither the public partner nor the joint representative, the county agent, may properly take part (p. 128).

These initial warnings were in fact major situations which developed and led to a breakaway of farm bureaus from sponsoring Extension work. These issues and others leading to the breakaway will be examined in more detail, and will be

followed by the formation and functioning of the Extension Councils.

However, it is important to note that most of the problems encountered were not simply peculiar to Iowa. Thus, the struggle was going on at both the national and state levels. The narration will, therefore, draw on both levels of the controversy, and will conclude with results in Iowa.

Breakaway of Farm Bureau from Sponsoring Extension in Iowa

Attacks upon formal ties between county farm bureau organizations and Extension arose as early as the 1920s. These grew steadily until 1955, when the divorce was eventually accomplished.

The national struggle

In November, 1919, with the encouragement of C. B. Smith, head of the State Relations Service of the Department of Agriculture, a few state farm bureau leaders initiated and formed a temporary organization under the name of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The purpose was "to promote, protect and represent the business, economic, social and educational interests of the farmers of the nation" (Baker, 1939, p. 18-19). The Federation, as a national farm organization, necessarily competed for members with other farm organizations. Not only did the latter not enjoy the support of Extension personnel, but they were confronted with a rapidly

expanding competitor which Extension employees had helped to create. The older farm bodies, particularly the National Grange and Farmers Union, did not disappear. However, Extension Service continued to identify itself with those farmers whose formal interests were realized in the Farm Bureau. This naturally made the latter very critical of farm bureau-extension relationships (Block, 1960, p. 11).

Interfarm organization conflict flared up shortly after the Farm Bureau Federation was organized. The latter's opponents were not slow in using the privileged governmental relationship of county farm bureaus as the focal point of their attack. One of the first recorded public attacks was by Benjamin Marsh, Secretary of the Farmers National Council, in the spring of 1920. During the hearings on the meat packing industry (United States Congress, House Committee of Agriculture, 66th Congress, 2nd Session, 1920, p. 794), Mr. Marsh tried to prove that the packing industry had helped to sponsor the formation of the Farm Bureau Federation. This was countered by an Illinois congressman who quoted a number of articles from farm magazines and newspapers. These articles praised the Farm Bureau and denounced the Farmers National Council and Benjamin Marsh as "radicals" and not representatives of farmers (United States Congress, House Committee on Agriculture, 66th Congress, 2nd Session, 1920, p. 2720). The Congressman also charged that the Farmers Union, as an

association, was an overhead body for a number of farm organizations some of which were competitive to the Farm Bureau.

By the next session of Congress, Marsh had found an important ally in Chairman Louis McFadden, a Pennsylvania Republican and Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Chairman McFadden agreed to give Marsh a hearing on his organization's plan for government purchases of farm surpluses. Through an agreement that Marsh would answer questions about the Farmers National Council if similar questions were asked of spokesmen for other farm organizations, the hearings turned into an investigation of the latter (United States Congress, House Committee on Banking and Currency, 67th Congress, 1st Session, 1921). The hearings were very bitter public criticisms of the American Farm Bureau Federation and its ally, the states Relations Service of the Department of Agriculture. The major criticism was the relationship of the body to Extension employees, and Extension officials in Washington preferred to work through a specific formal organization, the county farm bureau, rather than attempting to reach their clientele through other farm organizations or individually.

The most obvious proof of the unique position of the farm bureau in the eyes of Extension people was shown in a New Year's message from the first President, James Howard of the

American Farm Bureau Federation, to county agents. President Howard said:

The American Farm Bureau Federation is exactly what the individual county farm bureaus make it. And the county farm bureau, I have found again and again, is just what the county agent makes it ... I would urge every county agent in America to assume a position of real leadership in his county and to stand or fall on his record as an organizer of farmers into a strong and effective county farm bureau (Tolley, 1943, p. 115).

A West Virginia Farm Bureau publication was also cited as taking credit for influencing congressional action, in order to refute the assertion that farm bureaus were purely educational.

Testimony against the Farm Bureau was also made by an official of the Kentucky Farmers Union and the Director of the Georgia State Bureau of Markets. Both accused county agents of organizing and administering farm bureaus in their respective states. Both also challenged the federation's standing as a farmers' organization by asserting that businessmen and bankers were being accepted into membership in that organization.

Dr. A. C. True, then Director of States Relations Service, Department of Agriculture, and other leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation tried to put up a defense against these charges. They argued first of all, that Extension must work through some type of organization to reach farmers, but as a governmental agency could not properly work with either

commodity organizations or "secret" organizations. This implied the exclusion of the Farmers Union and National Grange, respectively. Thus, according to the defendants, a proper and necessary organization was the county farm bureau, "formed to promote the general agricultural interests of a community or a state, or even the nation" (United States Congress, House Committee on Banking and Currency, 67th Congress, 1st Session, 1921, pp. 128-43). The defendants also indicated that the existence of other farm organizations within a particular area did not preclude the desirability or necessity of organizing farm bureaus to assist in carrying out Extension work. They also tried to dissociate the county agent, a public employee, from the state and national Farm Bureau organizations. They insisted that the county agent worked only with the county farm bureau and thus did not aid or promote the state or national units.

Although the chairman of the committee and at least three other members objected to the Extension-Farm Bureau arrangement, no congressional action resulted. During the same year, members of state Farmers Unions petitioned their legislatures to refuse to appropriate funds for the Extension Service, on the grounds that such public moneys were used primarily for the benefit of a private and competitive organization (Benedict, 1953, p. 190). Generally, these attacks were not

successful in getting a separation, however, their voices added to the mounting chorus of dissent.

These complaints accumulated and resulted in a public statement which defined the legitimate functions of the county agent. This statement, signed in 1921, by President James R. Howard of the American Farm Bureau Federation and Dr. A. C. True, head of the States Relations Service specified that:

Since these county extension agents are part of a public service as defined in the Smith-Lever Act, and receive some part of their salary from public funds, they are to perform service for the benefit of all the farming people of the county whether members of the farm bureaus or not, and are to confine their activities to such as are appropriate for public officials to perform under the terms of the Smith-Lever Act. The county agents will aid the farming people in a broad way with reference to problems of production, marketing and formation of farm bureaus and other cooperative organizations, but will not themselves organize farm bureaus, or similar organizations, conduct membership campaigns, solicit memberships, receive dues, handle farm bureau funds, edit and manage the farm bureau publications, manage the business of the farm bureau, engage in commercial activities or take part in other farm bureau activities which are outside their duties as extension agents (Smith and Wilson, 1938, pp. 378-79).

This statement included no power of enforcement. The following year Secretary of Agriculture Henry C. Wallace issued regulations embodying the substance of the True-Howard statement and applying it to all employees of the Cooperative Extension Service (Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, November 21-23, 1922, p. 220).

These regulations could not stop what had already taken up most of the attention of the county agents. This involvement of county agents in farm bureau affairs was established and nourished during the war years. The need for increased food production when the United States entered into World War I increased appropriations to extension work. Extension Service employees, both in Washington and in the field, recognized the greater effectiveness of their demonstration methods when farmers were organized in definite local associations. The difficulty of calling residents of a wide area together for demonstrations and of distributing written materials to them was considerably lessened with such associations. Extension workers were, therefore, very enthusiastic sponsors of farm bureaus (Gilbertson, 1948, pp. 7-8). The contribution of funds from quasi-private associations was authorized by the Smith-Lever Act, although membership was probably of more importance than financing in the early period. As long as farm bureaus were organized only on the county basis, their primary interest was agricultural education.

The war multiplied farm bureaus, as noted above especially in Iowa, and laid the foundation for what Gladys Baker (1939) called "that anomalous, powerful, semipublic organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation" with a paid membership of nearly a million and a program that grew more resolutely commercial each year (p. 57).

Nation-wide, between the spring day when America entered the war in 1917 and Armistice Day, 1918, extension funds increased 130%. The number of male agents increased from 1,400 to 2,400. Some 500 new 4-H agents were added to spur on the young to greater feats of production. Also, about 1,000 new home demonstration agents were recruited. Extension agents organized, under the slogan "Food Will Win the War," the "Women's Land Army," the "Boys' Working Reserve." They organized businessmen into "Shock Troops" and "Twilight Crews" to help farmers harvest. They served on draft boards and passed on claims of farm exemptions. They put on acreage adjustment drives, with drives always for more plowed land and higher production (Lord, 1939, p. 101).

The most outstanding feature of these activities was the grouping of farmers into numerous farm bureaus. Once they were grouped into county farm bureaus and similar county organizations, they moved almost immediately to cooperative buying and selling, and soon, many county agents found themselves engaged in business. Some of them were in a position to throw the greater part of a county's fertilizer bill to this company or that (Lord, 1939, p. 106). Further, some county agents found themselves keeping books for cooperative creameries or acting as managers for cooperative ventures. These activities aroused sharp protests from the business elements and eroded the popularity of Extension in certain

towns (Lord, 1939, p. 106). These and other activities mentioned earlier led to the True-Howard ruling, later made part of Department of Agriculture regulations by Secretary Wallace.

In most places, however, the ruling solved nothing beyond causing the county agent to be rather more circumspect in making sallies into the market places. Lord (1939) made an observation that unless strong groups of farmers, well-organized according to localities, "arose to take over commercial programs, county agents would go right on getting the colleges and the Department into difficulties" (p. 106). It was plain that with war-time appropriations sharply slashed, extension needed the support of other monies to keep growing.

The dilemma of the county agent in Iowa

In Iowa, county appropriation for extension work was dependent upon the organization of a farm aid association (The Farm Bureau) with 200 members and pledges paying a minimum of \$1,000 dues. The county board of supervisors were required to pay double the amount of farm bureau dues up to limits of \$3,000 and \$5,000 depending upon the population of the county. The county farm bureau board, within certain broad limits was given discretion in the expenditure of this mandatory county appropriation (Iowa Department of Agriculture, 1927, Chapter 138). Thus, the county farm bureau board determined the

amount of the county agent's salary beyond a minimum of state and federal funds contributed by the college. The county board could also bring about the agent's dismissal by withholding county funds at any time. As a result of this relationship, the work of the agent in Iowa was chiefly evaluated on the basis of the number of farm bureau members. Not only the size of his salary, but also his job depended upon keeping a minimum number of farm bureau members to qualify for the mandatory county appropriation.

However, when the World War ended, America was in a strong creditor position for the first time in her history. There was a decline in the export markets for farm products while war-induced output remained high. Foreign demand for American agricultural products caved in. Herbert Hoover, then Food Administrator, had a hard time making former allies take even part of the last great outpouring of export wheat and fats and other agricultural provisions which they had ordered prior to the Armistice, and which was in shipment to them, when the gunfire halted (Lord, 1939, p. 136). The leading device, therefore, was, in effect, dumping. With the foreign market out of the picture as an actual paying market, surpluses were being sent abroad and taking paper promises to pay.

Those were very hard times for farmers, and also for extension agents in the field. During the latter part of the post-war depression, the cooperatives sponsored by the Federal

Farm Board and the county agents were unable to meet the marketing-surplus problem. The methods of many individual farmers became increasingly efficient under the guidance of the county agents, but relative farm income rapidly decreased. As the post-war agriculture depression became increasingly oppressive, the county agent found his prestige diminishing.

Iowa farmers' holiday organizations immediately urged county supervisors to discontinue county appropriations and to evict the county agent from the courthouse. In some counties, large numbers of holiday members descended upon the courthouse forcibly to remove the county agent. Baker (1939) recounts that in one county the holiday organization members secured authorization to make a house to house survey of farmers in the county upon the assumption that the farm bureau's list was not a bona fide one. She also indicated that one county agent was threatened with lynching if he did not turn over the membership list (p. 59). In certain counties in Iowa where appropriations were withheld, county farm bureau members sued for a writ of mandamus to force the supervisors to make the appropriation. Opposing farmers brought suit against the constitutionality of the Iowa statute which backed Farm Bureau ties with Extension. Baker (1939) records that the courts upheld the constitutionality of the law in the case of Blume et al. vs. Crawford County et al., and also ruled that county

farm bureaus could not be forced to turn over their membership lists (p. 59).

The Iowa Farmers' Union under the leadership of Milo Reno labeled the Farm Bureau "an illegitimate subsidized organization" and the county agent a "tool of the international bankers" (Baker, 1939 p. 59). County agricultural agents in Iowa made an attempt to meet the emergency situation by sponsoring farm bureau credit councils to adjust relations between debtors and creditors, but this work was almost completely overshadowed by the work of the more daring United Farmers' organizations and Holiday Councils of Defense. In fact, according to the Washington representative of the National Grange, officials of the Farmers' Holiday movement in Iowa had protested against instances of discrimination in favor of Farm Bureau members to every secretary of Agriculture since 1921, the year previous to the signing of the True-Howard agreement (Brenckman, 1939a, p. 3). The delegates to the annual conventions of the National Grange in 1937 and 1938 passed resolutions condemning favoritism of the Extension Service to a particular farm organization and supporting their legal separation (Brenckman, 1939a, p. 6).

The upsurge of the national struggle

Growing discontent with the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act and its production control features provided the basis for attacks on the Farm Bureau and its Extension Service ties

during the spring and summer of 1939. Opponents of the act found continuing support for it in the alliance of these organizations in some states. County agents who were still helping to administer Farm Bureau programs in some states, sometimes also organized and maintained the bureaus, which in turn provided political support for appropriations for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. To strike at the latter effectively thus required some kind of attack at the public-private arrangement which helped to support it. These attacks were rather uncoordinated, often referring to isolated cases of Extension personnel aiding in building Farm Bureau membership.

In 1940, Claude R. Wickard, who had succeeded Wilson as undersecretary, was to be named head of the Department of Agriculture, since Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace was selected to be the Democratic nominee for Vice President. Although Wickard did not possess any great formal powers over the state Extension Services, by winning his support, the advocates of separation hoped to secure a more vigorous enforcement of the regulations established by secretary Wallace in 1923.

During the next four years, growing opposition of the American Farm Bureau Federation to the Department of Agriculture on both organizational and policy issues resulted in widened and increased intensity of the group which hoped to

separate the Farm Bureau and Extension Service. The early efforts primarily grew out of the integration of the action agencies within the department and the Farm Bureau's loss of influence over those units. As the United States moved from the role of neutral, to that of supplier, to that of participant in World War II, new agricultural policies developed.

It was the Farm Bureau's proposal for reorganization and decentralization of the department that first pushed the new secretary into a position of opposition to the bureau. The proposal was first expressed publicly by resolution of the American Farm Bureau Federation in its December 1940 convention (*The Nations Agriculture*, January, 1941, pp. 18-19). The resolution was placed before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in February of the following year by Ed O'Neal. The resolution proposed that administration of all the post-1933 agricultural programs was to be under a five man non-partisan board within the department. In the states, administration of departmental programs was to be divided between the state Extension Service, which would supervise the Soil Conservation Service and Farm Security programs, and a state committee that would head the field operations necessary to administer the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This committee was to be selected in each state by a non-partisan board upon nomination by the state director of Extension, after the latter had

consulted with "state-wide membership farm organizations" (United States Congress, House Committee on Appropriations 77th Congress, 1st. Session, 1941, p. 410).

These recommendations, if carried out, would not only have deprived the Secretary of Agriculture of control over much of his department, but would have inevitably given the Farm Bureau and its state units increased influence over administration of the production control and price-support programs. Conflicts between the views represented by the Farm Bureau and its allies and those of the department and its supporters provided the rationale for new Farm Bureau efforts to strike at the combination which was thwarting its efforts to achieve the agricultural price system which it desired. At that time, the American Farm Bureau Federation had affiliated organizations in at least 39 states, more than any other farm organization. It could thus dominate the selection of the state committees. In addition, the identity of interests which some state farm bureaus had with Extension officials would increase this organizational advantage. The recommendations were indicative of an underlying distrust of the current administrative structure, by those interests best represented in the American Farm Bureau Federation. The gradual integration and centralization of the action agencies within the department had greatly threatened the influence and strength of the Farm Bureau, especially at the county level.

During this year and continuing into 1943, the Farm Bureau came into open conflict with the administration, including the Department of Agriculture, over commodity prices. The department, supported by Farmers Union and labor spokesmen, successfully opposed a Farm Bureau-Grange effort to include the cost of farm labor in computing parity prices, asserting that the latter action would be inflammatory. Opponents of the Farm Bureau on this issue were aided by a revolt within that organization. The Illinois Agricultural Association, and the Iowa Farm Bureau refused to go along with the national organization.

Over a three-year period, the American Farm Bureau Federation had not been wholly successful in winning effective allies for its efforts to reorganize the department. Over the years, therefore, a growing number of interests were in opposition to the proposals of this major farm organization. It was, therefore, not surprising that the common point at which a counterattack could be launched was the privileged sponsoring relationship many county farm bureau units had with the Extension Service.

The Farm Bureau reorganization proposal of 1940-41 was not adopted: in fact, it was critically rejected. However, it did accomplish an unanticipated objective; it gave the other two major farm organizations a common cause with the Secretary of Agriculture. Several issues of the National Union Farmer

carried references to it, including the assertion that the recommendations "would turn the administration into a company union for the Farm Bureau, especially in the eleven states where the county agents and the Farm Bureaus are officially linked together" (National Union Farmer, March 6, 1944).

Secretary Wickard, in a letter to the House subcommittee, charged that the department's attempt to halt Farm Bureau recruiting by county agents had partly induced the recommendations. He attributed the suggested increase in the authority of the Extension Service to the long and close relationship of that agency to the Farm Bureau (United States, House Committee on Appropriations, 77th Congress, 1st Session, 1941, p. 529). The position of the secretary as an opponent of the close relationships which existed between Farm Bureau and Extension was confirmed some two weeks later by "memorandum 893" which became known as the "Wickard Charter." It prohibited departmental officers and employees from establishing, organizing, acting as business agents, or aiding membership campaigns for, or holding office in, any general farm organization. In effect, the order extended the old True-Howard agreement and Henry C. Wallace regulation, which had specified Extension employees, to all members of the department. Violations of any of the provisions of the memorandum were to be reported by the offender's bureau chief to the departmental director of personnel. No penalties were specified. The list of general

farm organizations to which the order applied included the National Grange, American Farm Bureau Federation, and Farmers' Union.

Within four months of the date it was issued, its application to state and local Extension employees was withdrawn. Extension Director M. L. Wilson notified the state directors that "memorandum 893" had not been issued to them, but to "direct" employees of the department. He did remind them of similar restrictions on Extension personnel, by citing the True-Howard agreement, the Wallace order of 1922, and the land-grant college resolution of the latter year (Circular Letter Miscellaneous No. 35-41 from M. L. Wilson, Director of Extension Work, to All State Directors of Extension, July 11, 1941, Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall). Meanwhile, for a short time, the Wickard memorandum had provided a threat of possible withdrawal of departmental resources from the Farm Bureau if its proposals to reorganize the department were renewed.

The following year, the Farm Bureau-led efforts to abolish the Farm Security Administration aroused even more opposition. Evidence was produced showing that Extension employees either solicited Farm Bureau membership, facilitated the cashing of government benefit checks so that Farm Bureau dues could be paid, or credited that organization with the program which made the checks available. Most convincing was the

solicitation of membership among 3,700 Alabama farmers by a county agent who had saved the county farm bureau money by using Extension-franked envelopes (United States Congress, House and Senate, 77th Congress, 1st and 2nd Sessions, 1942, p. 902). This evidence did not change the minds of committee members, but it did obtain publicity for the charges against Farm Bureaus.

Before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Albert Goss traced the background of the Extension-Farm Bureau arrangements and then concluded that they had several unfortunate results. He pointed out that they created a virtual monopoly of the use of Extension aid; they led to the failure of Extension to help farmers who needed guidance; they gave state farm bureaus dominance over the Extension Service; and they led to the development of counter-alliances in the farm organization and administration field (United States Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, 78th Congress, 1st Session, 1943, pp. 831-61). He particularly stressed the difficult position of the county agent as an impartial servant of the farmer, when part of his salary came from private sources.

Intensified struggles in Iowa

The Farmers Union organizations provided the major support for separation of Extension and Farm Bureau in Iowa. In the fall of 1942 the state Farmers Union, attempted to build

opposition before the legislature met. They called leaders of other farmer cooperative associations together at Iowa Falls to hear and to make suggestions which would improve Extension's aid to all farmers (News Handout, Iowa Farmers Union, September 1942 in Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall). The following February, Spade publicized the "talked-of bill in Iowa to separate Extension Service county agents from Farm Bureau" and claimed the support of the governor and private insurance companies (Spade, February 4, 1943).

Later in the year, the Iowa Farmers Union rallied around the principle of academic freedom and used it as a weapon to attack the Iowa Farm Bureau and the relationship of its units to Iowa State College. In 1943, at Iowa State College, a pamphlet was published stating that margarine compares favorably with butter in nutritive value and palatability (Pamphlet No. 5). The pamphlet also said that, in spite of the food value and efficiency of margarine, dairy interests have been rather effective in suppressing its use. It suggested as part of the war-time food policy that more margarine be made available to the public as a means of minimizing the shortage of dairy products. Restrictions on margarine's sale should be removed, the pamphlet argued, on the grounds that it was a more efficient form of fat than butter.

Dairymen flocked to the campus to do battle with the professors. The college appointed a committee of faculty members and dairy representatives to study the pamphlet. They recommended that the pamphlet be retracted on the grounds that many statements were "either incorrect or are susceptible to misinterpretation or are inadequately documented as to facts." Also, during this battle, officials of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation took a leading part in demanding the dismissal of the researchers. The American Farm Bureau Federation supported its state unit through a short article in its Official Newsletter, June 1, 1943, in which it approved the attempt to dismiss the faculty members (Moore, 1945, pp. 179-80).

This led to the resignation of a number of outstanding members of the social science faculty of the college. Dr. Theodore Schultz, head of the Department of Economics and Sociology led the parade away from Iowa State Campus, going to the University of Chicago. He explained the issue in the Des Moines Register as a clash between scholastic freedom and a special interest group (Des Moines Register, October 15, 1943). Describing the Iowa State Farm Bureau as a "monopoly in the representation of farmers interests," he said its position may "cause it to unwillingly stifle the research and educational activities of Iowa State College ..." (Des Moines Register, October 15, 1943).

The Farmers Union entered the controversy by charging that the state Farm Bureau improperly influenced college policy. The state board of education then requested that any such evidence be presented to it. The Farmers Union president refused, saying that two board members were prejudiced because of editorials they had written. "Pamphlet No. 5" soon ceased to be the real issue. Obviously, the protesting dairymen were not so much interested in good scholarship as in suppressing information which might harm their product. Their arguments were so plainly those of a special interest group that the issue soon became not butter versus margarine, but scholastic freedom versus control by pressure organizations, specifically farm bureaus.

The opposition which the Farmers Union expressed sought additional support during the summer of 1944 from the business community. An article on "The Farm Bureau," describing that organization's structure, officialdom, and policies, appeared in Fortune. In explaining that the Farm Bureau was "the best lobby [the farmer] ever had," the article pointed out that it was unique in that it was a "private lobby sponsored and supported by the government it seeks to influence" (Galbraith, 1944, p. 156). The use of the county agent as a "skilled organizer" and as a link in the chain of communication between state Farm Bureau or Extension officials and the county farm bureaus for political purposes was cited (pp. 158, 192, 194).

Concluding the discussion of Farm Bureau Extension relations the writer suggested that "the citizen ... can properly object to the quasi-public sponsorship that the Farm Bureau enjoys. Certainly nothing in the Bill of Rights suggests that petitioners should be aided by public funds ..." (p. 159).

By late summer, the criticism aimed at Extension Service administration stimulated Director Wilson to have the questionnaire and report on Farm Bureau-Extension relationships brought up to date (Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall). This was in the form of a letter from M. L. Wilson to all State Extension Directors on September 4, 1944. The maintenance of the information in a current state was viewed by activists of separation as an advantage since it would put them on the offensive and rebuff any unfavorable publicity.

The Administration also seized upon the Iowa State College "butter-oleo" controversy as a means of creating a division between the Farm Bureau and its Extension Service allies. The pressure exerted upon college research people by forces led by the president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation was exploited to show Extension personnel the potential dangers to them from Farm Bureau's and Extension's mutual supporting relationship. The approach was two-pronged: that of persuasion and that of publicity. The former path was taken by Secretary Wickard, who saw an opportunity when he addressed the annual convention of land-grant colleges. Appealing to the self-interest of

college and Extension researchers and administrators, he called upon them to see that their research and teaching were "free." More bluntly, he stated that the Extension employees should "not be used as a sales or promotional agent for any particular commercial, political or farm organization," or do "administrative work for any organization," (Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, October 24-26, 1944, p. 45). The November 20, 1944, issue of the Spade commented:

It's common knowledge here that more progressive land grant college presidents see the threat to academic freedom, and are looking for escape. But they also admit, in private, that they cannot afford to make the break for freedom, too much danger Farm Bureau would foreclose on the mortgage (p. 3).

The weapon of publicity, intended to shame and embarrass Extension's leaders into withdrawing from preferential relationships, was utilized by the Farmers' Union. At its annual convention, a resolution charged that "subservient" Extension employees were responsible for the "contamination" of land-grant college academic standards (National Union Farmer, December 1, 1944, p. 6). However, there was not much response from the Farm Bureau and its Extension associates.

This did not calm down the attacks. The chairman of the Iowa Soil Conservation Committee ascribed the failure of the Iowa Extension Service in soil conservation education to demands for "extra extension service." Such services included attending Farm Bureau membership meetings, and demands for contracts in sales of many articles sold by the Farm Bureau in

competition with the regular markets and local merchants (United States Congress, House Committee on Agriculture, 80th Congress, 1st Session, 1947, p. 1068).

These criticisms and attacks prompted Extension and the Farm Bureau in Iowa to work out a new office, that of county organization directors. The new officer was to manage farm bureau meetings, membership drives and dues payments, all of which were tasks prohibited to Extension employees by the Department of Agriculture regulations. The new arrangement was intended to remove basis for criticism and thus continue formal relationships between the Extension Service and county farm bureaus in Iowa.

During 1947-48, the opponents of Farm Bureau-Extension sponsoring arrangements were presented with two new alternatives to the usual legislative, administrative, or judicial approaches to separation. These were the study committees: one of which was to evaluate the program and policies of the Extension Service, the other to evaluate the organization of the nation's agricultural programs.

One of these committees (United States Department of Agriculture and Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 1948) although recommending that all formal ties be broken, suggested that initiatives should come from Farm Bureau and Extension leaders. The report stated that:

This committee expresses its conviction that it is not sound public policy of Extension to give

preferred service to any farm organization or to be in a position of being charged with such actions. The committee is further convinced that it would be in the public interest for any formal operation relationship between the Extension Service and any general farm organization such as the Farm Bureau to be discontinued at the earliest possible moment.

It is appreciated that this is a matter involved in the field of the state's rights. However this committee is convinced that the best interest of extension work, the Farm Bureau and farmers themselves will be served when all legal connections and exclusive operating arrangements between Farm Bureau and the Extension Service are discontinued. It is recommended that Extension Service and Farm Bureau leaders in the states concerned take the initiative in this matter. The Extension Service can function most effectively only when it is recognized as a public agency available to and operating in the interests of all on an equal basis (p. 13).

The committee concluded its report with the caution that,

Though close cooperation with general farm organizations is highly desirable, formal operating relationships with such organizations are considered detrimental to the public interest (p. 118).

The report was not however a unanimous decision of the committee. One member, Dean Rusk dissented very prominently. That did not make any great difference. High praises for the report were sounded in Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead which referred to it as "epoch making." Two editorials in the Des Moines Register attempted to counter criticism from within a state with a formal sponsoring relationship by pointing out that farm bureaus were no longer purely educational organizations and that availability of public funds in other states showed that Iowa could replace the private sponsorship of Extension with tax money, as other states had done.

At about the same period, the Cedar Rapids Gazette opened a very strong opposition to the Extension-Farm Bureau ties. It attacked the Iowa Farm Bureau's "outright plumping" for William Beardsley for the Republican gubernatorial nomination and described it as "a radical departure from the traditional Farm Bureau policy of keeping aloof from partisan politics (Cedar Rapids Gazette, April 20, 1948, p. 6). The paper also accused the Iowa Farm Bureau of launching "commercial activities as special services for its members." Specifically, the Iowa Farm Bureau was accused of setting up "companies specializing in auto, life, casualty and hail insurance, petroleum products, farm supplies, serums and veterinary supplies and fertilizers." Such political and commercial activities were inconsistent with the Iowa Farm Bureau's "chartered status as quasi-public administrators of government programs and funds," the paper insisted. It concluded by stating that:

The problems presented by the Farm Bureau developments in this state have been worked out in most other states by methods which relieve the farm organization of its quasi-public character.

It is increasingly apparent that similar steps should be taken soon in Iowa, especially if the Farm Bureau intends to take its place with independent organizations which go down the line for political candidates. The most logical group to begin the move toward a public and non-partisan administration of extension program is the Farm Bureau itself. It would be a wise move for the Farm Bureau to take its lead (p. 6).

Most Farm Bureau officials had publicly ignored the committee report mentioned earlier. However, the joint committee report was approved by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and at its annual convention in November 1948, its senate approved the report in a resolution which instructed the incoming president to set up a committee to implement it (Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, November 9-11, 1948, p. 257-58).

Other voices joined the chorus, and in May 1949, Louis Cook, Jr. in an article in the Des Moines Sunday Register, brought a number of charges against the Iowa Farm Bureau. He stated:

The Iowa Farm Bureau has become big politics and big business, as well as big education.

Farm Bureau affiliates have been selling cholera virus and serum for years and were supporting a bill to allow persons other than pharmacists to those substances (p. 20).

The bill referred to above passed, even though the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation's lobbyists were a little worried about the matter. The legislators themselves were aware of the political effectiveness of the Farm Bureau. As Cook (1949) further pointed out in his article:

The Farm Bureau has learned to exert tremendous pressure on the legislature. And there were more members of the Farm Bureau in the legislature than belong to any other one organization, farm or city. At least 52 of the 108 state representatives and 21 of the 50 state senators are members of the Farm Bureau.... Besides its excursions into politics, the Farm Bureau has backed a series of service companies which sell life, hail and auto insurance, fertilizer,

gas and oil, serum and insecticides in ever increasing volume.

The Farm Bureau's efforts in politics and business in recent years have somewhat overshadowed its traditional role as a pioneer in agricultural education.... Every county has local businessmen in the Farm Bureau. They join for social and strategic reasons. Some small town businessmen thus find themselves paying dues to support an organization which is competing with them. The net result however, is an organization which for power and evangelical fervor has become the most potent force in state politics (p. 1).

These activities resulted in rather harsh talk and criticism from the public, even though the Farm Bureau constantly maintained that it spent all public funds on educational work only, and that no public money is used in political and business activities.

In the same article, Cook accused the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation as being responsible for the defeat of Robert Blue in the Republican primary, and the election of druggist-farmer William Beardsley to the governorship. The federation never officially endorsed Beardsley but it lent its mailing list of members to "Representative Gus Kuester (Republican, Grimsword) who wrote a telling Beardsley-for-governor letter" (Cook, 1949, p. 5).

Cook also narrated how county legislative committees were made up of "politically potent" members who were of the same party as the area's legislators. He alleged that the federation specified that "at least one member of the committee be such a close friend of the legislator as to demand his

confidence and respect" (p. 51). These committee members were also to make sure they had their pictures taken with their legislators while in Des Moines for publication back home. The state federation also gave legislators a dinner early in each session in Des Moines, where the president of the Iowa federation gave the legislators the bureau's program. Cook listed the commercial companies associated with the state federation as the Iowa Farm Mutual Insurance Company, the Iowa Life Insurance Company, the Iowa Mutual Hail Insurance Company, the Iowa Plant Food Company, the Iowa Farm Serum Company, the Farm Bureau Building Corporation, and the Iowa Farm Services Company.

Beginning of legislative struggles in Iowa

Delegates to the National Farm Bureau convention in 1949 could not ignore the committee report entirely, and thus resolved that "the relationship of Extension to farm organizations should be left entirely to state determination" (Block, 1960, p. 126). This was to avoid congressional action forcing it on all states, since statutory sponsoring relationships had been dissolved in only two states in 1939, Nevada and Vermont.

By the end of 1948, Farmers Union leaders, seeking congressional aid for their separation objective, endeavored to assemble a detailed file of Farm Bureau-Extension irregularities, and to extend the unions alliances. According to Block (1960) the former goal was initiated by subscribing to all

news clippings that referred to these irregularities. In the search for new allies, the emphasis was upon alleged malpractices of the Farm Bureau-Extension relationships (p. 130).

The campaign was opened by James Patton, whose press release demanded that "the use of a public agency and public funds to build and maintain a private pressure group allegedly representing farmers" be discontinued (Press Release from National Farmers Union, February 20, 1949).

Meanwhile, there were efforts to secure a change in the basic legislation under which farm bureaus acted as sponsors of Extension work in Iowa. Representative Hicklin introduced a bill to prohibit county appropriations to farm aid associations in the 1947 session of the legislature. He defined the law as one which authorized a subsidy to organizations which actively competed with private business (Des Moines Register, February 13, 1947).

The house speaker assigned it to the Committee of County and Township Affairs, which soon recommended that it be indefinitely postponed. This enabled Representative Hicklin to move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Tax Revision, which repeated the recommendation of the first committee (Block, 1960, p. 137). The sponsor recognized that there was no chance of getting it to a vote, but took such action as to give it more widespread publicity.

The Farm Bureau responded in three ways. First, they tried to kill the bill through actions of the speaker and the committees. Secondly, they tried to punish the sponsor of the bill. In a letter from Hicklin to Block, Hicklin stated that two of the top officials of the Iowa Farm Bureau called on him, asking him if he intended to run for office again. They stated that if he intended to run they were prepared to spend \$10,000 to beat him (Block, 1960, p. 138). This was not a sufficient deterrent, and Hicklin was subsequently reelected. The third response was to adjust the organization of the County Extension Office by removing Farm Bureau responsibilities from the county agent. Each county was to hire an organization director, who would manage Farm Bureau membership drives, meetings, and dues payment (The Nation's Agriculture, May, 1947, p. 7). The change gave an appearance of separation, without impairing mutually beneficial relationships.

Two years later the Farm Bureau's attempt to increase the maximum legal authorization for county appropriations opened another way for separation efforts. The former was through a bill, the Weichman bill, which authorized increased appropriations of from \$4,000 to \$5,000 to county farm bureaus for educational work, with the money going into a separate fund from that used for other farm bureau purposes (Des Moines Register, January 25, 1949). This prepared the way for an amendment which proposed to bar county appropriations to any

organization which was engaged in or affiliated with any business enterprise. According to the Des Moines Register of February 3, 1949, the amendment did not specify the Farm Bureau by name, but recommended that:

No corporation or association shall be given any appropriation from the general fund of the county by the board of supervisors if the corporation or association is either directly or indirectly engaged in or promoting any retail, wholesale or manufacturing business, or any other type of business enterprise; or if said corporation or association through state and national affiliates engages in, endorses, promotes or sponsors the state or national enterprises in the retail, wholesale, manufacturing business, or any other type of business enterprise (p. 4).

It was followed in a few days by a separate bill to accomplish the same purpose.

These measures were introduced by a co-sponsor of the 1947 Hicklin bill. They commanded wider support than had been anticipated. In introducing them, Representative D. A. Donahue asserted that he was not opposed to the Farm Bureau as a farm organization, but that the entrance of a tax-supported association into cooperative business enterprises which competed with private business was unfair (Our Representative Speaks, February 9, 1949, p. 6). He was supported in this by a number of small town newspapers and the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association. The latter had been engaged in a controversy with a Farm Bureau cooperative over the distribution of hog cholera serum (Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall).

Against this threat, the Farm Bureau again rallied its forces with only partial success. The separation bill was withdrawn by its sponsors in order to prevent its being killed, but the amendment remained to focus publicity on the issue. According to Block (1960) he received a letter from Donahue dated August 7, 1958, in which he described how he received scores of letters from feed and fertilizer dealers, petroleum dealers, retail druggists and farmers from all over the state who objected to the county farm bureau's dual role as a recipient of tax funds and a competitor with private business (p. 139).

The result appeared to be a stalemate. The Weichman bill to increase appropriations to the Farm Bureau did not pass, but those who advocated cutting off public funds likewise failed. However, the volume of criticism forced the partners to the educational program into another reorganization. Some of this developed within the Farm Bureau itself. In early March, 1949, three directors of Benton County Farm Bureau publicly protested the proposed construction of a fertilizer plant in Des Moines by a Farm Bureau Cooperative. One of them, George Good, encouraged by "hundreds of letters" from farmers, sent a letter to every member of the 53rd Assembly, denouncing Farm Bureau's entrance into various businesses as leading to socialism (Block, 1960, p. 139). The increased discussion of Farm Bureau's proper role played a part in

preventing passage of the Weichman bill. As regards the reorganization, the Farm Bureau's board of directors and Extension officials worked out a division of offices, finances, and duties between Farm Bureau employees and Extension Service personnel. Specific proposals appeared in a joint statement sent to all farm bureaus by Director H. H. Kildee and Iowa Farm Bureau Federation President Howard Hill ("Joint Recommendations of Extension Service-Iowa State Farm Bureau Federation," Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall). The statement began by saying that it was

the feeling of both ... that if the pleasant and beneficial working relationship which we now have is to be continued permanently, it will be necessary to divide more clearly for Farm Bureau and Extension the following: office, finances, and duties of personnel.

As recommendations they were not compulsory, but had considerable weight of authority behind them. Although hailed by the Des Moines Register (April 17, 1949, p. 18) as a move toward separation, they were actually made in an effort to ward off criticism and preserve the more important aspects of the relationship, as implied in the opening statement quoted above.

Farm Bureau before national Congress

In 1949-50, Congressman Granger of Utah, introduced bills to divorce Extension from Farm Bureau. The Granger bill proposed to enact the True-Howard Agreement and to forbid

payment of federal grants-in-aid to states where either law or informal agreement:

- (1) establishes, requires, or permits a farm bureau, county farm aid association, or other organization or association as an official cooperating or sponsoring agency for the Extension Service;
- (2) requires the organization of farmers as a prerequisite to the conduct of cooperative agricultural work in any county or locality; or
- (3) provides for furnishing to, or accepting from, any private organization or association any housing, publicity, telephone, clerical, or other services in connection with cooperative agricultural extension work (Hardin, 1952, p. 43).

The pro-separation group finally realized an intermediate goal in its campaign when Chairman Cooley of the House Committee on Agriculture called for hearings to begin May 16. Thus in May and July, 1950, the first congressional hearings in history which centered upon the Extension-Farm Bureau relationship were held.

The claim of the American Farm Bureau Federation to be the voice of American farmers was disputed by charging that it did not represent them. It was stated that membership rolls were often filled by business and professional people, and by payments of dues for tenants and share-croppers by landlords. The frequent claim of Farm Bureau's nonpartisanship, which made their partnership with Extension appropriate, was also disputed. Two witnesses maintained that timing of Farm Bureau meetings and use of its membership lists aided Republican candidates in Iowa and Minnesota in 1948. Another witness

cited a Des Moines Register article which stated that someone in the state Farm Bureau had turned its membership lists over to a candidate for governor in the Republican primary of 1948.

A number of reasons were advanced to abolish sponsoring arrangements of Extension-Farm Bureau relations. Among them were:

1. Criticism of close Farm Bureau-Extension relationships in one state adversely affected the Extension Service in neighboring states.
2. Farmers living in states which organized a sponsoring organization for Extension work were denied freedom of choice in determining which of the farm organizations to join. The sponsoring organizations generally offered better choice because of access to Extension aids and services.
3. Violations of the True-Howard agreement and Department of Agriculture regulations by County agents; charging that they spent considerable time to recruit members for Farm Bureaus and misused the franking privilege.
4. Unfair business competition; a charge which came primarily from spokesmen of insurance agencies and livestock dealers.

Witnesses justified their presence before a congressional committee by admitting their lack of success and futility of appealing to both state and national administrators of the

Extension Service. Refusal of state legislators to follow the advice of the joint committee report was cited as a further reason for seeking congressional action. They also explained that opposition to separation led by Farm Bureaus was too well-organized in some of the states for them to accomplish their goal; hence, their request for congressional action.

Two provisions of the Granger bill were not too well-taken by some members of the pro-separation group who were more closely identified with the educational goals of the Extension Service. They were concerned that some of its specific provisions may harm the effectiveness of Extension teaching methods. They objected to the requirement of state matching of Extension appropriations, and that it was a change from the acts supplementary to the Smith-Lever Act, some of which required no state matching and some of which required only partial matching. It was said that complete matching would create unanticipated burdens in some predominantly rural states which received more than half of their extension funds from the federal government.

As regards the prohibition of any sponsoring or cooperative organization for Extension, the spokesman for the land-grant college body said this would prevent Extension workers from using very effective channels of communication. Further, it would bar them from working with specialized associations such as dairy herd improvement associations and parent-teacher

associations which often provided valuable services for farmers.

The hearings were recessed and a revised bill, H. R. 8676 drafted to replace H. R. 3222. The new bill dropped the matching requirement by state funds. It permitted private funds to be donated to Extension through the land-grant colleges. Terms of the donation could not restrict benefits to the donor. Permission for private sponsorship of Extension was specifically granted. The possibility of Farm Bureau monopoly was removed by specifying that such an organization, if required by state law, must not affiliate state wide or nationally, and must keep membership open to all. It exempted non-profit public or service organizations (specified as 4-H clubs, home demonstration clubs, breeding associations and cow-testing associations) from the farm organizations for which Extension employees could not solicit membership, aid in business, or give publicity.

The final hearing on the reissued bill was held July 28, 1950, with only a few witnesses. Representative Hoover of Iowa defended the arrangement in his state as being satisfactory to the people or else they would have been changed. After hearings the executive session voted 18 to 8 in favor of a motion by Representative Thomas Abernathy of Mississippi to postpone reporting the bill indefinitely, effectively killing

the bill and, therefore, a temporary victory for the anti-separation group.

These efforts to separate farm bureaus from the state Extension Services by act of Congress was only one method of achieving the goal. The Smith-Lever Act had not specified the organization of local sponsoring agencies, so they had been established under the laws of the various states. The law in Iowa which was passed a year before the Smith-Lever Act merely required an organization of farmers as a precondition to the receipt of Extension aid. Farm bureaus in Iowa, therefore, took advantage and established one of the most efficient and closest sponsoring arrangements in the nation.

Intervention by Department of Agriculture

A reappraisal of their congressional defeat by members of the Farmers Union staff led to the conclusion that a great deal more support outside the farm organization was a prerequisite to success. The "Friends of Extension" approach seemed to offer the greatest hope, so Benton Stong suggested such an organization to interested persons in Kansas, Iowa, and Minnesota. Success attended only the Kansas arrangement (Block, 1960, p. 190).

Late in August, 1954, Herschel Newsom of the Grange, then a member of the 10 man study committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture of the Commission of Intergovernmental Relations, wrote to Secretary Benson, calling attention to approaching

state and national Grange conventions and their interest in Extension's new responsibilities. This time he asked the secretary to state the department's policy relative to contributions of private organizations, including Farm Bureau, to county and state units of the Extension Service (Letter from Herschel D. Newsom to Secretary Ezra T. Benson, August 25, 1954. Copy in Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall, Ames).

With no satisfactory answer, he wrote Benson again on November 5, calling to his attention the development of County Farm Aid Associations as substitutes for farm bureaus in sponsoring Extension work in Iowa. Newsom referred to complaints of non-farm bureau members being denied aid by county agents. The latter, it was asserted, justified this because of Farm Bureau contributions to their salaries and expenses. Newsom said that he had hoped that separation would come about in all states "without any compulsion from the federal level, but a great many of our people are getting pretty tired of waiting" (Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall).

On November 24, 1954 "memorandum No. 1368" was issued at a Press Conference by Secretary Benson, going beyond the Wallace regulations and established, by authority of the Secretary, new regulations governing all employees of the Department of Agriculture. "Memorandum No. 1368" specified that no employee of the Department of Agriculture should:

1. Accept the use of free office space or contributions for salary or traveling expense from any general or specialized organization of farmers.
2. Advocate that any particular general or specialized organization of farmers is better adopted for carrying out the work of this Department than any individual citizen, group of citizens, or organization.
3. Advocate that the responsibilities of any agency of this Department of any other Federal agency should be carried out through any particular general or specialized organization of farmers.
4. Advocate or recommend that any state or local agency should carry out its responsibilities through any particular general or specialized organization of farmers.
5. Approve contracts for the Department with any cooperative or other commercial organization whenever such cooperative or other commercial organization deducts or "checks off" from payments due farmers, membership dues of such farmers to any general or specialized organization of farmers, except as it is determined that current authorization for such deduction has been knowingly filed by such individual farmers with the cooperative or other commercial organization.
6. Shall directly or indirectly solicit membership in any general or specialized organization of farmers as defined herein (Memorandum No. 1368, November 24, 1954).

The term "general or specialized organization of farmers" was defined to include national, regional, or state organizations such as the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers Union, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Bread and Commodity Organizations, and their regional, state or local constituent groups.

The prohibition of acceptance of office space or contributions to salary or expenses had been sought in the Granger bill. It struck directly at the two largest Farm Bureau states, Illinois and Iowa, which were the major remaining states where farm bureaus contributed substantial financial and organizational support to the Extension Service.

The public reception of "memorandum No 1368" by Farm Bureau leaders was not the bitter resistance which might have been anticipated, judging from the past attitude of officials of that organization. Iowa Farm Bureau President Howard Hill said that he had requested that the order not be issued, but took a conciliatory position (Letter from E. Howard Hill to County Farm Bureau Presidents, November 29, 1954, copy from Extension Permanent Files in Curtis Hall).

The issuance of "memorandum No. 1368" did not seek to automatically separate the Farm Bureaus from their sponsoring arrangements with the state Extension Services. Rather it was intended to induce separation in the states by prohibiting any departmental employee from accepting a salary or special assistance from any general farm organization. If county agents were forbidden to accept such aid, sponsoring arrangements might have to be discontinued or the Extension program halted.

A considerable number of questions concerning "memorandum No. 1368" applications flowed into the department, and the

solicitor's office had to issue a number of clarifying statements. In early January 1955, the Department asserted that existing statutes were the legal basis for "memorandum No. 1368" which clearly applied to county agents. This was done by a question-and-answer sheet, which explained that the Benson order had ample precedent in the Wickard order of 1941 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, "Questions and Answers Relative to Secretary's Memorandum No. 1368," January 5, 1955, Mimeographed).

Others who challenged the Secretary of Agriculture's authority over county agents were defeated by reference to United States Code, 22, which indicated that if they were either "officers" or "clerks" of the department, the secretary was authorized "to prescribe regulations" for their conduct. Although neither the Smith-Lever Act nor its 1953 amendment specified that Extension employees were employees of the Department of Agriculture, the agreements between the department and the state colleges specified that their mutual program should be carried out by joint employees. In addition, the formal appointment of Extension employees by the Federal Extension administrator partly justified their inclusion as federal employees.

Extension Service employees in the states also enjoyed at least three privileges as federal employees. They were: 1) the use of the penalty mailing privilege (United States

Statutes at Large, Vol 38, 1914), 2) disability and death coverage under the United States Employees Compensation Act and, 3) refinement under Civil Service regulations (Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall).

Final legislation in Iowa

During the legislative sessions of 1955, separation was accomplished by statutory means in three states, Iowa, New York, and Missouri. In Iowa, the development of a farm aid association in Adams County in 1954 did show that county farm bureaus in Iowa might become less interested in using a substantial part of their dues for the support of Extension (Des Moines Register, October 1, 1954). Iowa's basic Extension Law authorized a farm aid association in each county for the purpose of cooperating in a program of rural education. The statute permitted each association to determine the name it should use. In Adams County, the farm aid association replaced the county farm bureau as an Extension sponsor because the latter did not provide enough financial support.

Since the late 1940s, there had been unorganized support for a divorce between the Farm Bureaus and Extension in Iowa. Aside from the small business interests which had supported the Hicklin and Donahue bills, this group was made up of a few county agents, farm editors and Farm Bureau members who opposed policies of the national federation. Following the

issuance of the Benson order, this previously ineffective aggregation was strengthened when officials of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation joined it. Although the latter had opposed the issuance of the Benson order, they reluctantly accepted it as soon as it was promulgated. In fact, in a letter to County Farm Bureau Presidents on November 29, 1954, President E. Howard Hill, stated that, "We had advance information of the probability of such a statement and requested that it not be made" (Extension Permanent files, Curtiss Hall).

Once they had acknowledged the inevitability of separation, Farm Bureau leaders were determined to guide and control the process by which it was to take place. In President Hill's letter referred to above, he also stated that voting delegates to the annual convention had authorized the board of directors to take any action deemed necessary. He also indicated that the preparation of the separation bill was to be the joint effort of county and state Farm Bureau representatives and Iowa Extension officials. President Hill met with county presidents and Iowa State College officials early in December, 1954. Later, a special meeting of county presidents and members of the House of Delegates (one representative from each county) was called in Des Moines. At Des Moines, local spokesmen for the farm bureaus agreed to "go along" with separation (Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman, December 11, 1954, January 15, 1955, and January 22, 1955). When the separation

bill was introduced, a press release by Iowa College in January 1955, announced full support by the State Farm Bureau Federation and college officials of the principles expressed in the bill (Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall).

Once the bill to create a new system of local Extension support was introduced, the Farm Bureau faced three problems. The first two emerged from the Senate, which passed the separation bill with two amendments. One required the local Extension office to be in a separate building from the county farm bureau offices. At this time, the Extension office was in the Farm Bureau building, or shared rented quarters with the Farm Bureau in 78 counties. Nineteen county Extension offices were in a federally owned or rented building and three were in courthouses (Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall). The other amendment made a concession to urban taxpayers by amending the original requirement that the township representatives on the Extension council be farm owners or operators. It provided that each council should include three town or city residents, to be selected by the other council members (Des Moines Register, February 22, 1955). The Farm Bureau immediately mobilized its membership to oppose these amendments. The prohibition against occupancy of the same building was defeated by the house, and its wishes were accepted by the conference committee and both houses. On the other issue, the Farm Bureau did not fare as well. A house

amendment to permit any resident eligible voter to be a candidate for the Extension councils was supported by urban assemblymen, who rejected the senate concession (Des Moines Register, April 11, 1955). Although the Farm Bureau opposed this amendment vigorously, it survived, and was enacted into law as the only defeat suffered by the farm organization in its effort to determine the structure and rules which would control the new county Extension unit. In fact, President Hill wrote all house members, asking that only farm owners or operators be eligible for the township posts in the Extension council. He did not oppose the inclusion of three urban representatives (Letter, April 15, 1955, Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall). Also, more persuasive pressure came from a Des Moines representative who threatened to seek exemption of city property from taxation for Extension purposes if urban residents were barred from the councils.

The other problem, although it never achieved a critical status, was a potential threat to undercut the Farm Bureau leadership and to challenge Secretary Benson's willingness and authority to enforce "memorandum No. 1368." A sole representative of this viewpoint in the legislature was Representative Raymond Pim, a county Farm Bureau president. Like Governor Hugh at the time, Pim was a Republican and a resident of Lucas county. He persuaded the governor to call on Secretary Benson and seek a modification of the memorandum.

Meanwhile, late in the session, he was able to secure a week's deferral of any action on the pending separation bill. The governor did not get to see the secretary, and was unable to get a specific statement from Undersecretary True Morse as to the department's action in the event no divorce took place. Morse would only say that such might "jeopardize" federal grants to Iowa (Des Moines Tribune, April 14, 1955). Although Pim continued to insist that he doubted that the Federal Extension Service would withhold funds if Iowa did not require separation, most of the legislators heeded the advice of the governor and the Farm Bureau's chief lobbyist, Harry Storey. Pim wanted the "close alliance" continued. He doubted that federal aid would be withdrawn (Des Moines Register, April 20, 1955). Finally, Storey and the governor warned that failure to pass the bill would jeopardize the Extension in Iowa.

Consequently, the house passed its version, and both houses approved the conference committee bill unanimously. The new law repealed the 1913 state farm aid law, under which county farm bureaus had sponsored Extension work since 1918. A statutory change was not essential to separation, since under the old law county farm bureaus could have withdrawn from their agreement with the Extension Service, and the latter could have made new agreements with other local sponsors. To secure state-wide uniformity and to protect the

Farm Bureau from a relatively unregulated and possibly competitive farm organization, the new law was desirable.

The 1955 act formally separated the Extension Service from any private organization by establishing a public Extension district in each county, with its governing body popularly elected on a township basis, and local financing assured by the requirement of a property tax levy. The limitations on the Extension Council prohibited it or its representative from engaging in commercial or legislative activities, from giving preferred services, or from collecting or paying dues to any state or national organizations.

The County Agricultural Extension Councils

The Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, essentially made up of its county units finally had to give in rather reluctantly to the Benson Order. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation hinted that if any change in the existing federal state relationship was to be made, sources to provide the over \$400,000 contributed by the Farm Bureau to extension services annually in Iowa would have to be replaced. He indicated that extension educational programs had been available to all citizens of Iowa "without reference to membership in or affiliation with any organization." With reference to the Extension-Farm Bureau ties he said:

We believe that this relationship is workable and is in the public interest. Further study will be necessary to determine whether changes must be made in current practices (Russell, 1954, p. 6).

Russell, in the same article in the Des Moines Register, reported a statement from Iowa State College concerning the Benson order. The statement said:

For more than 35 years county Farm Bureaus have taken the leadership in extension education. The cooperative relationship which has existed between the college and county Farm Bureaus has resulted in a forward-looking instructive program for Iowa farm people. The Farm Bureau organization and especially the leadership in Iowa have always been strong supporters of research and education There will be problems ahead in any change but the splendid background of cooperation between the Farm Bureau and the college in the past makes it certain that any fundamental changes found necessary in the future can be worked out (p. 6).

One may be surprised at the statement of the college, a member of the land-grant colleges association, which had recommended and supported separation for some time. Iowa State College was also a direct victim of the Farm Bureau: incursion into academic freedom in the oleo-butter incidence referred to earlier on. However, one can understand the College's desperate position when it was not sure of the next source of funds to replace Farm Bureau appropriations.

In a similar reluctant mood, Allan B. Kline of Vinton, Iowa, who was also at the time the President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, described the Benson order as "obviously in accord with good public policy." He added that he believed the directive "would have a dramatic effect in

Illinois and Iowa if socked (quickly) into effect." However, he expressed considerable faith in the good judgment of the Secretary by stating that he believed Benson intended to implement the new policy "in such a way that nobody is injured seriously" (The Des Moines Register, November 27, 1954, p. 4).

The acceptance of the Benson order was no more the question, but specifically how it was to be implemented in Iowa. The Des Moines Register's Farm Editor, reported on November 28, 1954, that a study of ways to handle the educational program in the counties in light of the divorce order was in progress in Iowa. He stated that it seemed probable that the Kansas plan of a county extension council would be given due attention.

Foundations of the Iowa Councils

The Kansas plan had an elected council comprised of three members from each township, and with a county executive council to work with the state college in formulating local extension programs.

The Des Moines Register again reported in its January 25, 1955, issue that a bill was being prepared for introduction into the Iowa legislature to amend the state law regarding the setting up of county farm aid associations so as to comply with the Benson order and to replace the money contributed by Farm Bureau members to extension with public funds. Farm Bureau dues for extension work was estimated at \$375,000 in

round figures. In addition to solving the financial problem, the article further suggested that legislation would have to provide for a new method of local planning and guidance for Extension work. Specifically, it suggested a "county Extension board or council, elected by vote of the people." It also indicated that the county boards or councils "should be made up predominantly of farm people" and cautioning further that "it would be advisable for some city and town people to serve on them also" (Des Moines Register, January 23, 1955, p. 8).

In May, 1955, the Iowa Senate passed, 44 to 3, the extension divorce bill introduced by the Senate agricultural committee, and was thus on its way to the house. The bill would make counties raise enough taxes to finance county agricultural extension work without contribution from the Farm Bureau. The bill would cause counties to levy taxes to raise a maximum of \$2 million a year to replace both original county tax funds and Farm Bureau dues. The bill also sought to create 100 county agricultural extension districts (each County being a district and two in Pottawattamie County). Each district was also to elect by townships a county agricultural extension council to take over the direction and finances regarding extension work, in cooperation with the federal department and the college.

The 56th General Assembly of Iowa passed the new extension act, the "County Agricultural Extension Law." This legislation created county extension districts and transferred responsibility for conducting the extension program within the county to elected county agricultural extension councils. Subsequent general assemblies have amended certain provisions of the 1955 law. Many policies and working relationships have been established in keeping with national and state legislation. The present status of the councils will be examined next.

Present Organization and Functioning of County Agricultural Extension Councils

The present organizational pattern of the Extension Councils is quite unique to the situation in Iowa. The description of this pattern has been taken from an updated publication prepared for County Extension Councils by Director Robert L. Crom (1984) entitled "Background of ... Cooperative Extension Work in Iowa and Provisions of the County Agricultural Extension Law."

In accordance with the County Agricultural Extension Districts Law, County Agricultural Extension Districts, each a body corporate, were established. Each county is a district; Pottawattamie County is divided into two districts. A County Agricultural Extension Council is provided for in each

district. The council is composed of one elected resident member from each township in the district.

This locally elected group is assigned responsibility for planning, guiding, and directing local programs according to the needs of the people in the county and in cooperation with Iowa State University.

The members of the council shall be qualified by being resident qualified voters of the township. The resident qualified voters in each of the townships of a district meet annually during the period November 1 to December 31, upon a date and at a time and place determined and fixed by the extension council of the several districts for the election of the members of the council for a term of two years. Their term of office commences January 1, following the date of their election. They meet in the county extension office as regularly as deemed necessary.

The council is empowered to elect from their number a chairman, vice chairman, secretary and a treasurer who serve as officers of the council for a term expiring December 31, each year. These officers are responsible for conducting township election meetings for the election of new members. The councils enter into a memorandum of understanding with the extension service setting forth the cooperative relationship between the Extension service and the Extension district. Under such agreements the councils employ all necessary

Extension personnel from qualified nominees furnished to it and recommended by the Director of Extension. Termination of the employment of any Extension staff is also done by conferring with the Director of Extension. Compensations for the Extension staff are also fixed by the council in cooperation with the Extension service and in accordance with the memorandum of understanding entered into.

The council prepares the budget annually, on or before January 31, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, and ending the following June 30, and certify it to the board of supervisors of the county of their Extension district. A very significant part of their job is to prepare and adopt an educational program on Extension work in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H club work, reviewing such a program periodically, implementing it in cooperation with the Extension service in accordance with the memorandum of understanding with Extension service. The council, therefore, adopts any rules not inconsistent with the law as it may deem necessary for its own government and the transaction of the business of the Extension district. It receives and deposits all funds from the county agricultural Extension education fund in a bank in the name of the Extension district, which is disbursed by the treasurer of the Extension council on vouchers signed by its chairman and secretary, and approved by the Extension council. It expends the "county agricultural

Extension education fund" for salaries and travel, expense of personnel, rental, office supplies, equipment, communications, office facilities and services, and in payment of such other items as shall be necessary to carry out the Extension district program. Full details of reports under oath of all receipts, from whatever source derived, and expenditures of the county agricultural Extension education fund showing from whom received, to whom paid and for what purpose for the last fiscal year have to be filed with the county auditor and published in two newspapers of general circulation in the district before August 1.

The sole purpose of the Extension council is to supervise the dissemination of information, the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations on subjects relating to agriculture, home economics, rural and community life, and the encouragement of the application of the same to and by all persons in the extension district, and imparting to such persons of information on said subjects through field demonstrations and publication. As a limitation on their activities, the council is not to engage in commercial or other private enterprises, legislative programs, nor attempt in any manner by the adoption of resolutions or otherwise to influence legislation, either state or national. The council's services are for all persons of the district without discrimination. It can help any organized farm group in

whatever capacity possible, but shall not be directly involved in organizing the group.

The council is to meet in January each year to estimate the amount of funds required to be raised by taxation for financing the county agricultural extension education program. Such annual tax levy shall not exceed a certain minimum depending on the population of the district. Finally, the council is expected to cooperate with the extension service and United States Department of Agriculture in the accomplishment of the county agricultural extension education program contemplated, to the end that the federal funds allocated to the extension service and the county agricultural extension education fund of each district may be more efficiently used.

The council members are to cooperate in all these efforts without compensation.

Summary

The conclusion of this chapter draws attention to most of the questions raised as objectives of this study. First, the idea of an organization of farmers through which extension could effectively reach its clientele has been with extension officials since the days of Seaman Knapp. The demonstration movement was the seed, which grew on fertile grounds pointing out concretely how beneficial farmer organization and initiative is to agricultural improvement. In Iowa, Holden's

effort with demonstrations were second to none in their practical evidence.

Other farmer organizations like the Grange, the Farmers Union, and others could certainly not sustain their position with extension because of secrecy, business interests and political orientations. The farm aid association law drew the Farm Bureau in Iowa into direct relationship with Extension Service of Iowa.

Farm Bureaus were specifically intended to aid extension in its educational program with farmers. It did work in that capacity, but its other activities like expanding into business and influencing legislation were unacceptable. However, the experience of farm organizations' ties with extension were very valuable learning situations, pointing specifically to the need for the organization of local people to sponsor and promote extension's educational efforts. These lessons combined with other forces led to the need to separate extension from farm bureaus, and instead organize in another direction to retain the basic elements of Extension-Farmer Organization ties.

The commercial and business interests or undertakings of farm bureaus brought them into direct competition with private businessmen. That competition was seen as unfair since the bureaus were regarded as quasi-public institutions, supported by or at least receiving tax money. Extension employees were

alleged to be primarily dominated by farm bureaus, and that the employees felt obligated to give preferential treatment to bureau members, since their jobs and salaries were largely controlled by the bureau. Not only favoritism, but a great deal of the agent's time was spent on farm bureau affairs; membership campaigns, bookkeeping, editorial duties and the like. This created conflict between the Farm Bureau on the one hand and other farm organizations, private business, and the ordinary farmer. The Iowa State University was being challenged in various ways by farm bureaus. Academic freedom and its functions in extension service were threatened by Farm Bureau policies and wishes.

On the political scene, the Farm Bureau built up a great hatred for itself. It did not only lobby for legislation that would spread its domination over various agencies, it promoted or sponsored candidates covertly or overtly. It threatened to unseat other incumbents. The media did not spare a moment to educate the public on Farm Bureau's activities in every sphere of life. This paved the way for separation and then the emergence of a new kind of county organization to sponsor, promote and conduct extension's educational programs in the counties, the County Agricultural Extension Councils.

The Councils were created through an act of legislation, complying with the Secretary of Agriculture's order on dissociating extension from private organization. Their

unique pattern was worked out of the Iowa experience, coupled with examples of other states who had earlier separated Farm Bureau from the Extension Service.

However, the development of the Farm Bureau in very clear terms built a class association. It gradually built economic power, thus dominating politically every issue in the public and private sector. Farm Bureau members were found everywhere, in Congress, in state legislature, the Senate, both state and national, and even in the Department of Agriculture and the Universities to defend its interests. Alliances were very visible and inter-class struggle to gain control over extension continued, but always Farm Bureau emerged victorious. The final separation was not so much a defeat of Farm Bureau as a farm organization, but victory for opposing classes to the private business that initiated, created and financed Farm Bureau activities.

Categories and properties

The separation controversy, leading to the formation of the extension councils constitute the final unit of analysis from which categories and properties will be sampled. These categories and properties together with earlier ones sampled in the other chapters will constitute the elements of the theory to be generated.

The first category here is designated contradictions. This embraces all elements or processes that by nature,

constitute obstacles in the stabilization and further growth of the extension-Farm Bureau relations. The very nature of these contradictions will constitute the properties of this category.

The first property is the competitive spirit between the Farm Bureau and other farm organizations. There was a great deal of competition for members. There was the issue of attention of extension personnel, who were in fact more allied to Farm Bureau than the other farm organizations. These two aspects of this competition helped to unite the forces of all other farm organizations against the Farm Bureau.

The second property of the contradictions is derived from the alleged ambitions of the Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureau was accused of dominating and monopolizing extension services, and venturing into business, politics, and academic matters. In the business sector, these accusations were the basis on which an allied force of private business associations emerged and grew very critical of the Farm Bureau's usurping role. The insurance agencies, the pharmaceuticals, the feed and fertilizer houses, the gasoline interests, all mounted a strong campaign against the alleged expanding monopolistic tendencies of the Farm Bureau. Also, within the bureau itself there was a growing opposition to its business interests as exemplified by the Des Moines Fertilizer plant incident.

The bureau's alleged intentions to dominate legislation brought a bitter situation. The bureau was accused of lobbying in Congress, funding candidates, threatening to dislodge others, and endorsing others. In fact, it was alleged that by various other covert means the Farm Bureau succeeded in getting direct representation in legislature. The Farm Bureau was accused of using its special dinners to bribe legislators. In the academics, it was accused of trying to orientate research in its favor and to deny the universities of academic freedom.

These accusations, if correct, were not only contradicting the basic purpose for which Extension-Farm Bureau ties were encouraged from the beginning, but actually united forces against it.

The second category will be called the disintegration. As noted from events narrated, there was a final separation. This category points to the separation of Extension from Farm Bureau influence. There was a physical as well as bureaucratic break in all linkages between Extension and Farm Bureau. There is not much to talk about this category, and no further properties can be drawn as such. But it is important to note that this category is linked to the final category, which is designated "birth of a new order." The rupture referred to above did not lead to a total collapse of social organization. It necessitated another kind of process to seek

new paths to further enhance extension education. It gave rise to a new form of organization, based on new concepts which incorporated positive aspects of the old order, grounded in dynamic principles. These principles involve widening the base of democratic participation, eliminating coerciveness and possessiveness, and equalizing opportunities for all to be served or to serve the community. The structure is what is now called the County Extension Councils.

From these categories and properties a few conjectures will also be postulated.

Conjectures

1. If an organization is publicly supported, then it must be publicly accessible. Any departure from this guideline could result in destructive consequences.
2. If an organization designed specifically to support education expands into other pursuits, then it will lead to serious contradictions in functions.
3. If contradictions are adequately and clearly identified, then the chances of resolving them and working out new directions for progress are increased.
4. If a public organization, supported especially by public funds for purposes of providing educational services and claiming the status of a non-profit organization, ventures into private business, then disruptive consequences will

evolve in the functioning of the organization. Some of such disruptive consequences would include:

- i. The stated primary objective of the organization will be subjected to critical scrutiny by the clientele or the public.
 - ii. Distrust of officials of the organization and a search for the hidden agenda of the organization will preoccupy the clientele at the expense of the growth and progress of the organization to provide necessary services.
 - iii. The question of accountability will take on a broader scope, requiring either reorganization to cope with the expanded nature of the organization, or a total collapse of the organization.
 - iv. Competition with the private sector will consume the primary objective of the public organization and its services will be easily side-stepped and even completely forgotten to the total detriment of the whole community.
 - v. Finally, allegiances will develop within the organization, resulting in divisions in the organization according to who is gaining or not gaining from the new concerns.
5. If an organization, during its growth and development embraces other objectives, whose attainment introduces

conflict into the practical implementation and achievement of initial objectives, then an evaluation of the organization becomes necessary. Such an evaluation will further enhance the chances of continued growth and structural changes that will ensure stability and avoid deviations. The chances of such a reexamination are greater with public organizations serving the interest of the public, supported financially by the public, with a legal backing. Such a conscious evaluation of the organization could have a number of positive results:

- i. Deviations will be identified and dealt with accordingly.
- ii. Structural changes will be effected to guard against future malfunctions.
- iii. Legal authority will be broadened to sustain the primary objective of the organization.
- iv. A process involving the principle of self-correction will be set into progress. This principle will ensure effective action against future deviations, and, also inject dynamism into the functioning of the organization. This dynamism is the essential ingredient for evolution in social action.

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

It is the intent of this chapter to trace the pathways allowing critical insights into the general forces leading to and helping in the creation of county councils in Iowa. The councils' contributions to the growth and enhancement of extension education will also be made clear. Thus, the lessons that can be learned from this unique example will be the subject of this chapter. It will be concluded with a discussion of further inquiry needed on this subject and related areas.

Summary and Conclusions

County Agricultural Extension Councils in Iowa are the sponsoring organizations of extension work at the county level. They were created in 1955 by Iowa legislature to replace County Farm Bureaus in the discharge of this sponsoring function.

However, these councils emerged through a long process of social movements. The roots of the idea, therefore, are buried in a mass of historical events. This study, therefore, had two broad objectives which it hoped to achieve by a historical analysis of the development of the County Extension Councils. These objectives are:

1. To trace as far back as possible into events and processes which gave birth to the idea of county extension councils,

nourished it and finally culminated in the actual creation of these councils. It was hoped that this analysis would illuminate a certain pattern that would identify concrete lessons useful for developing extension services, especially in relation to adopting the method of county councils in countries other than the U.S.

2. Finally, by the use of Grounded Theory methods the study explored the possibility of evolving a theoretical statement which will contribute to the area of theory development in Adult and Extension Education.

This section will, therefore, dwell on some possible answers to the questions raised in the "objectives of the study." The questions are:

1. How did the idea of the County Agricultural Extension Council evolve and become related to other segments of the Cooperative Extension Service?
2. What institutional and legislative forces and indigenous organizations contributed to the evolvement of the County Extension Councils?
3. How have the County Extension Councils contributed to the delivery system and functioning of Extension?
4. What is the present organization, structure and functioning of County Extension Councils?

5. What further modifications, if any, can be suggested for the organization and improvement of the County Agricultural Extension Councils?
6. What can be learned as guidelines in developing and improving extension services in Ghana?

Evolution and growth of county extension council idea

The whole idea of County Agricultural Extension Councils is concerned with getting the audience of extension actively involved in extension activities. This principle was realized by rural people even earlier than organized extension work as it is known today.

The origin of the organization to diffuse useful information among the people regarding agricultural production is traced back, in the United States of America, to the early farm organizations. The first and most frequently referred to is the Philadelphia Agricultural Society of 1775. These societies spread, and in Iowa, various forms evolved as narrated in Chapters II and III. County fairs, Farmers Institutes, Corn Trains and formal organizations like the Grange, the Farmers Union and a whole host of others are only a pointer to the great need for farmer's active involvement and control of an institution that would serve their basic interests.

The study revealed that after a long period of experimentation by farmers to organize themselves for agricultural

education, the demonstration movement was eventually discovered. In these demonstration movements, a clear pattern of organizational structure and functioning was laid out to ensure effective farmer involvement and control of their destiny - the achievement of educational growth. This philosophical foundation involved the following principles.

1. Useful and practical information on subjects relating to Agriculture must be disseminated to all farmers.
2. The dissemination of such information can best be conducted through local groups and organizations of farmers.
3. The local group should be responsible for planning, guiding and directing the educational program according to their needs in cooperation with any governmental agency properly equipped to aid the farmers.
4. The farmers concerned must be ready to bear some of the expenses involved in this educational pursuit.
5. Local initiative must be the backbone of the whole business, with appropriate county, state, and federal support.

The first county wide farm demonstration in Iowa was established in Sioux County in 1903.

Meanwhile three major congressional acts had laid down a concrete framework within which the necessary county, state, and federal support could be obtained to aid farmers'

education. The first was the 1862 act authorizing a Department of Agriculture, with a major emphasis upon farmer education. Its first specific objective was "to acquire and diffuse among the peoples of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of the word" (U.S. Statutes, 387, 1862).

The same year the first Morrill Act granted land from the public domain to the states, for the purpose of establishing in each a college "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts ... without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics" (U.S. Statutes, 503, 1862). The colleges which were established in accordance with this act were known as land-grant colleges, a name which they still carry in their national association.

The interest of the colleges in a program of farmer education aside from their on-campus teaching, was aided by the Hatch Act of 1887, which provided aid from the national government for the establishment and maintenance of experiment stations at each college for the purposes of carrying out agricultural research. It thus established a precedent for the Extension organization which was created almost three decades later.

Thus in Iowa, the Iowa State University was authorized to undertake and maintain a system of Agricultural extension work by the first Extension Act passed by the Iowa Legislature, April 10, 1906. This furthered the cause of county demonstration work, and additional funds became available for the work.

The demonstration movement in Iowa thus continued to grow as fast as funds would permit. It required a full-time agricultural trained personnel, and in the initial stages "required about four months of a college person's time in each county" (Crom, 1984, p. 1).

As a direct consequence, in 1912, full-time county extension or county agent work began developing and grew steadily. In the same year the Chamber of Commerce in New York, initiated the formation of a bureau to organize farmers for educational purposes. This organization spread into Iowa, and was being actively patronized in Iowa counties. Other farm associations were also being organized to aid in farmer education.

In 1913, the Iowa Legislature passed the Farm Aid Association Act. This law authorized county boards of supervisors to appropriate money to "farm aid associations" for county extension work. In 1914, the federal Smith-Lever Act was passed by Congress, creating the Cooperative Extension Service. Certain federal funds were appropriated provided that each state would match certain portions of such funds.

Each state also had the responsibility of developing a plan of cooperation among the United States Department of Agriculture, the state, and the people in the counties. In Iowa, therefore, a unique pattern was developed involving the Department of Agriculture, the Iowa State University, the County government and the local people.

By 1918, each Iowa county had a county cooperative extension agent supported by county, state, federal and farm organization funds working on agricultural education problems. To meet the requirements of the Farm Aid Law, each county was required to have a local organization that would be responsible for the local financing and for assistance in the planning and supervision of county extension work. The County Farm Bureaus met these requirements and were the sponsors of educational work in the field from 1918 until May 12, 1955 when the County Agricultural Extension Law became effective.

The need for the separation of the Farm Bureaus from extension was necessitated by various allegations against the Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureaus were accused of neglecting their educational obligations to extension, and instead becoming a front for big business; venturing into commercial enterprises; indulging excessively into politics and various lobbying activities at the national level; monopolizing the services of extension to the exclusion of other farmers and farm organizations; interfering with academic freedom on

college campuses; and dominating county agents, thereby engaging them in the business and management of Farm Bureaus with very little time left for extension educational work with farmers. Despite various precautions taken by the Department of Agriculture in the form of regulations to guide the Extension-Farm Bureau ties, these abuses nevertheless went on. Finally in 1954, Secretary of Agriculture Benson issued an order separating Farm Bureaus from Extension.

In response to Benson's order, the 56th General Assembly of Iowa, in 1955, repealed the Farm Aid Law, and in its place the County Agricultural Extension Law was enacted. This law, bearing in mind the basic principles which were established during the demonstration era and on which extension work in Iowa was built over a long period of years, established County Agricultural Extension Districts and provided for the organization of an extension council in each district. These councils were composed of elected members from each township within the district, to cooperate with the Iowa State University and United States Department of Agriculture in conducting educational programs in agriculture, home economics, 4-H club work in the counties of the state.

Thus, the councils grew out of various forces in Iowa communities working together over a period of years. Farmers initiative, indigenous farmers organizations, the Congress, and state legislature together with the University and its

experiment stations laid concrete foundations and followed a well-defined path to arrive at these councils. It is not a theory postulated by a genius of extension organization, but it is a practical evolution of organizational work among the people of Iowa.

The Councils thus replaced Farm Bureau, to perform the basic role that the Farm Bureau had come short of - extension educational activities.

Forces contributing to the evolvement of councils

The most important element in the growth of this idea is the farmers. The farmers, through their initiative, organized first around the demonstration movements. In these movements, they laid down a basic philosophy which would govern extension education.

However, there were certain essential infrastructural elements involved which urged on the continuity and functioning of this philosophy. The land-grant colleges with their experiment stations had produced the necessary research results needed for improved agriculture. In addition, personnel from the colleges got involved in farmer education. The business community was very eager to elevate the rural economy that would provide a ready market for their wares, thus actively supported and financed the hiring of agents.

The state and federal legislatures provided the necessary acts and laws to legalize extension work on lines already

worked out. The legislation also made it possible for various appropriations in aid of extension work.

The county councils and delivery system in extension

Effective extension work essentially demands that farmers be at the core of the organization, have control in terms of decision making, be involved practically in the learning experience, and help to sponsor all activities financially for their own interests. This philosophy was the secret of success of the demonstration movement. It enhanced the development of the county agent system leading to the birth and growth of Farm Aid Associations.

The councils are composed of volunteers who are ready to devote their time to seeking the welfare of their counties. Such sacrifice and patriotism is necessary for community development. They do not belong to or represent any party or farm organization, are free from politics and legislative squabbles, and are dissociated from any private business. This freedom to act in the interest of the communities they represent is the first basic positive contribution of the idea of county councils to an effective delivery system.

The councils afford the widest of local representation for county programming procedures. Apart from representation on the council of each township in the county, their minimum term of office of two years, and a maximum of four years affords the council great participation by many people in the county

with varying ideas and interests. This variety of representation also affords diversity in programming and the opportunity to cover basic essential needs of various sectors of the county. Active participation of clientele has been a cornerstone of extension programming. This is basically what the councils afford the county people, both in personnel and in finance.

The council members are not dependent on any particular organization for funds. They have been mandated by the county people to levy taxes, which are used solely for county agricultural education problems. The financial independence of the county councils gives them enough incentive to plan without favoritism, take unbiased decisions, and to deal boldly with every individual or organization or interest within the county on an equal basis. It affords them the opportunity to introduce democratic principles in their decision making process. The members also develop leadership skills for other tasks in the community.

The creation of the councils has also freed the government employees of extension from their discredited fame. They are not dependent on membership numbers of any organization to keep their jobs, neither are their salaries determined by dues solicited from members of any organization. They do not have any obligation to organize any farm organization, edit any papers for any organization, court the favor of any board

members of any organization or even be under any pressure to give selective treatment to any individual based on his membership or non-membership of any group. Most importantly, they now have all their time to devote to the main purpose for which they are paid - agricultural education for all members of the county.

There is a built-in accountability, whereby a balanced sheet of the council's finances is expected to be submitted to the county auditor and published in at least two newspapers. This document holds council members accountable for their use of the people's money.

Organization, structure and functioning of councils

In May 1955, the Farm Aid Law was repealed by the 56th General Assembly, and in its place the County Agricultural Extension Law was enacted. This law established County Agricultural Extension Districts and provided for the organization of an extension council in each district to cooperate with Iowa State University and the United States Department of Agriculture, in conducting educational programs in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H club work in the counties of the state. It also provided for the levy of an annual tax in each extension district for this purpose.

Each County Agricultural Extension District is a corporate body. Each county except Pottawattamie County is a district. Pottawattamie County is divided into two districts.

Presently, according to an amendment to the 1955 law passed by the 59th General Assembly, two or more districts are allowed to be consolidated. In each district is formed a County Agricultural Extension Council, composed of one elected resident member from each township in the district.

At their first meeting in January of each year, the councils elect a chairman, a vice-chairman, a secretary, and a treasurer from their membership to serve for one year. The councils serve as agencies of the state to manage and transact all the business and affairs of their districts. These councils have also entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Extension Service setting forth the cooperative relationship between each district and the Extension Service. They employ all necessary extension professional personnel and other personnel in accordance with the memorandum of understanding with the State Cooperative Extension Service. They prepare an annual budget and certify the same to the county board of supervisors. The councils prepare and adopt an educational program on extension work in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H club work, carry it out, and review the program in accordance with the memorandum of understanding with the State Cooperative Extension Service. Accordingly, the councils establish a county agricultural extension education fund and prescribe the method of drawing such funds from the county treasurer.

To guide the councils in the performance of their duties, the law makes it clear that the sole purpose of the councils is to supervise the dissemination of information, the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations on subjects relating to agriculture, home economics and rural and community life, and encouraging the application of the same by all people in the district. Members of the councils are not to engage in commercial or business activities, legislative programs, nor attempt to influence legislation as representatives of the councils. It is also emphasized that preferred services shall not be given to any individual, group, organization, or private agency. However, they are to cooperate with every individual, group or organization, but not promote or sponsor or engage in the organization of any groups for any purpose except the promoting, organization and development of the programs of 4-H clubs. No member of the council is compensated or reimbursed for expenses incurred. Also, a member could be reelected to serve another year. No member, who has been elected for a two-year term, shall be eligible for election for more than one successive two-year term.

Members of councils meet annually and at times necessary for them. They fix dates and times for township election meetings, and designate two resident qualified voters in each town to supervise elections. Finally, the councils are to publish a balance sheet for the year's activities in two

circulating newspapers of their districts and file the sheet with the respective county auditor. The councils are to function in the interest of the community, concentrating on community problems.

Further improvements in the councils

As of now the councils are only concerned with supervising extension educational activities. However, the audience of extension has expanded, within its area of concentration. Extension is no more limited to rural people and their farm problems, but includes community resource management, urban disadvantaged and their many physical, social, and psychological problems, and public policy. Thus, township representation alone may not be adequate. Special interest areas need to be represented on the council.

A function that was being performed by Farm Bureau was its involvement in legislation. There is no doubt that the Farm Bureau went too far with this legislative involvement. The Councils have, therefore, been barred from politics in general. The emerging farm crisis is a case of grave consequences calling for greater involvement of county councils.

Norman Borlag, an Iowan and a Nobel Prize winner for his work in developing the "Green Revolution," in an interview with the Des Moines Register (April 26, 1985) warned that

... the lack of interest among Americans over the financial plight of farmers and the tax and fiscal policies of the government eventually would result in the same social unrest that spawned revolutions in Latin America (p. 1).

This allegation of "lack of interest among Americans" cannot logically be extended to include the Extension Councils. The councils are divorced from politics by legislation. Their activities are, therefore, limited to devising strategies to help farmers cope with their situations. Such programs include stress management and effective means of dealing with creditors. In his interview, Borlag further stated that

... the US was headed either toward a 'landed aristocracy' or a 'corporate aristocracy' in which the land now owned by independent farmers eventually would be bought up and operated by relatively few wealthy individuals or companies I hope our political and education leaders are smart enough to look far enough ahead. Our short-term programs now don't touch on the issue of who will control production (p. 1 & 6A).

If the politicians and educational leaders are to look ahead, then the Extension Councils too must start broadening their horizons to save the farming people.

The farm crisis has ushered in a new era; farmers are selling their land, federal help is not forthcoming, corporate business is buying land, banks are reclaiming land and welfare and food stamp lines are getting longer. What all this means is that:

1. Farmers will soon become farm-hands on their own land.

2. The number of farmers living on their land are getting fewer.
3. Extension audiences are diminishing.
4. Corporate business is gradually swallowing up agriculture.
5. The farmer is losing his identity, since "farm owners" will actually be "banks," "corporate business" and the city dweller, the absentee farmer.

What all this means for the extension council is for the council to start breaking new grounds: to fight to retain its audience.

This path is really difficult to predict. However, one thing is certain: not to indulge in the kind of political activities Farm Bureau was engaged in, but a new kind of involvement. Whether this will involve fundamental structural changes or philosophical changes of the councils is something that the emerging changes in the farm situation will dictate. One thing is clear, the close of the 20th century is bringing forward new problems for the council.

Grounded Theory

Historical science basically seeks explanation for past events. These events normally follow a certain critical social process, not necessarily clear by casual observation. However, by careful examination and applying certain techniques of theory building it soon becomes clear that a

pattern can be traced. Grounded theory methods are just one of such means available.

In this section, therefore, the essential components of a theoretical position derived from the narration will be carefully synthesized. This synthesis aims at evolving a theoretical statement, substantive or formal, which would give general guidance to understanding and interpreting similar historical developments.

The building blocks of grounded theory are categories and properties. In deriving these components, four comparative cases were delineated and studied. They are:

1. The development and growth of the Demonstrations Movement.
2. The development and growth of the Farm Bureau and its relation to the Extension Service, particularly in Iowa.
3. The separation of Farm Bureau from Extension Services.
4. The creation of County Agricultural Extension Councils.

The categories and properties derived from these case studies will be summarized below. In addition, the conjectures formulated from these categories and properties will be examined and synthesized into a theoretical statement.

Categories and properties

1. Social urgency. This refers to problems identified by a community requiring immediate attention by all members of the community in order to ensure progress. The properties of this category include:

- (a) Widespread poverty - the impoverization of the community; especially the farming community.
 - (b) Non-scientific farming practices in the era before the demonstration movement.
 - (c) Natural calamities, manifested in the cotton boll weevil disaster.
 - (d) Unorganized farming people. This refers to the lack of a coherent farmers organization to handle the major problems of the day collectively.
2. Social intervention. This category concerns processes initiated by groups, institutions and even individuals within the community to address the issues and problems shared by all members of the community. It is an ongoing process occurring over a period of time through a sequence of activities and events. Its properties are:
- (a) Meetings - these include formal and informal discussions focusing on issues and needs of the community.
 - (b) Creating groups - this aspect involves conscious attempts to rally members of the community around specific issues, and to seek formation of organizations for purposes of solving community problems.
 - (c) Leadership training - this involves deliberate and planned efforts to educate or facilitate educational growth in individuals for purposes of providing

necessary services to the community. Such training could include upgrading knowledge and skills and organizational abilities.

- (d) Facilitating and supporting community organization. This is the process of initiating and sustaining community enthusiasm in getting involved in community activities collectively.
 - (e) Technical assistance - this includes the provision of research information and training in the use of improved scientific practices.
 - (f) Citizen initiative - this involves the voluntary and genuine efforts by individuals to evolve strategies and programs to solve their problems.
 - (g) Committee formation - it involves the process of seeking concentrated deliberation of an issue or an aspect of an issue by selected community members.
3. Social action. This third category refers to ultimate implementation of a strategy or planned course of activities to ensure the achievement of desired goals. Such activities must be shared by the members of the community over time, and moving the community toward its objectives. Social action is a process as well as a product. The properties of this category are:
- (a) Individual and collectively responsibility. This involves the readiness and sacrifices of individuals

and groups to be accountable for their actions, both overt and covert and including risks involved.

- (b) Shared investments. This is the genuine commitment of one's resources, material or in kind, to the pursuit of a desired goal.
 - (c) Community ownership. This is the genuine feeling of belonging to a community and the active acceptance and sharing in community problems, solutions and consequences.
 - (d) Partnership. This is the shared agreement between parties involved in seeking solutions to community problems.
 - (e) County agent work. This is the product of social action. It is an institutional function that evolved and developed as a result of the activities initiated to solve community educational issues.
4. Social reaction. This is the critical examination of activities, plans, programs and accomplishments in the light of desired conditions. It is the self-criticism process, extremely essential to ensure continuous growth. In this study the properties are:
- (a) Community surveys. These are structured, unstructured and even casual evaluations undertaken by community members to determine their progress toward set targets.

- (b) Community concern. This is the interest shown in community activities, expressed in any form possible by members of the community. It is an essential ingredient for programming self-corrective measures in community problem-solving situations.
 - (c) Will and enthusiasm. The courage and preparedness to embark upon difficult tasks and to continue to strive for excellence is equally necessary for community success. This will must be self-sustaining and self-motivating.
5. Social evolution. It is the continuous process of growth in the effort to sustain success and excellence. The properties are:
- (a) Organizational restructuring. This refers to the constant examination and reexamination of procedural matters that affect decision making for purposes of reconstituting decision making and problem-solving bodies.
 - (b) Community leadership. This entails the involvement of practically every individual in community decision-making, and active participation in community affairs. This quality sustains interest in community affairs, and also strengthens the self-motivating spirit of individuals in the community.

- (c) Strengthening cooperative relationships. This describes the mutuality of relationships in which interdependence benefits all parties involved in community activities.
- (d) Institutionalization. This is the system of making an activity or agency a permanent aspect of a community structure; normally by legalizing its continued existence as a part of the community's organizational structure.
- (e) Expansion and integration. This is the process of spreading-out the base of an organization; increasing membership and area-wide organization, and also seeking coordination of various units of the organization. This involves soliciting membership, establishing county and state branches and the final federation of these units.
- (f) Specialization: This is the creation of special departments, committees, bureaus or even agencies within an organization to handle special or specific responsibilities. Efficiency and continuity are best served by this effort.
- (g) Community responsibility. It refers to all efforts, including financial and moral contributions toward sustaining and maintaining the organization. It

ensures commitment and enthusiastic participation in community affairs.

(h) Growth incentives and public relations. This covers all activities designed to maintain a high degree of community involvement.

6. Contradictions. This particular category refers to those processes which create conflict within an organization. Consciously or not, when stated objectives and means of attaining such objectives are not reflected in actual practice, these conflicts stagnate or even retard growth if not solved. On the other hand, solving these conflicts propels the organization towards greater achievements.

The properties of this category are:

(a) Competition. This is when various sectors of the community enter into a competitive relationship, instead of mutual cooperation as a major objective.

(b) Biased policy. This attribute refers to relationships that favor certain groups and individuals while denying other basic opportunities of service. Such practices are contrary to the guiding principles of a public organization.

(c) Deviations. This concerns the alleged involvement in other enterprises and activities that are previously not agreed upon.

7. Disintegration. This refers to the breaking up of a previous relationship between cooperating parties exemplified by the divorce between farm bureaus and extension. Its properties include:
- (a) General orders like those directives coming from the Secretary of Agriculture Benson.
 - (b) Legislative action. This refers to legal backing of a decisive separation of extension from farm bureaus.
8. New order. This refers to the birth of a new type of organization out of the ruins of the old relationship that existed. Its properties are:
- (a) Restructuring of the sponsoring organization, eliminating the inconveniences that hindered the smooth conduct of farmers' education.
 - (b) Legislative backing to ensure stability and continuity.

An examination of the above listed categories and properties resulted in the formulation of a number of conjectures. The conjectures are the hypotheses that are derived from the categories and properties.

Conjectures

1. If social conditions become deplorable, thus creating an awareness in a community of its inadequacies, then the individuals, groups, institutions and agencies within the

community will be prompted to do something about the situation.

2. If community issues are comprehensively appraised, and a spirit of preparedness and interest is generated for purposes of sharing concerns of the community, then a process of organizing, seeking out, and agitating for concerted and sustained effort to solve community problems will evolve.
3. If individuals or groups in a community identify their common concerns and set out to seek help from an outside agency or institution, then the chances of working out a cooperative relationship for the solution of community problems becomes more feasible.
4. If coordination involves facilitative interdependence which permits two or more organizations to simultaneously maximize their goals, then the attainment of desired goals will become more meaningful and real.
5. If investments (i.e., money, land, time and services) and responsibilities are shared by all members of a community for the purposes of evolving and adopting a strategy of social action, then the foundations for continuity will be effectively enhanced.
6. If continuity in any social action program is ensured, then the ultimate product will be the institutionalization of the social action process.

7. If individuals and institutions deliberately and consciously undertake evaluative inquiries of social processes in a community, then better and improved decisions may be made.
8. If all institutions and groups in a community realize the interdependence of their existence, then the chances of cooperation between such groups and institutions for effective social growth are increased.
9. If community agencies, institutions and individuals are ready to cooperate in terms of resources and commitment to community affairs, then community stagnation and degeneration can be avoided and a way paved for continued progress and growth.
10. If community leaders will work with reference to public opinion and in cooperation with legislators, then viable institutions can be created with the necessary legal backing to enhance effective functioning.
11. If legal cooperation can be enhanced for the support of local initiative then genuine local creativity, support, enthusiasm and a spirit of volunteering can be effectively harnessed to aid progress, stability and continuity in community growth processes.
12. If an organization is publicly supported, then it must be publicly accessible. Any departure from this guideline will result in disruptive consequences.

13. If an organization designed purposely to support education expands into other pursuits, then it will be led into serious contradictions in functions.
14. If contradictions in functions are adequately and clearly identified, then the chances of resolving them and working out new directions for progress are increased.
15. If a public organization, supported especially by public funds for purposes of providing educational services and claiming the status of a non-profit organization, ventures into private business, then disruptive consequences will evolve in the functioning of the organization. Some of such disruptive consequences would include:
 - (a) The stated primary objective of the organization will be subjected to critical scrutiny by the clientele or the public.
 - (b) Distrust of officials of the organization, and a search for the hidden agenda of the organization will preoccupy the clientele at the expense of the growth and progress of the organization to provide necessary services.
 - (c) The question of accountability will take on a broader scope, requiring either reorganization to cope with the expanded nature of the organization, or a total collapse of the organization.

- (d) Competition with the private sector will consume the primary objective of the public organization and its services will be easily side-stepped and even completely forgotten to the total detriment of the whole community.
 - (e) Finally, allegiances will develop within the organization, resulting in divisions in the organization according to who is gaining or not gaining from the new concerns.
16. If an organization, during its growth and development embraces other objectives, whose attainment may introduce conflict into the practical implementation and achievement of initial objectives then an evaluation of the whole organization becomes necessary. Such an evaluation may result in structural changes that will ensure stability and avoid deviations. The chances of such a reexamination are greater with public organizations serving the interest of the public, supported financially by the public, and with a legal backing. Such a conscious evaluation of the organization could have a number of positive results:
- (a) Deviations will be identified and dealt with accordingly.
 - (b) Structural changes will be effected to guard against future malfunctions.

- (c) Legal authority will be broadened to sustain the primary objective of the organization.
- (d) A process involving the principle of self-correction will be set into progress. This principle will ensure effective action against future deviations, and also inject dynamism into the functioning of the organization. This dynamism is the essential ingredient for evolution in social action.

These conjectures will be synthesized into a theoretical statement below.

Synthesis of conjectures

Individuals in society are always seeking opportunities to improve their lot. Economic realities, to a large extent, mold the social life of the individuals constituting a community. In other words the traditional and indigenous methods of obtaining and sustaining a livelihood are the basis of social interaction and organization.

In this milieu of economic struggles certain objective situations arise, confronting the community. These situations sometimes threaten the existence of that community and are often aggravated by certain natural and/or man made calamities like drought, epidemics, wars, etc. At this juncture, society reacts. This results in social action.

Social action is a dynamic process. Contradictions develop within the social action. These contradictions develop for a number of reasons.

- (a) The mode of operation becomes obsolete with time.
- (b) The intrinsic benefits accumulating from the mode of operation of the social action outgrow the confines of the organizational pattern of the social system. New outlets become necessary to express fully the urgencies of the new situation.
- (c) The need for a higher level of social action becomes urgent, expressing itself in the inability of the present system to contain and control activities and processes operative in the social system.

As a direct consequence of these contradictions a new system evolves, erupting from the old system. This new form of social action will retain most of the positive aspects of the old order, discard the negative parts and incorporate new ideas and modes of operation.

In summary, the theory arrived at is this: Social movements or organizations, for whatever purpose, are conditioned by perceptions of community members. These perceptions include both the urgency of the situation needing attention, and the remedy thought necessary. However, as organizations develop they learn to grow; they learn how to define what they need and what their direction and goals are.

Additionally this development is constantly being fed and redefined as times and conditions change.

Implications for Extension in Ghana

Agricultural Extension System in Ghana was created by the British Colonial System. The main objective was to organize production of raw materials to feed European industries. To maximize production of agricultural raw materials the British Colonial masters stipulated that:

The approach to extension work must be through local leaders who will act as pioneers with new methods and influence their neighbors. In the Colonies, tribal structure has made special organizations less necessary (Lynn, 1949, p. 13).

This approach amounted to an emphasis on the "trickle down effect" concept.

However, to enhance effective transmission of valuable information to the farming community the Colonial Extension System also indicated that Extension workers should

... encourage rural people with common interests to come together under local leadership to form neighborhood groups, community clubs, ... farming clubs, womens clubs, boys and girls clubs, pig and poultry societies, fruit growing associations, spray circles, livestock improvement societies and so on (Lynn, 1949, p. 13).

These groupings in fact, did develop in addition to the numerous cultural and social organizations in the rural communities. The leaders of these groups were the targets of extension education, and no special effort was made to involve

them in determining program objectives. The groups were recipients of information.

Since the independence of Ghana in 1957, the emphasis has gradually shifted from the trickle down effect concept to one of more involvement by local people in determining extension programs. Such efforts have aimed at creating more permanent special organizations of farmers and rural people for extension purposes. With increasing agricultural aid programs from the United States (and its accompanying influences) and the training of more extension personnel in the United States, the need and feasibility of creating farmers organizations to actively participate in extension activities is receiving serious attention. Thus, the concept of District Program Planning Committees (the equivalent of County Agricultural Extension Councils in Iowa) is being introduced into extension organization in Ghana.

For a meaningful adoption of this idea, the Iowa experience as narrated in this study, reveals significant features deserving serious attention. The lessons for Ghana will, therefore, be examined.

The role of farmer organizations for agricultural education in the development of the Cooperative Extension Service has been very significant in the history of Extension in the United States. In Iowa after a period of the rise of narrow interest groups, like various crop improvement

associations, broad based organizations emerged. Through the tireless initiative of the farmers, farm improvement associations emerged, cutting across specific crop or livestock interests and embracing all farmers in the county. These developments were energized by the 1913 Act, legalizing Farm Improvement Associations. This was a great milestone, not only for the recognition of these associations by law, but further institutionalized county appropriations to these organizations for extension purposes. As revealed by the study, it was these associations that assumed the name of Farm Bureaus. The separation of Farm Bureaus from the Extension Service did not create a vacuum. With the experience gained, and the lessons pointing to the beneficial effects of Extension's working relation with and through a sponsoring organization of local people, the County Agricultural Extension Councils were established. These councils are backed by legislation, with special county appropriations in addition to state and federal funds.

Will Ghana have to wait for farmers to go through this process of forming Crop Improvement Associations which will also develop into county councils? Maybe not! However, as the colonial extension policy started, village groups have emerged. Extension agents are still working informally with these groups, particularly with the leaders. What is needed now is the proper legislation to formalize district

organization of farmers for extension purposes. With this legal status, various Local District Councils (the equivalent of County Governments in Iowa) can then also legally contribute financially to Extension work.

The legislative backing will not only ensure continuity but it will also invest authority in the hands of local people to determine program objectives. Local funds will also help expand education programs in extension in addition to funds provided by National Government, and will create enthusiasm for extension programs as part of the plans and products of the local people.

Legislative backing is only one aspect. The details of the organizational structure of these councils in Iowa have been worked out in compliance with the democratic ideal. Each township in the county is represented on the council. Township representatives are duly nominated and elected by popular vote.

The concept of election of local leaders is not a popular ideal in Ghana. Local chiefs and elders ascriptively take office. They are replaced after death; and their successors are hand picked by the council of elders. Should the extension councils also be created in this tradition? Such councils in Ghana will definitely have to assume a different character than the traditional system. One major role the councils will perform is the opportunity for the involvement

of as many local people as possible in Extension activities. This will afford a training forum for local leadership, and also ensure variety of expertise and talents in programming district extension educational programs. The democratic ideal, the basic foundation on which extension councils have been founded in Iowa, can only be given expression through universal suffrage.

Thus, in Ghana representation on the councils will have to be on a village basis, popularly elected with specific terms of office. This will ensure that the peoples' own representatives are elected. This will also give the people the opportunity to elect people who will best serve their interests. Most important of all, the people will be satisfied that the councils are their own creation; and, therefore, enhance the necessary loyalty and cooperation needed for the functioning of the councils.

In Iowa, council members receive no compensation for their services. The councils are non-profit organizations and free from any political activities. These criteria ensure that the best of volunteers serve in the councils, putting the interest of the community above all other interests. A sense of genuine commitment to community growth is, therefore, an essential ingredient for council members.

These criteria will be most needed in Ghana for the stabilization of council operations. Like most Third World

countries, political stability is very questionable in Ghana. Change of government, normally by a military coup, comes in Ghana very frequently. These changes are accompanied by changes or even total destruction of institutions and organizations created by previous governments. New organizations are created to serve the political ends of the new government. Volunteerism is observed by political ambitions and thus, self-interest overshadows community values. Thus, for these councils to effectively function in Ghana, the spirit of volunteerism should be encouraged. Political affiliations in the councils must be discouraged, and business interests must be separated from council activities.

One other essential characteristic of the councils in Iowa is that certain powers have been bestowed upon them by legislation to enhance their functioning. They are empowered to levy special taxes for the extension educational programs. They are responsible for budgeting and expanding the extension appropriations in each county according to their programs. This responsibility provides the necessary flexibility for evolving programs from the grassroots. It is also an incentive for council members to create viable programs of greatest benefit for the people.

This basic freedom to budget and expend extension funds in every district in Ghana by the councils is equally significant. Such flexibility will eliminate prescriptiveness

from the national government and further ensure that programs are planned within an affordable budget. It will also help council members to plan programs that are based on priorities, and thus providing for community growth.

Finally, the Iowa situation provides a built in accountability process, whereby a balance sheet of the councils is presented to the public. It is a condition which enables the public to be informed of the programs of the councils, the use of their funds and the accomplishments of the councils. It gives the public a chance to evaluate the performance of the councils and to decide on the retention or replacement of council members for the next term of office. Most importantly, it serves as a basic reminder to councils to make responsible decisions and expend the peoples' funds judiciously.

The fundamental issue that crops up with the political instability in Third World situations like Ghana is the inability to create systems with built in accountability. Thus, local sponsorship of programs becomes very difficult to solicit, since the people normally are not informed of the use of their funds. The absence of accountability gradually builds up corruption among elected officials; makes the people apathetic, and ultimately alienates the people from institutions which are created for their growth. The viability and continuity needed for effective functioning is

thus disrupted, local enthusiasm is killed and community ideals abandoned halfway. This built-in-accountability must be a cornerstone in the adoption of Extension Councils in Ghana. The national newspapers, community or village general meetings are some of the sources available for reporting the accomplishments of councils in Ghana.

In conclusion, the theoretical position arrived at from this study should be a guiding principle for creating extension councils in Ghana. That is, organizations do not come to perfection instantly. They grow and learn to grow, learn new directions and deal with emerging issues as part of their growth processes. Ghana, therefore, needs a start. The problems and remedies for the problems will then be worked out with time. Once the necessary structure has been created, the first step in the journey has been taken.

In this connection a few cardinal principles learned from the Iowa experience deserve emphasis for the Ghanaian situation.

1. County extension councils should be made up essentially of farmers and managed by farmers. Urban people may be members, but should not be officers and should not seek to control its policy or interfere in the execution of its plans.
2. The councils must have a serious purpose, a well-developed plan, and an active part in the execution of the projects

undertaken by the county agent. It must stand for organized self-help.

3. The councils should be organized substantially independent of the county agent. The agent can give as much technical advice and assistance as possible, in terms of facilitating the formation of the councils. However, his influence regarding who should or should not be a council member must be completely eliminated.
4. Public organizations, created for educational purposes and supported by tax funds should be clear from politics, business interest and discriminatory practices of any kind.
5. Effective appraisal of the progress of a public organization should be done constantly. This is the means of sustaining dynamism in the functioning of the organization. It will also ensure that the practice of the organization does not conflict with its primary objective.
6. Accountability of public organizations is essential for continuity and public support. It will ensure trust, interest in the organization and active participation in the organizations' functions.
7. Finally, legislative backing is an indispensable ingredient for institutionalizing public organizations. Guidelines can thus be effectively worked out, reviewed as time goes by, and the necessary powers necessary for the

effective functioning of the organization can be guaranteed.

Further Research

This study to a very large extent is exploratory. It is hoped that various areas for further study have been illuminated, a few of which will be enumerated below.

1. As can be realized from this study, four historical epochs have been delineated, each being expressed by specific developments, viz
 - a. The Demonstration Movement,
 - b. The Farm Bureau-Extension Ties,
 - c. The Farm Bureau-Extension Separation, and
 - d. The era of the County Agricultural Extension Councils.Each of these issues can be examined historically for an in depth interpretation of events of the epoch.
2. The present organizational and administrative structures of third world Extension need a more comprehensive appraisal for the introduction of innovative ideas into their functioning. Such studies undoubtedly should be on a comparative basis, for example the Ghanaian situation as compared to the U.S. Cooperative System. The secrets of success and/or failures will be brought to light, and areas of adaptations can be isolated and worked on.
3. The concept of Grounded Theory methods, when applied to such comparative studies, as mentioned above, will

contribute not only to theory development in Adult and Extension Education, but will also throw light on fundamental assumptions yet uncovered that are operative in Third World situations. These discoveries will enhance the development of substantive theories specifically for unique situations in Third World situations. Foreign Aid to Extension Services will then start having a meaningful starting point on which to grow and effect desired changes.

4. The growing farm crisis in the United States opens a new chapter for the history of Extension Councils. It is evidently unthinkable that Extension Councils will remain stagnant at their routine technical duties. The political system is now widely opened, inviting Extension councils to participate. Specific studies will therefore be needed to give direction to such participation.
5. A question needs to be asked concerning the desirability, mode of operation and actual effectiveness of Extension Councils in present day political and economic situation of the country. This will entail a study of every structural unit of Extension Services in relation to Extension Councils against the background of fundamental national issues, so as to determine contradictions, and therefore identify forces of progress that can be harnessed for further development of Extension Education.

This last issue is specifically related to the growing marriage between agricultural and industry; Extension's involvement in policy issues and human resource development; welfare of urban middle class, lower class and the unemployed with their numerous needs; and the growing forceful ejection of farmers from their lands.

6. As indicated earlier, this study is exploratory. A number of conjectures have been postulated. These conjectures could form the basis for in depth studies of various other organizations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Allan Kline, New Head of National Farm Bureau, Punches Straight and Hits Hard." Des Moines Sunday Register, 21 December 1947, p. 6L.
- American Farm Bureau Federation. Official Newsletter, 6 October 1942.
- Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Proceedings of the Fifty-eight Annual Convention. October 24-26, 1944.
- Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Proceedings of the Sixty-second annual Convention. November 9-11, 1948.
- Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Proceedings of the Thirty-sixth Annual Convention. November 21-23, 1922.
- Bailey, Joseph Cannon. Seaman A. Knapp: Schoolmaster of American Agriculture. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.
- Baker, Gladys. The County Agent. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Benedict, Murray R. Farm Policies of the United States: 1790-1950. New York: Harper and Bros., 1953.
- Bliss, Ralph K. History of Cooperative Agriculture and Home Economics: Extension in Iowa - The First Fifty Years. Ames: Iowa State University, 1960.
- Bliss, R. K.; Symons, T. B.; Wilson, M. L.; Gallup, Gladys; Reese, Madge J. (eds). The Spirit and Philosophy of Extension Work. Washington, D. C.: Epsilon Sigma Phi, 1952.
- Block, William J. The Separation of the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service: Political Issues in a Federal System. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960.
- Borg, Walter R.; and Gall, Meredith Damien. Educational Research: An Introduction (4th ed). New York: Longman Inc., 1983.

- Brenckman, Fred. "Shall Government Funds be Used to Build Organization Membership?" The National Grange Monthly, July 1939a, pp. 3, 6.
- Brenckman, Fred. "A Thorough Investigation is Needed." The National Grange Monthly, August 1939b, p. 5.
- Brigham, Johnson. Iowa, Its History and Its Foremost Citizens. Vol. 1. Chicago: S. J. Clark Publishing Co., 1916.
- Brunner, Edmund de S.; and Yang E. Hsin Pao. Rural America and the Extension Service: A History and Critique of the Cooperative Agricultural and Home Economics Extension Service. New York: Columbia University, 1949.
- Burritt, M. C. The County Agent and the Farm Bureau. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922.
- Buttrick, Wallace. "The Farm Demonstration Work of Seaman A. Knapp." Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 30, 1913.
- Carlson, Robert A. "Humanistic Historical Research." In Changing Approaches to Studying Adult Education, pp. 41-49. Edited by William S. Griffith and Howard Y. McClusky. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.
- Carr, E. H. What is History? New York: Knopf, 1965.
- Cedar Rapids Gazette, 20 April 1948.
- Clifton, C. C. "Vote a Tax by Counties for Extension Aid: Would Replace Help of Farm Bureau." Des Moines Register, 13 April 1955, p. 7.
- Cohen, Stanley. "BART makes tracks to the future." Consulting Engineer, January 1972.
- Cook, Louis, Jr. "Iowa Farm Bureau A Powerful Force in Politics and Business: Public Funds Used for Agricultural Activities of Federation." Des Moines Sunday Register, 15 May 1949, pp. 1, 20.
- Crom, Robert L. "Background of ... Cooperative Extension Work in Iowa and Provisions of the County Agricultural Extension Law." Ames: Cooperative Extension Service, March 1984. (Pamphlet).
- Dahl, Robert A. Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an America City. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

- Darkenwald, Gordon G. "Field Research and Grounded Theory." In Changing Approaches to Studying Adult Education, pp. 63-77. Edited by William S. Griffith and Howard Y. McClusky. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.
- Davidson, J. Brownlee; Hamlin, Herbert M.; and Taff, Paul C. A Study of the Extension Service in Agriculture and Home Economics in Iowa. Ames: Collegiate Press, Inc., 1933.
- Davie, Lynn E. "Community Development in the Cooperative Extension Service." Journal of the Community Development Society 14, No. 2 (1983): 95-106.
- Davis, John W. Land-Grant Colleges for Negroes. Series 21, No. 5. West Virginia State College, 1934.
- Des Moines Register, 23, 24 September; 15 October; 6 November 1943. 13, 15 February 1947. 27 September; 1 October 1948. 25 January; 3 February; 7, 17 April 1949. 1 October; 27 November 1954. 23, 25 January; 22 February; 11, 14, 20 April 1955. 26 April, 1985.
- Eddy, Edward D. Jr. Colleges For Our Land and Time, The Land-Grant Idea in American Education. New York: Harper Brothers, 1957.
- Dye, Thomas. Who's Running America? Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.
- Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames. (Typewritten).
- "Farm Bureau Departs From Political Aloofness." Cedar Rapids Gazette (Iowa) 20 April 1948, p. 6.
- Galbraith, J. K. "The Farm Bureau." Fortune, 27 (June 1944): 156-60, 187-88, 191-92, 194, 196.
- General Education Board: An Account of Its Activities, 1902-1914. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1915. (Pamphlet).
- Gilbertson, H. W. "Extension-Farm Bureau Relations - 1947." Washington, D.C., 1948. (Mimeographed).
- Glaser, B. G.; and Strauss, A. L. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. New York: Aldine Publishing Company, 1980.

- Groves, D. B.; and Thatcher, Kenneth. The First Fifty: History of Farm Bureau in Iowa. Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphic Publishing Company, Inc., 1984.
- Hardin, Charles M. Freedom in Agricultural Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Hardin, Charles M. The Politics of Agriculture. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952.
- Hill, E. Howard. Letter to County Farm Bureau Presidents, November 29, 1954. (Typewritten copy in Extension Permanent Files in Curtiss Hall, Ames).
- Honan, Joseph C. "The National Farmers' Organization: A Study of Agricultural Protest." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Missouri, June 1966.
- "Howard Hill Cites the Record on Close Farm Bureau-Extension Cooperation." Iowa Farm and Home Register, 7 November 1948, p. 31-H.
- Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman, 11 December 1954; 15,22 January 1955.
- Iowa Department of Agriculture. "Law Relating to Farm Aid Associations as Set out in Chap 138 of the Code, 1927. Forty-third General Assembly." (Typewritten copy in Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall, Ames).
- Iowa State Agricultural Society. "Fourth Annual Report, 1857." Iowa State Agricultural Society, Des Moines, Iowa, 1858.
- "Iowa Nobel Prize Winner Foresees US Farm Unrest." Des Moines Register, 26 April 1985.
- Iowa State Agricultural Society. "Twenty-first Annual Report, 1874." Iowa State Agricultural Society, Des Moines, Iowa, 1875.
- Iowa State College. Agricultural Extension Department (Agriculture and Home Economics). Annual Report for the Period July 1, 1916 to June 30, 1917. Ames, Iowa.
- Iowa State College, Agricultural Extension Service (Agriculture and Home Economics). "Report of the Supervisory Work, Vol II." Iowa State College, Ames, 1928.

Iowa State College. "Annual Report for the Period 1906-1910."
Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

Iowa State College, Extension Service in Agriculture and Home Economics. Press Release, January 1955. (Typewritten copy from Extension Permanent Files in Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames).

Iowa State College. Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1865-73, Ames, Iowa. (Typewritten in Extension Permanent Files in Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames).

"Joint Recommendations of the Agricultural and Home Economics Extension Service and the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation Relative to County Farm Bureau Finances." December 1, 1951. (Typewritten copy in Extension Permanent Files in Curtiss Hall, Ames).

Kelsey, Lincoln D.; and Hearne, Cannon C. Cooperative Extension Work. 2nd Ed. New York: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1955.

Kile, Orville Merton. The Farm Bureau Movement. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922.

Kile, Orville Merton. The Farm Bureau Through Three Decades. Baltimore, MD: The Waverly Press, 1948.

Knapp, Seaman A. "Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work and Its Results." In Proceedings of the 9th Conference for Education in the South, Richmond, VA, 1906.

Knapp, Seaman A. "Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work in Its Relation to Improvement." In Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry, Circular No. 21, Washington, D. C., 1908.

Knapp, Seaman A. "Recent Foreign Explorations as Bearing on the Agricultural Development of the Southern States." Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry, Bulletin No. 35. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903.

Kramer, Dale. The Truth About The Farm. Falls Church, VA: National Affairs Press, 1950. (Pamphlet).

Leagan, J. P. Elements of Extension Education Process Related to Community Development. New Delhi: Ford Foundation, 1959.

- Lloyd, W. A. "Four Types of Farmers Organizations." US Department of Agriculture, States Relation Service, Circular No. 1, 1915.
- Lloyd, W. A. "Status and Results of County Agricultural Agent Work in the Northern and Western States, 1915." US Department of Agriculture, States Relation Service, Document 32, 1916.
- Lord, Russell. The Agrarian Revival: A Study of Agricultural Extension. New York: George Grady Press, 1939.
- Lynn, C. W. Agricultural Extension and Advisory Work with Special Reference to the Colonies. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1949.
- MacKeracher, Dorothy; Davie, Lynn; and Patterson, Terry. "Community Development: Evaluation and The Shapes Approach." Journal of Community Development Society 7, No. 2 (Fall 1976): 4-17.
- Martin, O. B. The Demonstration Work: Dr. Seaman A. Knapp's Contribution to Civilization. San Antonio, Texas: The Naylor Company, 1941.
- "Memorandum No. 1368." Typewritten copy in Extension Permanent Files, 1954, Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames.
- "Memorandum of Understanding" between Iowa State College, the U.S.D.A. and County Farm Bureau. 1927. (Typewritten copy in Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames).
- Moore, Arthur. The Farmer and the Rest of US. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1945.
- "More Public Aid for Extension." Des Moines Register, 23 January 1955, p. 8.
- Morgan, Barton. A History of the Extension Service of Iowa State College. Ames: Collegiate Press, Inc., 1934.
- National Farmers Union. National Union Farmer, 6 March 1941; 11 December 1944.
- National Farmers Union. Press Release February 20, 1949. (Clipping in Extension Permanent Files in Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames).

National Union Farmer. 1 December 1944; 20 February 1949.

News Handout. Iowa Farmers Union. September 1942.
(Typewritten copy in Extension Permanent Files, Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames).

Newsom, Herschel D. Letter to Secretary Ezra T. Benson.
(Typewritten copy in Extension Permanent Files in Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames).

"Our Representative Speaks." Lowden News (Iowa) 9 February 1949, p. 3.

Pender, J. M. K. Adaptation of Extension to Western Europe. International Studies Centre Series No. 13, Wageningen, The Netherlands, 1954.

Prawl, Warren; Medlin, Roger; and Gross, John. Adult and Continuing Education Through the Cooperative Extension Service. Columbia, Missouri: University Printing Services, 1984.

Ross, Earle D. Democracy's College: The Land-Grant Movement in the Formative Stage. Ames: The Iowa State College Press, 1942.

Russell, J. S. "Iowa to Miss Farm Bureau Extension Aid: Must Reorganize Local Set Ups." Des Moines Register, 26 November 1954, p. 6.

Smith, C. B.; and Wilson, M. C. The Agricultural Extension System of the United States. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1938.

Spade, 4 February 1943; 20 November 1944.

Stong, Benton J. "Rock-Ribbed Farmers" New Republic 120 (28 February 1949): 16-18.

The Nations Agriculture, January 1941; April 1943, May 1947.

Tolley, Howard R. The Farmer Citizen at War. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943.

True, Alfred Charles. A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States: 1785-1923. Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1928.

"Unscramble Farm Bureau-Extension." Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead, 18 December 1954, p. 9.

United States Code 22 (1952 ed).

- U.S. Congress, House Committee on Agriculture. Granger Bill. H.R. 3222 and H.R. 8676: Hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture. 81st Cong. 1st Sess., 1949.
- U.S. Congress, House Committee on Agriculture. Long Range Agricultural Policy: Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture. 80th Cong. 1st Sess., 1947.
- U.S. Congress, House Committee on Agriculture. Meat Parker Legislation: Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture. 66th Cong. 2nd Sess., 1920.
- U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations. Department of Agriculture Appropriations: Hearings on Agricultural Department Appropriations Bill for 1942 Before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. 77th Cong. 1st Sess., 1941.
- U.S. Congress, House Committee on Banking and Currency. Farm Organizations: Hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency. 67th Cong. 1st Sess., 1921.
- U.S. Congress, House and Senate. Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Hearings before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. 77th Cong. 1st and 2nd. Sess., 1942.
- U.S. Congress, Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Hearings on H.R. 2481 Agricultural Department Appropriations Bill for 1944 Before the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. 78th Cong. 1st Sess., 1943.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture and Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Joint Committee Report on Extension Programs, Policies and Goals. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1948.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service. Extension Service Review, June 1941, p. 92.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service. Extension Service Review, October 1940, p. 133.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. Federal Legislation, Regulations, and Rulings Affecting Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics. Miscellaneous Publication No. 285, Washington, D.C., 1946, pp 25-26.

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary.
"Memorandum No. 1368." 24 November 1954.
(Mimeographed).
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. "Questions and Answers
Relative to Secretary's Memorandum No. 1368." January 5,
1955. (Mimeographed).
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. Yearbook of Agriculture.
Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. Yearbook of Agriculture.
Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903.
- U.S. Statutes at Large. Vol. 38, 1914.
- U.S. Statutes, 387, 1862; 503, 1962.
- Van Dalen, J. E.; and Meyer, W. J. Understanding Educational
Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Vines, C. Austin; and Anderson, Marvin A. (eds). Heritage
Horizons: Extensions Commitment to People. Madison,
Wisconsin: Extension Journal, Inc., 1976.
- Voorhees, E. B. "The Attitude of the Agricultural Colleges
Toward University Extension." Association of American
Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations
Proceedings 8 (1894): 49-50.
- Wallaces Farmer and Iowa Homestead, 7 November 1948, p. 6.
- Weeks, D. Richard. "Seaman A. Knapp and Union College." In
Union Worthlies, Number Seven, pp 6-14. New York:
Schenectady Union College Press, 1972.
- Whitt, J. Allen. Urban Elites and Mass Transportation: The
Dialectics of Power. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton
University Press, 1982.
- Wilson, M. L. Circular letter to Directors of Extension.
July 11, 1941. (Typewritten copy in Extension Permanent
Files in Curtiss Hall, Iowa State University, Ames).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all praise to Allah, the Beneficent the Merciful.

All of a sudden I have found myself wanting appropriate words to express myself adequately for my indebtedness to Dr. John Philip Wilson. He served not only as my major academic advisor for this work, but as a mentor and a moral booster (spiritually and materially) during the most difficult periods of this study. May Allah be pleased with him, Amen.

Dr. Roger Lee Lawrence deserved my heart-felt gratitude. This study is his brain child. Dr. Lawrence, thank you for your tireless and invaluable assistance. I wish you a joyous retirement. To Dr. Anton J. Netusil, Jr., who encouraged diversification of research orientation especially into historical studies, I say thank you many fold for your priceless advice and service on my committee. I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the services of Dr. Irene Beavers on my committee. Special thanks also go to Dr. Peter F. Korsching for serving on my committee and rendering such invaluable suggestions and comments.

This study was facilitated by some very special people in Curtiss Hall. To Mr. John W. Johnson, Jr. and Ms. Sue K. Gunkel Kruse and their secretaries, I extend my warmest appreciation for their efforts in making available to me all kinds of books, documents and files.

With a great sense of gratitude, I salute the Ghana Government and the Cocoa Services Division of Ghana for making my studies in the U.S. possible. Specifically, I would like to thank Mrs. J. M. A. Wontumi and Mr. A. A. Gyamfi. May Allah bless Dr. Yakubu Saaka, Mr. Tohma, Ahmad Abdullah, Janet Dampsey (my only consolation), Valerie and Pastor Tom Nesbitt, for their support, love, encouragement, sacrifice, forbearance and understanding which have been a source of gratification throughout my studies in the United States.

Last but not least, my special love and thanks go to Ms. Nancy Qvale for her very patience in plowing through my very terrible handwriting to get this work typed, and to Dr. Charles R. Kniker who, on a very short notice agreed to substitute for Dr. Lawrence on my committee. I am very grateful to Dr. Kniker for his critical review of the study and his valuable suggestions.